IN THE MATTER OF an application submitted by the New York City Department of City Planning, pursuant to Section 201 of the New York City Charter, for an amendment of the Zoning Resolution of the City of New York, establishing the Special East Harlem Corridors District (Article XIII, Chapter 8) and modifying Appendix F, for the purpose of establishing a Mandatory Inclusionary Housing area, and modifying related sections, Borough of Manhattan, Community District 11.

This application for an amendment to the Zoning Resolution was filed by the Department of City Planning on April 24, 2017. The requested action, in conjunction with the related actions, would facilitate the East Harlem Neighborhood Rezoning.

RELATED ACTIONS
In addition to the proposed zoning text amendment (N 170359 ZRM) that is the subject of this report, implementation of the proposed East Harlem Neighborhood Rezoning also requires action by the City Planning Commission on the following applications, which are being considered concurrently with this application:

C 170358 ZMM Zoning map amendment
C 170360 HUM Amendment to Milbank Frawley Circle East Urban Renewal Plan

BACKGROUND
A full background discussion and description of this application appears in the report for the related action, (C 170358 ZMM).

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW
This application (N 170359 ZRM), in conjunction with the applications for the related actions (C 170358 ZMM and C 170360 HUM), was reviewed pursuant to the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), and the SEQRA regulations set forth in Volume 6 of the New York Code of Rules and Regulations, Section 617.00 et seq. and the City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Rules of Procedure of 1991 and Executive Order No.
91 of 1977. The designated CEQR number is 17DCP048M. The Lead Agency is the City Planning Commission.

A summary of the environmental review and Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) appears in the report for the related zoning map amendment action (C 170358 ZMM).

**PUBLIC REVIEW**

This application (N 170359 ZRM) was referred for information and review in accordance with the procedures for non-ULURP matters on April 24, 2017, in conjunction with the related actions (C 170358 ZMM and C 170360 HUM), which were certified as complete by the Department of City Planning and duly referred to Community Board 11 and the Manhattan Borough President in accordance with Title 62 of the Rules of the City of New York, Section 2-02(b).

**Community Board Public Hearing**

Community Board 11 held a public hearing on this application (N 170359 ZRM) on June 20, 2017, and on that date, by a vote of nine in favor, 32 opposed, and one abstention, adopted a resolution recommending disapproval of the application with conditions.

A summary of the Community Board’s resolution appears in the report for the related zoning map amendment action (C 170358 ZMM).

**Borough President Recommendation**

This application (N 170359 ZRM) was considered by the Manhattan Borough President, who issued a recommendation disapproving the application on August 2, 2017.

A summary of the Borough President’s recommendation appears in the report for the related zoning map amendment action (C 170358 ZMM).

**City Planning Commission Public Hearing**

On August 9, 2017 (Calendar No. 17), the City Planning Commission scheduled August 23, 2017, for a public hearing on this application (N 170359 ZRM) and the applications for the related
actions. The hearing was duly held on August 23, 2017 (Calendar No. 35).

There were a number of appearances, as described in the report for the related zoning map amendment action (C 170358 ZMM), and the hearing was closed.

WATERFRONT REVITALIZATION PROGRAM CONSISTENCY REVIEW
This application (N 170359 ZRM), in conjunction with the related applications (C 170358 ZMM and C 170360 HUM) was reviewed by the City Coastal Commission for consistency with the policies of the New York City Waterfront Revitalization Program (WRP), as amended, approved by the New York City Council on October 30, 2013 and by the New York State Department of State on February 3, 2016, pursuant to the New York State Waterfront Revitalization and Coastal Resources Act of 1981, (New York State Executive Law, Section 910 et seq.) The designated WRP number is 17-020.

This action was determined to be consistent with the policies of the New York City Waterfront Revitalization Program.

CONSIDERATION
The Commission believes that the proposed amendment to the Zoning Resolution, in conjunction with the related actions, is appropriate, as modified. A full consideration and analysis of the issues and the reasons for approving this application appear in the related report for the zoning map amendment action (C 170358 ZMM).

RESOLUTION
RESOLVED, that having considered the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), for which a Notice of Completion was issued on September 19, 2017, with respect to this application (CEQR No. 17DCP048M), and the Technical Memorandum 002, dated September 29, 2017, the City Planning Commission finds that the requirements of the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act and Regulations have been met and that
1. Consistent with social, economic and other essential considerations, from among the reasonable alternatives thereto, the Proposed Actions, as modified with the modifications adopted herein and in the Technical Memorandum 002, is one which minimizes or avoids adverse environmental impacts to the maximum extent practicable; and

2. The adverse environmental impacts identified in the FEIS will be minimized or avoided to the maximum extent practicable by the placement of (E) designations for Hazardous Materials, Air Quality, and Noise, which form part of the Proposed Actions, or the specification of required mitigation measures, as appropriate.

The report of the City Planning Commission, together with the FEIS and the Technical Memorandum 002, constitutes the written statement of facts, and of social, economic and other factors and standards, that form the basis of the decision, pursuant to Section 617.11(d) of the SEQRA regulations; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, the City Coastal Commission finds that the action will not substantially hinder the achievement of any WRP policy and hereby determines that this action is consistent with WRP policies; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, by the City Planning Commission, pursuant to Section 200 of the New York City Charter, that based on the environmental determination, and the consideration described in this report, the Zoning Resolution of the City of New York, effective as of December 15, 1961, and as subsequently modified, is further amended as follows:

Matter underlined is new, to be added;
Matter struck out is to be deleted;
Matter within # # is defined in Section 12-10;
* * * indicates where unchanged text appears in the Zoning Resolution

* * *
ARTICLE I
GENERAL PROVISIONS

Chapter 1
Title, Establishment of Controls and Interpretation of Regulations

*     *     *

11-122
Districts established
In order to carry out the purposes and provisions of this Resolution, the following districts are hereby established:

*     *     *

Special Purpose Districts

*     *     *

Establishment of the Special Downtown Jamaica District

In order to carry out the special purposes of this Resolution as set forth in Article XI, Chapter 5, the #Special Downtown Jamaica District# is hereby established.

Establishment of the Special East Harlem Corridors District

In order to carry out the special purposes of this Resolution as set forth in Article XIII, Chapter 8, the #Special East Harlem Corridors District# is hereby established.

Establishment of the Special Enhanced Commercial District
In order to carry out the special purposes of this Resolution as set forth in Article XIII, Chapter 2, the #Special Enhanced Commercial District# is hereby established.

*   *   *

Chapter 2  
Construction of Language and Definitions

*   *   *

12-10  
DEFINITIONS

*   *   *

Special Downtown Jamaica District

The “Special Downtown Jamaica District” is a Special Purpose District designated by the letters “DJ” in which special regulations set forth in Article XI, Chapter 5, apply.

Special East Harlem Corridors District

The “Special East Harlem Corridors District” is a Special Purpose District designated by the letters “EHC” in which special regulations set forth in Article XIII, Chapter 8, apply.

Special Enhanced Commercial District

The “Special Enhanced Commercial District” is a Special Purpose District designated by the letters “EC” in which special regulations set forth in Article XIII, Chapter 2, apply.

*   *   *

Chapter 4  
Sidewalk Cafe Regulations

*   *   *

*   *   *
14-40
AREA ELIGIBILITY FOR SIDEWALK CAFES

*   *   *

14-44
Special Zoning Districts Where Certain Sidewalk Cafes Are Permitted

*   *   *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manhattan</th>
<th>#Enclosed Sidewalk Cafe#</th>
<th>#Unenclosed Sidewalk Cafe#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinton District</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Harlem Corridors District</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Commercial District 2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Columbus and Amsterdam Avenues)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*   *   *

ARTICLE II
RESIDENCE BULK REGULATIONS

Chapter 3
Residential Bulk Regulations in Residence Districts

*   *   *

23-011
Quality Housing Program

*   *   *

R6 R7 R8 R9 R10
(c) In the districts indicated without a letter suffix, the optional Quality Housing #bulk# regulations permitted as an alternative pursuant to paragraph (b) of this Section, shall not apply to:

* * *

(2) Special Purpose Districts

However, such optional Quality Housing #bulk# regulations are permitted as an alternative to apply in the following Special Purpose Districts:

#Special 125th Street District#;
#Special Downtown Brooklyn District#;
#Special Downtown Jamaica District#;
#Special East Harlem Corridors District#;
#Special Grand Concourse Preservation District#;

* * *

23-03

Street Tree Planting in Residence Districts

R1 R2 R3 R4 R5 R6 R7 R8 R9 R10

In all districts, as indicated, the following shall provide #street# trees in accordance with Section 26-41 (Street Tree Planting):

* * *

(b) #enlargements# of #single-# or #two-family residences# by 20 percent or more within the following special purpose districts:

#Special Bay Ridge District#;

#Special Clinton District#;

#Special Downtown Brooklyn District#;

#Special Downtown Jamaica District#
ARTICLE III
COMMERCIAL DISTRICT REGULATIONS

Chapter 3
Bulk Regulations for Commercial or Community Facility Buildings in Commercial Districts

* * *

33-03
Street Tree Planting in Commercial Districts

C1 C2 C3 C4 C5 C6 C7 C8

In all districts, as indicated, the following shall provide street trees in accordance with Section 26-41 (Street Tree Planting):

* * *

(b) enlargements of single- or two-family residences by 20 percent or more within the following special purpose districts:

#Special Bay Ridge District#

#Special Clinton District#

#Special Downtown Brooklyn District#

#Special Downtown Jamaica District#

#Special East Harlem Corridors District#;
#Special Grand Concourse Preservation District#

* * *

* * *
ARTICLE IX
SPECIAL PURPOSE DISTRICTS

Chapter 5
Special Transit Land Use District

95-00
GENERAL PURPOSES

*     *     *

95-03
Transit Easement

Any development or enlargement involving ground level construction within the Special Transit Land Use District shall provide an easement on the zoning lot for subway-related use and public access to the subway mezzanine or station when required pursuant to the provisions of Section 95-04.

The issuance by the Department of Buildings of an excavation permit for any zoning lot located within the Special District shall be dependent upon prior compliance with the provisions of this Chapter.

The transit easement required on a zoning lot shall permit the realization of one or more of the following planning objectives:

(a) the integration and relating of subway station design to surrounding development;

(b) the introduction of light and air to; stations; and mezzanines; and other related facilities constructed pursuant to the provisions of Section 95-032 (Determination of transit easements at other stations);

*     *     *

95-031
Selection of transit easement at certain stations

At the stations specified below, the transit easement required on a zoning lot shall constitute a volume whose dimensions above and below curb level shall comply with the requirements as set forth in Table A or Table B of this Section, depending on the depth of the proposed subway mezzanine below curb level, as established by the Metropolitan Transportation Authority.

*     *     *
95-032
Determination of transit easements at other stations

At the 106th Street, 116th Street and 125th Street stations, a transit easement shall be provided to accommodate, whether singly or in any combination, light wells, stairs, ramps, escalators, elevators, passageways, or ancillary facilities required to support the functioning of subway station or rail mass transit facilities, including, but not limited to, emergency egress or ventilation structures, the Metropolitan Transportation Authority shall, in consultation with the owner of the zoning lot and the City Planning Commission, determine the appropriate type of transit easement and reasonable dimensions for such transit easement volume.

95-0323
Location of transit easements

* * *

95-05
Terms and Conditions for Permitted Uses and Construction within Transit Easement Volume

The transit easement volume shall be used as an entrance/exit for public access to the subway and/or to provide better access of light and air to the subway station mezzanine, and for related uses. Illustrative of such purposes are light wells, stairs, ramps, escalators, or elevators, or, for zoning lots subject to the provisions of Section 95-032 (Determination of transit easements at other stations), ancillary facilities required to support the functioning of subways, including, but not limited to, emergency egress or ventilation structures.

No floor area bonus shall be allowed for any transit easement provided on a zoning lot. When a transit easement volume required on a zoning lot is located within a building, any floor spaces occupied by such transit easement volume shall not count as floor area. Any portion of the lot area of a zoning lot occupied by a transit easement and weather protected by an overhang or roofed area, shall be considered as a public plaza in the districts that allow such public plaza bonuses.

* * *

95-051
Development of transit access facilities

All access facilities, including any light wells or sky lights required within a transit easement volume established pursuant to the provisions of Section 95-031 (Selection of transit easement at certain stations), or access and ancillary facilities required pursuant to the provisions of Section 95-032 (Determination of transit easement at other stations), shall be constructed and maintained by the Metropolitan Transportation Authority except for any building columns, footings or any other permitted obstructions allowed therein.
95-052
Special access facilities for persons with disabilities at certain stations

For #zoning lots# subject to the provisions of Section 95-031 (Selection of transit easement at certain stations), special elevators for persons with disabilities may locate within a transit easement volume, provided stair and/or escalator access to the subway mezzanine are located within the same easement and in no event located within the public sidewalk adjacent to the #zoning lot#.

* * *

Article IX
Special Purpose Districts

Chapter 7
Special 125th Street District

97-00
GENERAL PURPOSES

The “Special 125th Street District” established in this Resolution is designed to promote and protect the public health, safety, general welfare and amenity. The general goals include, among others, the following specific purposes:

(a) to preserve, protect and promote the special character of 125th Street as Harlem’s “Main Street” and the role of 125th Street as Upper Manhattan’s premier mixed use corridor;

(b) to guide development on the 125th Street corridor;

(c) to expand the retail and commercial character of 125th Street;

(d) to provide incentives for the creation of visual and performing arts space and enhance the area’s role as a major arts, entertainment and cultural destination in the City;

(e) to support mixed use development throughout the 125th Street corridor, including residential uses, and to provide incentives for the production of affordable housing;

(f) to ensure that the form of new buildings is compatible and relates to the built character of the 125th Street corridor;
(g) to enhance the pedestrian environment through appropriate ground floor uses and regulations;

(h) to ensure, in the Park Avenue Hub Subdistrict, compatibility with the purposes of the #Special East Harlem Corridors District#; and

(h)(i) to promote the most desirable use of land and thus conserve and enhance the value of land and buildings, and thereby protect the City’s revenue.

* * *

97-03
District Plan and Maps

The regulations of this Chapter are designed to implement the #Special 125th Street District# Plan. The District Plan, including Map 1 (Special 125th Street District and Core Subdistricts) and Map 2 (Permitted Small Sidewalk Cafe Locations), is set forth in Appendix A of this Chapter and is hereby incorporated as part of this Resolution for the purpose of specifying locations where the special regulations and requirements set forth in this Chapter apply.

97-04
Establishment of Core Subdistricts

In order to carry out the purposes and provisions of this Chapter, the Core two subdistricts are established within the #Special 125th Street District# and: the Core Subdistrict and the Park Avenue Hub Subdistrict. Each subdistrict includes specific regulations designed to support an arts and entertainment environment and other relevant planning objectives along 125th Street. The boundaries of the Core subdistricts are shown on Map 1 in Appendix A of this Chapter.

* * *

97-06
Applicability of Special Transit Land Use District Regulations

Applicability of District Regulations

[Note: existing provisions moved to Section 97-061]

97-061
Applicability of Special Transit Land Use District Regulations

[Note: existing provisions moved from Section 97-06 and updated a cross reference. The specification of the #Special Transit Land Use District# was eliminated since they are specified in Zoning Maps.]
Wherever the #Special 125th Street District# includes an area which also lies within the #Special Transit Land Use District#, the requirements of the #Special Transit Land Use District#, as set forth in Article IX, Chapter 5, shall apply, subject to the modifications described in paragraphs (e) (a)(4) and (f) (a)(5) of Section 97-433 (Street wall location) 442 (Height and setback regulations within the Core Subdistrict and areas outside of a subdistrict).

The #Special Transit Land Use District# includes the area within the #Special 125th Street District# bounded by a line 50 feet west of Second Avenue from 124th Street midway to 125th Street where such area widens to a line 100 feet west of Second Avenue.

97-062
**Applicability of the Quality Housing Program**

[Note: existing provisions moved from 97-40 (SPECIAL BULK REGULATIONS)]

In the #Special 125th Street District#, #buildings# containing #residences# shall be #developed# or #enlarged# in accordance with the Quality Housing Program, and the regulations of Article II, Chapter 8 shall apply. The #bulk# regulations of this Chapter shall be considered the applicable #bulk# regulations for #Quality Housing buildings#.

97-063
**Applicability of Inclusionary Housing Program**

[Note: existing provision moved from Section 97-421 (Inclusionary Housing) and changed to include Mandatory Inclusionary Housing applicability]

For the purposes of applying the Inclusionary Housing Program provisions set forth in Section 23-154 (Inclusionary Housing) and in Section 23-90 (INCLUSIONARY HOUSING), #Inclusionary Housing designated areas# and #Mandatory Inclusionary Housing areas# within the #Special 125th Street Districts# are shown on the maps in APPENDIX F of this Resolution.

97-10
**SPECIAL USE AND LOCATION REGULATIONS**

* * *

97-14
**Transient Hotels Within the Park Avenue Hub Subdistrict**

Within the Park Avenue Hub Subdistrict, as shown on Map 1 in Appendix A of this Chapter, the #development# or #enlargement# of a #building# containing a #transient hotel#, as listed in
Section 32-14 (Use Group 5), or the conversion or change of use within an existing building to a transient hotel, shall only be allowed:

(a) upon certification by the Chairperson of the City Planning Commission to the Commissioner of Buildings that the residential development goal, as set forth in this Section, has been met, or

(b) where such residential development goal, has not been met, by special permit by the City Planning Commission. To permit such a transient hotel, the Commission shall find that:

(1) sufficient sites are available in the area to meet the residential development goal; or

(2) a harmonious mix of residential and non-residential uses has been established in the area, and such transient hotel is consistent with the character of the surrounding area.

The Commission may prescribe additional conditions and safeguards to minimize adverse effects on the character of the surrounding area.

For the purpose of applying the provisions of this Section, the residential development goal shall be met when at least 4,470 dwelling units within the combined areas of the Special East Harlem Corridors District, and the Park Avenue Hub Subdistrict, as shown on Map 1 in Appendix A of this Chapter, have received temporary or final certificates of occupancy subsequent to [date of adoption].

97-20
LOCATION AND ACCESS REGULATIONS

[Note: applicability of Article II, Chapter 8 has been moved to Section 97-062]

Within the Core Subdistrict, as shown on Map 1 in Appendix A of this Chapter, and areas outside of a subdistrict, the provisions of Section 97-21 (Location and Access Requirements in Certain Areas), inclusive, shall apply.

Within the Park Avenue Hub Subdistrict, as shown on Map 1 in Appendix A of this Chapter, the provisions of Section 97-21, inclusive, shall apply to any zoning lot, or portion thereof, specified in Section 97-21, and the provisions of Section 97-22 (Use Location Regulations in the Park Avenue Hub Subdistrict), inclusive, shall apply to all other zoning lots, or portion thereof.
For the purposes of applying the provisions of this Section, defined terms shall include those set forth in Sections 12-10 (DEFINITIONS) and 37-311 (Definitions).

97-21
Location of and Access to Arts and Entertainment Uses
Supplemental Use and Streetscape Regulations along 125th Street

[Note: existing 97-21 provisions moved to Section 97-211]

[Note: existing provisions, moved from Section 97-20]

Within the #Special 125th Street District#, for any #zoning lot# that fronts upon 125th Street, the #use# regulations of the underlying districts shall be modified by the locational and access requirements of this Section, inclusive. However, on #through lots# or #corner lots# with frontage along 125th Street, such requirements shall apply within the first 100 feet of the 125th Street #street line#.

97-211
Location and Access to Art and Entertainment Uses

[Note: existing provisions, moved from Section 97-21]

Any arts and entertainment #uses# listed in Section 97-11 that are provided in order to comply with the requirements of Section 97-12 (Arts and Entertainment Use Requirement) or Section 97-422 (Floor area bonus for visual or performing arts uses) shall be subject to the following location and access requirements:

* * *

97-212
Uses not permitted on the ground floor of buildings

[Note: existing provisions moved from Section 97-22 and modified]

The following #uses# are not permitted within #stories# that have a floor level within five feet of #curb level# in #buildings developed# after April 30, 2008, or within #stories# that have a floor level within five feet of #curb level# within portions of #buildings enlarged# after April 30, 2008, where such #building# or portion of a #building# fronts upon 125th Street, or is within 100 feet from 125th Street. Entranceways and lobby space for access to such #uses# shall be permitted at the ground floor level, pursuant to the provisions of Section 97-224 213 (Access to non-ground floor uses).

* * *
97-213
Access to non-ground floor uses

[Note: existing provisions, moved from Section 97-221]

The maximum ground floor #street# frontage on 125th Street allocated to entranceways or lobby space for non-ground floor #uses# listed in Section 97-22 shall be as set forth for Type 1 lobbies in Section 37-33 (Maximum Width of Certain Uses), except that for #developments# or #enlargements# with at least 200 linear feet fronting on 125th Street, the Type 2 lobby regulations shall apply.

Additionally, within the Core Subdistrict the #residential# portion of a #development# or #enlargement# may be accessed from an entrance on 125th Street only if such #development# or #enlargement# does not front upon a #street# other than 125th Street.

97-214
Transparency requirements along 125th Street

[Note: existing provisions, moved from 97-23]

For all #uses#, other than houses of worship, libraries and primary rehearsal spaces, located on the ground floor of #developments# and #enlargements# that front upon that portion of 125th Street located within the #Special 125th Street District#, the ground floor #street wall# shall be glazed in accordance with the provisions set forth in Section 37-34 (Minimum Transparency Requirements).

97-22
Uses Not Permitted on the Ground Floor of Buildings
Supplemental Use and Streetscape Regulations within the Park Avenue Hub Subdistrict

[Note: existing 97-22 provisions moved to Section 97-212]

Within the Park Avenue Hub Subdistrict, as shown on Map 1 in Appendix A of this Chapter, for #zoning lots#, or portion thereof, that are not subject to the provisions of Section 97-21 (Location and Access Regulations along 125th Street), inclusive, the provisions of this Section, inclusive, shall apply.

97-221
Access to non-ground floor uses
Modification of supplemental use location regulations

[Note: existing 97-221 provisions moved to Section 97-213]
The supplementary #commercial use# regulations of Section 32-421 (Limitation on floors occupied by commercial uses) shall be modified to permit #commercial uses# on any #story#, provided that at any level containing #residences#, no access exists between such #commercial# and #residential uses# and provided that such #commercial uses# are not located directly over any #residential use#.

97-222
Ground floor use and streetscape regulations

The provisions of this Section, inclusive, shall apply to #developments# or #ground floor level enlargements#. Any portion of a #ground floor level# allocated to a transit easement required by the MTA pursuant to the provisions of Article IX, Chapter 5 need not comply with the streetscape requirements of this Section.

For the purposes of applying the special #ground floor level# streetscape provisions set forth in Section 37-30 to this Chapter, any portion of a #ground floor level street# frontage along Park Avenue that is not subject to the provisions of Section 97-21 (Location and Access Regulations along 125th Street), inclusive, as well as any #narrow street# frontage within 50 feet of Park Avenue, shall be considered #primary street frontages#. A #ground floor level street# frontage along any other #street# shall be considered a #secondary street frontage#.

(a) Along #primary street frontages#

For #buildings#, or portions thereof, with #primary street frontage#, #uses# on the #ground floor level#, to the minimum depth set forth in Section 37-32 (Ground Floor Depth Requirements for Certain Uses), shall be limited to non-#residential uses#, except for Type 2 lobbies and entrances and exits to #accessory# parking spaces provided in accordance with the applicable provisions of Section 37-33 (Maximum Width of Certain Uses). #Group parking facilities# located on the #ground floor level# shall be wrapped by #floor area# in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (a) of Section 37-35 (Parking Wrap and Screening Requirements). #Ground floor level street walls# shall be glazed in accordance with the provisions set forth in Section 37-34 (Minimum Transparency Requirements).

(b) Along #secondary street frontages#

For #buildings#, or portions thereof, with #secondary street frontage#, all #uses# permitted by the underlying district shall be permitted on the #ground floor level#, provided that any #group parking facilities# on the #ground floor level# shall be wrapped or screened in accordance with Section 37-35.

The level of the finished floor of such ground floor shall be located not higher than five feet above nor lower than five feet below the as-built level of the adjoining #street#. 
97-23
Transparency Requirements

[Note: existing 97-23 provisions moved to Section 97-214]

* * *

97-40
SPECIAL BULK REGULATIONS

[Note: the applicability of Article II, Chapter 8 moved to Section 97-062]

Within the #Special 125th Street District#, all #developments# or #enlargements# containing #residences# shall comply with the requirements of Article II, Chapter 8 (Quality Housing), and the applicable #bulk# regulations of the underlying districts shall apply, except as modified in by the provisions of this Section, inclusive.

97-41
Special Floor Area Regulations

The maximum #floor area ratio#, #open space ratio# and #lot coverage# requirements of the applicable underlying district shall apply within the #Special 125th Street District#, unless modified by the following regulations.

97-411
Maximum floor area ratio in C4-4D, C4-7 and C6-3 Districts within the Core Subdistrict and areas outside of a subdistrict

In C4-4D, C4-7 or C6-3 Districts in the Core Subdistrict, as shown on Map 1 in Appendix A of this Chapter and areas outside of a subdistrict, the maximum permitted #floor area ratios# shall be as listed in the following table for #residential#, #commercial# and #community facility uses#, and may only be increased pursuant to Section 97-42 (Additional Floor Area Bonuses Regulations), inclusive.

* * *

97-412
Maximum floor area ratio in the Park Avenue Hub Subdistrict

Within the Park Avenue Hub Subdistrict, as shown on Map 1 in Appendix A of this Chapter, the maximum #floor area ratio# for #zoning lots# is set forth in paragraph (a) of this Section, and is modified for certain #zoning lots# in accordance with paragraph (b) of this Section.
(a) Maximum #floor area ratio#

The maximum #floor area ratio# shall be 12.0. Where a #development# or #enlargement# contains #residential floor area#, such #zoning lot# shall satisfy the provisions of either:

1. a minimum non-#residential floor area ratio# of 2.0 shall be provided on such #zoning lot#. Such #floor area# shall not include any #floor area# containing a #transient hotel# pursuant to the provisions of Section 97-14 (Transient Hotels Within the Park Avenue Hub Subdistrict); or

2. a minimum #floor area ratio# of 0.5, or a minimum amount of floor space equivalent to such 0.5 #floor area ratio#, shall be provided on such #zoning lot#. Such #floor area# or equivalent floor space shall be exclusively used for those visual or performing arts #uses#, designated in paragraph (b) of Section 97-11 (Special Arts and Entertainment Uses), and shall be certified by the Chairperson of the City Planning Commission to the Commissioner of Buildings that the conditions set forth in Section 97-423 (Certification for floor area bonus for visual or performing arts uses) have been met.

(b) Modified maximum #floor area ratio# for certain #zoning lots#

For #zoning lots# existing on or before [date of adoption] with a #lot area# of less than 5,000 square feet, or for #zoning lots# subject to the provisions of paragraph (d)(4) of Section 23-154 (Inclusionary Housing), the maximum #floor area ratios# set forth in paragraph (a) of this Section shall be modified, as follows:

1. the minimum non-#residential floor area# requirements set forth in paragraph (a) of this Section shall be optional for #zoning lots# existing on or before [date of adoption] with a #lot area# of less than 5,000 square feet. For #zoning lots# utilizing the provisions of this paragraph, the minimum non-#residential floor area# or visual or performing arts space requirements set forth in paragraph (a) of this Section shall not apply;

2. for #zoning lots#, subject to the provisions of paragraph (d)(4)(i) or (d)(4)(iii) of Section 23-154, the maximum #residential floor area# provision of the underlying district as specified in Section 23-153 (For Quality Housing buildings) shall apply; and

3. for #zoning lots# utilizing the provisions of paragraph (b)(1) or (b)(2) of this Section, the maximum overall #floor area ratio# shall be 10.0, except that such maximum #floor area ratio# may be increased pursuant to the provisions of paragraph (b) of Section 97-422 (Floor area bonus for visual or performing arts uses).
97-42

Additional Floor Area Bonuses Regulations

Within #Inclusionary Housing designated areas#, as specified in APPENDIX F of this Resolution, the maximum #floor area ratio# may be increased by a pursuant to the #floor area# bonus, pursuant to provisions of Sections 23-154 (Inclusionary Housing) or 97-422 (Floor area bonus for visual or performing arts uses), which may be used concurrently.

Within #Mandatory Inclusionary Housing areas#, as specified in APPENDIX F of this Resolution, the maximum #floor area ratio# may be increased for certain #zoning lots# specified in paragraph (b) of Section 97-412 (Maximum floor area ratio in the Park Avenue Hub Subdistrict) by the provisions of Section 97-422.

97-421

Inclusionary Housing

[Note: the Inclusionary Housing Program applicability provision moved to 97-063 (Applicability of Inclusionary Housing Program)]

Within the #Special 125th Street District#, In #Inclusionary Housing designated areas# within C4-4D, C4-7 and C6-3 Districts in the Core Subdistrict or areas outside of a subdistrict, shall be #Inclusionary Housing designated areas#, pursuant to Section 12-10 (DEFINITIONS), for the purpose of making the Inclusionary Housing Program regulations of Section 23-90 (INCLUSIONARY HOUSING), inclusive, and this Section, applicable within the Special District. Within such #Inclusionary Housing designated areas#, the #residential floor area ratio# may be increased by an Inclusionary Housing bonus, pursuant to the provisions of Section 23-154 (Inclusionary Housing).

97-422

Floor area bonus for visual or performing arts uses

(a) In C4-4D, C4-7 or C6-3 Districts within the #Special 125th Street District# Core Subdistrict or areas outside of a subdistrict, for a #development# or #enlargement# with frontage on 125th Street, the maximum #floor area ratio# otherwise permitted for #residential# or #commercial uses# listed in Section 97-411 may be increased up to the maximum #floor area ratio# specified in the table in this Section, provided that for every four square feet of bonused #floor area#, an amount of space equivalent to one square foot of such bonused #floor area# shall be used for those visual or performing arts #uses# designated in paragraph (b) of Section 97-11 (Special Arts and Entertainment Uses). Such bonused #floor area# shall be permitted only upon certification by the Chairperson of the City Planning Commission to the Commissioner of Buildings that the conditions set forth in Section 97-423 have been met.
MAXIMUM PERMITTED FLOOR AREA RATIO (FAR) FOR RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL USES WITH FLOOR AREA BONUS FOR VISUAL OR PERFORMING ARTS USES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outside the Core District</th>
<th>Within the Core Subdistrict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#Residential Floor Area Ratio#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#Residential Floor Area Ratio#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) In C6-4 Districts within the Park Avenue Hub Subdistrict, for a development or enlargement, the maximum floor area ratio permitted in paragraph (b) of Section 97-412 (Maximum floor area ratio in the Park Avenue Hub Subdistrict) may be increased up to a maximum floor area ratio of 12.0, provided that for every four square feet of bonused floor area, an amount of space equivalent to one square foot of floor area shall be used for those visual or performing arts uses designated in paragraph (b) of Section 97-11 (Special Arts and Entertainment Uses). Such bonused floor area shall be permitted only upon certification by the Chairperson of the City Planning Commission to the Commissioner of Buildings that the conditions set forth in Section 97-423 have been met.

97-423 Certification for floor area bonus for visual or performing arts uses

The minimum non-residential floor area or equivalent floor space provisions of paragraph (a)(2) of Section 97-412 (Maximum floor area ratio in the Park Avenue Hub Subdistrict) or the floor area bonus provisions of Section 97-422 shall apply only upon certification by the Chairperson of the City Planning Commission to the Commissioner of Buildings that the following conditions have been met:

(a) Drawings have been provided that clearly designate all floor area permitted pursuant to the provisions of paragraph (a)(2) of Section 97-412, or all floor area that will result from the permitted increase in floor area pursuant to Section 97-422, including the location of such floor area.

(b) Drawings also have been provided that clearly designate all floor area and/or below grade floor space for any new visual or performing arts uses provided for the purposes of satisfying the provisions of paragraph (a)(2) of Section 97-412, or for which a bonus is to be received pursuant to Section 97-422.
Such drawings shall be of sufficient detail to show that such designated space shall be designed, arranged and used for the new visual arts or performing arts uses, and shall also show that:

1. all such visual or performing arts uses are located at or above the ground floor level of the building, except that performance space meeting the requirements of paragraph (b)(4) of this Section may be located below grade, and accessory uses may be located below grade, subject to the requirements of paragraph (b)(5) of this Section;

2. all bonused floor area or below grade space occupied by visual or performing arts uses is primarily accessed from 125th Street, except where such visual or performing arts floor area or floor space is provided pursuant to paragraphs (a)(2) of Section 97-412 or (b)(2) of Section 97-422;

3. in the case of primary rehearsal space, where such space does not consist of accessory uses subject to the requirements of paragraph (b)(4), such space:

   * * *

   iii) has a street wall with at least 50 feet of frontage along 125th Street, except that where such primary rehearsal space is provided pursuant to paragraphs (a)(2) of Section 97-412 or (b)(2) of Section 97-422 such street wall with 50 feet of frontage need not be along 125th Street, and has a minimum area of 2,000 square feet, with a floor-to-ceiling height of not less than nine feet six inches; and

   * * *

4. Accessory space

   i) For primary rehearsal spaces, no more than 25 percent of such minimum required floor area or equivalent below grade floor space, or such the bonused floor area or below grade floor space, shall be occupied by accessory to such primary rehearsal spaces. Accessory uses shall include but are not limited to educational and classroom space, administrative offices, circulation space, restrooms and equipment space;

   ii) For visual or performing arts uses other than a primary rehearsal space, no more than 40 percent of such minimum required floor area or equivalent below grade floor space, or such bonused floor area or below grade floor space, shall be occupied by accessory to such visual or performing arts uses, provided no single accessory use occupies more than 25 percent of the such total minimum required floor area or equivalent below grade floor space, or bonused floor area or below grade floor space. Accessory uses shall include but are not
limited to educational and classroom space, non-primary rehearsal space, administrative offices, lobbies, circulation space, ticket offices, restrooms, dressing rooms, other backstage areas and equipment space; and

* * *

(6) Signage

(i) Signage that identifies the visual or performing arts facility shall be provided at the 125th Street entrance of the visual or performing arts facility, subject to the requirements of Section 97-30, inclusive, except where such visual or performing arts facility is provided pursuant to paragraphs (a)(2) of Section 97-412 or (b)(2) of Section 97-422; and

* * *

(e) A legal commitment by the owner has been provided for continued occupancy of all #floor area# or equivalent #floor space provided for the purposes of satisfying minimum equivalent #non-residential# floor space provisions of paragraph (a)(2) of Section 97-412, or for which a bonus has been received, pursuant to this Section 97-422, as a visual or performing arts space only in accordance with the drawings and design plans provided pursuant to paragraphs (b) and (c)(5) of this Section, and providing further that in the event of a change of operator, the owner or operator shall obtain a new certification pursuant to this Section. An #adult establishment use# shall be prohibited for the life of the #development# or #enlargement#.

* * *

(g) A legal commitment by the owner has been provided that, in the event of an adjudicated violation of the provisions of paragraph (e) of this Section, requiring the continued occupancy of all #floor area# or equivalent #floor space provided for the purposes of satisfying minimum equivalent non-#residential# floor space provisions of paragraph (a)(2) of Section 97-412, or for which a bonus has been received, pursuant to Section 97-422, as a visual and performing arts space only, the owner shall not permit the occupancy of any #floor area# in the #development# or #enlargement# which is vacant as of the date of such adjudication or thereafter, or up to the amount of the increased #floor area# permitted under Section 97-422, as applicable, until such time as the Chairperson of the City Planning Commission has determined that the visual or performing arts space is occupied in accordance with the provisions of this Section.

* * *

The owner shall not apply for or accept a temporary certificate of occupancy for such portion of the #development# or #enlargement# identified under the terms of the declaration of restrictions as utilizing the #floor area# permitted pursuant to the
provisions of paragraph (a)(2) of Section 97-412 or the increased #floor area# permitted pursuant to Section 97-422, and the Department of Buildings shall not issue a temporary certificate of occupancy for such portion of the #development# or #enlargement#, until the Commissioner of the Department of Cultural Affairs has certified that the visual or performing arts space is substantially complete. The owner shall not apply for or accept a permanent certificate of occupancy for such portion of the #development# or #enlargement#, nor shall the Department of Buildings issue a permanent certificate of occupancy for such portion of the #development# or #enlargement#, until the visual or performing arts space has been finally completed in accordance with the approved plans and such final completion has been certified by the Commissioner of the Department of Cultural Affairs. The declaration of restrictions shall be noted on any temporary or final certificate of occupancy for the #building#. The temporary or final certificate of occupancy for any portion of the #development# or #enlargement# identified under the terms of the declaration of restrictions as utilizing the #floor area# permitted pursuant to the provisions of paragraph (a)(2) of Section 97-412 or the increased #floor area# permitted pursuant to Section 97-422 shall include the provisions of paragraph (e) of this Section, requiring the continued occupancy of all #floor area# for which a bonus has been received as a visual or performing arts space only, as a condition of occupancy of such portion of the #development# or #enlargement#.

*     *     *

97-44 43
Special Height and Setback Regulations

Within the #Special 125th Street District#., the underlying height and setback regulations shall be modified in accordance with the provisions of this Section, inclusive.

97-441 431
Permitted obstructions

The provisions of Section 33-42 (Permitted Obstructions) shall apply, except that dormers may penetrate a maximum base height in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (c)(1) of Section 23-621 (Permitted obstructions in certain districts).

97-442 432
Height and setback regulations for C4-7 and C6-3 Districts in the Core Subdistrict and areas outside of a subdistrict

[Note: provisions of paragraph (a) moved from Section 97-443 and modified]
(a) **Street wall location**

In all Commercial Districts within the Core Subdistrict and areas outside of a subdistrict, the street wall shall be located on the street line of 125th Street and extend along the entire street frontage of the zoning lot up to at least the applicable minimum base height of the underlying district, or the height of the building, whichever is less.

The street wall location provisions of such Commercial Districts shall be modified, as follows:

(a)(1) On Park Avenue, within 10 feet of its intersection with any street, the street wall may be located anywhere within 10 feet of the Park Avenue street line. However, to allow articulation of the street walls pursuant to the provisions of paragraph (b) of this Section, the street walls may be located anywhere within an area bounded by a street line, the street wall on Park Avenue and a line connecting these two lines 15 feet from their intersection.

(b)(2) To allow articulation of street walls at the intersection of any two streets within the Special District, the street wall may be located anywhere within an area bounded by the two street lines and a line connecting such street lines at points 15 feet from their intersection.

(e)(3) Recesses, not to exceed three feet in depth from the street line, shall be permitted on the ground floor where required to provide access to the building. Above a height of the second story and up to the applicable maximum base height, recesses are permitted for outer courts or balconies, provided that the aggregate width of such recesses does not exceed 30 percent of the width of the street wall at any level, and the depth of such recesses does not exceed five feet. No recesses shall be permitted within 20 feet of an adjacent building or within 30 feet of the intersection of two street lines, except in compliance with corner articulation rules.

(d)(4) The street wall location and minimum street wall height provisions of this Section shall not apply to any existing buildings that are to remain on the zoning lot.

(e)(5) For any development or enlargement within the Special 125th Street District that is partially within the Special Transit Land Use District and located directly over the planned Second Avenue subway line tunnel, the residential portion of such development or enlargement may be constructed pursuant to the R8A street wall requirements and the commercial portion of such development or enlargement may be constructed pursuant to the C4-4D street wall requirements in lieu of the requirements of this Section.
(6) The requirements of this Section shall apply within the Special Transit Land Use District except that, for the area of the Special Transit Land Use District that is also within the Special 125th Street District, a street wall of a development or enlargement located on the street line of a zoning lot need not exceed 15 feet if that portion of the development or enlargement is located directly over the planned Second Avenue subway line tunnel.

(b) Maximum height of building and setback

The following modifications of the underlying district regulations shall apply for C4-7 and C6-3 Districts within the Special District the Core Subdistrict and areas outside of a subdistrict:

(a)(1) The minimum and maximum base height of the street wall and the maximum height of a building or other structure shall be as set forth in the following table:

*   *   *

(b)(2) Special regulations for certain C4-7 Districts

(i) For the area located within 50 feet of the 126th Street frontage and between 200 feet east of Adam Clayton Powell Boulevard and 150 feet west of Lenox Avenue/Malcolm X Boulevard, the height of any portion of a building or other structure shall be limited to 80 feet.

(ii) For zoning lots bounded by 125th Street, Park Avenue and 124th Street, the maximum height of a building or other structure shall be 330 feet.

(iii) For Lots 1 and 7501 on Block 1910, the requirements of City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Environmental Designation Number (E-102) have been modified, as set forth in the Technical Memorandum to the Final Environmental Impact Statement for CEQR Number 07DCP030M, dated July 18, 2008.

(e)(3) In C6-3 Districts, the maximum length of any story located above a height of 85 feet shall not exceed 150 feet. Such length shall be measured by inscribing within a rectangle the outermost walls at the level of each story entirely above a height of 85 feet. No side of such rectangle shall exceed a width of 150 feet.
97-44 43
Special Height and Setback Regulations

Within the #Special 125th Street District#, the underlying height and setback regulations shall be modified in accordance with the provisions of this Section, inclusive.

97-441 431
Permitted obstructions

The provisions of Section 33-42 (Permitted Obstructions) shall apply, except that dormers may penetrate a maximum base height in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (c)(1) of Section 23-621 (Permitted obstructions in certain districts).

97-442 432
Height and setback regulations for C4-7 and C6-3 Districts in the Core Subdistrict and areas outside of a subdistrict

* * *

97-443 433
Street wall location

Height and setback regulations in the Park Avenue Hub Subdistrict

[Note: existing provisions of Section 97-443 moved to paragraph (a) of Section 97-432]

In C6-4 Districts within the Park Avenue Hub Subdistrict, as shown on Map 1 in Appendix A of this Chapter, the following provisions shall apply.

(a) #Street wall# location

The applicable provisions of Section 35-651 shall be modified as follows:

(1) Along 125th Street

Along 125th Street, the minimum base height shall be 60 feet, or the height of the #building#, whichever is less, except that for #buildings# or portions thereof within 50 feet of Park Avenue, the minimum base height shall be 40 feet, or the height of the #building#, whichever is less. The street wall location provisions of this paragraph shall be modified to allow a sidewalk widening pursuant to the provisions of paragraph (a)(2) of this Section; and

(2) Along Park Avenue and #narrow streets#
Along Park Avenue and any narrow streets, the provisions of paragraph (a) of Section 35-651 shall apply, except that the minimum base height shall be 40 feet, or the height of the building, whichever is less.

In addition, for zoning lots with frontage along Park Avenue between 124th Street and 125th Street, any development or horizontal enlargement shall provide a sidewalk widening along the street line of Park Avenue. Such sidewalk widening shall have a depth of 10 feet, be improved to Department of Transportation standards for sidewalks, and be at the same level as the adjoining public sidewalk.

(b) Basic maximum building height and setback regulations

The maximum height of buildings or other structures shall be as set forth in Sections 35-652 (Maximum height of buildings and setback regulations) or 35-654 (Modified height and setback regulations for certain Inclusionary Housing buildings or affordable independent residences for seniors), as applicable, except that the minimum base height shall be as set forth in paragraph (a) of this Section, and the maximum base height for buildings or other structures along the street line of 125th Street and within 50 feet of such street line shall be 85 feet.

For the purposes of applying the provisions for qualifying ground floors, the provisions of Section 97-20 (LOCATION AND ACCESS REGULATIONS), inclusive, shall apply in lieu of the applicable provisions of paragraph (b)(2) of Section 35-652.

(c) Optional height and setback regulations

As an alternative to the provisions of paragraph (b) of this Section, the provisions of this paragraph (c) may be applied to zoning lots meeting the criteria set forth in paragraph (a) of Section 23-664 (Modified height and setback regulations for certain Inclusionary Housing buildings or affordable independent residences for seniors), or zoning lots where 50 percent or more of the floor area is allocated to non-residential uses.

(1) Setbacks

At a height not lower than the minimum base height specified in paragraph (a) of this Section, nor higher than a maximum base height of 85 feet, a setback shall be provided in accordance with paragraph (c) of Section 23-662 (Maximum height of buildings and setback regulations). Above such required setback, any portion of a building or buildings on the zoning lot shall be considered a “tower.”
(2) Lot coverage requirements for towers

Each story of a tower containing residential floor area shall not exceed a maximum lot coverage of 40 percent, except that, for zoning lots less than 20,000 square feet, such lot coverage may be increased in accordance with the table in Section 23-65 (Tower Regulations). Each story of a tower allocated exclusively to non-residential floor area shall not exceed a maximum lot coverage of 50 percent. However, where dormers are provided within the required setback, such portions of buildings shall not count toward the maximum allowable lot coverage set forth in this paragraph.

(3) Maximum building height

No height limit shall apply to towers.

97-45 44
Special Provisions for Zoning Lots Divided by District Boundaries

* * *

97-50
SPECIAL OFF-STREET PARKING AND OFF-STREET LOADING REGULATIONS

* * *

97-51
Required Accessory Off-Street Residential Parking Within the Core Subdistrict and areas outside of a subdistrict

[Note: existing provisions moved to Section 97-511]

97-511
Required Accessory Off-Street Residential Parking

[Note: existing provisions moved from Section 97-51]

Accessory off-street parking spaces, open or enclosed, shall be provided for all developments or enlargements within the Special 125th Street District that contain residences, according to the provisions of the underlying district, as modified by the provisions of Section 97-50 (SPECIAL OFF-STREET PARKING AND OFF-STREET LOADING REGULATIONS), inclusive.
97-512
Required Accessory Off-Street Commercial Parking

[Note: existing provisions moved from Section 97-52]

In Commercial Districts within the Special 125th Street District Core Subdistrict, as shown on Map 1 in Appendix A of this Chapter, and areas outside of a subdistrict, accessory off-street parking spaces shall be provided if required by Section 36-21, as modified by the provisions of Section 97-50 (SPECIAL OFF-STREET PARKING AND OFF-STREET LOADING REGULATIONS), inclusive, except that no accessory parking spaces shall be required for commercial uses in C4-4D Districts.

97-52
Required Accessory Off-Street Commercial Parking Within the Park Avenue Hub Subdistrict

[Note: existing provisions moved to Section 97-512]

In the Park Avenue Hub Subdistrict, as shown on Map 1 in Appendix A of this Chapter, no accessory off-street parking shall be required for residences. Off-street parking shall be permitted in accordance with the regulations of the underlying district.

*   *   *
Appendix A
Special 125th Street District Plan

Map 1: Special 125th Street District and Core Subdistricts

[EXISTING MAP]

[PROPOSED MAP]
Article XIII
SPECIAL PURPOSE DISTRICTS

*     *     *

Chapter 8
Special East Harlem Corridors District

138-00
GENERAL PURPOSES

The “Special East Harlem Corridors District” established in this Resolution is designed to promote and protect public health, safety and general welfare. These general goals include, among others, the following specific purposes:

(a) encourage and guide the development of East Harlem as a dynamic mixed-use neighborhood by permitting the expansion and development of residential, commercial, community facility and light manufacturing uses in appropriate areas;

(b) encourage the development of residential uses along appropriate corridors;

(c) encourage the development of permanently-affordable housing;

(d) facilitate the development of high-density commercial and manufacturing uses in order to locate jobs near transit connections in;

(e) enhance the vitality of both existing and emerging commercial corridors by ensuring that ground floor frontages are occupied by active uses that enliven the pedestrian experience along the street;

(f) ensure that the form and use of new buildings relates to and enhances neighborhood character and responds to unique neighborhood conditions such as the Park Avenue viaduct; and

(g) promote the most desirable use of land in the area and thus preserve, protect and enhance the value of land and buildings and thereby protect City tax revenues.
138-01
General Provisions

The provisions of this Chapter shall apply within the #Special East Harlem Corridors District#. The regulations of all other Chapters of this Resolution are applicable, except as superseded, supplemented or modified by the provisions of this Chapter. In the event of a conflict between the provisions of this Chapter and other regulations of this Resolution, the provisions of this Chapter shall control.

138-02
District Plan and Maps

The regulations of this Chapter are designed to implement the #Special East Harlem Corridors District# Plan. The District Plan includes the map, “Special East Harlem Corridors District and Subdistrict,” in the Appendix to this Chapter which is hereby incorporated and made part of this Resolution for the purpose of specifying locations where the special regulations and requirements set forth in this Chapter apply.

138-03
Subdistrict

In order to carry out the provisions of this Chapter, the Park Avenue Subdistrict is established within the #Special East Harlem Corridors District#. The location of the Subdistrict is shown in the Appendix to this Chapter.

138-04
Applicability

138-041
Applicability of Article IX, Chapter 5

In the event of a conflict between the provisions of this Chapter and Article IX, Chapter 5 (Special Transit Land Use District), the provisions of Article IX, Chapter 5 shall control.
138-042  
**Applicability of Article XII, Chapter 3**

In M1 Districts paired with a Residence District, the special #use#, #bulk# and parking and loading provisions of Article XII, Chapter 3 (Special Mixed Use Districts) shall apply, except where modified by the provisions of this Chapter, and shall supplement or supersede the provisions of the designated #Residence# or M1 District, as applicable.

138-043  
**Applicability of the Quality Housing Program**

In the #Special East Harlem Corridors District#, #buildings# containing #residences# shall be #developed# or #enlarged# in accordance with the Quality Housing Program and the regulations of Article II, Chapter 8 shall apply. The #bulk# regulations of this Chapter shall be considered the applicable #bulk# regulations for #Quality Housing buildings#.

138-044  
**Applicability of the Inclusionary Housing Program**

For the purposes of applying the Inclusionary Housing Program set forth in Section 23-90 (INCLUSIONARY HOUSING), the #Special East Harlem Corridors District# shall be a #Mandatory Inclusionary Housing area#.

138-10  
**SPECIAL USE REGULATIONS**

The #use# regulations of the underlying districts, or Article XII, Chapter 3 (Special Mixed Use Districts), as applicable, are modified by the provisions of this Section, inclusive.

138-11  
**Location of Residential Use Within Buildings**

In C4 or C6 Districts, the underlying provisions of Section 32-422 (Location of floors occupied by commercial uses) shall be modified, for #mixed buildings# that are #developed# or #enlarged#, to permit #dwelling units# on the same #story# as a #commercial use# provided no access exists between such #uses# at any level containing #dwelling units# and provided no #commercial uses# are located directly over any #dwelling units#. However, such #commercial
uses# may be located over #dwelling units# by authorization of the City Planning Commission upon a finding that sufficient separation of #residential uses# from #commercial uses# exists within the #building#.

**138-12**

**Transient Hotels**

C2-5 C4-6 C6-4 M1-6/R9 M1-6/R10

In the districts indicated, the #development# or #enlargement# of a #building# containing a #transient hotel#, as listed in Section 32-14 (Use Group 5), or the #conversion# or change of #use# within an existing #building# to a #transient hotel#, shall only be allowed:

(a) upon certification by the Chairperson of the City Planning Commission to the Commissioner of Buildings that the residential development goal, as set forth in this Section, has been met, or

(b) where such residential development goal, has not been met, by special permit by the City Planning Commission. To permit such a #transient hotel#, the Commission shall find that:

(1) sufficient sites are available in the area to meet the #residential development# goal; or

(2) a harmonious mix of #residential# and non-#residential uses# has been established in the area, and such #transient hotel# is consistent with the character of the surrounding area.

The Commission may prescribe additional conditions and safeguards to minimize adverse effects on the character of the surrounding area.

For the purpose of applying the provisions of this Section, the #residential development# goal shall be met when at least 4,470 #dwelling units# within the combined areas of #Special East Harlem Corridors District#, and the Park Avenue Hub Subdistrict, as shown on Map 1 in Appendix A of Article IX, Chapter 7 (Special 125th Street District), have received temporary or final certificates of occupancy subsequent to [date of adoption].
138-13

**Physical Culture or Health Establishments**

Within the #Special East Harlem Corridors District#, the provisions of Section 73-36 (Physical Culture or Health Establishments) shall not apply. In lieu thereof, #physical culture or health establishments# shall be permitted as-of-right in C2-5, C4-6, and C6-4 Districts, and in M1 Districts paired with an R9 or R10 District.

138-14

**Public Parking Garages**

C1-5  C2-5  C4-6  C6-4  M1-6/R9  M1-6/R10

In the districts indicated, for the purpose of applying regulations applicable to #public parking garages# set forth in Article III, Chapter 2 (Use Regulations) and Article III, Chapter 6 (Accessory Off-Street Parking and Loading Regulations), the regulations set forth for C1-4 Districts shall apply to C1-5 Districts, and the regulations set forth for C2-4 Districts shall apply to all other districts. In an M1 District paired with an R9 or R10 District, the regulations of #public parking garages# in Article XII, Chapter 3 (Special Mixed Use Districts) shall not apply. In lieu thereof, the provisions of this Section shall apply.

138-20

**SPECIAL BULK REGULATIONS**

In the #Special East Harlem Corridors District#, all #developments# and #enlargements# shall comply with the #bulk# regulations for #Quality Housing buildings#, as modified by the provisions of this Section, inclusive.

In all districts, the #floor area# provisions of Section 138-21 (Floor Area Regulations), inclusive, and the #street wall# location provisions of Section 138-22 (Street Wall Regulations), shall apply. In #Commercial Districts#, the height and setback provisions of Section 138-23 (Height and Setback Regulations in Commercial Districts) shall apply. In M1 Districts paired with an R9 or R10 Districts, the height and setback provisions set forth in Section 138-24 (Height and Setback Regulations in M1 Districts Paired With an R9 or R10 District) shall apply.
138-21
Floor Area Regulations

138-211
Floor area regulations in the Park Avenue Subdistrict

The maximum #floor area ratio# for #zoning lots# within the Park Avenue Subdistrict, as shown in the Appendix to this Chapter, is set forth in paragraph (a) of this Section. Such provisions are modified for certain #zoning lots# in accordance with paragraph (b).

(a) Maximum #floor area ratio#

In M1-6 Districts paired with an R9 District, the maximum #floor area ratio# shall be 8.5. Where a #development# or #enlargement# of a #building# on a #zoning lot# contains #residential floor area#, such #zoning lot# shall provide a minimum non-#residential floor area ratio# of 1.5.

In C6-4 Districts and M1-6 Districts paired with an R10 District, the maximum #floor area ratio# shall be 12.0. Where a #development# or #enlargement# of a #building# on a #zoning lot# contains #residential floor area#, such #zoning lot# shall provide a minimum non-#residential floor area ratio# of 2.0.

Where a #development# or #enlargement# of a #building# on a #zoning lot# contains #residential floor area#, such #zoning lot# shall provide a minimum non-#residential floor area ratio# of 1.5 in M1-6 Districts paired with an R9 District, and 2.0 in C6-4 Districts and M1-6 Districts paired with an R10 District.

(b) Modified maximum #floor area ratio# for certain #zoning lots#

The maximum #floor area ratios# set forth in paragraph (a) of this Section shall be modified, as follows:

(1) the minimum non-#residential floor area# requirements set forth in paragraph (a) of this Section shall be optional for #zoning lots# existing on or before [date of adoption] with a #lot area# of less than 5,000 square feet. For #zoning lots# utilizing the provisions of this paragraph (b)(1), the minimum non-#residential floor area# requirements set forth in paragraph (a) of this Section shall not apply;
(2) for #zoning lots# subject to the provisions of paragraph (d)(4)(i) or (d)(4)(iii) of Section 23-154 (Inclusionary Housing), the maximum #residential floor area ratio# of the underlying district as specified in Section 23-153 (For Quality Housing buildings) shall apply; and

(3) for #zoning lots# subject to paragraphs (b)(1) or (b)(2) of this Section, the maximum #floor area ratio# for all #uses# shall be 7.52 in M1-6 Districts paired with an R9 District, and 10.0 in C6-4 Districts and M1-6 Districts paired with an R10 District.

138-212
Floor area regulations outside of the Park Avenue Subdistrict

For #zoning lots#, or portions thereof, outside of the Park Avenue Subdistrict, as shown in the Appendix to this Chapter, the underlying #floor area# regulations shall apply, except that:

(a) in C2 Districts mapped within an R9 District, for any #zoning lot# containing #residential floor area#, the maximum #residential floor area ratio# for #zoning lots# complying with the applicable provisions of paragraph (d)(3) of Section 23-154 (Inclusionary housing), or, for #affordable independent residences for seniors#, shall be 8.5, the maximum #residential floor area ratio# for #zoning lots# utilizing the provisions of paragraphs (d)(4)(i) or (d)(4)(iii) of Section 23-154 shall be 7.52, and the maximum #floor area ratio# for any combination of #uses# shall be 8.5; and

(b) in C4-6 Districts and in C2 Districts mapped within an R9 or R10 District, the #floor area# provisions of Sections 33-13 (Floor Area Bonus for a Public Plaza) or 33-14 (Floor Area Bonus for Arcades) shall not apply.

138-22
Street Wall Regulations

All #developments# and #enlargements# within the #Special East Harlem Corridors District# shall comply with the #street wall# regulations of Section 35-651 (Street wall location), as specified and modified in this Section. Where M1 Districts are paired with R9 or R10 Districts, #developments# and #enlargements# within such districts shall comply with the provisions of paragraph (b) of this Section. The applicable provisions of Section 35-651 are specified and modified as follows:
(a) Along #wide streets# other than Park Avenue

Along all #wide streets# other than Park Avenue, and along #narrow streets# within 50 feet of an intersection with such #wide street#, the provisions of paragraph (b) of Section 35-651 shall apply, except that the minimum base height shall be 60 feet, or the height of the #building#, whichever is less.

(b) Along Park Avenue

Along Park Avenue and along #narrow streets# located within 100 feet of Park Avenue, the provisions of paragraph (a) of Section 35-651 shall apply, except that the minimum base height shall be 40 feet, or the height of the #building#, whichever is less.

(c) Along all other #streets#

Along all #streets# not subject to the provisions of paragraph (a) or (b) of this Section, the provisions of paragraph (a) of Section 35-651 shall apply, except that the minimum base height shall be 60 feet, or the height of the #building#, whichever is less.

(d) Within #flood zones#

For #buildings# within the #flood zone#, the provisions of paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of this Section, as applicable, shall be modified as follows:

1. For #developments# or horizontal #enlargements#, or portions thereof, where no transparent materials are provided on the #ground floor level street wall# below a height of four feet above the level of the adjoining sidewalk pursuant to the provisions of Section 37-34 (Minimum Transparency Requirements), for a continuous distance of more than 25 feet, such #street wall# shall be located at least three feet beyond the #street line#;

2. For portions of #developments# and #enlargements# where the provisions of paragraph (a) of this Section apply, such #street wall# shall not be located beyond five feet of the #street line#, except that such #street wall# may be located beyond such distance pursuant to the applicable provisions of paragraph (b) of Section 35-651 or of Section 64-333 (Street wall location in certain districts); and

3. The area between such #street wall# and the sidewalk, or portions thereof, that do not contain any planting pursuant to the provisions of paragraph (a) of...
Section 138-32 (Special Streetscape Provisions for Blank Walls), shall be improved to Department of Transportation standards for sidewalks, be at the same level as the adjoining public sidewalk and be accessible to the public at all times. In addition, such area shall provide visual mitigation elements in accordance with the provisions of Section 138-32.

138-23

Height and Setback Regulations in Commercial Districts

In #Commercial Districts#, the underlying height and setback provisions are modified as follows:

(a) Basic Height and Setback Regulations

Except as provided in paragraph (b) and (c) below, in #Commercial Districts#, the maximum height of #buildings or other structures# shall be as set forth in Sections 35-652 (Maximum height of buildings and setback regulations) or 35-654 (Modified height and setback regulations for certain Inclusionary Housing buildings or affordable independent residences for seniors), as applicable, except that the minimum base heights shall be modified by the provisions of Section 138-22 (Street Wall Regulations).

The regulations of paragraph (b)(2) of Section 36-652 relating to requirements for #qualifying ground floors#, where otherwise applicable, shall not apply. In lieu thereof, the provisions of Section 138-30 (STREETSCAPE REQUIREMENTS), inclusive, shall apply.

(b) Alternate Height and Setback Regulations in Certain Districts

Except as provided in paragraph (c) below, in C2 Districts mapped within an R9 or R10 District, or in C4-6 or C6-4 Districts, as an alternative to the provisions of paragraph (a) of this Section, the provisions of this paragraph may be applied to #zoning lots# meeting the applicable criteria set forth in paragraph (a) of Section 23-664 (Modified height and setback regulations for certain Inclusionary Housing buildings or affordable independent residences for seniors), or to #zoning lots# where 50 percent or more of the #floor area# is occupied by non-#residential uses#. 
(1) **Setbacks**

At a height not lower than the minimum base height specified in Section 138-22 (Street Wall Regulations), nor higher than a maximum base height of 85 feet, a setback shall be provided in accordance with paragraph (c) of Section 23-662 (Maximum height of buildings and setback regulations). Above such required setback, any portion of such building shall be considered a “tower.”

(2) **Lot coverage** requirements for towers

Each story of a tower containing residential floor area shall not exceed a maximum lot coverage of 40 percent, except that, for zoning lots of less than 20,000 square feet, such lot coverage may be increased in accordance with the table in Section 23-65 (Tower Regulations). Each story of a tower containing exclusively non-residential floor area shall not exceed a maximum lot coverage of 50 percent. However, where dormers are provided within the required setback, such portions of buildings shall not count toward the maximum allowable tower lot coverage set forth in this paragraph.

(3) **Maximum building height**

No height limit shall apply to towers.

(c) **Special Height and Setback Regulations in Certain Areas**

In Commercial Districts in certain areas, the following maximum height and setback modifications shall apply.

(1) **In C2-5 Districts mapped over R9 Districts and in C4-6 Districts in the following locations, the provisions of paragraph (a) of this Section shall apply, except that the maximum building height shall be 175 feet:**

(i) The area bounded by the centerline of East 124th Street, the centerline of Second Avenue, the centerline of East 123rd Street, and a line 100 feet west of the westerly street line of Second Avenue;

(ii) The area bounded by a line 100 feet north of the northerly street line of East 116th Street, a line 100 feet east of the easterly street line of Lexington Avenue, a line 100 feet south of the southerly street line of East 116th Street, and a line 100 feet west of the westerly street line of Lexington Avenue;
(iii) The area bounded by the centerline of East 124th Street, a line 100 feet east of the easterly #street line# of Third Avenue, the centerline of East 123rd Street, the centerline of Third Avenue, the centerline of East 122nd Street, and a line 100 feet west of the westerly #street line# of Third Avenue.

(2) In C2-5 Districts mapped over R9 Districts and C2-5 Districts mapped over R10 Districts in the following locations, the provisions of paragraph (a) of this Section shall apply, except that the maximum #building# height shall be 215 feet:

(i) The area bounded by a line 100 feet east of the easterly #street line# of Park Avenue, the centerline of East 115th Street, a line 100 feet west of the westerly #street line# of Park Avenue, the centerline of East 122nd Street, the centerline of Park Avenue, and the centerline of the #block# located between East 120th Street and East 119th Street;

(ii) The area bounded by the centerline of East 132nd Street, the centerline of Park Avenue, the centerline of East 131st Street, and a line 100 feet west of the westerly #street line# of Park Avenue.

138-24
Height and Setback Regulations in M1 Districts Paired With an R9 or R10 District

In M1 Districts paired with an R9 or R10 District, the applicable #street wall# location and minimum base height provisions of paragraph (c) of Section 138-22 (Street Wall Regulations) shall apply. The maximum height of #buildings or other structures# and setback provisions set forth in Section 123-66 (Height and Setback Regulations) shall apply as modified in this Section.

(a) In M1 Districts paired with an R9 District, at a height not lower than the minimum base height set forth in Section 138-22, nor higher than a maximum base height of 105 feet, a setback shall be provided in accordance with paragraph (c) of Section 23-662 (Maximum height of buildings and setback regulations). The maximum #building# height shall be 215 feet; and

(b) in M1 Districts paired with an R10 District, at a height not lower than the minimum base height set forth in Section 138-22, nor higher than a maximum base height of 155
feet, a setback shall be provided in accordance with paragraph (c) of Section 23-662. The maximum building height shall be 215 feet.

138-30
STREETSCAPE REQUIREMENTS

The provisions of this Section, inclusive, shall apply to developments or ground floor level enlargements in all districts. In Commercial Districts mapped within R7D Districts, the underlying provisions of Section 32-434 (Ground floor use in C4-5D and C6-3D Districts and in certain C2 Districts) shall not apply. Any portion of a ground floor level that is within a transit easement required pursuant to the provisions of Article IX, Chapter 5 need not comply with the streetscape requirements of this Section, inclusive.

138-31
Ground Floor Use Regulations

The special ground floor level streetscape provisions set forth in Section 37-30, shall apply to Second Avenue, Third Avenue, Lexington Avenue, Park Avenue and East 116th Street, within the Special East Harlem Corridors District which, for the purposes of applying such provisions, shall be considered designated retail streets, and any portion of a ground floor level street frontage along the designated retail streets, as well as any narrow street frontage within 50 feet of such streets, shall be considered primary street frontages. A ground floor level street frontage along any other street shall be considered a secondary street frontage. For the purposes of this Section, defined terms shall also include those defined in Section 37-311 (Definitions).

(a) Along primary street frontages

For buildings, or portions thereof, with primary street frontage, uses on the ground floor level, to the minimum depth set forth in Section 37-32 (Ground Floor Depth Requirements for Certain Uses), shall be limited to non-residential uses, except for Type 2 lobbies and entrances and exits to accessory parking spaces provided in accordance with the applicable provisions of Section 37-33 (Maximum Width of Certain Uses). Group parking facilities located on the ground floor level shall be wrapped by floor area in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (a) of Section 37-35 (Parking Wrap and Screening Requirements). Ground floor level street walls shall be glazed in accordance with the provisions set forth in Section 37-34 (Minimum Transparency Requirements), except that:
(1) in M1-6 Districts paired with an R9 or R10 District, where the ground floor level is occupied by uses in Use Groups 16, 17 and 18, up to 50 percent of the ground floor level street wall width may be exempt from such regulations, provided that any street wall width exceeding 50 feet with no transparent elements on the ground floor level shall provide planting or screening in accordance with the provisions of paragraphs (a) or (f) of Section 138-32 (Special Streetscape Provisions for Blank Walls) for at least 75 percent of such blank wall; and

(2) in flood zones, where no transparent materials or building entrances or exits are provided on the ground floor level street wall below a height of four feet above the level of the adjoining sidewalk for a continuous width of at least 15 feet, visual mitigation elements shall be provided in accordance with Section 138-32 for such blank wall.

(b) Along secondary street frontages

For buildings, or portions thereof, with secondary street frontage, all uses permitted by the underlying district shall be permitted on the ground floor level, provided that any group parking facilities on the ground floor level shall be wrapped or screened in accordance with Section 37-35.

The level of the finished floor of such ground floor shall be located not higher than five feet above nor lower than five feet below the as-built level of the adjoining street.

138-32
Special Streetscape Provisions for Blank Walls

Where visual mitigation elements are required on a blank wall along the ground floor level street wall pursuant to the provisions of Section 138-31 (Ground Floor Use Regulations), at least 75 percent of the linear footage of any such blank wall shall be treated by one or more of the following visual mitigation elements which shall be provided on the zoning lot, except where such elements are permitted within the street under other applicable laws or regulations. Such features when utilized as visual mitigation elements shall include:

(a) Planting

Any combination of perennials, annuals, decorative grasses or shrubs shall be provided in planting beds, raised planting beds or planter boxes in front of the street wall. Each
foot in width of a planting bed, raised planting bed or planter box, as measured parallel to the #street wall#, shall satisfy one linear foot of frontage mitigation requirement. Such planting bed shall extend to a depth of at least three feet, inclusive of any structure containing the planted material. Any individual planted area shall have a width of at least five feet, and the height of such planting, inclusive of any structure containing the planted materials, shall be at least three feet.

Where a blank wall exceeds a #street wall# width of 50 feet, at least 25 percent of such #street wall# width shall be planted in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph.

(b) Benches

Fixed benches with or without backs shall be provided in front of the #street wall#. Unobstructed access shall be provided between such benches and an adjoining sidewalk or required circulation paths. Each linear foot of bench, as measured parallel to the #street wall#, shall satisfy one linear foot of frontage mitigation requirement. Any individual bench shall have a width of at least five feet, and no more than 20 feet of benches may be used to fulfill such requirement per 50 feet of frontage.

(c) Bicycle racks

Bicycle racks, sufficient to accommodate at least two bicycles, shall be provided in front of the #street wall#, and oriented so that the bicycles are placed parallel to the #street wall#. Each bicycle rack so provided shall satisfy five linear feet of frontage mitigation requirement. No more than three bicycle racks may be used to fulfill such requirement per 50 feet of frontage.

(d) Tables and chairs

Fixed tables and chairs shall be provided in front of the #street wall#. Each table shall have a minimum diameter of two feet, and have a minimum of two chairs associated with it. Each table and chair set so provided shall satisfy five linear feet of frontage mitigation requirement.

(e) Wall treatment

Wall treatment, in the form of permitted #signs#, graphic or sculptural art, rustication, decorative screening or latticework, or living plant material, shall be provided along the #street wall#. Each linear foot of wall treatment shall constitute one linear foot of frontage mitigation requirement. Such wall treatment shall extend to a height of at least 10 feet, as measured from the level of the adjoining sidewalk or grade, and have a minimum width of 10 feet, as measured parallel to the #street wall#.
OFF-STREET PARKING AND LOADING REGULATIONS

The applicable parking and loading regulations of Article II, Chapter 5, Article III, Chapter 6, Article IV, Chapter 4 (ACCESSORY OFF-STREET PARKING AND LOADING REGULATIONS) or Section 123-70 (PARKING AND LOADING), inclusive, shall be modified in this Section, inclusive.

 Required Accessory Off-street Parking Spaces for Residences

In the #Special East Harlem Corridors District#, no #accessory# off-street parking shall be required for #residences#. Off-street parking shall be permitted in accordance with the underlying district regulations.
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APPENDIX F
Inclusionary Housing Designated Areas and Mandatory Inclusionary Housing Areas

MANHATTAN

Manhattan Community District 11

In the R7D, R9 and R10 Districts within the areas shown on the following Map 1 and Map 2:
Map 2 – [date of adoption]

[PROPOSED MAP]

Mandatory Inclusionary Housing Program area \textit{see Section 23-154(d)(3)}

Area I [date of adoption] — MIH Program Option 1 and Option 2

Portion of Community District 11, Manhattan
The above resolution (N 170359 ZRM), duly adopted by the City Planning Commission on October 2, 2017, (Calendar No. 2) is filed with the Office of the Speaker, City Council, and the Borough President in accordance with the requirements of Section 197-d of the New York City Charter.

MARISA LAGO, Chair
KENNETH J. KNUCKLES, Esq., Vice-Chairman
RAYANN BESSER, ALFRED C. CERULLO, III, JOSEPH I. DOUEK,
RICHARD W. EADDY, CHERYL COHEN EFFRON, HOPE KNIGHT,
ORLANDO MARIN, LARISA ORTIZ Commissioners

ANNA HAYES LEVIN, Commissioner, abstained

MICHELLE DE LA UZ, Commissioner, voting “No”
June 26, 2017

Marisa Lago
Director
New York City Department of City Planning
120 Broadway, 31st Floor
New York, NY 10271

Re: Recommendation on ULURP Application Nos. C 170358 ZMM and C 170360 HUM
East Harlem Neighborhood Rezoning

Dear Director Lago,

Community Board 11 (CB11) held two, separate public hearings on the East Harlem Neighborhood Rezoning, one on May 16th, 2017 and another on June 20th, 2017. On June 20th, 2017 Community Board 11 voted on the rezoning proposal for East Harlem. Over the past few years, Community Board 11 has invested a considerable amount of time and resources into engaging the community and planning for the future. Through our initial engagement and planning along Park Avenue in 2013, to the East Harlem Neighborhood Plan Steering Committee, and more recently through our Rezoning Task Force, we've helped create a vision for our community that acknowledges existing growth and change, but emphasizes the protection of existing community residents and neighborhood character.

Through the East Harlem Neighborhood Plan, we developed a simple rezoning framework and that embraced the City’s new Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH) program, supporting the minimum up-zoning needed to trigger MIH. This would require affordable housing in every new development in the rezoned areas, but minimize the added density and help to preserve community character and stimulate local small business and economic growth.

We suggested up-zoning all avenues and 116th Street, intentionally deciding to spread a minimum increase in density throughout a large area, rather than a higher density rezoning in a limited area. We determined this would allow for development of affordable housing throughout the district, but not permit new development inconsistent with the existing community context.

The Community Board and the EHNP Steering Committee were disappointed to learn that after two years of developing a community-based rezoning proposal, the Department of City Planning did not embrace all of the goals. While their proposal does rezone the community with the goal of developing affordable housing and economic stimulation, it does not preserve the existing character of the neighborhood. DCP has instead decided to allow the highest density residential districts allowed under state and city law in a limited geography - on Park Avenue and Third
Avenue. Rather than spreading out a minimum up-zoning across the neighborhood, DCP left out the area south of 104th Street, all of First Avenue, as well as the lower stretches of Madison Avenue, all of which was included in the EHNP.

The need to develop affordable housing and job creation is not just an East Harlem goal, it is clearly a citywide goal, but the Department of City Planning must approach this goal without impacting the community excessively and respecting its existing character. DCP instead chose to extend the same density found on the Upper East Side into East Harlem. Community Board 11 feels strongly that the proposal as it is does not conform to our core values, the EHNP and the CB11 Park Avenue Recommendations.

The following is a comprehensive analysis of the proposed rezoning that includes our proposed recommendations, as well as the voting results.

**PREAMBLE**

East Harlem stakeholders have spent many years engaging in extensive community planning. Community residents, community organizers, Community Board 11, Speaker Mark-Viverito, Manhattan Borough President Gale Brewer, and non-profit organizations dedicated to quality of life issues are some of the entities that have been involved in thinking through the myriad issues facing East Harlem and mapping a course that thoughtfully balances the diverse array of interests represented in our community. This process consisted of, to name a few of the steps along the way, the Park Avenue Corridor recommendations, the 2013 study conducted by Community Board 11 and Civitas, and the recent multiyear process resulting in the East Harlem Neighborhood Plan. Unfortunately, the City’s current proposal to rezone a substantial portion of East Harlem utterly misses the mark. The City’s professed goals are to create permanent affordable housing by rezoning our community to allow for a significant increase in density and thereby trigger Mandatory Affordable Housing and to create economic opportunities for residents to meet their earning potential and thus meet affordability challenges. However, while the City’s plan contains some virtues, as discussed below, overall it thoroughly disregards the recommendations made by East Harlem stakeholders after years of multilateral planning in favor of a top-down approach that ignores East Harlem’s concerns. For this reason, the City’s plan to rezone East Harlem must not pass without considerable revisions.

**INTRODUCTION**

**PROPOSED ACTIONS**

The New York City Department of City Planning (“DCP”) has proposed a series of land use actions including zoning map amendments, zoning text amendments, and city map changes (collectively, the “Proposed Actions”) affecting a 95-block area in the East Harlem neighborhood of Manhattan Community District 11 (“CD11”). The Proposed Actions are intended to facilitate the development of affordable housing, create new commercial and manufacturing space to support job creation, and preserve existing neighborhood character. According to the Draft Scope of Work for the project Environmental Impact Statement (“DSOW”), issued November 10, 2016, the Proposed Actions are expected to result in a net
increase of approximately 3,500 dwelling units, 151,100 square feet of commercial space, 98,000 square feet of community facility space, and 132,400 square feet of manufacturing space. The Proposed Actions are also expected to result in a net decrease of 10,600 square feet of auto-related space, 33,000 square feet of hotel space, and 53,800 square feet of warehouse/storage space.

The Proposed Actions reflect DCP’s ongoing engagement with Community Board 11 of Manhattan (“CB11”) and other community partners. This proposal reflects input generated from the East Harlem Neighborhood Plan (“EHNP”), a comprehensive, community-focused study aimed at identifying opportunities for the creation of new mixed-income housing and the preservation of existing affordable units consistent with Mayor de Blasio’s housing plan, Housing New York: A Five-Borough, Ten-Year Plan. Any changes to the zoning map should be evaluated for consistency, accuracy, and—given the land use implications—appropriateness for the growth, improvement, and development of the neighborhood and borough. Our goal in evaluating the text amendment, is to consider whether the Proposed Actions are consistent with the goals of the EHNP (as well as the information gleaned from community engagement sessions) and if they are appropriate and beneficial to the community.

BACKGROUND

East Harlem

In 2003 the City of New York (“NYC”) rezoned 57 blocks of East Harlem including most of the area between Lexington Avenue, 122nd Street, Pleasant/First Avenue and 99th Street. The rezoning replaced height factor zoning districts with height limited contextual zoning districts that allowed greater density on the avenues. The 2003 rezoning omitted public housing estates from the rezoning, which resulted in an irregular rezoning area. A 2015 study found that development within the 2003 rezoning are tended toward smaller buildings when compared to development that occurred outside the rezoning area, and new development inside the rezoning area had much less rent regulated housing. In 2008, the 125th Street Special District was mapped in an area that spanned 124th Street to 126th Street across most of Manhattan. Together with the 2008 East 125th Street rezoning, this corridor was rezoned to higher density, height limited buildings that provided incentives for affordable housing and visual arts uses.

As of 2016, East Harlem is comprised of approximately 126,307 residents with a median income of $31,422. CD11 is predominately comprised of multi-family residential and mixed residential/commercial properties (low to midrise multi-family walk-up and elevator). CD11 is generally bordered by 96th Street to the south, Fifth Avenue to the west and the FDR / Harlem River Drive to the north and east. Additionally, CD11 also includes Thomas Jefferson Park, Marcus Garvey Park, Harlem River Park, and Randall’s and Ward’s Islands.

East Harlem Neighborhood Plan

The EHNP is a community-driven comprehensive roadmap for fostering smart growth in East Harlem. The process was led by City Council Speaker Mark-Viverito, CB11, and Community Voices Heard (“CVH”) in partnership with a 21-member steering committee of local stakeholders. Developing the plan was a year-long process with no less than eight large public meetings, approximately 40 policy discussions, numerous calls and meetings with city agencies,
and on-the-ground canvassing for person-to-person survey collection. The culmination of this work resulted in a detailed neighborhood plan with over 230 key objectives and recommendations to ensure a stable and inclusive future for the neighborhood with ideas of how we can achieve it.

According to the EHNPs’s recommendations, all future rezoning plans should be done in conjunction with each other to ensure that 50 percent of the new housing on private rezoned and public sites is affordable to a variety of low- and moderate-income levels. More specifically, the EHNPs recommends that 100 percent of units on public sites be permanently affordable, and that 20 percent of affordable units be set aside for those earning no higher than 30 percent of area median income (“AMI”).

Area Context

The neighborhood surrounding the project area is comprised of strong residential and commercial elements, as well as a variety of building typologies.

Boundaries
The Proposed Actions put forth by DCP affect approximately 95 blocks in an area primarily bordered by East 104th Street to the south, East 132nd Street to the north, Park Avenue to the west and Second Avenue to the east; between East 126th Street and East 132nd Street, the western border approaches Fifth Avenue, as more fully described in the ULURP application for the Proposed Actions (the “Rezoning Area.”) While much of the area proposed for rezoning has not been rezoned since 1961, the Rezoning Area also includes portions of the 125th Street Special District that was mapped in 2008, and large portions of the 2003 contextual rezoning.

CONSIDERATIONS FOR COMMUNITY BOARD 11

It is the mission of CB11 to reflect the needs and desires of the community in any position CB11 takes with respect to DCP’s rezoning proposal. To evaluate and more fully consider the Proposed Actions, CB11 has created the East Harlem Rezoning Task Force, which has interacted extensively with the community (through public meetings, community outreach, electronic and paper surveys and other efforts) to develop a comprehensive response reflecting the community’s interests in, and concerns with, the Proposed Actions.

Although the City’s proposal to rezone a large portion of East Harlem is the largest such proposal in East Harlem since the 1961 zoning was implemented, it is not the first time that CB11 has engaged community residents and community partners with the objective of developing democratic and bottom-up—rather than top-down—priorities for the development of East Harlem. CB11 has long advocated for increased affordable housing in East Harlem and for the continued preservation of affordable housing. Recently, CB11 was one of several project partners that developed the EHNP, and in that process, worked to make sure that many of the community’s priorities became a part of the Plan’s recommendations. Prior to the EHNP, CB11 and Civitas developed rezoning recommendations for the Park Avenue corridor in 2013 where the community pioneered a version of Mandatory Inclusionary Housing by asking that such a concept be developed for the Park Avenue corridor. For years CB11 has consistently advocated
for policies that would maximize the number of units available for affordable housing, and specifically housing that is affordable to the East Harlem community. In addition, CB11 has worked to address a number of community priorities, including local workforce development, protection of small businesses, and the adequacy of schools and afterschool programs for our youth.

We are keenly aware that rhetoric and practice often fail to square with each other in any proposed rezoning of a neighborhood. First, we note that DCP’s proposal occurs against a backdrop of historical rezonings of low-income communities of color, which have resulted in tremendous displacement. To address this reality, CB11 supports measures that both preserve affordable housing and develop new, permanent affordable housing. To that end, it is imperative that we strengthen and enforce rent-regulation laws. Furthermore, we support the construction of permanent mixed-income housing with a baseline 50/30/20 model, also discussed below. We support the requirement for mandatory inclusionary housing (“MIH”) in any sweeping rezoning proposal; however, given that the majority of our neighbors live below 30% of the AMI, CB11 firmly advocates for deeper affordability than that currently offered under MIH.

CB11 recognizes that while the City’s rezoning proposal is in the spirit of the EHNP rezoning recommendations, there are important and significant differences that remain of concern, especially as they relate the impacts of increased density. While the EHNP recommended that even a larger area rezoned, it generally recommended the minimum increase in density necessary to trigger MIH on wide streets and avenues. The purpose of this recommendation was to ensure that when new development occurred, affordable housing would be required. In large portions of the rezoning area, the Proposed Zoning brings the highest density residential districts allowed by law to both Third Avenue and Park Avenue, much more than necessary to trigger MIH. In these areas, the proposed zoning introduces densities considerably higher than the density recommended by the EHNP, and much higher than the Park Avenue Rezoning recommendations. If Third Avenue is rezoned to R9 (8.5 FAR), the large majority of the additional building bulk allowed will be for affordable housing. This is not true under the Proposed Rezoning, which will double the allowable FAR on Third Avenue, but only about half of that additional bulk will be for affordable housing.

The goal of creating as much affordable housing as possible is laudable, but the increase to 12 FAR from 6 FAR on Third Avenue is just too much for a building that will only have approximately 25% of its units permanently affordable: CB11 recognizes that this amount of density will forever change the character of the community, and unless it was for 100% affordable housing, this is simply too much density for the District. But more than just character, CB11 remains concerned that the Proposed Actions will cause a range of externalities that must be addressed by NYC in order to both minimize the impact of rezoning as well as improve the lives of residents of East Harlem. For example, the Proposed Actions have raised questions concerning the expected increase in pedestrian traffic, the ability of current public transportation options to accommodate the increased population, the sufficiency of the existing education facilities, the availability of social services to meet an increased population, the risk to displacement of local businesses, and the suitability of existing infrastructure.
We note that the gap between the City’s plan and the community’s plan is due at least in part to findings in the EIS that CB11, along with numerous community stakeholders, consider to be extremely dubious. Thus, to the extent that any neighborhood-wide rezoning (or any rezoning of any NYC neighborhood whereby five (5) or more city blocks are proposed for rezoning, NYC Department of City Planning or any other city agency, office or elected official shall ensure that the community board for the affected community shall be provided with funding reasonably sufficient to conduct an environmental impact statement, in addition to any required environmental impact statement any city agency may itself conduct, through a vendor or contractor of its own choosing.

This document is will discuss these concerns in detail. CB11 believes that some of these concerns may be mitigatable through direct and indirect actions that support the rezoning, some of which are detailed in the EHNP and others of which are detailed in the Statement of District Needs, but mitigation will only go so far. There is no mitigation for the change in the district character that 12 FAR districts will bring to East Harlem, and this and other elements of the Proposed Rezoning will need to change. Nevertheless, CB11 appreciates the City’s close attention to the EHNP and earlier community driven efforts in East Harlem. We look forward to working with the Manhattan Borough President and the City Council Speaker to identify capital projects and dedicated funds toward which private developers will contribute should the Proposed Actions be approved in some form, and we will continue to work with the City on changes to the Proposed Actions that will support an affordable, sustainable, East Harlem for all its residents.

LAND USE AND ZONING

CB11 has long advocated for the development of increased affordable housing. Insofar as the Proposed Actions seek to create additional housing opportunities that are affordable to the East Harlem community, CB11 is supportive of such efforts. However, the Proposed Actions raise a number of concerns that require mitigation or further consideration in order to best produce an increase in the number of units available that are affordable to the East Harlem community while also minimizing the harmful effects that increased development may cause.

This section will evaluate the Proposed Actions and how they meet the needs and concerns of the East Harlem community. First, this section will address one of the core elements of the plan: rezoning to spur development that is affordable to the East Harlem community. Second, this section will evaluate the Proposed Actions as a whole and evaluate comprehensive concerns. Third, this section will focus on individual components of the Proposed Actions, including specific boundary issues, the Park Avenue corridor, the Third Avenue corridor and other elements.

**Practical Effects of the Proposed Actions**

The Proposed Actions intend to create a substantial increase in affordable housing for the East Harlem community--a priority for the East Harlem community and a matter long advocated for by CB11. To achieve this goal, however, the Proposed Actions seek to “upzone” portions of the Rezoning Area fronting avenues. As a result, the likely impact of the Proposed Actions will be: (a) An increase in new construction as developers seek to avail themselves of the higher density allowed; (b) an increase in the height, density and overall size of buildings in the avenue portion
of the Rezoning Area; and, relatedly, (c) an increase in the number of new residential units and commercial space. Additionally, as the Proposed Actions are overlaid with MIH, the residential units created will be “affordable” units at a minimum of the prescribed MIH requirements.

**Alternatives and/or mitigation strategies for addressing the negative impacts of the Proposed Actions**

**General Analysis**

CB11 has long advocated for increased affordable housing. In this context, CB11 has expressed a number of priorities: (1) more affordable housing needs to be built; (2) existing affordable housing needs to be preserved; and (3) affordable housing--both newly developed and preserved units--needs to be “affordable” to the East Harlem community, and must meet the needs of residents at the AMI bands that are reflective of the East Harlem population.

The Proposed Actions undoubtedly seek to increase the number of affordable units in East Harlem with its main mechanism an upzoning that increases density so that more units can be built. However, the goal of creating more affordable housing is not the only priority for East Harlem. It is also important to seek to preserve the character and culture of East Harlem and to minimize the disruption and difficulty associated with the increased density (both with regards to the increased number and size of buildings, and with the increased population that such development entails). Thus, CB11 strongly believes that greater consideration needs to be made as to whether the Proposed Actions appropriately balance the need for increased affordable housing with the need to preserve a sustainable, livable environment. In this regard, CB11 believes that less significant up-zoning would provide a better balance of the goal for increased affordable housing with the needs and interests of the East Harlem community. The Proposed Actions permit taller, denser buildings and, by doing so, provide for an increase in the number of affordable units. But the greater density does not equate to a 1-for-1 increase in the number of affordable units; rather, it provides an opportunity for luxury-style, high-priced rental housing at the cost of taller, denser buildings that dramatically increase the population of the neighborhood, placing a strain on the services provided to residents.

In addition to the development of increased affordable housing, it is imperative that NYC improve and expand efforts to preserve affordable housing. There are limited vacant development sites in East Harlem and the rezoning is mapped onto many occupied buildings, some of which are small and affordable. These smaller buildings will experience development pressures because of the rezoning, which will put these existing affordable units at risk. Further, new market rate development may cause affordable rents to increase, putting existing affordable, but unregulated units at risk. In short, it is not sufficient to simply build new affordable housing and lose existing affordable housing; instead, NYC must commit to increasing efforts to preserve the existing affordable housing. Specifically, concurrent with the potential approval of the Proposed Actions, NYC must (1) commit additional resources to renovate existing affordable units; and (2) improve and expand tenant protection efforts (including, but not limited to, even further expanding the guarantee of universal access to legal representation for Housing Court to support East Harlem renters that are at or above the $50,000 threshold, enforcement by HPD and...
other city agencies to protect against landlord harassment, funding to promote tenant organizing efforts as well as increased tenant rights awareness efforts.

Even the units that are called “affordable” fail to provide housing that is actually affordable to the current residents of East Harlem. As CB11 has previously indicated through its disapproval of MIH during the ULURP process, MIH’s requirements for affordable housing are important first steps but fail to address the actual affordability needs of the East Harlem community. As indicated above, the median income of East Harlem is $31,422. Deeper levels of affordability are needed for housing that does not create rent burdens for existing residents.

In particular, MIH’s requirements are insufficient for East Harlem. MIH offers one or more of several options for developments applying MIH zoning: a set-aside of 25% of units at 60% of AMI (approximately $47,000 on average for a family of three), including 10% of units at 40% of AMI (approximately $31,000 on average for a family of three); a set-aside of 30% of units at 80% of AMI (approximately $62,000 on average for a family of three); a set-aside of 20% of units at 40% of AMI; or a set-aside of 30% of units at 115% of AMI (approximately $89,000 on average for a family of three), including 5% of units at 70% of AMI (approximately $54,000 on average for a family of three) and 5% of units at 90% of AMI (approximately $70,000 on average for a family of three). Thus, with the exception of the limited number of units potentially set-aside at the 40% of AMI level, the MIH affordability set-asides fail to create affordable housing for those residents of East Harlem at the district’s median income, let alone for those residents below the median income. MIH does not provide affordable housing for any residents earning 10% and 20% of AMI. In addition, MIH does not provide any benefit to those residents of East Harlem whose incomes exceed the highest income threshold for affordable unit set-asides (families earning in excess of 115% of AMI) though these families are nonetheless often rent burdened. These concerns are more fully discussed below in the Housing section. Yet it remains important to understand that the land use and zoning changes being proposed through the Proposed Actions permit increased development through upzoning on the basis that affordable units are being developed for East Harlem residents. Despite this upzoning benefit, there remain vast swaths of the East Harlem community that will remain unable to obtain affordable housing, and this need must be addressed concurrently with any Proposed Actions.

**Broad Analysis of Proposed Actions**

CB11 has a number of overarching concerns with how the Proposed Actions impact land use and zoning:

First, the boundaries of the Proposed Actions differ from those advised by the EHNP. CB11 has supported the principle of a rezoning that would spur affordable housing development in every new development. However, the Proposed Actions omitted the areas east of Second Avenue and south of 104th Street. The exclusion of these two areas shows a disregard for the recommendations of the EHNP, and the exclusion of the area south of 104th Street is particularly disconcerting as CB11 believes there are extensive market pressures here driving up rents, and this area needs affordable housing in every new development. The failure to use the larger rezoning area recommended by the EHNP is a missed opportunity to create more affordable housing in East Harlem. A rezoning that would map MIH areas to the east of Second Avenue, to
the south of 104th Street, and perhaps areas along Madison Avenue as described in the EHNP should be discussed with the Community Board so that affordable housing can be a part of developments in these areas as well.

Second, CB11 and East Harlem residents have expressed extensive concern that the Proposed Actions will create tall and massive buildings. The Proposed Actions call for large portions of East Harlem to be up-zoned to R10 and R10 equivalent districts, which allow buildings up to 12 FAR, Third Avenue and Park Avenue. CB11 believes that R9 or R9 equivalent districts provide a more appropriate balance between supply of units, preservation of community character, and the mitigation of community impacts. R9 is the minimum density increase necessary to trigger MIH on Third Avenue. If Third and Park Avenue were rezoned to allow 12 FAR buildings, many sites would be developed with buildings of approximately 30-35 stories or possibly more. Such building heights far exceed East Harlem’s existing buildings and do not provide a sufficient number of increased affordable units to justify the loss of space, the imposition of tall buildings and the change in community character. To the extent new developments fail to provide 100% affordable housing—and affordable housing that is actually affordable to the residents of East Harlem—CB11 believes the maximum floor area ratio should not exceed 8.5 FAR on Third and Park Avenues, outside the 125th Street Special District. The only exception to CB11’s position on the 12 FAR districts are the changes proposed to the 125th Street Special District, which considering this area’s current and future proximity to transit, the high densities proposed by the City in the rezoning are appropriate.

Third, in addition the massive increase in density proposed by the City, CB11 is also concerned about the new tower form the Proposed Actions introduces. The proposed East Harlem Corridors Special District allows a great deal of flexibility in building form. Flexibility is not, in and of itself, a bad thing, but as currently written, the proposed zoning text would allow thin, very tall towers on a small base, and not require the tower-on-base regulations that are currently described in the Zoning Resolution. Tower-on-base is the required tower form on avenues for most of the Upper East and Upper West sides. Because it has a track record, we understand how this building form performs and the types of buildings it produces. It is a mistake to abandon it in East Harlem to allow a new form that lowers the base height, removes provisions for minimum tower coverage and floor area located less than 150 feet. These changes will effectively allow for much taller buildings, but produce no additional floor area or units. The current tower-on-base regulations provide effective height limits without being prescriptive. Further, very tall, thin towers permitted by the proposed zoning are both completely out of character, and because they are extremely expensive to build, are not appropriate for affordable housing. Consequently, the Proposed Actions should adopt the existing tower-on-base building form, in addition to the quality housing envelope and not include the new tower form described in the East Harlem Corridors Special District; the East Harlem rezoning needs to promote building forms that make sense for affordable housing, not luxury housing.

Fourth, there are elements of the proposed rezoning that were not a part of either the EHNP or the Park Avenue rezoning that are welcome new additions and these improvements should be acknowledged: The Park Avenue rezoning recommendations incented the development of non-residential spaces along Park Avenue, but the proposed zoning text requires it, which is a better solution. Further, the limitation on the development of transient hotels appears to be a well-
considered solution to the concern that higher density districts that allow non-residential uses would not produce affordable housing, job intensive commercial spaces, or services for the local community, but hotels designed to serve tourists. This limitation on transient hotels helps to ensure that the needs of East Harlem are met first.

Fifth, there are also elements that were not a part of either the EHNP or the Park Avenue rezoning recommendations that CB11 categorically rejects. The Special East Harlem Corridors District as proposed will allow public parking garages in the district as-of-right, which in most districts require a CPC special permit. While there has been some support in the community for keeping some amount of accessory residential parking, there has never been any indication from CB11 that the community district needed more commercial parking garages. Large commercial parking garages would be terrible uses in this area: As a job producing non-residential use, they are large but produce very few jobs, taking away non-residential spaces from uses that might produce more jobs, or provide necessary local services. They deaden the streetscape and attract traffic to areas that are already congested. There is also a concern that if congestion pricing ever became law, the demand for parking garages in East Harlem could soar due to its easy proximity to Midtown, and push out higher and better uses that serve the needs of East Harlem residents.

Finally, the proposed Special East Harlem Corridors District includes important provisions designed to keep commercial streets active and functioning as attractive, walkable retail areas, including transparency requirements, parking wrapping, limited residential lobbies and limited curb cuts. It does not, however, add full Enhanced Commercial Corridor protections to any part of the district. The contemplated rezoning is likely to spur increased development and dramatically increase the number of residents. The Proposed Actions do not provide assurances that new commercial establishments will provide the services necessary for these new residents as well as the existing residents. East Harlem has historically lacked access to grocery stores, amongst other challenges, and an Enhanced Commercial District could be designed to encourage these historically underrepresented uses that are critical to the well-being of neighborhood residents, but new and existing. At minimum an Enhanced Commercial District should be designed to help preserve the very fine grained commercial uses along 116th Street. Within the rezoning area, 116th Street is lined with small to tiny store fronts that provide a variety of goods and services that are important to the community and contribute to the street’s excellent urban design; large footprint retail uses would disrupt the continuity of the street and diminish the quality of the place. An Enhanced Commercial district should be designed to limit the size of retail frontages in at least this area. With respect to La Marqueta and the Park Avenue Commercial Corridor, the City should advance the East Harlem community’s recommendations by supporting (a) the construction of capital improvements to the City-owned lots underneath the Metro North viaduct, (b) the creation of a contiguous corridor that has integrated design and use standards for those lots, and (c) the creation of a local governance structure for overseeing the implementation of the community’s recommendations for the development and operations of this local community asset.

Specific Analysis

In addition to the foregoing, the effects of the Proposed Actions must be considered as they impact specific geographic areas.
Third Avenue. The Proposed R10 district along the Third Avenue corridor is too dense housing. Instead, R9 in the southern portion and an R9 equivalent commercial district in the northern portion would more appropriately serve the needs of the community to simultaneously increase the number of affordable units while also minimizing the negative externalities of taller, larger and denser buildings. The density proposed for Third Avenue must be lowered to equal that proposed for Second Avenue.

Park Avenue. As with the Third Avenue corridor, CB11 believes that a R10 district along the Park Avenue corridor is too dense without providing sufficient benefit to the community in the form of increased affordable housing. As with Third Avenue, CB11 believes that this corridor should not exceed R9 densities of 8.5 FAR. Increased height and density along the Park Avenue corridor poses considerable challenges and potential direct impacts on neighboring residents. For example, the highest density district proposed is located directly abutting small (2.0 FAR and less) three family rowhouses built in 2002 on the midblocks between 118th Street, Park Avenue, 120th Street and Madison Avenue. These units were built on property taken during Urban Renewal and their development was facilitated by HPD. While CB11 acknowledges that the existing parking lots on Park Avenue are not a desired use, the urban renewal plan (URP) currently does not allow any new residential buildings in a portion of this area to be rezoned R10. To both amend the plan to allow residential uses, and then to allow those uses at the highest possible density, is too large of a change for the residents of this area: R9 zoning will activate the street, provide substantial new housing, and affordable housing, while lowering the impact on neighbors when compared with the City’s R10 proposal.

But even at the R9 densities, the City will have to make public safety and infrastructure investments, as further described herein, to mitigate negative impacts and to allow the Park Avenue corridor to realize its potential. Further, the City must engage in efforts to find better uses and designs for the area underneath the Park Avenue railroad tracks as a necessary complement to the Proposed Actions. Any up-zoning of the Park Avenue corridor adjacent to the tracks must convert current parking lots, vacant space and other city uses into opportunities for local business to better serve the needs and interests of the residents of the potential developments as well as the East Harlem community as a whole. It must further make additional investments in La Marqueta so that this important market can better serve the needs of the existing and new community that will be created along Park Avenue.

To be clear, CB11 does agree that R10 equivalent densities are appropriate with the modified 125th Street Special District. Here, the deleterious effect of taller and denser developments will be reduced due to existing and planned transportation infrastructure (Metro North station, the future Second Avenue Subway terminus and the nearby Lexington Avenue station) as well as the existing zoning and nature of the thoroughfare.

116th Street. One of the most significant intersections along the 116th Street corridor is the intersection of 116th Street and Lexington Avenue. This intersection, in the heart of East Harlem, is a central hub: The 116th Street subway stop meets with both crosstown buses and downtown buses bring significant foot traffic to a vibrant commercial street. As a result, the intersection is already significantly populated. The Proposed Actions call for ½ of each block
frontage at this intersection to be up-zoned to R9. Outside this intersection on 116th Street and Lexington Avenue, the Proposed Actions call for changes to the existing zoning that are the minimum required to trigger MIH, but do not increase density any more than required.

CB11 is supportive of the increased affordable housing this will bring to this intersection and agrees that there is an opportunity to spur new development. However, changes to the zoning must be accompanied by significant investment in development to better address the bustling nature of this corner. First and foremost, the subway stations need to be improved and stairs and elevators should be integrated into new development that occurs on this intersection so that sidewalk widths can be expanded and ease access to the subway station and neighboring bus stops. Additionally, consideration should be given to the former presence of a grocery store at this intersection and efforts should be made to encourage the development of a grocery store in the ground floor of any new development.

The proposed Special East Harlem Corridors District, of which 116th Street is a part, includes important provisions designed to keep commercial streets active and functioning as attractive, walkable retail areas. Because of the fine grained existing nature of 116th Street, an Enhanced Commercial District should be developed to protect this existing character. Within the rezoning area, 116th Street is lined with small storefronts that provide a variety of goods and services that are important to the community and contribute to the street’s excellent urban design; large footprint retail uses would disrupt the continuity of the street and diminish the quality of the place. An Enhanced Commercial district should be designed to limit the size of storefronts along 116th Street.

Zoning boundary differences and City Map changes. As indicated above, the Proposed Actions do not mirror the East Harlem Neighborhood Plan and/or the Park Avenue Rezoning recommendations. CB11 believes that these differences are important and the City should reconsider the Proposed Actions to better match those specific recommendations. The following is a list of changes the CB believes should be made to the Proposed Actions:

1. **127th Street between Lexington and Park Avenue should be remapped.** This street was vacated during urban renewal, but with the density that is now being proposed, this one block—one block north of the Metro North station—should be remapped. Remapping 127th Street was a part of the 2013 Park Avenue Rezoning recommendations as a related ULURP action, and at that time it was found that a 60 foot street could be remapped without impacting existing buildings. The Proposed Actions is likely the City’s last chance to correct this error and to provide a relief for the congestion this increased density proposed will bring. Further, by breaking up this superblock any future development on this site will be more in-scale with the surrounding neighborhood.

2. **A commercial overlay (C1-4) should be mapped on the west side of Madison Avenue between 127th and 128th Street.** This change was identified in the Park Avenue rezoning recommendations in 2013 and was a comment included on the Draft Scope of Work.

3. **The south side of 124th Street between Park and Lexington should be rezoned as either R7D or C4-4D.** The Proposed Actions omits northern midblock portion of western portion of block 1772 and leaves it as R7-2 with a C2-4 commercial overlay. All adjacent areas were either
rezoned in 2008 or are now proposed to be rezoned. This small section of 124th Street is largely non-residential and the existing R7-2 is a poor fit for current uses and form. The Park Avenue rezoning recommendations called for the MX district on Park Avenue to “turn the corner” to cover this part of 124th Street, but considering Proposed Actions’ density for Park Avenue, this would be too dense for this narrow street. Instead, this block should be rezoned to either the R7D proposed on Lexington Avenue, or the C4-4D that is mapped on the north side of 124th Street.

4. **Do not rezone Eugene McCabe playground or the Henry J Carter Specialty Hospital to high densities that produce unwanted development pressures on these sites.** These sites on the west side of Park Avenue between 120th and 122nd Street and should not be rezoned. They were not recommended for rezoning in the EHNP and they should not be rezoned in the Proposed Actions. The Park Avenue rezoning noted the playground as a “Park,” reflecting 11-13 of the zoning resolution. The site of the Carter Hospital was recommended for rezoning in the Park Avenue recommendations, but the initial recommendation was made before the hospital was built. The playground should be left as open space and a rezoning to R10 or equivalent will put pressures on the Carter Hospital, which is a new facility and an asset to the community. There is concern that because the Eugene McCabe playground is a Jointly Operated Playground that the City will use it for development rights just as it has attempted to do at the ECF site on East 96th Street. Consequently, it should not be rezoned.

5. **Rezone the Urban Assembly school,** which is the block bounded by Park Avenue, 127th Street, Madison Avenue and 128th Street. The Proposed Actions carves out this site, rezoning all land around it, but leaving this school as R7-2. This site was identified as a potential public development site in the EHNP and contains an outdated school facility that was built without windows. This is a prime location for increased density to support both substantial amounts of affordable housing, as well as for a new, updated school facility that would serve the northern part of the District and beyond.

6. **Rezone the mid-block portion of the blocks bounded by 122nd Street, 124th Street, Lexington Avenue and Third Avenue.** Like the Urban Assembly School, these portions of blocks were inexplicably carved out of the rezoning while everything around them is proposed for rezoning. The R7-2 district here has been in place since 1961 and allows for community facility towers in the mid-block, and height factor buildings that are not considered the future of East Harlem. The midblock portion of the block bounded by 122nd Street, Lexington Avenue, 123rd Street and Third Avenue should be zoned R7B, just as was proposed directly to the south. The mid-block portion of the block bounded by 124th Street, Lexington Avenue, 123rd Street, and Third Avenue was identified as a public site in the EHNP and should be rezoned as described in the EHNP (R8 or R8A) in anticipation for development with 100% affordable housing.

7. **Rezone the east side of Park Avenue from 128th Street to 131st Street.** Like Park Avenue directly to the west and south, CB11 recognizes that this area that can accommodate growth: it is within easy walking distance to the Metro North Station and the future terminus of the Second Avenue subway, as well as just a block from an exit of the Harlem River Drive. This area was identified for rezoning in the 2013 Park Avenue rezoning recommendations and in the EHNP, yet is inexplicably carved out of the Proposed Actions. The current zoning is M1-2, a low density manufacturing district that does not describe the desired future of this area. The current uses on these blocks that front Park Avenue are: the Addicts Rehabilitation Center (ARC), A
Consolidated Edison substation, and the DSNY garage for Community District 10. ARC and the DSNY garage for Community District 10 are not appropriate uses to support the redevelopment of Park Avenue into an active destination street. A rezoning to a higher density district would bring development pressures to this area, which would be a positive development and it would help in the relocation of these uses. The DSNY garage should be in CD10 or in a consolidated garage placed elsewhere. The ARC facility, while providing an important public service, should provide this service on a site that is better suited for its needs, and the needs of the community. Finally, the ConEd substation is part of critical infrastructure, but 1) it is not the kind of use that is appropriate for the vision of Park Avenue of the future; and 2) it was built before Superstorm Sandy on a piece of land that is 14 feet above sea level very close to the Harlem River. This use should be moved to a more appropriate location and a rezoning to a higher density mixed use district will support the redevelopment of this area into more desirable uses.

8. **Commercial overlays should not be mapped onto NYCHA housing estates.** The Proposed Rezoning maps commercial overlays on most of the avenue portions of the NYCHA housing estates in the rezoning area. Mapping commercial overlays on NYCHA property was a draft recommendation of the EHNP that was overwhelmingly rejected by the Steering Committee. Any plan for future development on NYCHA estates needs to be developed directly with residents. To be clear, future development on NYCHA estates is not rejected, but only that any future development on NYCHA be planned in conjunction with NYCHA residents, CB11, and the larger community. Mapping a commercial overlay in these areas without any plan is a distraction that does nothing to further a development plan for these areas and should be abandoned.

9. **Modify the Park Avenue Hub Subdistrict of the 125th Street Special District and the proposed zoning changes to that subdistrict to exclude the New York City landmark at the northwest corner of 125th Street and Park Avenue.** CB11 has concerns that the excess floor area from this Landmarked building will be shifted to the vacant site abutting the landmark to the north, allowing a new building in the proposed 12 FAR district to be too tall for the area.

**HOUSING**

**Practical effects of Proposed Actions on housing**

East Harlem is home to a large amount of regulated and subsidized housing. At least 75% of East Harlem residential units are subject to regulation of some sort: specifically, approximately 15% of units are subject to rent stabilization; 30% of units are public housing units administered by the New York City Housing Authority (“NYCHA”); and an additional 30% of units receive some sort of government assistance, such as Section 8 subsidies. As a result, only one-fourth of East Harlem residential units are unregulated.

Furthermore, 38% of CD11 make 30% or below of the area Average Median Income (“AMI”), and a further 17% of CD11 have household incomes between 31% and 50% of AMI. Thus, a majority—55%—of CD11 make 50% of AMI or less. However, there is a wide array of income levels in CD11. Almost one-third of East Harlem makes over 80% of AMI, and nearly one-fifth
of the community’s households make over 120% of AMI. While it is imperative that we advocate for households on the lower end of the income spectrum—a position consistently adopted by CB11 throughout its existence—it is important to ensure housing protections for middle-class, or moderate-income, households. All too often, housing safeguards fail to contemplate the large segments of our community that have too much income to qualify for government-assisted housing but not enough income to afford market-rate apartments. Protection of low-income tenants and moderate-income tenants are not mutually exclusive. It is clear that both low-income and moderate-income East Harlem residents would benefit from housing preservation strategies. Even without a planned rezoning, landlords have a financial incentive to deregulate apartments so as to maximize profits, often doing so by harassing existing rent-regulated tenants. This reality is worsened when the City proposes an upzoning of the community—as is the case here with the Proposed Actions—as property owners sell to developers at sharply increased prices. Indeed, CD11 already has many buildings that are being warehoused, i.e., sitting vacant, rather than using their potential and renting out the units, as owners wait for shifts in development trends in order to maximize sale prices.

As the law currently stands, all rent-stabilized apartments—ones that give tenants an array of protections, including a right to a renewal lease and limits on how much the landlord can raise the rent—can be removed from rent-stabilization if the apartment becomes vacant and the monthly rent crosses the threshold of $2,700. Additionally, in buildings with limits on rents that can be charged because of subsidies from the New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development (“HPD”), limited rents are only offered as long as the regulatory agreement between the landlord and HPD is in place, and some of those agreements last for only 30 years. After the regulatory agreement expires, landlords are no longer bound to offer the affordable rent, which means that the only permanently affordable residential units are the public housing complexes operated by NYCHA. As a result, even if a landlord of a rent-regulated or government-assisted residential unit does not engage in unlawful conduct to charge market rental rates, the fact remains that the unit will eventually become lawfully deregulated and convert to a market apartment, if the landlord chooses not to renew their regulatory agreement with HPD.

While these realities potentially paint a dire picture, make it all the more important that the City engage in serious preservation efforts.

The requirement of the Proposed Actions that any new development taking advantage of the upzoning comply with MIH obligations with respect to affordable housing is an important idea and a step in the right direction. That being said, there are ways that the City can improve upon the affordable housing requirement included in MIH. First, CB11 firmly advocates for deeper affordability, which is possible through, for example, financial incentives. CB11 has consistently maintained that MIH in new residential development should be set at 50/30/20, with 50% market units, 30% moderate-income units, and 20% low-income units. Second, CB11 maintains that the City is capable of incentivizing and encouraging the development of affordable housing by local non-profit developers; specifically, the City must give preference to local non-profit developers for any request for proposals (“RFP”) for development on public land, as well as provide other financial incentives and relief for non-profit developers and their investors, in light of the fact that non-profit developers are more likely to maintain permanent affordability than their for-profit counterparts.
In sum, it is imperative that, in order to ensure East Harlem’s long-term housing vitality and accessibility to our low- and moderate-income, the Proposed Actions include both robust strategies to enforce and expand existing legal protections for tenants aimed at preserving existing affordable housing and provisions for the construction of additional permanent affordable housing in any new development.

**Alternatives and/or mitigation strategies for addressing the negative impacts of the Proposed Actions**

**Preservation/Protection**

CB11’s priority is the preservation and protection of affordable housing. As noted above, at least 75% of East Harlem housing is regulated in some fashion. Even after adjusting for the approximately 30% consisting of NYCHA public housing, nearly half of East Harlem residences are rent-regulated (subject to rent control or rent stabilization) and/or government-assisted housing. For these privately-owned, government-subsidized residential units, HPD can play a role in extending financial incentives to maintain these units as affordable units with regulated rent limits. To that end, HPD should expand the financial resources available to East Harlem building owners and developers to preserve affordable units by creating a neighborhood-wide HPD funding set-aside. HPD should work to identify privately-owned buildings that could most benefit from an injection of city funds, such as those in need of major repairs, and also those that have rent limits due to regulatory agreements in place between the landlord and the City, which are buildings whose owners may be amenable to the refinancing of their mortgages in exchange for an extension of the regulatory agreement.

Moreover, the City should identify those unregulated buildings containing between one and five residential units that may be suitable for entry into an affordable housing preservation program.

Additionally, the City must continue to fund the current expansion of free legal representation for those families making under 200% of the federal poverty line. In February 2017, Mayor Bill de Blasio and City Council Speaker Melissa Mark-Viverito announced an increase in funding of $93 million toward legal services for low-income tenants. This unprecedented allocation in funding for civil legal services in New York City Housing Court is a very positive step in the right direction. However, this recent increase in funding should be implemented in a way that serves to build upon the City’s strides toward equal justice. The City should ensure that it robustly funds not only individual eviction defense, but also group representation of legal services providers. Group representation enables tenants, among other things, to adequately and efficiently address building-wide conditions, rectify power imbalances, and embolden renters to vindicate their rights. While there is overlap between the group and individual contexts, there exist important differences between those contexts with respect to leverage, strategy, and legal issues, to name a few. Tenants, tenant organizers, and tenant attorneys know this reality well, and the City must take heed if it wishes to ensure that this historic allocation of funds is deployed in a manner that actually effectively addresses the displacement forces the City declares it seeks to combat. To this end, the City must continue to vigorously fund the Tenant Rights Coalition (“TRC”)--a project established by Legal Services NYC and The Legal Aid Society through City
funds—which has a mission specifically targeted to combating displacement forces of
gentrification in the largely low- and moderate-income communities of color that are slated for
up-zoning. The City must extend the TRC contract on terms that enable legal services providers
to meet realistic benchmarks. CB11 is particularly interested in the renegotiation and extension
of the TRC contract given the City’s designation of zip codes that encompass East Harlem
neighborhoods.

Furthermore, in light of the realities presented by rezoning, access to information, and disparate
access to the courts depending on economic status, the City should provide funding to allow
legal services providers to maintain East Harlem storefront offices and/or satellite offices in area
community-based organizations for a period of no less than five years from the date of approval
of the Proposed Actions, if ultimately approved. Such funding would allow legal services
providers to have a visible presence in East Harlem, further increasing access to civil legal
services for many individuals who may not receive judicial referrals or who do not otherwise
have access to information regarding their legal rights and/or how to attain counsel in Housing
Court proceedings.

In addition to the City’s injection of needed funds to increase the level of tenant representation in
Housing Court, the City itself must aggressively identify and penalize incidents of tenant
harassment. The need for a proactive stance by the City in this realm is reflected in the EHNPA as
well as in the positions adopted by community organizations.

Additionally, the City must create a citywide Certification of No Harassment (“CoNH”). Under
this program, landlords would have to attain a CoNH prior to alteration or demolition of a
building that contained any rent-regulated unit within the last ten years. In order to attain a
CoNH, landlords seeking to demolish a building containing formerly rent-regulated units would
have the burden of proving that they have no history of tenant harassment. At a minimum, in the
interim the City must expand the applicability of the current CoNH program to include CD11.
The City must include the entirety of CD11 to account for the potential effects of the Proposed
Actions on the areas outside of the study area.

Furthermore, the City must exercise its power to institute an anti-warehousing tax and/or
additional tax on the transfer of warehoused residential properties. Such a tax would
disincentivize the practice of allowing residential spaces to remain vacant for long periods of
time. Implementation of an anti-warehousing tax will lead to productive use of property and
increase the housing stock for the community. CB11

New Development

Although CB11’s primary focus has been and continues to be the preservation and protection of
affordable housing in our community, the Proposed Actions present an opportunity to ensure the
development of permanently affordable housing stock. Under current zoning regulations in East
Harlem, there is no requirement that affordable housing be built in new residential construction.
As gentrification and its attendant displacement forces continues in East Harlem, residents risk
replacement of the current housing stock with almost exclusively unregulated market units by
way of new construction and deregulation of currently regulated apartments.
The City justifies the Proposed Actions as a tool to ensure that East Harlem preserves affordable housing and that any new residential development offsets displacement of low- and moderate-income residents through MIH, part of Mayor de Blasio’s Housing New York plan. However, while MIH is a serious step in the right direction, it falls well short of addressing the housing affordability needs of the East Harlem community. The majority of East Harlem residents earn less than 30% of AMI, yet the deepest level of affordability under MIH is a set-aside of 25% of any new residential development averaging to 60% of AMI. Of this 25%, 10% will be required at 40% of AMI.

Though MIH is a step in the right direction in that it makes affordable housing mandatory in any new residential development, its current options are wholly insufficient to meet the needs of East Harlem. Not only is the affordable set-aside under MIH actually unaffordable for most East Harlem residents, but it also neglects the substantial percentage of East Harlemites who make over 80% of AMI. These East Harlem families would not qualify for the new affordable units, yet they have insufficient income to afford the unregulated market units or to afford them without being severely rent-burdened. Therefore, CB11 supports a 50/30/20 model wherein 50% of new units are market units and the remaining 50% are affordable units (30% of the units are available to moderate-income families and 20% of the units are accessible to low- and very low-income families, based on a percentage of AMI reflective of East Harlem). CB11 calls on the City to incentivize and subsidize the 50/30/20 model, so that 20% of new residential units will be available to residents earning less than 30% of AMI and 30% of new residential units will be set aside for residents earning between 30% and 120% of AMI. CB11 further calls on City and State subsidies that are directed toward deeper MIH affordability to be insulated against federal budget cuts.

Furthermore, it is important that developers meet MIH requirements within each building. That is, developers cannot be permitted to offset failure to meet the affordable housing targets by making up for the shortfall offsite. Permitting developers to transfer the shortfall to offsite projects serves to reinforce socioeconomic segregation, which reinforces notions of second-class status and defeats the purpose of mixed-income housing.

For any development on public land, including NYCHA in-fill proposals, CB11 demands that such development offer 100% affordable housing, with bands targeting a spectrum from 10% of AMI to 120% of AMI. Moreover, in the current climate of budget cuts of programs focused on assisting the most vulnerable families, CB11 requests that the City and State ensure that the incentives and subsidies toward housing preservation and deeper affordability in new development are insulated against federal budget cuts, so that the programs can run in perpetuity regardless of federal allocation decisions.

Finally, CB11 notes that although NYCHA public housing will not be directly affected by the rezoning, there will be myriad indirect effects created by the Proposed Actions. First, as stated above, any process that could yield development of NYCHA land must include the affected NYCHA residents and development should not occur without those NYCHA residents’ approval. Second, the effects on economic opportunities, open spaces, and affordability of local goods and
services springing from the Proposed Actions, to name but a few areas, will have a direct impact on the day-to-day lives of East Harlem’s NYCHA residents. CB11 steadfastly maintains that East Harlem, home to the second highest concentration of public housing projects in the nation, should not be up-zoned and developed in a manner that isolates NYCHA residents. NYCHA residents must be continuously respected as an important part of the fabric of our community. The City must improve the conditions and quality of life of CD11 NYCHA residents through sufficient funding, and it must actively consider the effect of any development on local NYCHA residents.

**LOCAL ECONOMY**

**Practical effects of Proposed Actions on the local economy**

East Harlem contains a significant number of businesses and non-profit organizations that collectively employ over 40,000 individuals. The City’s Proposed Actions will have a tremendous impact on the businesses and organizations located in East Harlem. As the City’s proposal stands, small businesses and non-profit agencies will likely face substantial challenges, such as steep increases in rent and non-renewal of lease agreements. Those small businesses and organizations that remain may experience further collateral consequences, such as the inability to retain employees due to the sharp increases in rent. Moreover, the failure of the Proposed Actions to limit the width of certain commercial spaces leaves small businesses vulnerable to displacement by chain stores, banks, or other large businesses.

Furthermore, East Harlem has a higher rate of unemployment than that of New York City and the country as a whole. The increase in development due to the City’s Proposed Actions presents employment opportunities. Without requirements (and enforcement of those requirements) that developers hire local residents for their projects, East Harlem residents may experience a massive transformation of their community that largely leaves them on the economic sidelines, confirming a feeling of marginalization and exploitation.

Historically, East Harlem contained many local and family owned businesses, which provided vital products and services catering to the core residents. Often serving as a vital lifeline for integrating the community, local family based locales such as La Marqueta continue to this day. However, during the many years of accumulation of investment properties by non-East Harlem investors in the hopes of profiteering during heightened speculation has directly led to the aforementioned warehousing and devolution of the community, thus stifling economic opportunity.

Along First, Second and Third Avenues, many of these buildings do not achieve their commercial potential due to neglected, if not blighted conditions. The remaining businesses, which survive this process, are surrounded by storefronts that continually change due to increased unaffordable rent assessments. With current tax laws in effect, the owners of these properties possess no incentive to engage in fair negotiations with the existing tenants/businesses and in many cases the owners gain more by continuing the practice of rotating the commercial space for additional tax write-offs. Such practices result in abandoned storefronts. Coupled with the vacant apartments above the commercial spaces carry a stigma for investment and
revitalization, thus negatively impacting the surrounding environment and the community at large.

The incoming extension of the Second Avenue Subway will offer new advantages for many of these shareholders and the community. With this planned public works project, the potential for many of these investors to maximize their investment without community input may be realized. The Community Board has initiated outreach to advocate for the community with the aforementioned investors in the past and in most instances, the owners neither care to engage or at best are ambivalent to the community’s overall needs. Beyond the general workforce development for this project and other future construction developments, responsibility for creating favorable terms for CD11 should be of the highest priority.

The City can dictate the terms to offset the negative impact of rezoning such as the potential displacement vacuum. The City possesses the singular opportunity to direct mandates through the combined efforts of the rezoning process and the City’s legislative powers that would foster local economic growth through issuing incentives to property holders. Working in tandem with the City and State through issuance of financial mechanisms incorporating financial floors, ceilings, sunset clauses, etc. for CD11 specific rezoning would engender community-based engagement. Such implementation would foster retention of many of these treasured businesses that have survived and create an environment for more businesses to invest in our community. Adopting a community-based preference mechanism in conjunction with the above methodology would allow for a more engaged and comprehensive approach.

Beyond standard economic practices, engagement with neighborhood based MWBEs would engender a more widespread approach to the memorialized positions of CB11. Those small businesses and organizations catering to the needs of the community would create opportunities for both local hiring and commodities acquisition. Locally-owned businesses become the economic web for the community. As well as the cultural elements, many of these businesses cater to various economic bands within the community. By incorporating more locally-owned MWBEs from the community, the City will maintain a necessary component to maintaining the community fabric during the rezoning process. All the while, these businesses attract those outside of the community with a more robust disposable income. Additionally, these businesses trend towards hiring locally, which only engenders more economic opportunity for the community.

Further to the provisions above, the City should fully incorporate those enshrined positions and requests that align with the District Needs Statements, EHN, and any and all positions memorialized by CB11. An approach of this nature would foster a renaissance of the community while mitigating the potential impacts associated from a rezoning process.

Alternatives and/or mitigation strategies for addressing the negative impacts of the Proposed Actions

Developers wishing to build in East Harlem should the Proposed Actions be approved must adhere to the following guidelines, which are specifically geared toward the inclusion of the East Harlem community, (located in zip codes 10029, 10035, 10037, 10128) and to serve as the basis
of economic development goals when executing land use actions for the building of local infrastructure, commercial, and residential projects:

1) Requirement for the utilization of community-based organizations (“CBOs”), located in East Harlem as a first source for workforce training, development, and placement on projects in East Harlem.

2) Implement funding to establish pipeline capacity for required training qualifications acquisition, trainee opportunities, or any prerequisite requirement assistance through local CBOs to ensure East Harlem residents have the ability to qualify for such placements. Include in funding initiatives, support for business development for women- and/or minority-owned business enterprises (“M/WBEs”).

3) Ensure local community participation in all phases of development, not only during construction, but also in the pre- and post-construction phases. At a minimum, developers must hire East Harlem residents to be a minimum representation of 35% of their workforce.

4) Utilize local businesses and M/WBEs or disadvantaged business enterprises (“DBE”). Minimum participation level should account for 33% of projects stemming from the Proposed Actions.

5) Provide reports to CB11 throughout the project in order to track progress on the above items.

Of particular importance to CB11 is the way that lower income communities of color, which includes East Harlem, are subjected to a level of policing and prosecution that is not found in other communities. Once individuals have a criminal record, they experience a multitude of collateral consequences, including housing discrimination, inability to qualify for student loans, and employment discrimination, to name but a few. These consequences make it nearly impossible for those who have paid their debt to society to return to society as productive members. Consequently, it is critical that the City provide additional funds for non-profit organizations engaged in reentry work so that they can train East Harlem residents reentering the community after their sentence to attain the requisite skills for employment opportunities stemming from the Proposed Actions.

**INFRASTRUCTURE**

**Practical effects of Proposed Actions on East Harlem’s existing infrastructure**

East Harlem has a population of nearly 125,000. While there are good transportation links between East Harlem and the rest of New York City, as well as the greater metropolitan area, the existing transportation is insufficient to optimally support the existing population, and the City’s Proposed Actions will serve to exacerbate the existing infrastructure challenges facing East Harlem. Specifically, the 4, 5, and 6 trains are often overcrowded and are the MTA subway lines with the lowest rates of on-time departures and arrivals. The Q train recently opened three new stations, with the most northern station of 96th Street serving the southernmost point of CD11.
Further relief will occur when the MTA eventually opens the Q train Phase 2 stations of 106th Street, 116th Street, and 125th Street; however, by that point, East Harlem will have experienced considerable growth due to not only the Proposed Actions, but also due to large projects on Second Avenue that contain significant residential construction and are currently in the pipeline, such as the Avalon Bay project at Second Avenue and East 96th Street and the African Burial Ground at Second Avenue and East 125th Street. Additionally, crosstown travel is difficult and congested. Unless the crosstown links are improved and expanded, East Harlem will continue to face crosstown backlogs on a consistent basis. Finally, the increased density permitted under the Proposed Actions will see important but narrow corridors, i.e., Lexington Avenue and Park Avenue, facing increasing challenges with respect to pedestrian congestion and safety.

Alternatives and/or mitigation strategies for addressing the negative impacts of the Proposed Actions

Transportation

According to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Actions (including the proposed Sendero Verde site), East Harlem can expect an influx of 15,962 residents and 3,803 workers by 2027. However, the Proposed Actions provide no means for addressing this substantial increase in population for the community. A massive influx of new residents, as well as workers, requires a significant investment in transportation to appropriately mitigate the impact that this new development will cause. In conjunction with the Proposed Actions, NYC must dedicate additional resources to improve methods of transportation in East Harlem. All of these considerations must consider not only the effect of the Proposed Actions but all other developments that are outside the scope of the Proposed Actions but nonetheless contributing to an increase in residents and a substantial change to the overall transportation needs of East Harlem.

In particular, NYC must improve existing transportation infrastructure and expand transportation opportunities in the following ways. First, NYC must ensure that funding is secured for the long-proposed Phase 2 expansion of the Second Avenue Subway. This expansion will provide additional means of transportation for East Harlem residents and will mitigate the overcrowded conditions of the only other subway in the East Harlem neighborhood. Until such time as Phase 2 of the Second Avenue Subway is actually constructed, it is important to require that the MTA and the NYC Department of Transportation actually mitigate the effect of increased ridership in the East Harlem community through alternative means. As of now, the Draft Environmental Impact Statement disregards the expected ridership in anticipation of the finalization of the Phase 2 project. Unfortunately, after years of being disregarded, CB11 remains skeptical that East Harlem will have an opportunity to benefit from the development of the Second Avenue Subway. Second, NYC must improve bus service in East Harlem. Both the north-south bus lines as well as the crosstown bus lines are regularly overcrowded and increased bus service will provide an invaluable service to East Harlem residents, particularly as a significant increase in neighborhood population is anticipated. Third, alternative public transportation must be encouraged. For instance, the proposed expansion of Citi Bike to East Harlem must be expedited and further expansion to ensure that Citi Bike is a viable method of transportation for East
Harlem residents. More importantly, Citi Bike membership costs must be reevaluated and potentially subsidized to make it a viable alternative for East Harlem residents.

Finally, vehicular traffic and congestion requires further consideration. In connection with the development spurred by the Proposed Actions, an increase in construction vehicles and other traffic is likely to increase. In addition, street closures and related detours seem likely as construction vehicles consume East Harlem’s roadways. For instance, along the Park Avenue corridor where a R10 upzoning is proposed, the effect of construction vehicles along one lane streets in each direction seems likely to cause significant challenges to vehicular traffic in East Harlem. Mitigation must be considered and approval of street closures must take a comprehensive view of all developments in East Harlem and not just site-specific approvals or rejections.

**Public Safety**

As the population of East Harlem is expected to increase in connection with the Proposed Actions, CB11 believes additional resources are necessary to preserve the safety of the East Harlem community.

Police resources need to be expanded to reflect the anticipated increase in the population. Yet such increased resources need to also reflect a need for effective community policing. Overpolicing and overcriminalization must be avoided at all costs. As the population increases, CB11 expects that the police will continue to be a presence in the community but policing must avoid targeting specific populations. In addition, policing must be conducted in a manner that avoids creating the appearance of an actively policed neighborhood. Police must improve efforts at community engagement and community relations. Financial resources should be dedicated to promoting these efforts.

In addition to police, other public safety issues must be addressed. The Fire Department and EMS must also be sufficiently staffed and provided with the necessary resources to address an increased population. Other than emergency services, the anticipated increase in the population is likely to increase vehicular traffic and pedestrian traffic. The NYC Department of Transportation and other relevant agencies must consider how best to address this, how to promote pedestrian safety, how to avoid overcrowding on local streets and, otherwise, how to preserve a safe neighborhood.

**Sanitation**

The asthma hospitalization rate in East Harlem is among the highest of all neighborhoods in New York City. Among the top contributors to poor air quality in the community are its proximity to the FDR and the presence of two sanitation garages. As such, CB 11 believes that additional resources are necessary to address inadequate sanitation infrastructure and to mitigate poor air quality.

The expected population growth connected to the Proposed Actions will undoubtedly increase strain on outdated sanitation infrastructure, which, in its current state, exacerbates asthma related
illness and vermin. According to the EIS, development resulting from the Proposed Actions would generate approximately 133.3 additional tons per week of solid waste, of which approximately 55 percent (73.1 tons) would be handled by the New York City Department of Sanitation (“DSNY”). The increase in solid waste generated by the Proposed Actions translates to over 17 additional truckloads per week of solid waste. Air pollution from sanitation garages and trucks in the community should be mitigated by permanently relocating the M-10 Sanitation Garage located on 131st Street and Park Avenue, which is in direct violation of the City’s Fair Share Mandate. CB 11 believes the M-10 garage should be relocated to Central Harlem, the neighborhood it serves, in order to avoid further environmental and health damage to the East Harlem community.

Furthermore, the M-11 Sanitation Garage, which is currently adjacent to Metro East 99th Street, an affordable housing complex for seniors, continues to cause high rates of airborne particulate matter. While DSNY has proposed moving the M-11 Sanitation Garage to the Potamkin site on 127th Street and Second Avenue, their current proposal would do nothing to mitigate air pollution or vermin infestation by either upgrading the existing fleets with zero emissions buses and sanitation trucks or developing a fully enclosed, green facility with advanced indoor air filtration systems. It is CB11’s position that the City should dedicate resources necessary to fund the construction of a consolidated sanitation garage for the CB11 catchment area, using best practices in environmental controls including a fully enclosed sanitation garage in addition to upgrading the entire sanitation fleet.

Finally, more trash receptacles are needed, and existing receptacles should be collected more frequently to prevent overflowing or littering, which can also have adverse impacts on stormwater drainage during heavy rainfall.

HEALTH

Practical effects of Proposed Actions on the health of East Harlem’s residents

East Harlem has some of the poorest air quality in New York City, which has led to an asthma hospitalization rate among children ages 5 to 14 that is more than double the rate for New York City overall. The roads traversing CD11 as well as FDR Drive are frequently and regularly congested, which contributes significantly to the area’s poor air quality. Additionally, and alarmingly, East Harlem has an infant mortality rate and a premature mortality rate that is nearly double the average for Manhattan in each category. East Harlem also has an elevated level of individuals living with hypertension, which is exacerbated by stressors like living in apartments with consistently substandard conditions or in households that are rent-burdened. The real estate realities in our community also heighten the risk of creation and/or aggravation of mental health conditions.

Regrettably, the primary and secondary health impacts of government action on the affected communities are often overlooked or given short shrift. The increase in population resulting from the Proposed Actions will further burden the transportation networks in the area. As noted above, the existing subway lines and bus options are overcrowded and already insufficient to
fully meet the existing public transportation needs of East Harlem. The increased demand will have both direct health impacts, e.g., worsening asthma rates, and indirect health impacts, e.g., increased stress. Additionally, the increase in property values and corresponding increase in rent levels due to an up-zoning of the area will contribute to further worry surrounding housing stability. As noted in the New York Academy of Medicine’s East Harlem Neighborhood Plan Health Impact Assessment (“HIA”), there is a direct correlation between higher rent burdens and increased health problems and likelihood of postponing medical treatment for financial reasons. Its HIA also highlights direct correlations between housing unaffordability and poor mental health in low- and moderate-income groups, as well as acceptance of substandard housing conditions.

**Alternatives and/or mitigation strategies for addressing the negative impacts of the Proposed Actions**

CB11 firmly believes that the City’s DEIS severely underestimates the number of people whose health will be adversely affected by the Proposed Actions, a position supported by the New York Academy of Medicine (“NYAM”), one of the community partners engaged in the EHNP process. NYAM’s HIA highlights the East Harlem health realities, which entail a community already combating hypertension, obesity, child and adult asthma, diabetes, and mental health issues--and avoidable hospitalizations due to these conditions--at a rate well above Manhattan and New York City averages.

Without implementation of the recommendations herein regarding housing preservation and deeper affordability in new development, the City’s Proposed Actions will certainly lead to deterioration in the health of current East Harlem residents, particularly those who are low- and moderate-income, which encapsulates the vast majority of CD11 residents. In order to mitigate the health impacts that any up-zoning of the area would undoubtedly bring about--in addition to the implementation of the recommendations with respect to density, transportation, infrastructure, as well as housing recommendations concerning housing preservation, housing maintenance, and deeper affordability--the City must encourage development design and construction specifications that mitigate noise pollution, particularly near the Park Avenue viaduct, and incorporate green design. Moreover, all new development must incorporate dust mitigation techniques to reduce the impact on the health of existing residents. Furthermore, the City must allocate a substantial increase in funding for community treatment programs specializing in asthma or mental health, as well as facilities offering basic, low-cost preventative care.

Finally, CB11 notes that the City’s process for assessing the health impact on the residents of any community slated to be rezoned is fundamentally flawed and leads to counterfactual determinations that there will be little to no impact on the health of current residents if new development occurs. Consequently, CB11 calls for future health impact assessments performed not only by the City, but, as detailed above in the Introduction, to the extent that any neighborhood-wide rezoning (or any rezoning of any NYC neighborhood whereby five (5) or more city blocks are proposed for rezoning, NYC Department of City Planning or any other city agency, office or elected official shall ensure that the community board for the affected community shall be provided with funding reasonably sufficient to conduct an environmental
impact statement, in addition to any required environmental impact statement any city agency may itself conduct, through a vendor or contractor of its own choosing.

SCHOOLS/EDUCATION

East Harlem faces unique challenges with respect to the educational needs of our children, as youths (up to 24 years old) consist of one-third of the area’s population. CB11 has long advocated for increased investment in our school’s capital needs, as well as an expansion of programming for pre-K, daycare and afterschool programs in our community. The Proposed Actions seek to create both affordable and market-rate housing opportunities in the East Harlem community, which CB11 is supportive of such efforts. However, the analysis regarding the direct and indirect effects of the Proposed Actions on Community Facilities raise several concerns that require mitigation or further consideration. The Proposed Actions are estimated to increase the community’s residents and workers by approximately 9.5%, from the original estimate of 4.5%, which will undoubtedly increase the number of youths and cause further strain on the current limited spaces in the schools.

This section will evaluate the Proposed Actions and how they meet the needs and concerns of the East Harlem community about Schools and Education. First, this section will address a known calculation error with using CEQR Technical manual to determine generation rates for youths. This error significantly skews the reality and may cause the Proposed Actions to have a significantly adverse impact to East Harlem. Second, this section will discuss the concerns regarding the methodology used to demonstrate the Proposed Actions will not have a significantly adverse impact to the neighborhood. Third, this section will provide data from the NYC Department of Education that contradicts the analysis provided by the Proposed Actions.

Practical effects of Proposed Actions on East Harlem schools and educational needs of East Harlem’s students

There are concerns regarding the rezoning-neighborhood plan and how youth and school seats are counted under the current DOE use, which does not accurately account for the numbers in our community. Over the years, CB11 has drawn attention to the fact that the composition of youths in this district has consistently been different than the rest of the borough. East Harlem School District 4 has approximately 24.2% students with disabilities, as compared to 18.7% for New York City overall, and only 18% of East Harlem students graduated from high school ready for college, as compared with 70% of students graduating on the Upper East Side. The Proposed Actions uses the school children Generation Rates in the CEQR Technical Manual in its analysis, which is a known error as it regards data gathered from the entire borough of Manhattan. The Final Scope of Work needs to explicitly address this error, otherwise it is intentionally undercounting the number of school children generated by the action.

According to the 2014 CEQR Technical Manual, a significant adverse impact may result, warranting consideration of mitigation, if the proposed project would result in both of the following:
  • A collective utilization rate of the schools in the study area that is greater than 100 percent in the With-Action Scenario; and
• An increase of five percent or more in the collective utilization rate of the schools in the study area between the No-Action and With-Action Scenarios.

This methodology indicates that even if the collective utilization rate is greater than 100%, so long as the difference is not greater than five percent, the Proposed Actions is not considered a significantly adverse impact. However, a utilization rate greater than 100% suggests that there is overcrowding in schools, thus adding even one percent is exacerbating the existing condition. Using this methodology does not adequately justify that there isn’t significant adverse impact to the study area.

The analysis also does not provide percentages for the current utilization rates of Community District 4 schools. Furthermore, there is no data provided that addresses the current infrastructure of the district’s schools. Without these necessary data points, it is impossible to verify or adequately evaluate the Proposed Actions’ impact. Based on 2015-2016 School Year Enrollment Capacity and Utilization Report produced by the NYC Department of Education, Elementary and High School target utilization rates in Community School District 4 have both exceeded 100%. Thus, any additional load of students will aggravate the current condition. This is precisely why the current methodology fails to justify the Proposed Actions will not have a significantly adverse impact to the neighborhood.

Alternatives and/or mitigation strategies for addressing the negative impacts of the Proposed Actions

School Children Generation Rates in the CEQR Technical Manual

There is a known error with the student generation rates found in the CEQR Technical Manual. The rates found in the Manual are as follows:

Student generation rates for all unit types from the CEQR Technical Manual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>Elementary (Age 4-10)</th>
<th>Middle school (Age 11-13)</th>
<th>High school (Age 14-17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRONX</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROOKLYN</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANHATTAN</td>
<td><strong>0.12</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.04</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.06</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUEENS</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEN ISLAND</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The New York City Zoning Resolution makes a distinction between the Manhattan Core and upper Manhattan in a host of land use policies. Zoning has shaped these two areas of Manhattan and created places with important physical, cultural and socio-economical differences. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the children are not produced at the same rate.

Student generation rates for all unit types from 2010-2014 ACS PUMS
Furthermore, data queried from the American Community Survey (ACS) Public Use Microdata (PUMS) file confirms this, as Upper Manhattan produces more than twice as many school-aged children per unit as the Manhattan Core. By averaging upper Manhattan and the Manhattan Core together, CEQR uses a generation rate that is wrong for both regions: under-estimating the number of school-aged children in upper Manhattan and over-estimating the number of school-aged children in the Manhattan Core. The above table is shown graphically below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elementary (Age 4-10)</th>
<th>Middle school (Age 11-13)</th>
<th>High school (Age 14-17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEQR Data</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ACS PUMS is a US Census Bureau product that is widely considered to be the timeliest and reliable source of data for such detailed queries. Since the best data available for this kind of analysis tells us that the Manhattan Core and upper Manhattan function differently when it comes to child production, the environmental review for the East Harlem rezoning cannot use the student generation rates found in the Technical Manual because they are demonstrably incorrect. The DGEIS should evaluate the Proposed Action impacts using student generation rates represent the different area rates of Manhattan Core and Upper Manhattan.

All this being said, no sophisticated jurisdiction outside New York City generates estimates of school-aged children absent of assumptions of the type of units being built by number of bedrooms. Simply, 100 studio apartments will produce far fewer school children than 100 two bedroom apartments and student projections should be taking this into account. But with few exceptions, CEQR requires that all units are treated the same, which is illogical if the goal is to produce reliable estimates.

Therefore, CB11 requests that the East Harlem Rezoning EIS perform its analysis again using the ACS generation rates for Upper Manhattan only, and the Draft Scope of Work should be
amended to instruct the use of these rates, and accompanied by a discussion of why the rates in the CEQR Technical Manual are not being used. Alternatively, the East Harlem Rezoning EIS could develop estimates based on Reasonable Worst Case unit mixes for the project. In the future, New York City should develop generation rates with at least as much sophistication as other jurisdictions in the United States, and recognize that unit mixes, unit types, tenure, affordability, and even the age of the building matters in school children generation.

**PARKS/OPEN SPACES**

**Practical effects of Proposed Actions on parks and open spaces**

East Harlem currently faces a shortage of communal open spaces. Thomas Jefferson Park and Marcus Garvey Park are the largest parks bordering the areas affected by the Proposed Actions. A large section of the East River Esplanade represents the eastern border of our neighborhood. Additionally, the southwestern portion of CD11 borders the northeast corner of Central Park.

Although these parks and open spaces provide a good foundation for East Harlem, there is much that can be done to improve the availability and quality of open areas for the residents of Community District 11 (CD11). Furthermore, these spaces including community gardens, playgrounds, and parks, will undoubtedly be further strained as the population grows. The City sets a benchmark of 1.5 acres of open space per 1,000 residents, while New Yorkers for Parks sets a goal of 2.5 acres per 1,000 residents; regardless of which measure one uses, East Harlem falls below that threshold. The City’s Proposed Actions permit a drastic increase in residential density, which will greatly increase the use of what open spaces currently exist and will also incentivize the use of land for maximum profit, which in turn will require the vigilant safeguarding of East Harlem’s parks and open spaces. Indeed, this is a time for the City to engage in active planning to improve and expand CD11’s open spaces.

According to the CEQR Technical Manual, a proposed action may result in a significant adverse direct impact on any specific open space resources if there would be direct displacement/alteration of existing open space. Eugene McCabe Field is a jointly operated playground adjacent to P.S. 79 within the areas that is subject to rezoning by the Proposed Actions. Although there are no specific development plans for Eugene McCabe Field, the proposed high density rezoning will bring development pressures that may change the playground’s use in the future.

**Alternatives and/or mitigation strategies for addressing the negative impacts of the Proposed Actions**

The development of Sendero Verde and the Proposed Actions are expected to increase the population of East Harlem by over 12,000 residents and workers in the next 10 years. Although, the study indicates that the increased demand would not result in significant adverse impacts to open spaces, it will increase the original population growth by over 50%. In addition, the Final Scope of Work analysis details the necessary negative externalities of shadows that the Proposed Actions will cause to existing open spaces. It is then reasonable to recommend that additional funds are allocated towards existing open spaces like the East River Esplanade, and other parks and playgrounds to offset these externalities. In 2016, the New York City Department of Parks
and Recreation (NYCDPR), its Community Parks Initiative (CPI), and the Randall’s Island Park Alliance (RIPA), inaugurated the East Harlem Esplanade Project, which aims to completely rebuild the 107th Street Pier while expanding its programming in the process. This all includes a strategy pertaining to reconstruction advocacy, stewardship, and programming best practices for an improved Esplanade along East Harlem, covering East 96th to East 125th streets. In order to maintain and/or improve the quality of life for residents of East Harlem, it is crucial to expand and improve on these efforts.

Currently, Eugene McCabe playground is within the R7-2 zoning, but is within the area planned to be rezoned to R10. In order to preserve and protect Eugene McCabe playground from being developed/redeveloped, CB11 recommends that this space is carved out of the rezoning Proposed Actions.

CONCLUSION

For all of the reasons detailed above, the Proposed Actions must be considerably modified before CB11 can support the City’s plan. In its current form, the City’s proposal to rezone East Harlem utterly fails to account for the community’s needs. The City must match its rhetoric with action. The impact of the Proposed Actions in their current form would be far-reaching and destructive for the overwhelming majority of East Harlem’s current residents and would upend our community’s vibrant culture and character. The City’s plan to rezone our neighborhood is part of its plan to ensure housing stability and affordability throughout New York City; however, the years-long process that has yielded CB11’s recommendations makes clear that a more nuanced and local approach is required. It is not enough for the City to say that it cares about low- and moderate-income New Yorkers; it must demonstrate that dedication through proposals that address the needs of the community as laid out by the community itself.

Community Board 11 (CB11) does not recommend approval of ULURP Application Nos. C 170358 ZMM and C 170360 HUM unless such proposed actions are considerably modified to reflect the interest and desires of the residents of East Harlem. Modifications are as follows:

1. Maximum R9 and R9-equivalent up-zoning, exception being R10 equivalent district along modified 125th Street Special District
2. Require special permit application process for commercial parking garages
3. Enhanced commercial district on 116th Street, limiting size of storefronts
4. Carve out Eugene McCabe playground and Henry J. Carter Specialty Hospital
5. Include 127th Street between Park Avenue and Lexington Avenue
6. Include current carved out portions of north Park Ave
7. If 116th Street is rezoned, public transportation must be folded into building envelope
8. Utilize local community-based organizations for workforce development, training, and placement on East Harlem projects
9. Establishment of adequately funded workforce development program, which offers certifications and apprenticeships necessary to
10. 35% of workforce must be from East Harlem
11. Funding for community partnerships with existing local reentry programs to facilitate productive transitions for those returning to society after criminal convictions
12. Preference for MWBE/DBE
13. Creation of tax incentive program to incentivize contracts with local MWBE/DBE in development
14. Creation of tax incentive program for commercial property owners to ensure growth of small businesses
15. Community engaged before, during, and after construction, with regular reports to CB11 to track progress on goals
16. Renewal of anti-displacement legal services contracts, i.e., Tenant Rights Coalition, with realistic benchmarks determined by current housing law practitioners that enable thoughtful and effective group representation in order to harmonize rhetoric with reality in combating and/or mitigating the effects of gentrification
17. Increase the number of HPD inspectors as well as convenience of inspection times, and ensure adequate follow-up on whether violations were cured, efficiently issuing fines where the violations go uncorrected beyond the time allowed by law; importantly, HPD must increase its response to complaints regarding emergency conditions (e.g., no heat or hot water), as well as promptly fine and correct failures to correct emergency violations, with the agency billing the emergency repairs to the landlord
18. Greatly increase HPD outreach on HPD’s role in addressing housing maintenance issues and create and publicize HPD website with consolidated user-friendly information regarding housing maintenance issues
19. Increased, proactive outreach by City to identify landlords who could benefit from subsidies to being unregulated buildings into rent-regulation schemes
20. Establishment of citywide Certification of No Harassment, or at least expansion of current program to all of CD11
21. 50/30/20 MIH made possible through subsidies
22. Prohibition against offsetting affordable housing offsite
23. Public land reserved for 100% affordable residential housing, which includes any NYCHA in-fill (affected NYCHA residents must be included in decision-making)
24. Priority given to local non-profit developers in all RFPs for development on public land
25. Ensure that City and State subsidies directed toward housing preservation, deeper affordability in new development, and open spaces continue in perpetuity, regardless of federal budget allocations
26. Increase programs and subsidies for homeownership opportunities for low-income and moderate-income families
27. M11 sanitation garage must be in fully enclosed facility with updated technology
28. City must relocate M10 sanitation garage to central Harlem to comport with Fair Share Mandate
29. Funding for asthma and mental health treatment centers, as well as facilities offering preventative medical care
30. Health impact assessment must be done not only by City, but also by community-based organization and/or local community board

*Full Board Vote: 32 in favor, 9 opposed, 1 abstained and 1 no vote*
If you have any questions regarding our recommendation, please contact Angel Mescain, District Manager at 212-831-8929 or amescain.cb11@gmail.com.

Sincerely,

Diane Collier
Chair
Community Board 11

Enclosure

cc:  Hon. Melissa Mark-Viverito, Speaker, New York City Council (via email)
     Hon. Brian Benjamin, New York State Senate (via email)
     Hon. Gale A. Brewer, Manhattan Borough President (via email)
     Hon. Robert J. Rodriguez, New York State Assembly (via email)
     Hon. Jose M. Serrano, New York State Senate (via email)
     Candy Vives-Vasquez, Community Board 11 (via email)
     Judith Febbraro, Community Board 11 (via email)
August 2, 2017

Recommendation on ULURP Application Nos. C 170358 ZMM, N 170359 ZRM, and C 170360 HAM - East Harlem Rezoning by The New York City Department of City Planning

Summary of Recommendation

The East Harlem Neighborhood Plan (EHNLP) is a community driven plan for the redevelopment of East Harlem produced after an almost two-year process with input from hundreds of community stakeholders. It calls for:

(1) An extensive and upfront effort to preserve affordable housing;
(2) A maximum residential density of R9 or R9A on certain avenues to preserve neighborhood character;
(3) A broad rezoning area stretching all the way down to East 96th Street to ensure that the development needed to create adequate affordable housing is not so concentrated that it puts existing neighborhood context at risk;
(4) A plan for setting aside no less than 20 percent of the new affordable housing to be for residents earning at or below 30 percent of Area Mean Income (AMI);
(5) Addressing a number of community needs including preservation of cultural and historic resources, NYCHA funding, and resources for youth and seniors.

The Administration’s ULURP application addressed here, while intended to create and preserve affordable housing falls short of the community plan in a number of significant ways. Additionally, Manhattan Community Board 11 in a show of faith with the extraordinary process that was the EHNLP, issued a recommendation with conditions to improve the rezoning framework but significant progress has not been made in satisfying those conditions.

This application:

(1) Fails to provide a significant enough upfront preservation effort to stem the loss of existing affordable housing in East Harlem;
(2) Rezones significant swaths of Park Avenue and Third Avenue to the maximum residential density of R10;
(3) Shrinks the boundaries of the rezoning to exclude East 96th Street to East 104th Street necessitating the higher densities on Park and Third avenues;
(4) Fails to demonstrate that the target of 20 percent of newly developed affordable housing will be affordable to East Harlem residents earning below 30 percent of AMI; and
(5) Does not address many of the needs identified by the community, including a viable cultural and historic building landmark plan.

I support an East Harlem rezoning, but I cannot support the administration’s ULURP application. I support most of what is contained in the EHNP, although it is not perfect. When I supported the administration’s mandatory inclusionary housing program two years ago, I recognized that somewhat higher density would be required in order to build large amounts of new affordable housing. But the degree of density would have to be consistent with neighborhood context and community input. Here, the community gave extensive, thoughtful and informed input, but the administration could not see its way to support significant elements of the community’s recommendations, which forces me to recommend a disapproval of the application.

Introduction

Residents of East Harlem are frightened by and angry about the prospect of tenant displacement caused by widespread and rapid gentrification. By all measures, it appears that East Harlem has been and continues to be one of the most quickly gentrifying neighborhoods in New York City. It is one of the neighborhoods in the City where rents are increasing most rapidly\(^1\) and affordable housing is being lost at a fast pace\(^2\). According to the East Harlem Neighborhood Plan (EHNP), there are 46,000 households in East Harlem and over a quarter of them have severe housing needs that include those who spend more than half their income on rent, those entering homeless shelters, and those living in extreme overcrowding. The neighborhood is losing close to 300 units of affordable housing from rent protections and regulations every year with the rate of loss increasing substantially each year. If nothing is done (or if what is done does not adequately address the problem) we leave 12,000 households who currently remain in need of affordable housing or housing that they can afford.\(^3\)

In the meantime, new as-of-right development continues in East Harlem under the current zoning framework and with no requirements for affordable housing. Through the purchase of existing buildings, new owners are pricing their apartments to take advantage of a hot market. The average costs per square foot of multifamily buildings in the neighborhood rose to $416 in 2016, an 8 percent increase from 2015. This year development sites are going for over $200 per-buildable-square-foot, a 25 percent increase from 2015.\(^4\)

---


\(^3\) This number represents the “total serve housing need” for East Harlem which includes those entering homeless shelters, households severely rent-burdens and those units that are severely overcrowded. More information, including the data sets used, can be found in the EHNP, pg 85. http://www.eastharlemplan.nyc/EHNP_FINAL_FINAL_LORES.pdf

In these circumstances, doing nothing is not an option - unless we want to see accelerating large-scale displacement of East Harlem residents. To prevent this, our first priority is to preserve as much existing affordable housing as possible. Second, we need to ensure that new development creates housing that is affordable to neighborhood residents and to limit market rate development that speeds up displacement. Finally, we must, as I have always maintained, require that development respect the neighborhood character.

In March 2015, I joined Council Speaker Melissa Mark-Viverito, Manhattan Community Board 11 and Community Voices Heard as a project partner for the EHN Plan steering committee. The process involved 21 stakeholders, 8 public visioning workshops and over 40 meetings. Approximately 1,500 East Harlem residents helped inform over 260 recommendations that covered 12 key topics areas. It was not an easy process, and all the Steering Committee partners worked hard to overcome the significant fears over adverse impacts on the part of stakeholder organizations and community members. The City knows this because the Department of City Planning (DCP) was present at most meetings and public forums.

That process culminated in the East Harlem Neighborhood Plan (EHN) (www.eastharlemplan.nyc), a comprehensive roadmap for the redevelopment and future growth of the community. The plan is designed to carefully balance the goals of preserving and developing affordable housing, protecting neighborhood character and affording sufficient opportunity for development. That plan includes:

- An array of preservation actions including substantial funding for tenant legal services and organizing, and an East Harlem anti-harassment/anti-eviction district similar to the Special Clinton District to deter and remedy abusive practices by landlords; and a land trust and other mechanisms to preserve distressed and warehoused properties for affordable housing;
- Boundaries that stretch further south on the Avenues – in some cases to the upper East 90s – than the boundaries in the DCP proposal, so that greater density as well as affordable housing opportunities could be spread over a larger area and significant luxury housing pressure above East 96th Street might be tempered with mandatory inclusionary housing;
- No greater density than a R9 or R9A District on Avenues and wide streets to preserve neighborhood character and ensure that additional density is not being utilized predominantly for taller luxury housing that puts additional pressures on rents and strains preservation efforts; and
- A minimum requirement that 20 percent of the affordable housing added be for income brackets at or below 30 percent of AMI, with specific commitments to go even lower, so that they would be available to East Harlem residents and so that the affordable housing component of the rezoning would not further exacerbate displacement.

Even with these well-considered and carefully balanced recommendations, crafted to maximize benefit to the East Harlem community, there was concern among community stakeholders that significant new development would increase housing pressure on residents without providing sufficient housing opportunities that would be available to them.
When the DCP certified this application, it was obvious that there were some major differences that we hoped could be resolved. But at this point, despite the community planning process they participated in, the administration has not made sufficient progress in resolving these differences.

Separate from the zoning - but almost equally important - are the policy, capital and programmatic recommendations in the EHNP that were made to offset impacts from any proposed rezoning. While the administration committed to some significant items, key priorities that were outlined by the EHNP steering committee still remain unaddressed and even more are awaiting further discussion.

Perhaps the most significant of all the issues continues to be density. Not only has the administration insisted on keeping large swaths of Third Avenue and Park Avenue with an R10 zoning designation, they have included a loosening of the tower-on-a-base rules so that even taller building heights can be achieved. These building forms -- much more appropriate for luxury high-rise buildings than for building affordable housing -- only further fuel the community’s fears that the proposal is tipping the balance too far in favor of market-rate development. It is the opposite of how we should be adjusting this proposal.

In addition, the administration has failed to commit to an up front and rigorous housing preservation program for the neighborhood. The City’s plan for housing preservation in East Harlem remains in draft form and has been criticized for needing to be more tailored to East Harlem. To feel confident about the preservation program it would need to:

- Permanently increase enforcement and building sweeps by HPD in East Harlem;
- Integrate more mission-driven developers and community land trusts into city sponsored new development on city-owned land;
- Rely on those same partners to rehabilitate distressed and abandoned properties for use as affordable housing; and
- Create an anti-eviction/anti-harassment district modeled on the Clinton Special District.

Another place where the Administration and the EHNP diverge from one another is on the appropriate boundaries of the rezoning. As part of the EHNP process, the facilitators and steering committee members had difficult conversations with the public about the tradeoffs between density and affordable housing. The final position in the EHNP represented a compromise that would trigger the minimum amount of additional density required to create new affordable housing but spread out that new bulk throughout the neighborhood so that no specific corridor would be overly burdened with a drastic change in scale or pressure from new users. The City’s application narrows the boundaries - leaving out the area west of Second Avenue and below East 104th Street - and calls for the maximum residential density allowed on swaths of Park Avenue and Third Avenue. Rezoning proposals at the start maximize their scope for the purpose of environmental review; but the City’s unwillingness to compromise from that maximum is not reasonable or in the best interest of the community. East Harlem needs new affordable housing is needed for the neighborhood, but the distribution and concentration of new development should reflect to recommendations that came out of the EHNP process in which so many local participants sough to balance growth and preservation.
Finally, and admittedly difficult to address, is the need for commitments on how we can achieve deeper affordability in the planned affordable housing. The EHNP called for a minimum of 20 percent of affordable units to be affordable to those earning 30 percent of AMI or less. We have barely been able to meet that target in most projects on City-owned land. If we cannot do it there, success is less likely on private development. Thus, from the community’s perspective, their fears of too much luxury development are compounded by fears that even the affordable development will remain out of reach.

Each one of these failings alone, while significant, might not be fatal. But in the aggregate, given the enormous study and work of the EHNP, a failure to address and incorporate the community’s concerns and recommendations puts the proposed proposal at odds with the community planning process.

What follows below is my recommendation on the City’s proposed application for the rezoning of East Harlem. Because the factors I have outlined are so essential to an acceptable rezoning, this recommendation is a recommendation to disapprove.

BOROUGH PRESIDENT’S COMMENTS

After careful review, the application in its current form still does not represent a plan that I believe ensures a better future for East Harlem and for that reason I cannot support it. While the application shares broader themes with the EHNP about the need for required affordable housing, active street walls, and concentrating new commercial use along the viaduct to better utilize that area, there remain significant points of disagreement.

As Borough President, I came into office determined to challenge the top-down planning framework that drove many neighborhood-rezoning efforts. Instead, I have worked for decision-making models that approach planning from the bottom-up.

For Manhattan Community Board 11, which encompasses the East Harlem neighborhood, the loss of affordable housing and corollary need for new affordable housing development, the increased market-rate development, the increasing occurrences of tenant harassment, and the displacement of existing residents, motivated discussions and repeated efforts to plan comprehensively. The Board, with the help of Civitas and the Regional Planning Association, launched several studies to understand the various housing problems of their community and came up with solutions. Other advocacy organizations such as Picture the Homeless undertook their own analysis and focused on underutilized and warehoused properties, which they believed could contribute to replenishing a diminishing affordable housing stock if activated and put into the hands of nonprofit developers and/or community land trusts.

With the announcement of Mayor de Blasio’s housing plan in 2015 and its focus on East Harlem, the East Harlem Neighborhood Plan Steering Committee, convened by City Council Speaker Melissa Mark-Viverito, came together to respond with a bottom-up plan for the future of the community. Two years of in-depth analysis, engagement, research, organizing, and consensus building produced a plan and a process that has been recognized nationally as the gold standard
for other neighborhoods to replicate. In the end, we believed that the Plan was a fair and comprehensive strategy for achieving critical neighborhood investments.

The EHNP was submitted to the administration in February 2016. The City made its proposal in the fall of 2016, and while there were some significant differences, members of the EHNP believed these differences could be resolved. My office and the rest of the members of the EHNP spoke to the Administration early about our disagreement with this application’s proposed densities along portions of Park and Third Avenues. We also voiced our concern that there were no specifics on how the potential gap between the affordability of the lower-income housing proposed to be developed and the incomes of the current residents would be addressed.

Unfortunately, months of meetings did little to resolve differences on the environmental analysis, the geographic boundaries and additional density proposed by the City. Given the difficulty involved in coming to the consensus in the EHNP, the failure to make headway on significant differences with the administration lead us to conclude that the City’s proposal is inappropriate.

Land use applications for the redevelopment of East Harlem constitute only one piece of the neighborhood plan necessary to achieve the complement of preservation and growth the neighborhood desperately needs and has been promised. The Mayor’s 10-year housing plan commits to aggressive preservation strategies including legal services, other anti-harassment programs and funding for rehabilitation of existing housing. The allocations of dedicated pools of capital for rezoning areas through the Neighborhood Fund (administered by EDC), the Rezoning fund (administered by DEP) and the Housing and Acquisition Funds (separate entities, both administered by HPD)\(^5\) and the mayor’s statements and housing plan created an expectation that neighborhoods subject to these rezonings could expect an upfront, targeted and aggressive preservation program in conjunction with any rezoning proposal\(^6\).

While there are some City-wide programs and strategies available for housing preservation, the programs are not comprehensive, sufficiently funded or tailored to meet the preservation challenges of the East Harlem community. East Harlem is a community in which three-quarters of all housing is regulated in some form, units are rapidly being deregulated and landlords are warehousing properties subject to regulations. What is more, some 28 percent of residents live in distressed NYCHA properties. So there is a clear need for more aggressive and tailored strategies.

In addition, the EHNP sets forth numerous other capital and programmatic investments needed to ensure the success of the neighborhood rezoning as contemplated in the Administration’s housing plan. While some of these have been addressed, others, discussed below, have not. All of these programmatic and capital needs-related recommendations have been available to the administration for over a year and a half and could have been incorporated into commitments accompanying this rezoning proposal.

---


To separate the land use elements from the programmatic and capital-needs elements of the plan would yield an inadequate analysis of the merits of the proposal and so for our review we consider the work done on both the zoning and community commitments together.

We begin with what, in my opinion, should come before, and continue throughout and beyond the period of any rezoning – the preservation effort. Then, a discussion of the proposals for the development of new affordable housing is laid out, followed by a discussion of the need for additional support for NYCHA developments. Next, this recommendation covers the land use issues of rezoning boundaries, density, and other zoning issues. And, finally we address other programmatic and infrastructure efforts to strengthen the East Harlem Community. We are left with an incomplete picture of what the impact of this application will be and how we can ensure the better future for the community promised by the applicant. Ultimately, the current proposal falls short in both the land use and the programmatic categories.

Affordable Housing

Housing Preservation Plan

If we are concerned about affordable housing for the residents of East Harlem then protecting the existing housing stock is essential. Approximately 75 percent of East Harlem residents live in regulated housing. Given that East Harlem has lost approximately 3,444 units of affordable housing since 2007 and is estimated to lose 3,666 units over the next 13 years, this proposal needs to lead with a robust preservation strategy because new construction alone is insufficient.

A central idea behind all of the administration’s neighborhood rezonings is to create opportunities for new development that include significant amounts of required affordable housing in areas that are experiencing major development pressures. A plan to preserve affordable units is essential to ensure that these plans actually result in a net gain of affordable housing and not merely an attempt to tread water against strong currents of incoming market rate housing and outgoing regulated units.

The City has put forward a draft of their preservation plan for East Harlem with goals to preserve and develop affordable housing, reduce barriers to applying for affordable housing and increase economic opportunities alongside their planned housing investments. The draft report provides important details about the housing crisis in East Harlem, the impact of as-of-right development in a strong real estate market on stability in the neighborhood and why government intervention is necessary to stave off further harm. The analysis goes on to outline several existing and some new programs that correspond to the aforementioned goals. But this housing preservation plan falls short from what the EHNP and other stakeholders requested to have in place prior to the push for more density.

8 The data is based on CB11 analysis, using RPA affordable housing database, John Krauss rent stabilization data, and NYC PLUTO database. pg 83 http://www.eastharlemaplan.nyc/EHNP_FINAL_FINAL_LORES.pdf
A draft housing plan that has been crafted and circulated to the public is a laudable step forward but its status as a “draft” highlights its failure as an upfront and aggressive strategy. Strategies to forcefully root out existing harassment and poor building conditions, which will only be exacerbated with the incentive to develop even with new affordable housing requirements, need to be underway now.

As part of their analysis of conditions on the ground, the HPD’s Office of Enforcement and Neighborhood Services (OENS), the Neighborhood Planning and Preservation Unit, the Division of Neighborhood Preservation (DNP) coordinated to do “block sweeps” and additional enforcement visits as part of the development of the proposed rezoning. The results included a more robust list of distressed properties that can be stabilized through subsidized repairs or proactive identification of places that need tenant services, violations correction or litigation. While the temporary increase in services were welcome it still is unclear if this heightened level of involvement is permanent for an area that has needed it for some time and will need it even more moving forward.

Also missing is a commitment that strengthens the anti-harassment protections afforded to tenants in situations where bad landlords are creating unsafe conditions and trying to remove tenants to achieve higher rents. For tenants, the burden of providing proof of harassment is extraordinary, with most judges requiring an extensive history laid out in excruciating detail for a case to be seriously considered. A Real Deal article from July 2017 explained that in NYC Housing Court from 2014 to 2016 tenants only won 2 percent (or less) of cases brought when suing for harassment. In 2016, only 15 of the 977 cases that tenants lodged were decided in a tenant’s favor. Recommendation 1.7 of the EHNP called for an East Harlem anti-harassment / anti-eviction district, modeled after the Special Clinton District on Manhattan’s West Side with the funds to support tenant organizers that will monitor for abuse. At our first meeting with HPD after the release of the report, my office made clear that this would be essential to any support for this proposal. In response, we were told that a citywide answer to the request for anti-harassment districts was being crafted. However, several deadlines have passed and we have nothing yet to assure us that it will be in place.

One particular stock of existing housing within the rezoning boundaries that has remained inaccessible to East Harlem residents is the warehoused units kept unoccupied by various property owners throughout the neighborhood. One Crain’s article estimates at least 50 properties throughout East Harlem fit this description. These units – many of which are located between East 106th and East 116th Streets and between Lexington and Third Avenues - have been off line for decades and residents and business owners view them as blighted. Based on the age and size of these buildings and their similarity to occupied buildings in the area, there is reason to believe these units, if they were in circulation, would constitute a much-needed pool of rent-

---

regulated apartments. Despite that, a lack of concern for the surrounding area has resulted in owners of these warehoused buildings keeping those units vacant and limiting activity to the commercial ground floor simply to keep up with tax bills. Now the rezoning we are considering would award those same owners for their speculative actions.

DCP has explained that applying the proposed zoning districts would ensure any value realized by these particular owners will at least result in the minimum affordable housing requirements of MIH, and maybe more if HPD term sheets are considered by the developers of those sites. While this is encouraging, the minimum 25 percent of required affordable housing that would be created at these locations is not sufficient. If new development occurs here, mechanisms should be explored to require additional affordable housing to reflect the disinvestment these buildings represented for the community. While the City has pushed back against applying modified versions of their inclusionary housing program, exploring this concept in East Harlem for these sites could send a strong message against speculation and warehousing.

The City needs to confront this issue because it is not only an East Harlem problem; it is a citywide problem. A 2012 report, Banking on Vacancy, initiated by Picture the Homeless (PTH), found that 3,551 vacant buildings that were surveyed could potentially house 71,707 people. There are several recommendations in the report, including some legislative solutions that should be piloted as part of the East Harlem Preservation Plan. The Housing Not Warehousing Act is a package of three City Council bills that create a mandatory registry for all landlords holding their property vacant, mandate the City to do an annual count of all vacant property, and require a report of all city, state, federal, and authority-owned vacant property suitable for the development of affordable housing. The report would also include recommendations on how to turn these city-owned properties into affordable housing as soon as possible. These underutilized properties should be targeted for extremely low to middle-income families and kept permanently affordable under the direction of mission-driven developers and/or community land trusts.

Development of New Affordable Housing

The EHN recognizes that the City’s current affordable housing development tools leverage the private market and balance affordable unit production with market-rate unit production. Our plan called for at least 50 percent of all units produced in East Harlem to be affordable to extremely low-income up to middle income residents and a minimum of 20 percent of those units to be affordable to those at or below 30 percent of AMI.

There is significant doubt that MIH alone will deliver on the units we need for East Harlem families searching for affordable housing. Option 1 and Option 3, the most likely designations for this area, are set at 60 percent of AMI with a required tranche of 20 percent of MIH units at 40 percent AMI. These levels of affordability do not go deep enough to provide housing for our most vulnerable communities. In East Harlem, 37 percent of residents make under $23,350 or lower than 30 percent of AMI. That is not a specified AMI bracket addressed by MIH, but

---

instead is a probable result of the averaging that will happen as projects move forward. But this creates uncertainty that causes people in the community not to trust that these residents are being considered in this plan.

Where we have found some common ground is that the EHNP and the administration both look to maximize our opportunity for lower levels of affordability on public sites where we have more control. My office has regularly stood by the policy that projects on public sites should be 100 percent affordable and that the affordability should be made lasting through “practical permanence.” Recent HPD affordable housing pipeline projects like La Promesa/Acacia Gardens (C-150212 HAM), Lexington Gardens II (C-160338 ZSM), and the proposed Sendero Verde (C-170361 ZMM) give us a sense of what to expect. Those projects have set aside 10 to 20 percent of their units for residents that are at or below 30 percent AMI. On some of the public sites, such as the Harlem Burial Ground Project on the former 126th Street Depot site (C-170275 ZMM), the City is only agreeing to making 50 percent of the total development affordable, citing the funding constraints for the community facility and memorial elements that will be part of the future ground plan. While on this project it will include 20 percent of the affordable units at 30 percent of AMI, we are still forced to access market-rate housing on city-land. If we are barely (or in some cases not) reaching the 20 percent target of affordability necessary for a significant segment of the East Harlem community on public sites, it is impossible to assure the community that we can satisfy this goal overall when developments on private land are added.

We must call for more affordability on our city-owned sites since we are limited in our ability to push for changes in how the Mandatory Inclusionary Housing program is implemented. In these projects, we would work with mission-driven developers and/or the East Harlem/El Barrio Community Land Trust to get to those tiers that are below 30 percent and require entire projects to be 100 percent affordable. Together with projected private development under MIH we could target for 50% of the new housing on private rezoned and public sites to be affordable at a variety of low- and moderate-income levels. This model still encourages the building of desperately needed moderate and middle-income units and targets our housing policy and scare city-owned land where it is needed most.

The EHNP identified at least five public sites for the City to review. We should receive a commitment to target these sites, and any other remaining city-parcels for mission-driven developers and community land trust partners who share our goal of creating housing inclusive of all families, regardless of total income.

A Commitment to NYCHA residents in East Harlem

Manhattan’s largest concentration of public housing is in East Harlem and represents almost 28 percent of all the residents that call this area home and 9 percent of the City’s entire NYCHA
population\textsuperscript{14}. Data using NYCHA’s 2011 Physical Needs Assessment Summary compiled by the Community Service Society places the total cost for capital needs of the NYCHA developments in East Harlem at approximately $1.88 billion.\textsuperscript{15} Any final proposal that moves forward with a growth plan for this community should identify a significant down payment toward bringing these developments back to a state of good repair. Without a commitment at this stage, the plan lacks a central piece advocated for by residents.

Regarding the zoning proposal specifically, there were several areas where the City’s proposal deviated from the EHNK and made my support for the application improbable.

\section*{Zoning Changes}

\subsection*{Rezoning Boundaries}

The EHNK-recommended rezoning boundaries included all of Manhattan Community Board 11. The proposed study area was supported with a list of potential soft sites we felt represented the kind of as-of-right development that may be possible and should be subject to MIH. The current application shrinks those boundaries to an area generally bounded by East 104\textsuperscript{th} Street to the south, East 132\textsuperscript{nd} Street to the north, Park Avenue to the west and Second Avenue to the east. Part of the rationale to support a larger study area was that the EHNK sought structured growth on a scale more appropriate for the neighborhood. Instead of concentrating higher densities into narrower corridors as this application does, the EHNK looks to spread the additional density needed to achieve affordable housing goals over a greater area and reduce the burden that comes with new development on any one location.

Moreover, there is significant concern about the area south of East 104\textsuperscript{th} Street. The southern area has been rising in value due to several factors such as its proximity to the Upper East Side, access to existing and new mass transit with the opening of the 96\textsuperscript{th} Street Q train station and distance from the Manhattan Core. Institutions are even recognizing value here; Marymount had recently filed a BSA application to build a new campus. This strong market has also seen a decline in existing rent-regulated housing. Property tax data collected by programmer and cartographer John Krauss shows numerous buildings losing between 10 to 50 percent of their rent-regulated stock below East 104\textsuperscript{th} Street and above East 96\textsuperscript{th} Street.\textsuperscript{16} We believe current and potential market attraction to this area warrants preservation districts or mandatory housing requirements for new development in this area.

\subsection*{Height, Density and Neighborhood Character}

It is important to recognize there are several areas where this application overlaps with the spirit of the EHNK. Along Madison Avenue above East 126\textsuperscript{th} Street, DCP included our


\textsuperscript{16} To view the property tax data and review the change over time of rent-stabilized units in the area you can visit http://blog.johnkrauss.com/where-is-decontrol/
recommendations about contextual and preservation districts. DCP proposes to map large sections of Lexington Avenue and several midblock sections with contextual districts that reflect the existing built character. This application also embraced recommendations for active street requirements along East 116th Street and additional density along Second Avenue. However, those areas of agreement still left some significant disagreement over key corridors.

The difference between the East Harlem Neighborhood Plan and the applicant’s proposal in suggested density for Park and Third Avenues was one of the most difficult components to overcome. DCP put forward a proposal that would apply the highest floor area districts available along parts of Park Avenue between East 115th Street and East 132nd Street and Third Avenue between East 104th Street and East 122nd Street where our own community-driven process suggested a more contextual alternative that triggers MIH but is more closely aligned with the existing neighborhood character.17

- For Park Avenue between East 115th Street and East 132nd Street, the EHNP recommended MX/R7 or R8 districts, with some additional density above that around transit nodes. This works out to densities ranging from 7.2 to 10 FAR. The Administration proposed a R9, R10 and MX/R9 and R10 districts or densities ranging from 8.5 to 12 FAR.
- For Third Avenue between East 104th Street and East 122nd Street, the EHNP recommended R9 or R9A with densities of 8 and 8.5 FAR respectively. The Administration proposed a R10 and C4-6 (R10 equivalent) district with a maximum 12 FAR for residential use.

Since the release of DCP’s proposal in the fall of 2016, there has been no support for the City’s proposed R10 districts. One important reason why some preferred R9 or R9A was that the bulk of the extra density would go to create affordable housing, whereas R10 would have allowed for a greater ratio of market-rate units. Though asked by EHNP, our office and others to consider revisiting other, more modest alternatives, the administration has refused to amend their application. The opposition to change includes refusing to study height limits more generally as one of the alternatives so that we can identify other possibilities that could create affordable housing but also preserve neighborhood character.

I am concerned that the new tower form proposed in the East Harlem Corridors Special District exacerbates the height and density issue even further. As currently written in the application’s “Proposed Actions,” the new text would allow thin, tall towers on a small base, a floor plate more appropriate for luxury and not affordable development. This further plays into the fears that the balance struck by the proposal has swung too far to the side of market-rate development. Instead, the text should require the tower-on-base regulation typically found in high-density districts or set high enough minimums where you have a building form that responds to the proximity of the viaduct, but also addresses the concern for excessive height in residential areas.

17 A comprehensive comparison of the EHNP and this application is available on the CB 11’s website under “Presentations” at http://www.cb11m.org/east-harlem-rezoning/
Finally, during negotiations with the Administration over potential height limitations my office was told that Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regulations for this area prohibited buildings from going above specific heights identified in the La Guardia field Flight Obstruction Area Map. This would place an effective height-limit on buildings in the proposed R10 districts from achieving heights that might otherwise be allowed.

After reviewing the FAA obstruction area map, it was clear that the airport conical surface\(^{18}\) that extends west from the airport over Manhattan only covered the northern proposed R10 districts (Above East 118\(^{th}\) Street along Park Avenue and above East 116\(^{th}\) Street up to East 124\(^{th}\) Street along Third Avenue) while leaving the southern proposed R10 district untouched. According to the Administration’s own Market and Financial Study that was done as part of the MIH Program application, the southern portion of the district is considered a “strong market” identified by strong sales prices, robust land prices and the ability to command attractive market-rate rents.\(^{19}\) This is exactly the kind of area where we would fear out-of-context development. For the northern proposed R10 Districts that are covered by the FAA obstruction map, the effective height limit is approximately 400 feet and much higher than what the community was comfortable with during height discussions in the EHNP process.

**As of Right Parking Garages**

The application would allow public parking garages of up to 150 spaces as-of-right in districts where they are not currently allowed. This provision is in conflict with the policy of this office to disincentivize car use in areas with access to mass transit. Even in areas where the special permit is required, we have raised concerns with some of the study parameters and underlying assumptions of the residential parking study that accompanies those types of applications. My concern would only deepen if the public review component is removed.

**Commercial Overlays on New York City Public Housing Authority (NYCHA) Campuses**

The proposal includes several commercial overlays to be mapped along the wide street frontages of several NYCHA campuses. As part of the EHNP process, there was discussion among the subgroups about targeting these spaces for economic development driven by NYCHA residents. I believe that DCP’s inclusion of the overlays was intended to be responsive but it did not reflect the recommendation in the Plan. The EHNP concluded that such a drastic change to NYCHA’s built environment required separate and direct engagement with the residents who live there. The proposal uses too broad a brush and applies the overlays without considering fears related to displacing residents, playgrounds and open space.

**Special transit land use (TA) district at East 116\(^{th}\) Street and Lexington**

\(^{18}\) An Airport Conical Surface is an imaginary surface, which extends upward and outward from the outer limits of the Horizontal Surface and exists primarily to prevent existing or proposed manmade objects, objects of natural growth or terrain from extending upward into navigable airspace. Retrieved from http://www.wacaz.com/services/obstruction-evaluation/airport-conical-surface/

As part of the administration’s proposal, special transit land use (TA) districts, first mapped in 1974, were updated to reflect recent planning decisions regarding Phase 2 of the Second Avenue Subway. TA districts have rules that efficiently lessen the conflict between substantial pedestrian movement and access to underground transit by removing stairway entrances from the middle of sidewalks and reserving space in new developments adjacent to subway stations for subway-related uses. For the developer, the reserved space is exempt from their floor area calculations. Given the support for this as a smart planning tool, I was surprised not to see it included elsewhere, particular along the existing Lexington line where additional density is being considered. The application proposes changing the area surrounding the East 116th Street Station on the Lexington Line from a R7-2 to a R9 District. While the plan and my office encourages the theory that extra density is most appropriate near mass transit, this location is not properly prepared to accept that density. This location was one of three transit nodes identified as being adversely impacted under the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Mapping a TA District, roughly similar to the subway improvement language of the Special Lincoln District, would mitigate this impact.

**Other Areas of Concern**

*Preservation of Historic and Cultural Resources*

The administration’s proposal also lacks concrete ways to preserve architecture, arts and culture in East Harlem. Preserving these assets from the impact that new development might have on visual aspects of neighborhood history has always been a priority for the community. In our plan and subsequent public hearings residents noted it as a top concern. We had hoped to engage in a thorough review of the sites proposed by the EHNPC and by Landmark East Harlem or discuss ways the City can continue to explore more culturally and historically relevant designations such as was accomplished with Stonewall Inn. Review and work by the LPC should have been occurring as this application progressed. It is incredibly disappointing that this work was not seen as a priority despite my continued calls since the beginning of my tenure as Borough President for parity for Northern Manhattan in the consideration of landmark designations.

*Environmental Review Issues*

Our office, the steering committee and the administration remain unable to agree on the appropriate criteria to determine projected and potential project sites in the DEIS. Key differences include the likelihood that houses of worship will build on these sites and the status of rent-stabilized buildings, which are often ruled out as developable sites by DCP. However our own research suggests these buildings might be susceptible to redevelopment. The City has recently launched the New York Land Opportunities Program (NYLOP), an initiative co-led by the Local Initiatives Support Corporation, a non-profit community development financial institution. , “to help mission-driven organizations with limited real estate experience form joint
venture partnerships to develop affordable housing on their underused land. Faith-based organizations constitute a significant category of these mission-driven organizations, a fact that underscores the potential for redevelopment of these properties. Underestimating the potential development universe will cause us to miss impacts we could have avoided. Moreover, failure to account for all development sites affects the calculations of the number of units of housing that can and will be created thereby impacting how much and where density is acceptable in East Harlem.

Other issues caused my office to question the environmental review. The DEIS found no impact on water and sewer infrastructure, solid waste and sanitation services, a finding that is implausible given that such problems occur in the neighborhood under existing conditions. Our concern about how generation rates for Upper Manhattan school children are calculated was brought to DCP’s attention early on. It was also identified as part of the Lexington Gardens II application and the Draft Scope of Work for the Harlem African Burial Ground application. An analysis using American Community Survey (ACS) Public Use Microdata (PUMS) completed by a land use consultant for CB11 shows the rate of child birth in Upper Manhattan as higher than in other areas of Manhattan. However CEQR has one generation rate for the whole borough. While the Zoning Resolution does draw a distinction between the Manhattan Core and Upper Manhattan for a host of other land use policies, this topic is exempt. The result is an underestimating of the need for future school seats.

Community Need for Public Investment in Services and Infrastructure

From the moment East Harlem was announced as a potential area for rezoning, stakeholders in East Harlem were aware that the needs that would have to be addressed so that any rezoning could benefit the community would have to come from a rigorous community process Zoning alone would be an insufficient tool for getting at many of the underlying problems identified in community district need statements submitted by the Community Boards or the lack of investments highlighted by local CBOs. There was general agreement that East Harlem’s future has to come from a comprehensive assessment of the state of the neighborhood and has to cover a range of socioeconomic and cultural areas of study. The EHNAP brought together residents and topic experts so that we could respond with hard data needed for that assessment.

In terms of our process, the administration has had a year and a half to consider, act on and incorporate our recommendations. During that time there has been some movement toward agreement. To support the desire for more holistic, service-rich education environments, the City has committed to funding three new community schools next year. Local art and cultural capacity-building initiatives will be funded through the awarding of a Building Cultural Capacity Grant. To address questions about healthy teaching environments for children, the DOE is installing air conditioners, with corresponding electrical system upgrades, throughout the school system by Fiscal Year 2022. The City opened a Neighborhood Health Action Center in April 2017 and partnered with the New York Academy of Medicine (NYAM) to provide small grants and support to local organizations to address community health issues. To respond to some of

---

our open space and green infrastructure concerns, NYC Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) is simultaneously proceeding with an East Harlem Resiliency Study and a design process for the Harlem River Park Greenway Link along the esplanade between East 125th and East 132nd Streets. Planning for a new East 125th Street Plaza to be located adjacent to the Metro North station has begun, and two Select Bus Service bus stations at Lexington Avenue and East 125th Street are in the works. To help small businesses, the City has committed to $1.49 million in Neighborhood 360 grants to local nonprofit partners and a new Workforce 1 center to supplement existing nonprofit-driven employment and training programs in East Harlem.

These measures are noteworthy, but essential needs remain unaddressed. There is no plan to boost opportunities for East Harlem students and young adults to access the Career and Technical Education opportunities in their own community board area. For those schools that are not community schools, ways to increase resources for social/emotional services and academic remediation have not been identified. There are no firm commitments on naturally occurring retirement community (NORC) project funding for the neighborhood, or integration of the findings into the EIS from the Health Impact Assessment conducted by NYAM. Few substantive conversations have occurred with the Department of Transportation (DOT) about strategies for decreasing vehicular congestion around East 125th Street and placing more City Benches around the community district. The community has received no commitment for a consolidated state of the art sanitation garage, though the DSNY Commissioner expressed interest in doing so at the City Council hearing on the District 11 garage on July 27, 2017. There is disappointment among many EHNPS members on the slowness to embrace local purchasing requirements, requiring local hire provisions for projects receiving subsidies under $2 million, as well as other labor demands, including good wages, apprenticeships, and safe working conditions. At the public forum related to education and relevant subcommittee discussions, participants called for increased afterschool program capacity and the desire to see prioritized repair or relocation capital for pre-K, daycare and afterschool facilities, particularly those located in publicly owned buildings such as NYCHA developments and the Heckscher Building. However, there has been little discussion to further these goals. Finally, even though the waterfront was left out of the City’s proposal, it must be addressed to prepare for East Harlem’s growth. We had hoped to see a funding strategy for esplanade repair and maintenance below East 116th Street and a long-term rebuild plan for the East 107th Street Pier by this time.

We understood that these types of actions, while perhaps not appropriately a part of the land use applications, would support and accompany a neighborhood rezoning. We are disappointed that more progress on these critical initiatives has not been made.

I believe that the City put forward this application with the intention of helping and supporting East Harlem. The application’s primary goals are to create new affordable housing, preserve neighborhood character, create opportunities for economic development, improve the pedestrian experience, and commit to the kind of capital needs East Harlem deserves. That said, while we agree on the principles, we are far apart on the specifics as to how these goals should be achieved. At this point in the process not enough of the critical community concerns have been addressed to allow me to support this proposal.
BOROUGH PRESIDENT'S RECOMMENDATION

Therefore, the Manhattan Borough President recommends disapproval of Application Nos. C 170358 ZMM, N 170359 ZRM, and C 170360 HAM.

Gale A. Brewer
Manhattan Borough President
APPENDIX – East Harlem Rezoning

PROPOSED ACTION

The City of New York Department of City Planning (DCP), together with the Department of Housing Preservation and Development (HPD), is proposing a series of land use actions—including zoning map amendments, zoning text amendments, and amendments to the Milbank Frawley Circle-East Urban Renewal Plan (collectively, the “Rezoning Plan”) in order to facilitate the creation of permanent affordable housing, amongst other goals. The Rezoning Plan is one implementation measure of the East Harlem Neighborhood Plan which was the result of a two year community planning process. The Proposed Actions would affect an approximately 96-block area of the East Harlem neighborhood in Community District 11, Borough of Manhattan.

Generally, any changes to the zoning map should be evaluated for consistency and accuracy, and given the land use implications, appropriateness for the growth, improvement and development of the neighborhood and borough. In evaluating the text amendment, this office must consider whether the amendment is appropriate and beneficial to the community and consistent with the goals of the MIH program. In evaluating the amendments to the Milbank Frawley Circle-East Urban Renewal Plan, this office must consider whether the changes are in line with the original goals of the renewal plan and if the changes improve on the existing agreement.

The Zoning Plan must also be evaluated using the lens of the East Harlem Neighborhood Plan (EHNP). The EHNP called for the development of permanent affordable housing, the preservation of existing affordable units, respect for the existing neighborhood character including its cultural landmarks, improvements to the pedestrian experience, and the creation of new commercial and manufacturing space to support job creation adjacent to existing and future transit nodes.

Goals of the Rezoning Plan

Collectively, the actions that make up the Rezoning Plan reflect DCP’s goal to achieve the following land use objectives:

- Create opportunities for requiring permanently affordable housing to ensure that the neighborhood continues to serve diverse housing needs;
- Modify the existing zoning, where appropriate, to preserve the built neighborhood character;
- Create opportunities for economic development while preserving the vitality of existing commercial and manufacturing uses;
- Establish a Special District with urban design controls that balance new development with existing neighborhood context and scale and improve the pedestrian experience; and
- Establish a planning framework that addresses capital infrastructure needs and services required to support current demand and future growth.
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Background

East Harlem

The boundaries of East Harlem coincide with the boundaries of Manhattan Community Board 11. The Community District is generally bordered by East 96th Street to the south, East 132nd Street to the north, Fifth Avenue to the west and the FDR Drive and Randall’s Island Park/Wards Island Park to the east. Additionally, CB 11 includes Thomas Jefferson Park, Marcus Garvey Park and Harlem River Park. As of 2016, East Harlem residents totaled approximately 122,434 residents with a median income of $30,380, down 9 percent from 2010. The area is characterized by multi-family residential and mixed residential/commercial properties (low to midrise multi-family walk-up and elevator buildings).

East Harlem Neighborhood Plan

The East Harlem Neighborhood Plan ("EHNP" or "Plan") is a community-driven comprehensive roadmap for fostering smart growth in East Harlem. The process was led by City Council Speaker Melissa Mark-Viverito, Manhattan Community Board 11, Community Voices Heard (CVH) and our office in partnership with a 21-member steering committee of local stakeholders. Developing the plan was a two year long process with no less than eight large public meetings, approximately 40 policy discussions, numerous calls and meetings with city agencies and on-the-ground person-to-person survey collection. Representatives from mayoral agencies necessary for implementation of the plan, including DCP and HPD, were present at most meetings. This work resulted in a final report with over 260 key objectives and recommendations to ensure a stable and inclusive future for the neighborhood. The Steering Committee continues to meet on implementation of its recommendations.

Previous East Harlem Rezoning Plans

DCP 2003 Rezoning

In 2002, DCP proposed a rezoning for 57 blocks in East Harlem, east of Lexington Avenue and south of East 124th Street to East 99th Street, much of which was originally zoned R7-2, a moderate density residential district. This plan was approved by the City Planning Commission and adopted by the City Council in 2003. The rezoning replaced height factor zoning districts with contextual zoning districts. While contextual, there were greater heights on the avenues and lower heights on mid-blocks. The purpose of the rezoning was to create new opportunities for residential development, encourage ground floor retail and local services, and protect the scale of mid-blocks and broad neighborhood character through targeted contextual districts. The proposal replaced much of the R7-2 with R7A, R7B, R8A, and C4-4D districts. The C4-4D district was

specifically written for East Harlem and was a new zoning district at that time. Several existing manufacturing districts were rezoned to residential districts or lighter industry. Parking regulations were also modified to meet the needs of new commercial overlays.

125th Street Rezoning

DCP collaborated with several other mayoral agencies in December of 2003 to generate a development framework for the entire 125th Street corridor between the Harlem and Hudson Rivers. The application affected 24 blocks along 125th Street spanning sections of Manhattan Community Boards 9, 10 and 11. The proposal focused on zoning and urban design controls, encouraging a balanced retail mix, addressing traffic challenges, and supporting growth for arts and entertainment in the area. The final zoning application approved by the City Council in April 2008 modified height and bulk regulations but retained many of the elements that sought to increase opportunities for new, mixed-use housing and cultural and retail development for Harlem.

2013 CB11 Rezoning Study

In January of 2013, Community Board 11 approved the East Harlem Land Use and Rezoning Initiative Final Recommendations, a joint project with CIVITAS and Community Board 11, informed by over a year of community input. The planning and zoning study area included East 115th Street and East 132nd Street, bounded by Madison Avenue on the west and Lexington Avenue on the east. The report made recommendations to update zoning districts and increase density in certain areas, promote affordable housing and economic development, and preserve neighborhood character. Many of the recommendations from this report were integrated into the East Harlem Neighborhood Plan initiated two years later.

Milbank Frawley Circle Urban Renewal Area and Milbank Frawley Circle East Urban Renewal Plan

The Milbank Frawley Urban Renewal Area (URA) is located in Community Board 11 and was created by the Board of Estimate in September 1967. In August 1992, a portion of the URA was established as the Milbank-Frawley Circle East Urban Renewal Area, an action which modified the boundaries to facilitate the development of a 130-unit affordable housing project (C-920139HUM). The URA is bounded by East 125th Street to the north, Park Avenue to the east, 107th Street to the south and Fifth Avenue to the west. Since then it has gone through four minor changes and one amendment.

The objectives of the URA are to:

- Redevelop the area in a comprehensive manner, by removing blight and maximizing appropriate land uses;
- Remove or rehabilitate substandard and unsanitary structures;
- Remove impediments to land assemblage and orderly development;
- Strengthen the tax base by encouraging development and employment opportunities in the area;
• Provide new housing of high quality;
• Provide appropriate community facilities, parks and recreational uses, retail shopping, public and private parking; and
• Provide a stable environment within the area which will not be a blighting influence on surrounding neighborhoods.

*Harlem-East Harlem Urban Renewal Plan*

Established in 1968, The Harlem-East Harlem URP covers portions of Manhattan Community Districts 10 and 11 from approximately East 106th to East 133rd Streets, east of Fifth Avenue. As part of the URP, design, building bulk and parking requirements were included to reinforce the existing urban character. Lots were separated into five land use categories, and supplementary controls were made on specific sites.

The objectives of the URA are to:

• Redevelop the area in a comprehensive manner, remove blight and maximize appropriate land use;
• Remove or rehabilitate substandard and unsanitary structures;
• Remove impediments to land assemblage and orderly development;
• Strengthen the tax base by encouraging development and employment opportunities in the area;
• Provide new housing of high quality and/or rehabilitated housing of upgraded quality;
• Provide appropriate community facilities, parks and recreational uses, retail shopping, public and private parking; and
• Provide a stable environment within the area that will not be a blighting influence on surrounding neighborhoods.

*Project Area*

The Project Area encompasses a portion of the East Harlem neighborhood in Manhattan Community Board 11. The rezoning area encompasses 96 blocks bounded by East 132nd Street to the north, Second Avenue to the east, East 104th Street to the South and Park Avenue to the west.

The predominant land use in the Project Area is residential with several New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA) developments and multi-family walk-up and elevator buildings. There are also a number of mixed commercial and residential developments, commercial and office spaces, public facilities and institutions including: La Marqueta, El Museo del Barrio, Museum of the City of New York, Mount Sinai Center and the New York Academy of Music. The area is well served by mass transit with the No. 4 and 6 subway line train stops at East 125th Street, East 103rd Street, and East 110th Street. Several bus lines also run along the major commercial corridors of 125th Street, 116th Street, Third Avenue and Second Avenue including the: M1, M2, M7, M35, M98, M100, M101, M102, M16, M60 Select Bus, and Bronx bound bus lines. Outside of the Project Area there is access to the No. 2, 3 and 5 subway lines and access to Citibike bike stations.
The Project Area is divided into three geographic areas which reflect distinct neighborhood character and land uses: North of East 125th Street, Mid-East Harlem and South of East 116th Street.

**North of East 125th Street**
The “North of East 125th Street” area extends along the east and west sides of Park Avenue to the west, midblock between Madison and Fifth Avenues. On the west side of Park Avenue between East 125th and East 132nd Streets is a predominantly residential neighborhood with few ground-floor retail uses and three- to four-story brownstones on the mid-blocks and five- to seven-story mid-rise buildings along the avenue. The northern portion of Park Avenue is predominantly automotive and manufacturing uses with surface parking, gas stations, the Metropolitan Transit Authority (MTA) Metro-North Railroad elevated viaduct and parking for Department of Sanitation vehicles. The intersection of East 125th Street and Park Avenue is a commercial node which was re-zoned in 2008 with height limits. Here there is a 12-story building that functions as an office space with ground-floor retail, and a few smaller buildings that have ground floor retail use and residential use on the upper floors.

**Mid-East Harlem (between East 125th Street and East 116th Street)**
The Mid-East Harlem area is bounded by East 125th Street, East 116th Street, Park Avenue, Lexington Avenue, Third and Second Avenues. This area is predominately residential with the highest concentration of NYCHA developments in the Project Area and mixed residential buildings with ground floor commercial uses along the avenues. The MTA Metro-North Railroad viaduct structure is along Park Avenue along with many surface parking lots facing the avenue and beneath the viaduct. Lexington Avenue is characterized by mixed-use buildings with ground floor retail space. The residential buildings vary from four to six story tenement buildings to tower-in-the-park buildings ranging from 11 to 32 stories. The mid-blocks in this area have shorter residential buildings not exceeding seven stories; there are a number of community facilities and at grade open spaces. Third Avenue is a commercial corridor with many vacant upper floors and heavily underutilized sites.

**South of East 116th Street**
The South of East 116th Street area includes East 104th Street to East 116th Street and Park Avenue, Lexington Avenue and Second Avenue. This area is largely characterized by mixed use buildings and multifamily walk-up buildings. The building heights range between four and eight stories along Lexington Avenue and along Third Avenue there are four to seven story tenement-style buildings with ground floor retail. Similar to the Mid-East Harlem area, there are many vacant upper floors with active ground-floor retail usage. The NYCHA developments that are in this area include the Lehman and Carver Houses along Park Avenue between East 104th Street and East 110th Street.

**PROPOSED ACTIONS**
The New York City Department of City Planning (“DCP”) and the New York City Housing Preservation and Development (“HPD”) seek several land use actions to facilitate a rezoning
plan in response to land use and planning recommendations from the East Harlem Neighborhood Plan (EHNP) and to advance the goals of Mayor De Blasio’s *Housing New York: Five Borough, Ten-year Plan*.

The DCP seeks to amend the Zoning Map, Section Nos. 6a and 6b, to change existing light manufacturing districts to mixed residential, commercial and manufacturing uses and establish the Special East Harlem Corridor District (“EHC”). This action would also amend the Zoning Map to include the boundaries of the EHC along major thoroughfares and the modified boundaries of the existing Special Transit Land Use District (“TA”). In addition, DCP also seeks Zoning Text Amendments to the Zoning Resolution to establish the EHC and establish a Mandatory Inclusionary Housing Area (“MIHA”) in the proposed rezoning area. As the co-applicant, HPD only seeks amendments to the Milbank Frawley Circle-East Urban Renewal Plan (“URP”).

The proposed actions summarized above are discussed in greater detail below.

*Proposed Zoning Map Amendment*

Changes to zoning map(s) nos. 6a and 6b would establish the boundaries of the Special East Harlem Corridors District (EHC) and modify boundaries of the Special Transit Land Use District. The EHC boundaries would be mapped along major corridors within the rezoning area including Park Avenue, Lexington Avenue, Third Avenue, Second Avenue, and the East 116th Street corridor. In addition, the amendments would replace all or portions of existing R7-2, C8-3, M1-2, M1-4, C4-4, C4-4D, R8A, R7A, and C6-3 districts within the rezoning area with M1-6/R9, M1-6/R10, C4-6, C6-4, R10, R9, R7A, R7B, and R7D districts. In addition, the proposed rezoning would replace or eliminate portions of existing C1-4, C2-4, and C1-5 overlays with C1-5 or C2-5 overlays and establish new C1-5 overlays.

*Proposed Zoning Text Amendment*

The Proposed Actions include amendments to the text of the City of New York’s Zoning Resolution (ZR) to:

- Establish special use, bulk, ground-floor design and parking regulations within a Special East Harlem Corridors District (EHC);
- Create a new special permit related to the development, conversion, or enlargement of hotels within the proposed EHC;
- Modify existing provisions of the Special 125th Street Special District applicable to the portion of the special district located at the intersection of East 125th Street and Park Avenue to implement new special use, bulk, ground-floor design, and parking regulations;
- Modify the boundaries of the TA District to reflect the current plans of the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) for prospective Second Avenue Subway locations, accommodate ancillary support facilities for the future phase of the Second Avenue Subway, and introduce bulk modifications to facilitate the inclusion of necessary
transportation-related facilities in new developments within Special District boundaries; and

- Amend Appendix F of the Zoning Resolution to apply the Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH) program to portions of the proposed rezoning area, including areas where zoning changes would promote new housing.

Urban Renewal Plan (URP) Amendments

The Proposed Actions include amendments to the Milbank Frawley Circle-East URP, to make the URP compatible as warranted with the above zoning actions:

- Remove the supplementary setback control on sites along Park Avenue between East 110th Street and East 123rd Street;
- Change the designated land use of Site 9 from ‘residential/public and semi-public’ to ‘residential’;
- Change the designated land use of Site 25A from ‘residential, residential/commercial, and commercial/semi-public’ to ‘residential’.

Waterfront Revitalization Program (WRP)

Portions of the rezoning area are within the Coastal Zone and will require review by the CPC, in its capacity as the City Coastal Commission (CCC), to determine if they are consistent with the relevant WRP policies.

COMMUNITY BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

At its Full Board meeting on June 20, 2017, Manhattan Community Board 11 (CB 11) passed a negative resolution with conditions related to this application. The final vote for the resolution was 32 in favor, 9 opposed, and 1 abstention. Due to difficulty experienced by the Board with recording individual votes from board members, a vote was held on Tuesday June 27, 2017 where the Board voted to ratify and affirm the previous week’s vote. The ratification and affirmation was adopted by a vote of 27 in favor, 7 opposed, and 0 abstentions. Before the full board vote, the representatives of DCP and HPD appeared before several committees between December 2016 and June 2017 and the Board held two public hearings, on May 16, 2017 and June 20, 2017, where they heard testimony from the public.

To more fully evaluate the Proposed Actions, CB 11 created the East Harlem Rezoning Task Force, which met from March to June 2017, and which interacted extensively with the community through public meetings, community outreach, electronic and paper surveys, and other efforts to develop a comprehensive response reflecting the community’s interests and concerns.

In their written comments submitted to the Department of City Planning, CB 11 supported the EHNP, and the zoning framework that would require affordable housing in every new development in the rezoned areas while minimizing density, preserving community character,
and stimulating local economic growth. However, while CB 11 recognized that the Proposed Actions are in the spirit of the EHNP rezoning recommendations, it found significant differences, especially as it relates to the impacts of increased density.

According to CB 11, the EHNP generally recommended the minimum increase in density necessary to trigger MIH on wide streets and avenues. However, in large portions of the rezoning area, the Proposed Actions would impose the highest density residential districts allowed by law on both Third Avenue and Park Avenue, which are considerably higher than those recommended by the EHNP.

CB 11 stated that it considers this increase in density excessive. Although it creates needed affordable housing, the Proposed Actions will irrevocably change the character of the community while only making approximately 25 percent of new units permanently affordable. Furthermore, CB 11 expressed concerns that the Proposed Actions will result in negative impacts including but not limited to increased pedestrian traffic, strain on public transportation capacity, sufficiency of existing education facilities, demand of social services, displacement of local businesses, and impacts on existing infrastructure.

While noting that there is no mitigation possible for the proposed increase in allowable FAR to 12, CB 11 presents alternatives and mitigation strategies to address these impacts. In particular, CB 11 supports a larger rezoning area as recommended in the EHNP that includes areas east of Second Avenue and south of 104th Street. Furthermore, CB 11 believes that for large portions of East Harlem that are proposed to be upzoned to R10 and R10 equivalent districts, R9 or R9 equivalent districts would provide a more appropriate balance between affordable housing, community character, and mitigation of impacts. CB 11 also raises the longstanding concern about the true affordability of housing for East Harlem residents, and recommends that MIH in new residential developments should be set at a 50/30/20 model, with 50% market units, 30% moderate-income units, and 20% low-income units, while any development on public land should be 100% affordable housing, with income bands targeting a spectrum from 10% of AMI to 120% of AMI.

In conclusion, CB 11 recommended disapproval of the Proposed Actions unless it undergoes a set of extensive and detailed modifications as follows:

1. Limit upzoning to a maximum R9 and R9-equivalent up-zoning, except for an R10 equivalent district along the modified 125th Street Special District;
2. Require a special permit application process for commercial parking garages;
3. Apply an Enhanced Commercial Corridor special district on 116th Street to limiting the width of storefronts;
4. Carve out Eugene McCabe playground and Henry J. Carter Specialty Hospital;
5. Include 127th Street between Park Avenue and Lexington Avenue in the rezoning proposal;
6. Include currently carved out portions of north Park Avenue;
7. Include entrances for MTA subway-related uses into building envelopes if East 116th Street and Lexington Avenue is rezoned;
8. Utilize local community-based organizations for workforce development, training, and placement on East Harlem projects;
9. Establish an adequately funded workforce development program, which offers certifications and apprenticeships;
10. Require 35 percent of the workforce to be from East Harlem;
11. Fund community partnerships with existing community local reentry programs to facilitate productive transitions for those returning to society after being incarcerated;
12. Provide preference for MWBE/DBE;
13. Create a tax incentive program to promote contracts with local MWBE/DBE in development;
14. Create a tax incentive program for commercial property owners to ensure growth of small businesses;
15. Maintain engagement with the community before, during, and after construction, with regular reports to CB11 to track progress on goals;
16. Renew anti-displacement legal services contracts, and improve benchmarks to ensure more effective representation to combat and/or mitigate the effects of gentrification;
17. Increase the number of HPD inspectors; make inspection times convenient to residents, and require follow-up on whether violations were cured, promptly impose fines where the violations go uncorrected beyond the time allowed by law; importantly, HPD must increase its response to complaints regarding emergency conditions (e.g., no heat or hot water), as well as promptly fine and correct failures to correct emergency violations, with the agency billing the emergency repairs to the landlord;
18. Greatly increase HPD outreach in addressing housing maintenance issues and create and publicize HPD website with consolidated user-friendly information regarding housing maintenance issues;
19. Increase proactive outreach by the City to identify landlords who could benefit from subsidies to bring unregulated buildings into rent-regulation schemes;
20. Establish a citywide Certification of No Harassment program, or at least expansion the current program to all of CD11;
21. Develop a 50/30/20 MIH model through subsidies (50 percent market units, 30 percent moderate-income units, and 20 percent low-income units);
22. Prohibit offsetting affordable housing offsite;
23. Require developments on public land to be 100 percent affordable residential housing, including all housing in any NYCHA in-fill project (affected NYCHA residents must be included in decision-making);
24. Give priority to local non-profit developers in all RFPs for development on public land;
25. Ensure that City and State subsidies directed toward housing preservation, deeper affordability in new development, and open spaces continue in perpetuity, regardless of federal budget allocations;
26. Increase programs and subsidies for homeownership opportunities for low-income and moderate-income families;
27. Ensure that M11 sanitation garage is located in a fully enclosed facility with updated technology and relocate M10 sanitation garage to central Harlem to comport with Fair Share Mandate;
BOROUGH PRESIDENT PUBLIC HEARING

On Thursday, July 13, 2017, the Manhattan Borough President conducted a public hearing on both the rezoning plan by the Department of City Planning (DCP) to rezone 96-blocks of East Harlem and a concurrent private application known as Sendero Verde at East 111th Street (Nos. C 170361 ZMM, N 170362 ZRM, C 170363 HAM, C170364 PQM, C 170365 ZSM, C 170365 ZSM, C 170366 ZSM, C 170367 ZSM, and N 170368 ZCM) located in the area of the proposed East Harlem rezoning. Approximately 135 people attended and 25 people presented testimony. Additional testimony from 13 people and organizations were submitted prior to and after the public hearing.

Those who testified all spoke out in opposition to the rezoning plan. Many who testified asked the Borough President to issues a no vote without conditions while some who spoke asked for the City to go back and consider amending aspects of the proposal, particularly around zoning and density, to conform to the recommendations in the East Harlem Neighborhood Plan. Several speakers mentioned the need for targeted investment in public housing developments throughout East Harlem. There were also several speakers who testified to discrepancies and differences of opinion in how the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) was conducted and where the analysis might have underestimated the impact on the community as result of the proposed rezoning plan.

A representative from the New York Academy of Medicine testified about the results of a health impact assessment (HIA) done specifically to gauge the impact of the affordable housing component of the application to public health in East Harlem. The HIA was requested as part of the EHNLP. HIAs are “structured process[es] to assess the potential health impacts of a policy, plan, or project and make recommendations on how to lessen negative health impacts and increase health benefits”22. The New York Academy of Medicine HIA found that the potential for residential displacement posed a threat to the health of the East Harlem community and recommended prioritizing the protection of existing affordable housing and building new units, as well as preventing displacement of long-term residents and local businesses.

---