

SECTION 5

Section 5 APPENDIX

Introduction

This appendix is intended to provide the user with an expanded set of resource materials and sources for additional information, ideas and contacts to be used in conjunction with the report. It is hoped that this will enable the district to confidently move forward in its efforts to preserve, strengthen and upgrade social, economic and physical resources located throughout the district. One important group is the list of Internet resources which have vastly expanded the capacity of individuals and organizations to become informed and to join in taking action on issues of common interest.

It is hoped that this report will provide a strong basis for neighborhood involvement with the activities of CB12, and that together, they can continue planning, supporting and preserving the many resources, both physical and human that make up Washington Heights and Inwood.

Recommendations, Resources and Resolutions

Observations, questions, or statements of fact that identify or describe a threat to a quality of life are ways to define problems. Thereafter, the challenge is to identify resources; first, to clarify the understanding of the issues involved, and, second, to implement solutions that mitigate or eliminate negative pressure on the ability of residents to sustain themselves and community life.

This summary builds on the project goals as guideposts. The **recommendations** will help turn these goals into objectives and strategies. They draw from a synthesis of demographic research, field observation, a review of previous studies, and extensive public engagement conducted through interviews, questionnaires, and interactive workshops.

Resources such as land and buildings, infrastructure, institutions and businesses are assets for the community. The community board influences public and private investment in these assets through setting priorities. These investments are measured by tangible improvements in community life including the prevention of damage to future generations.

The recommendations in this study provide opportunities for board action in pursuit of resources in two categories: *investment in land* and *investment in people*. They are framed in a way that makes them suitable for incorporation in Board resolutions and recommendations to the various agencies of the City. Eight of these recommendations are seen as having the highest priority. They are classified into two groups: those that refer to land and those that deal with the people of the District.

LAND

- 1) Apply Two-Track Approach to Rezoning
- 2) Identify Resources for Housing Finance
- 3) Energize Historic Preservation Initiatives
- 4) Development of Park & Open Space Resources

PEOPLE

- 1) Legal Services for Tenants
- 2) Development of MoU/CBA Capacity
- 3) Major Small Business Initiatives
- 4) Extensive Education/Cultural Programs

CD 12 Board	Lead "Kick-Off" Agent	Lead Agency-Jurisdiction w/ Partners & Collaborators	Immediate Action	Long Term Interest
Land				
Apply Two-track Zoning Identify Contextual areas for Growth	Land-Use Committee Working Group on Zoning Working Group on Housing	DCP Other CB12-M Committees, Local BIDs and CBO's	Sub-District Zoning Studies beginning with Sherman Creek/Inwood as test area for entire district.	Development of a 2-track zoning system for zoning changes in entire district stimulating: 1) comprehensive preservation and 2) new construction in within a desired development pattern w/ 3) incentives for creating affordable housing and needed services.
Identify Resources for Housing Finance and Production (New Construction and Preservation)	Housing Committee Working Group on Housing	HPD (NYC), HDC, DHCR (NYC) CBO's Housing Intermediaries and Lenders	Plan for Housing Summit	Balanced housing stock.
Energize Historic Preservation Initiatives	Task Force on Hist. Preservation	New CB12 Historic Preservation Committee CB12-M, DCP and LPC Conferencing with CCNY and Columbia University	Selection and implementation of 1 st HD application	Integration with re-zoning initiative
Park/Open Space Development	Parks Committee Working Group on Parks and Rec.	DPR w/NYC Open Space Coalition Metropolitan. Waterfront Alliance NY Restoration Project	Create a Parks Plan for CD12 Dyckman Corridor analysis (as spin off of Sherman Creek zoning evaluation).	Create "Upstate Manhattan" parks/open-space system for CD12
People				
Expanded Services for Tenants	Housing Committee Working Group to Expand Tenant Services	HPD (NYC), DoB CBO's and Local Credit Unions Banks ("Good Repair Clause")	Support for major increase in legal services	Assistance in establishing tenant equity and control
CBA/MoU Evaluation Capacity Development	Working Group on Binding Agreements and Role of CB	New York Lawyers for the Public Interest CB9	Initiate CBA process with NYPH Evaluation of District Authority option	"Binding agreement" policy Develop legal entity and revenue stream
Small Business Initiatives	Economic Dev Committee Working Group on Small Business	DSBS (NYC) WHIDC, Chambers of Commerce	BID conference	Balance small community-owned businesses with national retailers.
Education/Cultural Programs and Services	Econ. Dev and Ed. Committees Working Group on Education and Culture	DCA, Upper Manhattan Empowerment Zone	Target Site/Facility in Development Zones	Integration of Community Facilities with New Development

Goal 1: Identify trends and best-practices for balanced community development

Board Actions:

- R1.1 Deploy a "Fight for Common Ground" Board Resolution Strategy
 - Prepare with Nos Quedamos a resolution that supports the rights of working class families
- R1.2 Require Presentation of the Quality Housing Solution in all new development
 - Request action by DoB and DCP to inform owners and developers of this policy.
- R1.3 Facilitate Binding Agreements
 - Require submission of MoU's on all actions requiring CB (advisory) review.
- R1.4 Develop a Political Will
 - Seek resources for Board training on consensus building processes (15-20K)
- R1.5 Press for Zoning Innovation in Sherman Creek and adjacent areas of Inwood
 - Seek resources for independent review of CEQR of Inwood (30-40K)
- R1.6 Open Dialogue with DCP on rezoning for all of CD12
 - Seek resources to develop 197c strategy for all of CD12 using current proposal as impetus.
- R1.7 Community Benefits Agreement – Initiate Workable Tests
 - Approach NYPH as a willing partner in development of a CBA process (5-10K)
- R1.8 Enhance CB12 Analysis of ULURP and Related Monitoring Activity
 - Develop resource to map all development activity in the district subject to Board review. (5-10K)
- R1.9 Examine Potential for Formation of CD12 as a Public Benefit Corporation
 - Consider alternatives to CB9 CBA Process such as District Authority Charter

Listed in Relative Order of Action over 9-10 months beginning January 2007

Resource Implication: (\$55,000 - \$80,000)

Goal 2: Foster Development & Preservation of Affordable Housing

Board Actions:

- R2.1 Organize "Money for Housing" in CD12: A Summit on How, When and Where
 - Given actions below, sponsor joint land use committee, housing committee and general board summit, co-hosted with area banks city/state agencies and developers...(40-50K)
- R2.2 Support Reforms of Equity Financing Good Repair Clause & Escrow
 - Seek out Housing Here and Now and follow-up w/ NYC Comptroller on findings of lending practices.
- R2.3 Evaluate 421a Reforms for Changes in Affordable Housing Production in CD12
 - Formally support the city council proposal and support elimination of certificate buyouts in favor of mandatory onsite inclusion and/or creation of a dedicated housing trust fund
- R2.4 Reform/Repeal Urstadt Law
 - Annual letter to Governor and State Delegation
- R2.5 Support Tenant Representation in cases of Owner "Opt-Outs" of Sec.8 and other subsidies
 - Call for across the board support for tenants similar to the City Council's Tenant Empowerment Act
- R2.6 Develop Capacity for Tenant Organizing and Expand Education of Tenants' Rights
 - Make funding for tenant organizing a top expense budget category at the District Needs, District Cabinet and Borough Board levels. Align expense and capital budget priorities with recommendations made by local housing organizations and tenant's rights groups.
- R2.7 Implement Sub-District Housing Preservation and Development Plans
 - Seek resources and identify places and partners for closer analysis.
- R2.8 Seek Increased Support for Programs that Prevent Homelessness
 - Develop contacts with DHS regarding services specific to the needs of CD12

- R2.9 Support Intensive Building Inspections
 - Ask all NPP inspectors based in local CBOs for a bi-annual mini-conference and routine updates
- R2.10 Support Development of an "Emergency Rent for Families" Fund
 - Seek CBO conference to discuss rationale of the fund's development and management options
- R2.11 Support Formation of a Dedicated Housing Trust Fund (HTF)
 - Seek participation in policy sessions regarding the structure and purpose of the (HTF)
- R2.12 Support Set Aside Increases in New York State's Use of Tax Credits for Affordable Housing
 - Encourage state and federal representatives to direct surplus of NYS Low-Income Housing preservation dollars to communities such as CD12.

Listed in Relative Order of Action over 9-10 months beginning March 2007

Resource Implication: \$40,000-50,000

Goal 3: Locate Sites/Areas - and Actions - Meeting Community Needs

Board Actions:

- R3.1 Identify Resource to Produce a Community District Needs Progress Report
 - Conduct an evaluation of the District Needs Statement (DNS) process over last five years (5-10K)
- R3.2 Encourage Mixed-used Developments that Incorporate Community Facilities
 - Develop procedures for negotiating community facility development as part of all requests for zoning variances or changes. Develop a list of service providers seeking expansion development space and establish the necessary relationships.
- R3.3 Community Facility Location Priority: Schools and Health Related Services
 - Broker relationships between major commercial, institutional, and housing/real estate developers to provide low-cost space for priority service providers such as a charter schools and childcare centers on a site-by-site basis.
- R3.4 Investigate Impact of Small Business on Local Economy and Effects of Displacement
 - Support high priority funding for programs that assist small businesses and evaluate the impact of their loss on the economy of CD12 (25-30K)
- R3.5 Community Facilities: Pass the Word on 311
 - Seek data from this NYC DoITT system on 311 usage (Invoke Freedom of Information Act if necessary).

Listed in Relative Order of Action over 9-10 months beginning April 2007

Resource Implication: \$30,000 – \$50,000

Goal 4: Preserve and Strengthen District Character and Quality of Life

Board Actions:

- R4.1 "Safeguard against Over-Development"
 - Develop resident constituencies on a neighborhood-by-neighborhood basis with a long-term interest in evaluating contextual zoning choices and historic preservation options.
- R4.2 Target Resources for Cultural and Education Programs
 - Find and direct cultural organizations to funding sources (UMEZ-CIIF, DCA, NYSCA, NEA)
 - Recruit NYC-EDC, other agencies (DCA), CBO's and institutions for Task Force on Audubon Terrace
- R4.3 Target NYS Resources for Environmental Action and Community Planning
 - Build coalitions to apply for NYS Environmental Protection Funds (EPF) and "Quality Communities".
- R4.4 Promote and Develop Community Squares and Plazas, Park Edge and Access Improvements

- Engage DOT and DPR regarding opportunities for public space, traffic calming, plazas, and "green street" programs
 - Engage DCP on rezoning to support open space objectives (25-30K)
- R4.5 Support Neighborhood Preservation Constituency
- Establish "Community Preservation Areas within twelve contextual zones" (See R5 & R6)

Listed in Relative Order of Action over 6-12 months beginning January 2007

Resource Implication: \$25,000 - \$30,000

Goal 5: Locate Buildings/Areas of Special Architectural/Historic Interest

Board Actions:

- R5.1 Engage LPC to Advise on Historic Preservation Initiatives
- Establish a Task Force on Historic Preservation composed of board members, experts and residents charged with identifying historic and cultural resources for submission to LPC (15-25K)
- R5.2 Preservation through Historic District Research and Individual Building Designation
- Task Force will prepare report evaluating the Federal Historic Preservation Tax Incentive Program through NYC-LPC and the National Trust for Historic Preservation and promote use of the Low Income Tax Credit for preservation of all projects potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.
- R5.3 Expand the Use of Scenic View Easement and Scenic Landmarks
- Seek implementation of scenic view easements to all parks such as that enjoyed by Ft. Tryon.
- R5.4 Support Neighborhood Preservation Districts
- Define Historic Preservation and Landmark Designation options within the twelve contextual zoning areas

Listed in Relative Order of Action over 9-10 months beginning April 2007

Resource Implication: \$15,000 - \$25,000

Goal 6: Update Zoning

Board Actions:

- R6.1 Develop a two-track approach to rezoning all of CD12.
- Track one: "growth through development areas" and Track Two "growth through preservation" as outlined in policy Framework for Preservation and Development (75-100K)
- R6.2 Review Zoning Options Area by Area (Sub-District)
- Seek resources to evaluate full impact of Sherman Creek proposal and apply principles to entire district;
 - Include selection of areas for possible mixed-use (MX) and Special District designation with an emphasis on three central business districts (CBDs): Inwood, Bridge and Health. (30-40K)
- R6.3 Implement Sub-District Zoning Initiatives
- Initiate 197c applications seeking contextual zoning solutions in twelve defined areas. (120-150K)

Listed in Relative Order of Action over 18-24 months beginning June 2007

Resource Implication: \$225,000 - \$290,000

RECOMMENDATIONS: TURNING GOALS INTO OBJECTIVES AND STRATEGIES

Effective planning begins with an understanding of the interplay between problems experienced in a community and the resources to define them sufficiently to take or stimulate appropriate action. Problems can begin as observations, questions, or statements of fact that describe a threat to quality of life. Thereafter, the challenge becomes identifying resources, first, to clarify the understanding of the issues involved, and, second, to implement solutions that mitigate or eliminate negative pressure on the ability of residents to sustain themselves and community life.

Recommendations, Resources and Resolutions

The project goals established by the Working Group form the structure around which these recommendations have been made. They draw from a synthesis of demographic research, field observation, a review of previous studies, and extensive public engagement conducted through interviews, questionnaires, and interactive workshops.

The first and primary interest of this study is the needs of residents. To this end, recommendations focus heavily, although not exclusively, on affordable housing preservation and development. Little else is possible without making every effort to provide residents with the opportunity and choice to remain.

The second interest, as expressed by the Working Group, is to provide Board members with a framework for evaluating proposed development activities and policies as they come before them. The advisory power of community boards cover two broad areas 1) land use and 2) the allocation of municipal resources. As a result, the recommendations that follow also touch on education, health, recreation, and economic development. These subjects are less directly connected or impacted by land use, nonetheless, there is a connection, and the report seeks to make the links clearer. One clear link is in setting priorities for the use of city resources of funds and people. Those assigned to one use clearly cannot be used elsewhere. Understanding these linkages helps set priorities, and also provides some guidance in choosing objectives that impact more than one priority at a time.

Resources such as land and buildings, infrastructure, people and businesses make up the assets of a community. The community board influences levels of public and private investment in these assets on a routine basis. Part of this is directing funding to examine existing conditions and to take actions either strengthen the community or that remove or reduce problems.

The recommendations in this study therefore describe the development of resources, in two broad categories: *investment in land* and *investment in people*. From this perspective, there are four priority recommendations in each area.

Through the political process, the community board's priorities are tested against agency priorities through the ongoing expenditure of public funds. This dialogue refines these priorities for investments in capital projects and in programs that provide services directly to people. The community board may also influence private investment, particularly in land, through its review of proposed changes to the zoning law or disposition of city property. Recently, community boards have also flexed their muscles by requiring investment in people through exactions or incentives tied to proposed development.

These go well beyond the the terms of traditional development “as of right”. By action or inaction, a community has the power to influence the marketability of a project.

LAND

- 1) Apply Two-Track Approach to Rezoning
- 2) Identify Resources for Housing Finance
- 3) Energized Historic Preservation Initiative
- 4) Development of Park & Open Space Resources

PEOPLE

- 1) Legal Services for Tenants
- 2) Development of MoU/CBA Capacity
- 3) Major Small Business Initiative
- 4) Extensive Education/Cultural Programs

Investment in Land

A central responsibility of the Community Board is the review of land use changes. Most of the changes in a community occur "as of right" under existing regulations, and do not require the official review of the community. This is because the proposed development follows established procedures meeting a set of standards designed to protect the safety, health, and welfare of the public. Monitoring and enforcement of existing regulations and statutes becomes the central issue for these projects.

On the other hand, projects which require new authorization through changes in the zoning regulation are much more complex, and arguments over the return on investment versus the impact to the community are important to both sides. Unfortunately, communities often are only able to accept or reject proposals. These recommendations are intended to help change the situation so that the community can influence the development process more positively.

CD12 consists of three land environments: the largest is its open space network of parks and waterfront, the next largest is residential with many distinct neighborhoods, and third is commercial and institutions. The New York City Zoning resolution governs each by use and scale with increased sophistication through contextual zoning. A brief description of land investment needs in CD12:

Housing

CD12 is a substantial, residential community with a major proportion of the housing provided in high quality mid-19th century to pre-WWII 20th century structures. It is a place that is "built up". The majority of these buildings are six story walk-up apartment buildings. Through significant periods of challenge, this type of physical environment has established a proven capacity for self-renewal.

Business

Business services and retail goods are provided in three major business districts or clusters linked by Broadway and Saint Nicholas that serve as small business corridors along the community's two subway lines (A, C & 1). Each of these central business districts offers unique opportunities for growth. Consistent and effective pressure on the provision quality design and local monitoring of city services can accomplish a great deal. This report offers a design framework for defining these clusters.

Open Space

Large areas of open space in the form of parks and rivers surround the community. The parkland represents half of the land area of the district and is just eleven acres short of the land area of Central Park. The views to the Harlem and Hudson Rivers are breathtaking and awe inspiring. Increasing interest in both active and passive recreation is adding to the demand for facilities, yet nowhere in the city is access to the waterfront or major open spaces more obstructed. While challenging, expect renewed energy and investment in this area. The report therefore explores the relationship of housing and business centers to this open space/waterfront

network.

Zoning

A change in the zoning law may represent an investment in land by increasing its value based on gross floor area and the principle of “highest and best use”. It may also represent the preservation or protection of existing resources such as a park vista or a row of architecturally distinctive or historic buildings. These laws may arguably alter the value of a property in order to assure a public safeguard. In this regard, the Working Group seeks recommendations that reflect these values with alternatives to the current zoning regulations governing CD12.

Following are Four Priority Recommendations in each of the Land/and People areas of investment. The first group calls for board actions and resolutions in support of an integrative land investment strategy for housing preservation, second, the identification of urban growth areas, third, expanded historic preservation initiatives, and fourth a review of development options of the open space/parks and waterfront at the urban and waterfront edges. The second grouping calls for board actions and resolutions in support of expanded legal and organizing resources for tenants, second, for the board to develop increased expertise in the formation of community benefit agreements, third, for added protections and services for small businesses in the district, and fourth for innovations in the provision of education and training resources for residents.

Recommendations for Investment in Land:

- 1) An integrated strategy for preserving the existing housing stock and producing infill housing where sites are available, built upon:
 - a) The application of contextual zoning R7A, B or X R8A, B or X for significant portions of district, and the preservation of lower densities where appropriate
 - b) Encouraging voluntary adoption of Quality Housing, as these regulations provide for increased FAR for bulk context and through design.
 - c) Foster partnerships between community-based organizations and institutions; private lenders; public subsidy programs and private developers to produce new units on infill sites with long-term affordability.
- 2) Identify and promote mixed-use districts in which increased development is likely, possible, or desired. Link these areas to inclusionary zoning incentives and direct subsidies to produce onsite affordable housing and off-site credits through the construction or rehabilitation of permanently affordable housing. The areas identified by the study are:
 - a) Commercial corridors--Broadway, 181st Street, Dyckman Street and 207th Street--where concentrations of under-built sites (one and two-story buildings would allow for increased density of mixed-use development.
 - b) C-8 commercial zones that currently prohibit residential use
 - c) Locations near subway stations where new development is inextricably part of rebuilding the transportation infrastructure and re-assessing off street parking requirements.

- d) Unique "Development" zones--i.e. those triggered by major land-use changes (M-zone), public or institution ownership, e.g.
 - i) Sherman Creek and Inwood Upland area
 - ii) Cluster of transportation- and utility-related and city-owned properties north of Sherman Creek, east of 10th Ave.
 - iii) NY Presbyterian Hospital and vicinity
 - iv) Western end of Dyckman Street
 - v) Port Authority/GWB Bus terminal and Cross-Manhattan Expressway (I-95 Corridor)
- 3) Create new and expanded historic districts and campaign for designation of individual landmarks.
- a) Support resource development for preservation district formation.
 - b) Target contact with Landmarks Preservation Commission for review of specific districts and landmark designations in conjunction with petitioning City Planning for changes to contextual zoning districts
 - c) Engage New York City Parks and Recreation and New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation on the development of a "Management Plan" mandated by state law for the newly designated NYS "Heights Heritage Area" covering Washington Heights/Inwood, West Harlem/Hamilton Heights, and Morningside Heights (CB12 and CB9).
 - d) Target public and private investment in individual landmarks or potential districts with adjoining public space and transportation infrastructure to catalyze investment in area: Best examples:
 - i) Audubon Terrace, Trinity Cemetery, 157th Street Subway cluster.
 - ii) Jumel Mansion and 163rd Street Subway; St. Nicholas Ave. commercial hub
 - iii) Coogan's Bluff, Highbridge Park cluster
- 4) Plan Northern Manhattan's open space resources -- its parks, cultural landscapes and waterfronts-- as a unique "park system" for coordinated development and management
- a) Seek protection for and enhancements of view sheds from and within public parks along the Hudson and Harlem Rivers in form of scenic easements.
 - b) Engage wide community input on potential benefits/objectives to better served addressed through parks and open space to improve:
 - i) air quality in neighborhoods, along commercial corridors

- ii) health of residents through greater access to and use of recreation and other opportunities for physical activity in parks
 - iii) utilization of parks for educational programming within and outside of schools
 - iv) grass-roots economic development by making Northern Manhattan's parks and waterfronts a destination for New Yorkers and the region.
- c) Seek out local, state, federal, and private-sector funding sources to implement strategies matched to these goals.

Investment in People

If the neighborhoods of Washington Heights and Inwood have a stable foundation for economic exchange among local businesses, investment in people will occur rapidly. Without it, only the resources of government are available. A focus on development that further supports the work-force-development resources of the population is critically important to recent immigrants. The essential prerequisite for economic growth is a stable environment that supports small to medium sized businesses serving neighborhood economies.

This section talks about the need for investment in people. The increase in the U.S. population by 131 million by 2050 will create dramatic changes in the U.S. marketplace. Ninety percent of this growth will be people known as "minorities." Latinos, Asians, and African Americans are thus a key to the future economic health of the country, and its business community. Between 1987 and 1997, minority-owned firms formed at six times the rate of all businesses, with revenues increasing at twice the national average. It is plainly in the interest of both investors and society as a whole to lower old barriers more rapidly and improve the efficiency of investments that link, financial capital with social capital and human capital.

Several factors make CD12 a self-renewing environment capable of preserving its cultural history while stimulating investment in new and often unexpectedly creative ways.

- First, CD12 is a community of families and extended families.
- Second, the primary focus is in building a future for its children in the American immigrant tradition and in supporting family in the home country.
- Third, during the last two decades, 1985-present, the community experienced more of an age cohort transition than any transition related to the social constructs of race. In the short term through 1990-2000 the percentage of people below 18 years above 65 years decreased slightly caused in large part by a significant drop in the older white non-Hispanic population. Investment in those from 18 to 64 is a strong workable priority.

CB12 has no direct control over the allocation of resources. Through the District Needs process and its communication with elected officials, it can strongly affect the budgeting process and legislative policy.

Recommendations for Investment in People :

- 1) Greater government support for the rights of tenants by expanding access to legal services for households threatened with eviction, coupled with the following mea-

asures:

- a) Added staff and training for community organizing resources
 - b) An emergency rent-for-family's fund administered by a coalition of legal service attorneys
 - c) Expansion of tenant equity matching funds designed to help families participate in services such as the tenant interim lease program
- 2) Establish precedent for "memorandums of understanding" with private and public developers--the city, public authorities and utilities, institutions, private developers, lenders. Examples are:
- a) Community benefits agreements with all investors in the community.
 - b) Demand a policy commitment by the city's housing, social service and health agencies to strengthen local organizations
 - c) Increase awareness of and accountability to community concerns among private lenders through the NYS and NYC Comptrollers office.
- 3) Investments in Small Businesses and Programs that support them
- a) Access to capital through below-market and micro-lending programs
 - b) Assistance with training, business services and marketing for small businesses and entrepreneurs
 - c) Careful consideration of land-use policies and zoning changes for their effects on small-businesses, matched with policies to mitigate effects and enable existing businesses to benefit from increased growth planned for area.
- 4) Education for all citizens:
- a) Continued commitment, where CB12 and Northern Manhattan residents and elected officials have demonstrated leadership, to improving education for children.
 - b) Education opportunities for adults that combat cultural, linguistic, or economic isolation

Goal 1: Identify trends and best-practices for balanced community development

Trends in planning track influence of social or economic events and activities. Very little planning has been done for all of CD12, and the community senses a need to define a broad view of its potential to serve current residents by maximizing internal resources. The best practices associated with community development and planning are those that can assist the Community Board to support investments in its internal resources as a public service. The preservation imperative for CD12: is grounded by three factors, building conditions, tenant's rights, stable rents. The ongoing development of CD12 is grounded in the availability of sites and financing that are compatible with priority preservation interests

R1.1 ADDRESS THE REALITY OF DEMOGRAPHIC TRENDS: FIGHT FOR COMMON GROUND

- Prepare with Nos Quedamos a resolution that supports the rights of working class families

The term “common ground” in this recommendation is drawn from, J. Anthony Lukas. His book of the same name is without answers. It describes how building common ground in a complex urban society is difficult but attainable, especially when the alternative is considered. Tension exists in whether planning is for the residents who are here now or for those who might anticipate moving into the area. Build cross-cultural issues/needs forums for uniform statement of needs

- The social demographic analysis in the report provides a basis to discern trends that, while the community is diverse and perhaps becoming more so in terms of ethnicity and income levels, the majority of residents in CD12 are Latino and of low- and moderate-income.
- Other trends that need to be considered in planning for the allocation of limited resources is the median age of the non-Hispanic population--relatively high numbers of young children and seniors in the community who are white non-Hispanic will continue to decline; education and skill levels will remain relatively low. Relative real wages are declining and likely to continue to do so in the face of rising costs in housing and services both public and private.
- Demographic characteristics present a bifurcated picture and isolated geographies along ethnic and economic lines. This means that the demand for services may be more pressing in certain areas of the community district than in others. As a context for policy and decision-making, seeking common ground between areas and groups of difference will make the community stronger in its appeal for external resources.

R1.2 REQUIRE PRESENTATION OF THE QUALITY HOUSING SOLUTION IN ALL NEW DEVELOPMENT.

- Request action by DoB and DCP to inform owners and developers of this policy.

The city stimulates real estate investment through a menu of negotiable financial incentives in housing, community facilities, and commercial real estate. The objective is to find balance in a new set of trade-offs. The study of the contextual zoning option is a fine-tuning effort that limits the size and appearance of new buildings, while allowing higher den-

sity on wide streets or narrow side streets best expressed in expanded lot coverage.

The first use of contextual zoning protected affluent Manhattan neighborhoods threatened with over development. As development-pressure intensifies, residents will call for contextual solutions. Some recent examples of rezoning plans in New York City illustrate the trade-offs the city is willing to navigate are as follows:

- In 2003, 100 blocks of East Harlem and in Central Harlem around Frederick Douglass Boulevard were rezoned to allow contextual development. The avenues will see larger buildings with height limits at 12-stories. Development is occurring at a rate that is acceptable and consistent with comprehensive community development goals
- In Park Slope, Brooklyn the desire to downzone was more "anti-big-building", the result was a compromise plan. It reduced development potential on residential side streets, but allowed for bigger buildings on Fourth Avenue, a wide street, up to 12 stories. It also provided a reserve fund of several million dollars used to assist, encourage, and require developers to produce below-market-rate housing in Park Slope. Finalized in April 2001, construction on several 12-story buildings began in 2006.¹
- In 1974, the passage of the Clinton Special Purpose District (CL) may well become the bedrock zoning text for CD12². Following a series of independent community initiatives, the Department of City Planning responded with a combination of zoning text revisions leading to the protection of both residential and business based land uses. Since its passage, a vigorous network of community groups and activists been able to resist the displacement efforts of large real estate interests.

R1.2 PUSH FOR THE USE OF THE QUALITY HOUSING PROGRAM IN ALL NEW DEVELOPMENT

Engage HPD and Building Department (DoB) as well as lenders, to reach developers in early stages of their project development and design, introducing them to this program and the opportunities it presents, not to mention greater community support.

R1.4 PRESS FOR ZONING INNOVATION IN SHERMAN CREEK AND ADJACENT AREAS OF INWOOD

Sherman Creek is a watershed zoning change and a defining moment in the development history of Washington Heights and Inwood. Much of the current planning strategy is dependent upon zoning policy and multi-agency coordination facilitated by the Department of City Planning and the Economic Development Administration. An expected result is the rezoning of significant portions of Inwood through the Sherman Creek waterfront to R7A and R8A, including the transfer of development rights associated with a small amount of city owned land to a R7-2 district at the waterfront.

The rezoning proposal focuses on an up-zoning strategy to encourage increased residential development at the waterfront and in the "upland" area bounded by Dyckman Street, 207th Street and Broadway. The strategy deploys floor area incentives through inclusionary zoning to make 20 to 30 percent of the housing units as permanently affordable. The measure for access to affordable apartments is all applicant households earning between 30 percent and 120 percent of area median income willing to pay 30% of their household income for rent.

R1.5 ENHANCE CB12 ANALYSIS OF ULURP ACTIVITY

CD12's land use as it is today, the architecture that provides for these uses and the open space network that makes this community unique and beautiful represents one of the finest examples for a high quality urban life in the world. The challenge is to make it better for its

people who are resident today.

One area where the Community Board has power to influence land-use decisions is the Uniform Land Use Review Procedure, (ULURP), which applies to eleven major activities requiring application to and certification by the Department of City Planning (DCP). The ULURP triggers are: City Map changes (for example mapping or de-mapping of city streets); Zoning Map changes; City Planning Commission "special permits"; non-City public improvements; housing and urban renewal plans; disposition or acquisition of City-owned real property, including site selection. The first of these, changes in zoning, may come before the Community Board as a request for a change in approved use, bulk, or density. CB12 has the opportunity to request concessions and exactions on behalf of broad community interest--in exchange for the anticipated increase in value that will accompany a zoning change.

The allocation of funds to the boards varies considerably and requires reform. The capacity of community boards to build a useful public process is the central issue. A report released by then Assemblyman Scott M. Stringer and currently Borough President of Manhattan in June 2005 found a disparity worthy of inquiry. The example given is Community Board 8 on the Upper East Side serves the largest population and has the largest budget in Manhattan. It is a modest amount just \$284,000. But in Washington Heights in Community District 12, which has the second largest population received the least amount of money at \$180,500. Effectively addressing the communication and public service needs of a planning district requires a fair baseline formula that at a minimum aids the members of the board to build an effective case for meeting community needs while addressing inequities.

R1.6 ESTABLISHING A PUBLIC BENEFIT CORPORATION: AN AUTHORITY

Board members and residents of CD12 will follow the formation of a district public benefit corporation in CD9 to evaluate its implications as a "best practice" for CD12. Under New York State Law, a "district corporation" possesses the power to contract indebtedness and levy taxes or benefit assessments upon real estate or to require the levy of such taxes or assessments. The most commonly recognized is the Business Improvement District, now found throughout the five boroughs. The recommendation here is to begin discussions regarding a community wide district corporation as a vehicle for making binding agreements with city or state agencies or with private corporations or institutions.

R1.3 FACILITATE BINDING AGREEMENTS

Require submission of MoU's on all actions requiring CB (advisory) review.

When negotiating agreements or concessions with "developers" (public, private or institutional) legally binding agreements are essential. Promises made do not commit future actors. Making the conditions mandatory is most likely to create balance between the demands of developers for return on investment and those of ordinary residents and businesses speaking with a collective voice.

R1.7 COMMUNITY BENEFITS AGREEMENT – INITIATE WORKABLE TESTS

Establishing a model and precedent for a community benefits agreement should be a top priority. Currently the only model available is in development between Columbia University and the people of CD9. The sense that this "process" is moving "uptown" is not without merit.

The opportunity to build a CBA with New York Presbyterian Hospital (NYPH) as a means to recognize the potential burden the facility places on residents--through displacement of hous-

ing units and small businesses from key locations. A CBA process would serve to coordinate existing initiatives of great benefit to the community with strategies that would go further through better coordination. The NYPH could also be a partner in producing housing affordable in CD12 with a focus on lower-income workers of NYPH-as well as below-market space for nonprofit organizations and independent small-business ventures in conjunction with medical facilities or other spin-off developments. NYPH's current investment in the health of the people of NYC requires an outlay of time and energy that contributes to a stable living environment for lower-income residents and businesses within the vicinity of the hospital.

R1.9 DEVELOP A POLITICAL WILL

Sustaining support for tenant advocacy and related community-building efforts that will preserve the affordability of a rich and viable stock of housing is a key priority in any community. False choices are presented if the questions turn to the relative importance of buildings or people.

Two axioms demand reflection regarding the role of the board and the hundreds of residents that have contributed to this planning process and the debate it stimulates on issues, needs, and concerns. The first is that, "all plans are political" and the second is "all politics is local". The power of consensus on key issues must not be underestimated. Consistency in policy development requires a point of view dedicated to gains in the short term. Accomplishing this requires a broad base of support, one that is concerned less with fear of change than fostering the collective will to explore options that are "on the table".

Goal 2: Foster Development & Preservation of Affordable Housing

A second goal of the Working Group is to foster development and preservation of affordable housing, to encourage a mix of rental and ownership housing and to support the preservation the existing inventory of affordable housing.

A formal study to fully CD12's housing problems has begun with this study, focus group, workshops and "teach ins" sponsored by the board on housing finance, preservation, and development. That rent guidelines protect 95% of the CD12's rented stock should not detract from the need to define the housing crisis as experienced in Washington Heights and Inwood. The land use/building condition survey, combined with review of data on building type, age, housing violations, incomes and "rent-burden" yielded the following overall observations on the prospects for preserving housing affordability in CD12:

- CD12 maintains a high-grade housing stock that is physically capable of withstanding the stress of rehabilitation. The extensive bulk (square feet) makes replacement unlikely, given the current zoning. In effect, the 1961 zoning to R7-2 for most of the district was a down zone.
- The pre-war housing stock provides large and flexible apartment layouts that facilitate extended family, family friend, and guest living arrangements. Shared costs from food to rent, to childcare and small business development are effective means to survival that promote savings and the eventual building up of investment capital. CD12's dense but flexible and affordable housing stock is therefore a wellspring for the social and economic success of newcomers.³

- The continuing rise in building code violations and tenant complaint over the last five years is alarming. The central issues are therefore the quality of maintenance and management of the existing stock--and maintaining it as affordable for in place tenants
- The Rent Guidelines Board (RGB) measures the cost of operating a multi-unit apartment building in significant detail. As the decisions are now critical, an independent review of methods is long overdue. Nevertheless, a growing share of households (about 25%) experiences a severe rent burden in CD12. A key to preservation will be strong efforts to bring income up either directly, or through income supplements such as food stamps, expanded rent subsidies, and 100% utilization of the Earned Income Tax Credit.

R2.1 ORGANIZE "MONEY FOR HOUSING" IN CD12:

Given implementation on the supportive actions below, sponsor a joint land use committee, housing committee and general board summit, co-hosted with area banks city/state agencies and developers A CD12 summit on how, when and where capital resources for staffing and funding housing preservation and development will place the vision of preservation and development in context.

R2.2 SUPPORT REFORMS OF EQUITY FINANCING GOOD REPAIR CLAUSE & ESCROW

Preliminary indications suggest that debt on many buildings created through owner-equity financing may present a significant roadblock to advancing tenant-equity opportunities. Moreover, anecdotally we understand that existing low- and moderate-income cooperatives have been opting out of their obligations by altering bylaws designed to preserve the affordability of housing in perpetuity.

The number of buildings in disrepair continues to grow in CD12. Pressure from housing advocacy groups such as Housing Here and Now and others has led to some innovations in bank refinancing deals that require the primary lender to be more accountable to building conditions with escrow accounts, independent inspections, and penalties.

Maintain board oversight with the Office of the Comptrollers on this issue. Comptroller's William Thompson and Alan Hevesi recently led a tour of two northern Manhattan buildings on West 192nd Street with recent bank financing but very poor physical conditions. Advocates can hinder bank growth plans by blocking acquisitions through the Community Reinvestment Act. Because of this challenge, commitments to enforcing "good repair" clauses in mortgage and refinancing agreements and proactive steps that hold repair funds in escrow in partnership with city housing agencies can assure quality and the oversight essential to the rent regulated housing stock.

R2.3 EVALUATE 421A REFORMS FOR CHANGES IN AFFORDABLE HOUSING PRODUCTION IN CD12

Formally support the city council proposal and support elimination of certificate buyouts in favor of mandatory onsite inclusion and/or creation of a dedicated housing trust fund

Lowering property taxes as an incentive to development is a service of the 421 and J-51 tax policies. As NYC's property tax represents as much as a quarter of the city's total annual revenue, the tax incentives as currently provided have begun to look too costly. As early as 1984, the Manhattan Exclusion Zone was formed to exact funds for affordable housing, known today the zone is called the Geographic Exclusion Area (GEA) it requires developers

of housing from 14th Street to 96th Street on the East Side and down to Houston on the West Side to produce affordable housing onsite or through the funding of certificates for developing affordable units elsewhere. In 2005, the GEA expanded to include the entire Greenpoint Williamsburg waterfront in Brooklyn. As the GEA need not be contiguous, areas of CD12 should be considered for inclusion in the GEA, with a primary interest in the core area defined by Sherman Creek, Dyckman and 207th Street.

Based on the assumption that housing development will now occur without subsidies in overheated residential markets only the sections of Manhattan with the highest percentage of low income households are excluded in the recently proposed expansion of the GEA. The reason is two fold; first the GEA designation would be likely to dampen the housing market in CD12, or overall sales prices are too low for inclusion. In reality their exclusion from the GEA is a de facto method for encouraging continued gentrification and the displacement of lower income households without the provision of a mitigating resource. CD 12 needs a more progressive view aimed at increasing rent and household income supplements and lowering building management and operation costs in partnership with private owners.

In February 2006, the Mayor convened a task force to examine the 421-a program and the cost of the real estate tax abatements to the city. Just nine months later in October 2006, the Bloomberg 421a Task Force made their recommendations public. The six recommendations sum up by the phrase "money saved is money earned". A more progressive view would be to offer developers a break in total development cost or in cost of city services, or guarantees that turn potentially variable costs into fixed costs. With any break, then the inclusion of affordable housing in New York City becomes a long-term city/developer commitment. The recommendations are to

- 1) Enlarge the Geographic Expansion Area
- 2) Remove "automatic extended benefits in NPP and REMIC areas",
- 3) create an assessed value cap over which the property will be taxed at the current rate,
- 4) Eliminate the benefit for structures below six units,
- 5) Remove the certificate program to more strongly encourage onsite inclusion and if a dedicated fund for affordable housing can be created, and
- 6) do another study to recommend reforms in the methods and practices of assessing residential property.

In late November 2006, the New York City Council developed a bill that would require all market rate housing development projects to contribute to affordable housing production. Expect a city council resolution regarding a dedicated housing trust fund in early 2007. It may include other forms of real estate development such commercial offices.

As the program is available to all developers outside of the GEA each of these steps will reduce the benefit of developers outside of the zone and increase the responsibilities of developers within the zone. The result is hundreds of millions in foregone real estate tax revenue that can be recaptured by the City in trade for affordable housing production by private developers within a larger GEA. Based on the savings the Mayor budgeted an additional \$200 million for affordable housing, but the report suggests the amount saved could be considerably more.

As outlined above and if approved, all of Manhattan will be in the GEA except for substan-

tial portions of Harlem and all of Washington Heights and Inwood. In the past and often than not, the housing resource from the GEA turned up in Central Brooklyn and the South Bronx where land is cheaper and a larger number of units would be possible and theoretically more affordable. All rental buildings receiving the 421a benefits must follow the stabilization guidelines of the Rent Guidelines Board for rent increases, even if their apartments are over \$2,000 per month.

The central question for housing advocates of CD12 must therefore be about a fair distribution of funds for housing preservation through rent assistance programs administered by the city. The Mayor's initial mandate to the task force consider removing the Manhattan core area distinction and requiring developers in any part of the city to include affordable housing if they want to receive the abatement. The task force, which includes city officials, developers, bankers, and housing advocates considered a wide range of reform proposals aimed at benefiting from an increased level of production and presumably several side studies and property analysis reports are available that led to the final recommendations.

R2.4 REFORM/REPEAL URSDADT LAW

In 1971, the New York State Legislature passed the Urstadt Law taking away New York City's power to pass rent laws that are more stringent than the state's. Without doubt, revocation will decrease displacement and increase accountability of property owners by shifting control of rent regulations from state to local authority. This change is dependant on legislation that recognizes the differences between the dense urban centers of the state and its rural and county government counterparts. CB12 should support its state legislators in efforts to reverse this loss of "home rule" powers. In the mean time, the power to regulate housing to sustain affordability is by using this loss of power to encourage an organized and informed tenancy.

The Urstadt Law over thirty years old, but it triggers a key asset of every community – its long memory. As most of NYS's regulated housing is in New York City, this power has led many to call it regulation without representation. The NYS Supreme Court has upheld the law as constitutional; the possibility for repeal is therefore limited. Nevertheless, the community remembers this as a power taken and as such, it is tool for organizing the energy of people to build alternatives.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR RELATED PROGRAMS/INITIATIVES

Support direct links between anti-displacement social services for tenants and anti-abandonment services for building managers and owners. Support allocation of resources to strengthen awareness of tenants' rights and the capacity of organizations to address poor housing conditions. The lack of this intervention at this time is analogous to ignoring a cancer.

R2.5 SUPPORT TENANT RERESENTATION IN CASES OF OWNER "OPT-OUTS" OF SECTION 8 AND OTHER SUSIDIES

When Mayor Bloomberg vetoed pro-tenant legislation, the City Council overrode the veto leading to the Tenant Empowerment Act of 2005. The act aids Section 8 tenants and residents of Mitchell-Lama housing with rights to purchase if owners "opt out". A similar approach for tenants of rent stabilized buildings is needed.

The overwhelming issue facing CD12 will be displacement. The primary concern will be whether building owners and their managers are forcing tenants out of their homes thereby potentially initiating a renewed cycle of homelessness and overcrowding.

R2.6 DEVELOP CAPACITY FOR TENANT ORGANIZING/EXPAND EDUCATION OF TENANTS' OF RIGHTS

Make funding for tenant organizing a top expense budget category at the District Needs, District Cabinet and Borough Board levels. Align expense and capital budget priorities with recommendations made by local housing organizations and tenant's rights groups.

Well-trained community organizers will inform families of their rights, reduce threats to the stability of daily living, and mobilize organized representation. Expanded legal representation requires a prepared constituency with trust in the rule of law. Supporting early warning efforts in support of tenants can save a building from the anger of tenants and the ignorance of its ownership.⁴ Increased public funding is needed for the provision of legal services for every tenant threatened with eviction. Representation will allow tenants to present their cases completely and create a foundation for client stability. Currently, 20,000 tenants need help every year. The services currently available have resources to help and advise about 10% of these families.

As of November 2005, data provided by the NYC Housing Court indicated 17,413 residential eviction proceedings from Washington Heights-Inwood (WH/I). By March 2006, the Court issued 21,991 eviction warrants. This is a 26% increase in a three-month period. Of those cases, 89-90% are the result of non-payments, about 7% are from holdovers, and about 4% came from Housing Preservation Actions (HP) for repairs. At Housing Court, only 10% of the tenants have legal representation when compared to 90% of property owners who do have legal representation⁵.

R2.7 Implement Sub-District Housing Preservation and Development Plans

Twelve sub-district areas in CD12 suggest neighborhood housing environments within which a comprehensive approach supporting the preservation of the community. Preservation activities are recommended through historic landmark and districting approaches, code compliance initiatives and moderate to substantial rehabilitation. Seek resources and identify places and partners for closer analysis. Each of these areas are linked by centers and corridors that should be encouraged by the board for significant development activities.

R2.8 SEEK INCREASED SUPPORT FOR PROGRAMS THAT PREVENT HOMELESSNESS

Two new recently developed programs to prevent homelessness are *Home Base* and *Housing Stability-Plus*⁶. Home Base is a targeted program aimed at six community districts that have produced the highest number of homeless individuals and families.⁷ East Harlem (CD11) has the only facility in Manhattan (Palladia: Third Avenue at 124th Street) and plans to expand to CD12 remain confidential. Home Base starts with assumption that keeping people in their homes is better. It works with neighborhood organizations to stop homelessness before it occurs, on a case-by-case basis.

Housing Stability-Plus has become the largest discretionary rental subsidy program in the nation. It offers homeless clients five years of rental assistance-with the understanding that, as they re-establish themselves in permanent housing, there will be a 20% 'step-down' in their rental assistance grants each year. The program began in late 2000 and since then 7,400 men and women in the city have permanent housing, of these 6,700 of them families with children totaling 21,000 people.⁸ Housing Stability, as of June 2006, has helped about 4,000 people at an average cost of \$4,000 per client, compared to the higher shelter cost.

R2.9 SUPPORT INTENSIVE AND INDEPENDENT BUILDING INSPECTIONS

A housing stock of such high quality as CD12 can take substantial levels of disinvestment

without obvious signs. Quality exteriors can hide a rotting core infrastructure. Current anti-abandonment interventions may come too late to be comprehensively effective when the disgruntled but disquieted acquiescence of tenants fails to sound the alert and take appropriate action.

R2.10 ESTABLISH AN EMERGENCY RENT FOR FAMILIES FUND

An emergency fund will help families threatened with eviction, but in fact, the fund is equally important as insurance for related tenant support funding. It is also the first step for establishing the possibility of tenant held equity. ERF Fund administration is a form of creative finance (as opposed to charity) growing field of financial services innovation with a direct interest in establishing financial supports banking products for low- and moderate-income households.

R2.11 PROMOTE STRATEGY FOR A DEDICATED HOUSING PRESERVATION OR TRUST FUND

Seek participation in policy sessions regarding the structure and purpose of a dedicated housing fund. (See R2.3) Regardless of how funds develop, the essential missing ingredient in CD12 is a method for identifying buildings for the preservation of affordable housing. New market rate development in CD12 should be required to contribute to a fund for the rehabilitation of the existing housing stock and for programs assisting tenants to remain in the community. However, there are very few sites in CD12 can provide this bonus opportunity to developers. City Planning's recommendation for Sherman Cree will set the precedent for similar strategically located sites throughout the community.

Property ownership is a "bundle of rights" with trading power in the market place. Community land trusts private are nonprofit corporations created to acquire the right to hold land and to secure it for access to residents least served by the prevailing market.⁹ In dense areas such as New York City, development practices include the formation of mutual housing associations wherein the land is held by a trust in order to lower rent/acquisition costs to low- and moderate-income households. A local land trust organization developed in partnership with the Parodneck Foundation with land in CD12 is known as Community Assisted Tenant Controlled Housing ([CATCH](http://www.parodneckfoundation.org) – see: <http://www.parodneckfoundation.org>)

As of right new housing construction opportunities created by zoning changes proposed for Sherman Creek will produce economic "windfalls" that require sharing. Facilitating a connection between new construction and a modest number of rehabilitation sites should be central part of all discussions regarding distribution of benefits, however, the highest priority is clear for a maximum of onsite affordable unit availability.

Small vacant lots and a few vacant buildings in the district describe most of land available for new housing development. All of the city-owned buildings are in a pipeline, leaving a consequential but low-impact need to deal with the remaining privately owned vacant buildings. A best practice is to make a best effort to match these remaining sites with developers for the production of affordable housing.

R2.12 SUPPORT SET ASIDE INCREASES IN NEW YORK STATE'S USE OF TAX CREDITS FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Without doubt, CD12 would benefit greatly from an increase in 9% (construction) tax credit set asides for preservation. This would increase private activity bonds and the use of state housing trust funds and 4% credits aimed at expirations. NYS surplus of 4% credits became part of the HOPES program that provides financing for \$140 million in private activity bonds and 4% credits for preservation. Tenants helped to produce this resource to aid in the acquisition of Mitchell-

Lama buildings. A steady increase in NYC and NYS priority for preservation would also encourage a broader use of the states predevelopment and bridge loan programs for preservation. Support the strengthening of initiatives in NYC that expand notice requirements by owners leaving support programs by length, confirmation of effective recipient notice procedures and full disclosure of content. Support actions that increase the purchase right opportunities upon conversion notification for preservation purchasers to retain subsidies for affordable use including the use of general obligation bonds and inclusionary zoning bonuses.

Goal 3: Locate Sites/Areas - and Actions - Meeting Community Needs

The third goal of the Working Group is to identify sites meeting community needs.

Regardless of income, people should expect access to services such as a public education, police protection, and fire safety. Community values such as 'equal opportunity' that define social needs are distinct from those values that define its economic power. People should also expect sound buildings and clean streets in neighborhoods with well managed parks and playgrounds. The planning issue arises when these needs demand the use of new space in order to improve or expand service. Given the overall lack of land, all new facilities that meet need but express insufficient economic demand will be required to find development partners in the private sector.

Excluding the housing development potential of Sherman Creek, the Development Potential Scan (DPS) illustrated in Section Four of this report identified two large market rate housing development projects, approximately 85 one-story buildings on relatively large lots, and about 114 small vacant lots scattered throughout the area. In CD12 these are the most likely to be the subject speculative development. As "under-invested" sites, the quality of future development is a matter of concern regarding quality and affordability for residents and local businesses. The Community Board is in a position to bring these interests into convergence.

R3.1 Identify Resource to Produce a Community District Needs Progress Report

The District Needs statements developed by the board are pursuant to Section 230 and 231 of the New York City Charter. The Department of City Planning provides selected characteristics of the population, land use and the use of social services. Members of the community board provide the context for development in the district with an assessment of capital and expense budget priorities. City agencies are required to consider these priorities in the preparation of their departmental budget estimates. The purpose of the progress report is to identify areas of inaction that require attention built on a locally established record.

Vacant land is so scarce that mixed used development is an absolute priority. A majority of the buildings in the community currently provide more floor area than the 1961 zoning will allow through new construction. The conversion of existing housing into community service should be encouraged. Major public transit hubs are the best location for weak market facilities such as childcare and training "storefront" programs. A prefer-

ence in the provision of subsidies and incentives should be made developers willing to include these services through new construction or rehabilitation.

R3.2 REVIEW LOSS OF FAR FOR COMMUNITY FACILITY FROM EXISTING ZONING TO CONTEXTUAL ZONES

While not in direct conflict, the interest of the Working Group in establishing new residential zones in the community that are more consistent with the existing architectural fabric (R7 A, B or X) reduces the community facility alternative floor area ratio (FAR) in a range from 1.5 to 3 times the lot area in maximum bulk.

The implications require a careful analysis of locations in which the community facility option would be more strongly encouraged than others as an issue of urban design principles

R3.3 COMMUNITY FACILITIES: SCHOOLS

Public School Development has been continuous in CD12 and became the subject of mandated a 5 year capital plan by the Commissioner of Education in 1999. Recent criticism by community advocates has challenged the opinions established by the Board of Education's consultants. From a planning and land use point of view, support for small semi-independent community run schools will find places that work. The placement and development of large intermediate education facilities will not address the need in the short term. A series of small locations in local community and institutional partnerships offer the only significant resource for educational facility development.

Support the Community Education Council (CEC) in contesting the School Construction Authority (SCA) via the Grier Report's findings on school capacity and projected population. Regardless of statistical analysis, the plain simple fact is CD12 is in great need of resources for children of immigrant households at all levels.

The public school system is an effective vehicle for identifying resident needs for access to services. Expanding the availability of space for these additional outreach activities by combining public and private interest groups is effective. While important, the issue is less about classroom size and than it is an opportunity on the capacity of individual facilities to support service network resources in the district on a per child basis.

R3.4 COMMUNITY FACILITIES: HEALTH AND RELATED CHARITABLE SERVICES

The expansion of the New York Presbyterian Hospital campus is the only major form of concentrated, community-altering construction activity over the last two decades.¹⁰ The leadership of the New York Presbyterian Hospital (NYPH) complex has strengthened health facilities and services but has weakened its relationship to the urban fabric. There is a deep philanthropic history between NYPH Programs for research and community service partnerships. The availability of affordable space for nonprofit programs in health care, community education, on the other hand has a serious supply shortage in an area of high need. Build a stronger housing and community development relationship between nonprofit community-based organizations and the NYPH.

R3.5 COMMUNITY FACILITIES: PASS THE WORD ON 311

This is a vital community facility in arms reach of every resident. Seek data from this system such as call rates on issues using freedom of information act provisions if necessary.

Many distinct parts of a community can represent distressed housing market. Community-based groups use a focusing strategy on the "good buildings" that make the

city's legacy of heroism over despair real. Everyone knows about "the problems", but the power to affect change did not occur until a very simple tool became available known as the call for *Government Services and Information* - 311.

R3.6 SUPPORT SMALL BUSINESS

Local businesses employ about 30,000 people in CD12 in some 2,800 businesses. Adding supports for small business growth in this area through Business Improvement Districts (BID) and economic development zones (Federal Empowerment and State Empire zones) can help to deliver and market a significant range of small business incentives.

Services to small businesses that capture new markets will increase the income of current households. The historic patterns of immigrant economies in major cities reveal a strategy of investing directly in people (the family) to increase income yields. New development will likely add increased displacement on small family businesses in CD12. People will fight to stay. *Nos Quedamos* is a term that resounds throughout CD12 and The Bronx.

Goal 4: Preserve and Strengthen District Character and Quality of Life

At the core of the goal structure is the desire to preserve/strengthen district character and quality of life and to take steps to safeguard against over development. A clear and direct way for CD12 achieve this goal is to defend residents in their daily effort to live in decent and sanitary housing regardless of their incomes. The times must change, but the pace of it that destroys families can be resisted.

Board Actions:

R4.1 IMPLEMENT HERITAGE AREA

- Engage DPR for the development of the management plan for the heritage area.
- Open dialogue within community regarding heritage themes, sites, etc.
- Build on existing federal designations: Hudson River Valley National Heritage Area & American Heritage River

R4.2 TARGET NYS RESOURCES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION AND COMMUNITY PLANNING

- Identify stakeholders and encourage formation of coalitions from CD12 to apply for NYS Environmental Protection Funds (EPF) and Quality Community Programs. (model: "Take Me to the River")

R4.3 TARGET RESOURCES FOR CULTURAL AND EDUCATION PROGRAMS

- Find and direct cultural organizations to funding sources (UMEZ-CIIF, DCA, NYSCA, NEA)

R4.2 PROMOTE AND DEVELOP COMMUNITY SQUARES AND PLAZAS

- Engage DOT and DPR regarding opportunities for public space, traffic calming and plazas, and "greening of the streets" programs....
- Seek community for recommendations and stewardship for additional park plaza and public space involving a multiple agency approach similar to that implemented for Sherman Creek

- Explore rezoning possibilities around “bow-tie” or plaza sites.
- Examples are: 157th and Broadway (gateway to Audubon Terrace)

R4.3 PARK EDGE PROGRAMMING AND PARK ACCESS CELEBRATIONS

- Engage DOT and DPR to develop park edges
- Engage DOT and DPR park access plans from adjacent neighborhoods
- Engage DOT and DPR on waterfront access corridors (model: “Take Me to the River”)

R.4.5 SAFEGUARD AGAINST OVER-DEVELOPMENT

- Identify areas that are most susceptible to “over development”. Note: Over development is understood to be structures that are 1) out of character or scale, or 2) increase environmental burdens such as increased traffic and noise.
- Examine as of right zoning and make changes accordingly

Goal 5: Locate Buildings/Areas of Special Architectural/Historic Interest

Historic preservation districts do not “stop time”, nor do they prevent new construction, substantial redevelopment or changes in use. They do not constitute a “taking” or cause financial burden on owners. The responsibility of ownership includes the submission of proposed changes to a formal review process. This public process helps to assure consistency as it stipulates creativity in the adaptive reuse of older structures. The rich legacy of this community is of great importance as an influence on all new forms of development. Much more can and should be done.

R5.1 PRESERVATION THROUGH HISTORIC DISTRICT RESEARCH AND INDIVIDUAL BUILDING DESIGNATION

The community is physically stable due to the high quality of pre-war construction, historical significance, and distinctive architectural design over the last century. Greater exploration of historic district development and landmark designation should be encouraged by the community board as a component of its preservation strategy.

Washington Heights and Inwood expresses local history and the earliest periods of our national history. Yet, surprisingly just two historic districts have formed, and there is one scenic view easement in place to protect The Cloisters. Historic districts support the preservation of individual landmarks and enhance the recognition of significant buildings documented over the years by organizations such as the American Institute of Architects and the renowned historic preservation program at Columbia University. The study identifies the geographic location all of these significant sites numbering twenty-three buildings and one tree of major interest and an extensive listing of important Art Deco structures, largely in Inwood.

The inclusion of residential landmark and historic district properties in the Federal Historic Preservation Tax Incentive Program increases the deduction limitation for preservation easements to 50% of a donor’s adjusted gross income. These recent reforms demand an increased focus on this opportunity in Washington Heights and Inwood. New development in a historic district requires public hearings with the Community Board and the Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC). In the Community Board settings, residents can seek answers to ask questions and weigh in with comments, as well as encourage elected officials to par-

ticipate. The architect must get approvals for the project from the LPC before it can get permits for construction from the Department of Buildings. The Commission may accept, reject, or ask for modifications to a proposed design.

R5.2 SUPPORT LOCAL PRESERVATION EFFORTS

Support detailed discussion regarding the architectural and associative values that go into the making of these districts. The residents surrounding Audubon Terrace seek historic preservation to the north. Similar proposals call for the recognition of Wadsworth Terrace

R5.3 EXPAND THE USE OF SCENIC VIEW EASEMENT DISTRICTS

Several locations along the Hudson and Harlem Rivers have scenic view district potential in compliance with the provisions of Chapter 2 of Article 10 "Special Purpose Districts" of the New York City Zoning Resolution. Scenic view districts in New York prevent obstruction of outstanding views as seen from a mapped public park or esplanade

R5.4 ENCOURAGE HISTORIC DISTRICTS AND LANDMARKS DEVELOPMENT POLICY

Support detailed discussion and working groups regarding the architectural and associative values that go into the making of these districts. The residents surrounding Audubon Terrace seek historic preservation to the north. Similar proposals call for the recognition of Wadsworth Terrace

R5.5 ENGAGE AND ADOPT NYS HERITAGE AREA SYSTEM

In New York City, it would seem impossible to re-connect the historic relationship between human settlements and natural systems. Northern Manhattan's ribbons of river and park offer hope that its social and architectural history can successfully examine new forms of environmental compatibility with human generational change.

Take every opportunity to support the development of Washington Heights and Inwood as a New York State Heritage area.

R5.6 ESTABLISHING COMMUNITY PRESERVATION DISTRICTS

The study finds a real need for added resources in the identification and preservation of CD12 architectural and historic resources. Preservation advocates have identified large areas of the community that require investigation into the prospect of formal historic district designation, the identification of structures and might be eligible for listing on the national register of historic places and therefore eligible for additional affordable housing development resources through historic preservation task credit

The lack of land capital is inhibiting the formation of new institutions by residents and partners to meet social and educational service needs. The conversion of housing to commercial office space releases this pressure, especially near major universities or hospitals. Locally based fund and organizational development activities to fully explore this potential and to leverage citywide or national foundation support.

Goal 6: Update Zoning

A respect for context and the application of design guidelines should accompany any major change in use or bulk or through a request for a variance. Guidelines are now voluntary for new development sites in the current zones of CD12, and the choices are many and range from rezoning M or C-8 zones, to C-4 to allow greater development and encourage a mix of commercial and residential uses. In CD12, these are the Dyckman Commercial Corridor in Inwood, the transportation hub, formed by the I-95 corridor and the GWB Bus Station and the hub formed by the New York Presbyterian Hospital. These are all highly complex urban centers with intensive economic activity, but they offer the quid pro quo of preservation with development.

The scan of vacant sites for the development of new housing reveals limited opportunity. Three representative sites were selected as “massing case studies” to illustrate “as of right” development within the existing zoning envelopes of R7-2 and R8 in which the Quality Housing Program options are voluntary. In addition, the case studies review height and bulk using the contextual zoning framework (R7A, R7B, R7X and R8A, R8B and R8X), which makes several design elements mandatory. Evaluating these sites provides a route to understanding the height and bulk issues associated with changes in zoning and alternatives to the current zoning regulations.

Contextual zoning proposals (R7A, R8A) should include incentives for neighborhood based community facilities such as childcare and resident after school care centers. A majority of the buildings in the community currently provide more floor area than the 1961 zoning will allow through new construction. For this reason, little has changed. Voluntary contextual zoning became available in the mid-1980s. Establishing mandatory regulations will require new development to be contextual, but this alone will not produce the financial resources to preserve the existing stock.

R6.1 – DEVELOP A TWO-TRACK APPROACH TO REZONING ALL OF CD12

Apply the mandatory contextual housing district designation for large areas of the community with the intent of developing rehabilitation, tenant ownership and/or control services programs. This action recognizes a respect for the standing architecture. This would not require a text change, but a relatively simple map change to R7A, B or X and similarly for the R8 districts. The use of the Contextual Zoning Districts in CD12's R7-2 and R8-2 areas is only through the voluntary application of quality housing regulations. Changing the map for large areas of the community requires a map change.

Explore Special Purpose and/or Mixed Use Zoning districts for some areas in CD12. The identification of these possible areas pre-identify the major economic pump for priming community preservation resources.

R6.2 -- REVIEW OPTIONS OF MIXED-USE AND CONTEXTUAL DISTRICTS FOR TRANSITIONAL AREAS

The Special Purpose District is a special zoning district mapped in several locations throughout the city, including Dumbo and Red Hook in Brooklyn, Port Morris in the Bronx, and West Chelsea in Manhattan. Special District Overlays in some areas with major elevations (steep slopes) and rock outcrops, such as the “H” overlay hill district in Staten Island may have application should any of the community's park land areas be challenged with housing development proposals.

The MX District Permits mixed-use buildings, and includes an expanded definition of "home occupations," permitting a broader variety of live-work accommodations than is allowed in standard zoning districts. It combines a light industrial (M1) district with a residential district, and permits a mix of selected light industrial, commercial, residential, and community facility uses under the applicable regulations.

These three options are responding to managing the quality of change in a community. CB12's Land Use Committee and the Working Group should promote and adopt resolutions leading to contextual zoning in CD12. The architectural fabric of the community will remain sound and more than likely be rehabilitated and/or restored. Over the long term, it is in the community's interest to require as a matter of policy that all new development be contextual and over the long term through a zoning map change for most of the community from R7-2 to R7A.

In the interim it is in the community's interest to promote as strongly as possible, the volunteer use the quality housing option. Formalizing quality housing regulations provide added safeguards that recognize the bulk, height and to the degree possible, the architectural character of the community

R6.3 -- ADDRESS C8 ZONE DEFICIENCIES HOUSING INVESTMENT IN COMMERCIAL OVERLAY ZONES

Blocks currently designated within C8 zones prohibit residential use, whereas, conversely, residential-zoned blocks within commercial overlay zones permit retail activity only on the ground floor. In these two environments, increases in density can be an unobtrusive way to provide incentives for new housing production AND accommodate the demand for new commercial office space.

Adding the potential for greater mixed-used residential and commercial (office and retail) construction within these zones could balance the goals of stimulating development in some areas while preserving neighborhood character and scale in others.

Two locations in CD12 suggest a major opportunity for dense mass-transit based housing and commercial retail development in a C8 Zone.

- ✓ In these "special district" option areas, the maximum floor area ratios underlying the district need not apply. Instead, highly detailed zoning maps would define sub-areas in which the total allowable floor area becomes the subject of "bonus" increases permitted pursuant to the Inclusionary Zoning Program or in accordance with other increases that help to meet the general purposes of the district.
- ✓ The application of Quality Housing Regulations through a map change to R7A, B or X or R8 A, B or X would mandate design guidelines and produce architectural solutions through new construction that are more contextual to the existing fabric of the community.
- ✓ The identification of areas in Option 1 above provides for substantial new development for land areas that are capable of handling higher numbers of residents, workers, consumers, and institutional visitors.

R6.4 -- PROMOTE DENSE AREAS OF COMMERCIAL OFFICES AND RETAIL GOODS/SERVICES

The commercial office and retail goods and services of a community set the tone for a community. The architecture and graphic design of a community's retail commercial storefront business sector is its face.

Conclusion: Discussion of Recommendations:

A resolution is a single act by the Board to approve or adopt a change to a set of rules, or to begin a new program that is recorded in the minutes of the Community Board with greatest effect by unanimous consent. The following offers a means for building a housing and community development policy tailored to the needs of Washington Heights and Inwood.

Policies are statements of *actions eventually taken*. Once established, directive instructions in the form of regulations guide a prescribed course of action. Benchmarks or approvals mark the course of events. Within this framework, the capacity to move from expressing principles such as "support affordable housing" to problem solving the production problems is defined by taking action among across five cost categories and for major policies.

PLOT-M:

A straightforward method for breaking down the complexity of housing, community facility and commercial real estate finance and development is offered below. The final element – the cost of money has a strong influence on the prior four elements. The challenge is to manipulate each to encourage investment while benefiting end users of modest means.

- 1) Production: alter and reduce the cost of construction/professional services,
- 2) Land: reduce, defer or eliminate land costs through acquisition or control,
- 3) Operation and management costs are reduced
- 4) Taxes are deferred or eliminated and;
- 5) Money cost is reduce or eliminated.

Four Policies:

Public and corporate service agencies stimulate and regulate housing production in four basic policy areas to meet prescribed affordability goals. Note that all but one deal with the cost of money:

- 1) Provision of direct subsidies and community development grants
- 2) Regulation of private financial institutions, including public instruments that provide insurance, financial institution services or expansion, liquidity, and credit for housing
- 3) Offer incentives through city, state and federal tax policies designed to encourage investment in housing preservation or production across the board or in targeted areas
- 4) Enforcement of civil rights legislation that support the means for addressing housing discrimination

The community board can support or deny support for projects by 1) resolution 2) calls, letter, meetings, and workshops. It can provide for and encourage task-oriented groups through recommendations, space provision, media support, and issue/problem defining. Finally, the board has the power to develop a scope of work to acquire independent reviews or proposals on a routine basis, as well as contract for research services. In this context, we offer the

following recommendations.

R7.1 CREATE DESIGN STRATEGY FOR DEVELOPMENT IN EXCHANGE FOR PRESERVATION ELSEWHERE

The discussion of all development activity in CD12 will stimulate innovative resources that support new construction that includes the continuing rehabilitation and preservation of affordable housing.

There are environments in the community wherever owners and investors see an opportunity to put a deal together. This activity is subject to a predetermined set of planning, zoning, architectural, and urban design criteria. In some cases, these development possibilities confront a value in the community "to keep it pretty much the way it is".

Making Quality Housing regulations mandatory will not preserve the existing housing or sustain it as "affordable" for residents of low and moderate-income. To do so, individual buildings will need additional resources from a public resource stimulated by private development interests in meeting this end.

The criteria used to select the areas that may produce this stimulus are preliminary. A high-level of "metes and bounds", lot-by-lot, building-by-building, analysis would produce important refinements. The pre-selected areas developed for discussion represent the following values:

1. A comprehensive urban design framework that guides development in northern Manhattan while protecting residential neighborhoods, existing commercial business centers and fosters improved access to its recreational open spaces and waterfront.
2. Development bonuses for projects that in close proximity to the subway system triggering a full range of mass transportation based zoning incentives,
3. The formation of a coherent network of retail business districts (regional and neighborhood convenience) coupled with sites offering new multi-family housing development and commercial office construction.
4. The identification of areas of land zoned for housing in mixed-use commercial areas that has yet to produce new housing.
5. The identification of substantial areas of land zoned for commercial use only, but has lost market or consistently fails to produce viable mix of commercial uses.

R7.2 MEASURE FOR BALANCE, SITE BY SITE AND USE BY USE

The physical parameters for a balanced growth and preservation initiative outlined suggests a "give and take" process essential to a full understanding of the demands on land use. The underlying question is who is doing the giving and the taking?

The measure needed to be comfortable with this process is derived from the revenues produced by property owners in relationship to the needs, interests, and constitutional rights of current residents and businesses in their pursuits. This used to be sufficient. However, development today tends to produce a burden on the public's purse elsewhere. It comes in the form of homelessness, joblessness or in a poorly educated child.

Blocks with one-story structures throughout the community represent two types of land use. Buildings that have been always been part of the commercial retail environment and those more recently constructed as a result of a demolished building site largely during the 70s and 80s in NYC or other form of replacement.

R7.3 LOCATE SPECIAL PURPOSE AND MIXED USE DISTRICT SITE OPPORTUNITIES

Special Purpose District text tends to serve pre-existing developer interest and a mix of community-based concerns. Establishing these areas establishes the initiative of the community board. It also forms the legal basis for building a sustainable community development program.

Mixed-use Districts text tend to support "as-of-right" development conditions involving the expansion or development of diverse land uses ranging from manufacturing and warehousing to multi-family housing in close proximity.

These district strategies are effective, well-recognized tools for promoting the integration of housing, commercial office and cultural institution interfaces in complex urban environments. They help to ensure that the form and use of new buildings enhance neighborhood character and provide for physical transitions that specifically address scale and building size.

Much of CD12's development potential rests with advancing the Department of City Planning's capacity to initiate rezoning activities for residential and mixed-use purposes. Significant portions of the commercial districts in the community are well suited to additional residential and mixed-use development, especially in the Broadway and Amsterdam Avenue corridors.

Inclusionary zoning offers the potential for modest investments supporting the provision of affordable housing. Needed modifications to the existing inclusionary housing program may include expanding the radius of "inclusion" to two miles. As substantial new construction is less likely in CD12, this could help ensure that the neighborhoods of CD12 would benefit from source of financing for housing stability capital based on its needs and site opportunity as opposed to how much new development it can handle.

Community Board support for special districts in which the offer of bonuses of floor area are offered is nevertheless "on the inclusionary zoning table". The emergence of these areas suggests the need to explore development as a community-based planning and design function. The application of a community design criteria could establish Develop Environments with Action Leadership (DEAL).

R7.4 MARKET INNOVATIVE COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS: FUND CD12-ZAT

Marketing means getting people involved in the plan that will help to contribute written or verbal reports to the CD12 Working Group on Housing. Thereafter is possible to imagine support for "working groups on many subjects". For now, the challenge is to identify individuals with an interest in the following as a test:

- Housing trust funding via city/state legislation
- Help conduct routine housing finance agency briefing conferences
- Engage the "home rule" debate and report to the Board
- Fair Share Analysis from a Citywide and Statewide point of view
- Evaluate programs aimed at preventing homeless in CD12
- Tenant impact evaluation on 2006 amendments to Rent Stabilization Guidelines

Encourage housing and commercial real estate developers to include facilities for education and cultural facilities and to support mixed-use districts serving commercial office and cultural facility development. All new construction, rehabilitation of adaptive reuse of histor-

ic structures of CD12's substantial architectural fabric should seek out the institution builders in the arts, literature, music, dance, and theater.

The snapshot of possible development areas in the community is a test of community board policies on new development and preservation. The policy is applied to each of the sites that are either as-of-right or subject to Community Board review. This policy deals with the goal of zoning reconciliation, affordable housing, and historic preservation. The identification of "inclusionary" sites for community facilities meeting new or existing needs will require evaluation on a site-by-site basis.

CD12's position is cast as follows:

1. Sherman Creek is the first of several development concepts that the Community Board expect to face over the next few years. The challenge is to develop resources to examine the impact of these changes, and evaluate its capacity to make modifications that improve benefits to residents.
2. The Sherman Creek process begins with the conclusion of the ULURP process. From this point forward, the need for a community-based zoning analysis team (ZAT) is paramount. It will lay the groundwork to assist the entire board in understanding the nuance of zoning.
3. The R7A for the interior blocks is highly welcomed. The R7A and R7B zoning brings new development (if it occurs) into substantial conformity with the built environment with maximum heights at 80 and 75 feet. The board will seek to apply and adapt the criteria used here to the community at large.
4. It is logical for the community to be highly concerned about the physical condition of its existing stock of residential buildings. Begin work with HPD, HDC and other to identify moderate rehabilitation opportunities and other forms of financial assistance and assurances to aid tenants in place.

This leads to framing a set of questions for DCP as refined by CD12-ZAT. For example:

1. The proposed C4-4D along Dyckman is equivalent to R8A. Is there an effect on the inclusionary bonus formula along Dyckman?
2. Another question, is the transfer of development rights the only reason that the waterfront stays R7-2?
3. Will the inclusionary zoning options tied to the development rights transfer be a restrictive declaration of some kind or a zoning text change?
4. One individual holds a substantial portion of the land affected by the zoning change. Will the offices of DCP be available to facilitate discussions and negotiations?

The "surprise" portion of proposal is the conversion to R8A and C4-4D on the "U", but when the bulk of the buildings from the development rights transfer are computed it seems the R7-2 on the waterfront is very similar in impact (if not bulk).

The maximum FAR is 3.44 and view corridor requirements reduce lot coverage to produce towers as illustrated. Given the added waterfront restrictions, how likely is it that a developer would seek R8A FAR and the development rights transfer? This is a windfall zoning change has a cash value that belongs to the community as equally as it does a potential developer.

Addendum: Harnessing the Resources of Physical Landscape

R8.1 SUPPORT ARCHITECTURAL PROGRAM INNOVATION AND URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES

Exploring alternatives to existing building codes and zoning is important for stimulating production of new housing that addresses the full range of community needs. As an example, the American Institute of Architects New York Chapter's Housing Task Force identified technical changes that would permit housing development to occur without increased bulk, while providing badly needed singles' housing.

Another innovation includes the identification and provision of housing on a temporary basis during substantial rehabilitation of CD12 distressed apartment buildings. Providing up to three 30 to 40 unit buildings as temporary housing for households displaced by substantial rehabilitation would keep families together. This means helping to keep children in their schools and adults in employment. This service for the displaced could be of greatest importance by providing direct intervention for the unemployed uncle, brother, or sister staying with the family. Community-based development corporations should be encouraged to develop a management program and identify potential buildings for acquisition.

R8.2 GET MORE INVESTMENT IN MASS TRANSIT

This part of Manhattan has excellent access to Mass Transit providing a station entry within a five minute walk for 98% of the population. Security, safety, frequency, and quality of service are the only issues that remain. Two stations in Inwood offer the potential of expanded development options.

R8.3 JOB ACCESS REVERSE COMMUTE (JARC)

While New York City continues to capture a large number of jobs, its employment share in the region has declined. In 1958, New York City had over 3.1 million workers, representing 80 percent of total regional employment. In 2000, while the city has 3.2 million workers, its share of regional employment dropped to 65 percent. A significant portion of the loss is in sectors that provide a high percentage of entry-level positions. This has led to the "spatial mismatch" issue in which the location of entry-level workforce is too distant from sources of suitable work.

One short-term measure is to develop reverse-commuting services that help low-skilled workers reach jobs in the region. Longer-term strategies typically involve workforce development services that educate and train workers for new-service sector employment. The rehabilitation of the Port Authority's bus terminal be requested to include a "JARC" transportation center to facilitate movement of CD12 residents to employment opportunities in the region at minimal to no cost.

R8.4 PARKLAND TO WATERFRONT INFRASTRUCTURE

Half of CD12's land area is parkland created by the massive geological structures that formed the Hudson and Harlem Rivers. When direct "toes in the water" access is held as the high value CD12, the relationship of the parkland to the river landscape is the weakest in Manhattan. However, it is the strongest when the highest value becomes scenic. Protecting this resource is a significant priority.

The study recommends a pedestrian movement analysis to identify urban design treatments that would enhance the Washington Heights and Inwood as walking communities. Special attention to clusters of community facilities and commercial centers, mass transit resources and waterfront transit on the Harlem and Hudson River waterfront demands coordination.

Community-based stewardship of park resources is very important now, especially as privatization continues to lease out significant portions for specialized uses. The expansion of board oversight responsibility for parkland leases and concessions will encourage efforts to maximizing local business involvement. The proposed St. George Hill Mountain Bike trails offer an important test case for evaluation.

R8.5 COMMUNITY OPEN SPACE RESOURCE DATABASE WITH GIS PROGRAM

Complete, accurate, and up-to-date information is essential to decision-making and policy-making, yet this does not exist at present and no mechanism is in place to provide it. Knowledge about the character of the open space, such as how much is green or paved, portions of the parks that are fully accessible, or how local parks and open spaces connect with transportation corridors is vital to a sound land-use and environmental quality policy.

This recommendation anticipates the “upstate Manhattan” quality of the district’s open space as the target of leisure business investment. The sense that a series of major recreational development business will begin use the topography of Washington Heights seems apparent. Natural environment skate boarding and trail bikes, rock climbing, hiking and nature walks, complete with rest stops, emergency care centers, are just a brief sampling of leisure business pursuits in dense urban environments such as Manhattan. The board will require a policy framework for evaluating these investments in relationship to the economic development needs of the community.

(Endnotes)

1 Jerry Armer, the chair of the community board, is known for saying that residents have spent a dozen years trying to change the zoning in the southern part of the Slope to protect brownstone neighborhoods that were outside of the Park Slope historic district.

2 See DCP site: <http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcp/html/about/pr072604.shtml>. As recently as 2004 building height has been an issue in Clinton. The proposal by DCP responded to community concerns that existing zoning controls permit development along Ninth and Tenth Avenues to be considerably taller than many existing buildings along the avenues, and could result a "saw tooth" skyline and/or "sore thumb" buildings that are out of character with their neighbors. The proposed text amendment would establish new height controls to ensure that new development is consistent with the scale and character of the surrounding neighborhood. The Preservation Area of the Special Clinton District area is bounded by on the north by 56th Street and 43rd Street to the south, roughly between Eighth and Tenth Avenues. An interesting and detailed background on the formation of the Clinton District may be reviewed at <http://hellskitchen.net/reports/kik/kik01.html> in an article describing anti-gentrification efforts entitled keeping the "kitchen" in Clinton.

3 The idea of "newcomers" has been broadened recently by demographers reflecting changes in American immigration policies since the 1960s and by analysts such as Richard Florida in his book "The Creative Class" which explores the multi-racial, multi-ethnic composition of artists and entrepreneurs who find lower cost communities such as CD12 a fertile ground for their creative interests. An interesting website <http://www.creativeclass.org> on the subject explores these views.

4 Housing Here and Now has created a community-based resource file with the help of community-based housing advocates and tenants. Known as the **Fix it Now** campaign buildings with bad conditions can be reported this advocates website. To enter a building use this link: http://nycworstlandlords.com/nycwl/slumlord_form.php

5 Data: New York Housing Tenant Court November 2005 - March 2006

6 For detailed description see: <http://www.nyc.gov/html/dhs/html/atrisk/homebase.shtml> and <http://www.nyc.gov/html/dhs/html/rent/hsp.shtml>

7 These are Mott Haven/South Bronx (CD1), East Tremont (CD6), Bedford Stuyvesant (CD3), Bushwick (CD4), East Harlem (CD11), and Jamaica (CD12). DHS plans to expand the program to additional community districts in the future.

8 Mayor Bloomberg before the National Alliance to End Homelessness Annual Conference in Washington, DC July 17, 2006

9 An excellent source of expertise on community land trusts limited equity cooperatives, and community-based nonprofit is the **Institute for Community Economics** <http://www.iceclt.org/clt/index.html>

10 The Medical Center Neighborhood Fund awards small grants many community groups in Washington Heights/Inwood <http://www.washington-heights.us>. About \$80,000 is distributed among 60 organizations in an annual awards ceremony. The program is nearing its 20th year of operation.

