

Floral Park

Bellerose
Bellerose Manor
New Hyde Park

BULLETIN

Glen Oaks
Queens Village
Little Neck

Serving the communities of the Cross Island area

Vol. 54 No. 49

9,432 Consecutive Issues
Thursday, July 14, 1994

25¢

Page 2 Thursday, July 14, 1994 FLORAL PARK BULLETIN

Letters To The Editor

To The Editor:

Recent announcements of plans to site group homes and other similar facilities in eastern Queens highlight the need to change the existing process which denies any real opportunity for community members to get their concerns addressed. I had attended numerous public hearings and meetings over the placement of group homes. After attending a meeting on the siting of a group home in Little Neck in 1988, I observed, first hand, how the provisions of Section 41.34 of the State Mental Hygiene Law governing the siting of group homes, needlessly exacerbates community tensions.

Rather, the process should serve to mitigate community concerns.

My proposal would improve the opportunity for input and review and to provide accountability in the siting of state-licensed group homes, also known as community residences. As a neighborhood activist and as an attorney with extensive experience in government at both the state and city levels, I propose that the state law be amended to require that the state agency which licenses the proposed facility in a community, rather than a city community board, to 1) notify affected community members; 2) hold a public hearing in the community near the

proposed facility; 3) provide a 60 day comment period following the public hearing; and 4) provide resident the opportunity, presently afforded community board under existing law, to propose alternate sites; and 5) mandate that the community be able to present arguments of over-saturation but, unlike the current law, consider the existence of all types of community facilities which may impact a neighborhood.

My plan would stop the practice that pits neighbor against neighbor. The existing procedure has the unintended affect of putting neighborhood residents who serve on a community board in the position of

approving a group home near many of their neighbors.

Existing law gives local community boards very little ability to say yes or no. Presently, a community board can either approve the site recommended by the agency sponsoring, for example, a group home, suggest one or more alternate sites, or object 1) based on the over-saturation of the community board (not the community within the board) with community residences or facilities or 2) based on the over-saturation of the same kind of group homes in the area in proximity to the proposed facility.

As a result, most people come away from the community board public hearing with the sense that the decision was really made

before the hearing started. My more preferable approach stops that sham hearing and substitutes a real hearing that solves problems, not makes them worse.

My more sensible approach affords a facility's sponsoring agency ample time to schedule meetings and informal gatherings with community leaders, concerned residents and local officials. In this manner, community concerns can be addressed, perhaps in a series of smaller groupings. Agencies could reach out to communities in an atmosphere less threatening to the community. This contrasts with the large turnouts and accompanying outcry against facilities, such as group homes, at community board hearings. Too often, this engenders so much distrust that the community and the sponsoring agency start even farther apart once a facility is established.

Unlike the lengthy reviews mandated under the City's Uniform Land Use Review

Procedure (ULURP), Section 41.34 provides only 40 day for a community board to 1) schedule a hearing with adequate mail and newspaper notices, 2) look at any alternate sites, and 3) make its decision.

In contrast the to state process for review of group homes, the City review process affords a community board 60 days to hold a hearing and pass its decision on to the City Planning Commission and the City Council. The Borough President can also hold a hearing and make its recommendation to City Planning and the council. In addition, a community board can receive early - informal - notice that an application is being initiated under the City review process. This present an early opportunity to look at a proposal as needed.

A fair opportunity for community review should facilitate a dialogue among the parties. Under the current state law, heated hearings remain the rule
(Please turn to page 3)

Letters To The Editor

(Continued from page 2)

rather than the exception. Residents complain that the sponsoring agency overpays for the property, the site is unsuitable for the proposed use and there are concerns presented by some characteristic of some of the possible residents of the proposed facility.

Under my proposal, the licensing state agency commissioner's designee would review the site based on the testimony presented, including presentations on saturation and alternate sites, and make a presentation to the commissioner.

My proposal also gives residents to an opportunity to simply say yes or no.

In addition, I recommended a prohibition on the acquisition of any proposed site at a cost greater than the market value of any property based upon its zoned or intended use.

Any process where

tensions become so great and at which unruly proceeding remain the rule, rather than the exception, is but a great sham and merits change. My proposal brings change and, more importantly, offers a meaningful process for considering state-licensed facilities proposed for our neighborhoods in residential areas.

Sincerely,
Corey Bearak

*The writer, a Bellerose attorney, serves as counsel and chief of staff to City Councilman Sheldon Lettler and is active in the Eastern Queens Civic Council and on the steering committee of QUEST, the group considering Queens' secession from the city. He is President of the Northeast Queens Jewish Community Council, the Queens County Line Democratic Association and the North Bellerose Civic Association.