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The changing communities of New York City are frequently shaped by broad economic and social trends, which in turn impact local residents and small businesses who often struggle to remain. Forces of gentrification are negatively impacting our city and our communities, often leading to the displacement of existing residents, who are unable to reap the benefits of these changes. Mom-and-pop shops close because they can’t afford increases in rent; the empty lot next door is suddenly developed into luxury housing; a school loses funding for an arts program; the supermarket that used to serve the community exits and a more expensive one enters. Communities must advocate for their own needs amidst changing environments. And we must do this together.

When East Harlem was announced as a neighborhood for a possible rezoning, with the goal of creating new affordable housing, we collectively sprang into action. The Office of City Council Speaker Melissa Mark-Viverito, Manhattan Community Board 11, Community Voices Heard and the Manhattan Borough President Gale A. Brewer came together to host an informational forum at El Museo del Barrio, to inform the community about the rezoning proposal and kick off a robust neighborhood planning process. We recognized that through engagement and organization, utilizing a community-driven process, we could develop a plan for the neighborhood’s future that would place the needs of the community front and center.

The creation of the East Harlem Neighborhood Plan Steering Committee brought together and empowered local stakeholders to craft a plan that identifies broad community development goals and specific needs, all informed through rich community engagement. For the first time, a neighborhood has come together on its own initiative, prior to the Mayor’s announcement of a neighborhood rezoning, to create a roadmap for future success that prioritizes the needs of existing residents, in addition to preparing for anticipated development and growth.

This Neighborhood Plan is the culmination of months of engagement, research, analysis, organizing, and consensus-building. Through the hard work and thoughtfulness of community residents and Steering Committee members, in partnership with several organizations and City agencies, we have created a comprehensive vision for our community, which should direct City policy and resources for years to come. We believe these goals and recommendations will advance the needs of East Harlem residents, and better prepare our community for the growth and changes that continue to shape neighborhoods throughout New York City.

Sincerely,

East Harlem Neighborhood Plan Project Partners:
Office of City Council Speaker Melissa Mark-Viverito
Manhattan Community Board 11
Community Voices Heard
Manhattan Borough President Gale A. Brewer
The neighborhood of East Harlem has a rich cultural and social history. Tens of thousands of immigrants have made their first homes in the United States in East Harlem. First settled by Jews and Italians, later the center of New York City’s Puerto Rican community, and in more recent years, home to Mexican, African and Chinese immigrants, East Harlem has an astonishing history of diversity. For a time in the mid-20th century, East Harlem was one of the most densely populated areas on the planet. As its crowded conditions came to the attention of social reformers, the neighborhood became the center of an enormous urban renewal effort that lasted two decades. The combination of public housing and other forms of regulated housing means that East Harlem is a neighborhood defined by its affordability as well as its diversity.

The increasing income inequality throughout New York City is, however, affecting East Harlem’s continued affordability. There are approximately 12,000 households in the neighborhood facing severe housing needs based on the percentage of income paid to rent and mortgages, and parameters for overcrowding and homelessness. There is also a constricted supply of housing for families looking to grow and move, but that seek to remain in the neighborhood. Meanwhile, there is an ongoing loss of affordable units in East Harlem as rent-stabilization programs expire—on average over the last seven years, 360 homes have come out of rent stabilization programs each year.

The challenges around affordability extend to small businesses and non-profits that face rising rents. These businesses and non-profits underpin the fabric of the community and rising rents threaten the services that longtime residents are accustomed to. Just as importantly, there need to be opportunities to invest in people, including integrated early education programs and quality public schooling through post-secondary education and workforce development programs. We must ensure the implementation of a human capital development program that gives residents opportunities to invest in themselves. Any rezoning should support workforce training and infrastructure improvements that reinforce the community, such as new and improved facilities and open space, safer streets, better transit and a more culturally vibrant neighborhood.

When the City announced that East Harlem was to be one of the first neighborhoods to be rezoned as part of Mayor Bill de Blasio’s Housing Plan to construct and preserve 200,000 units of affordable housing by 2025, it was clear to City Council Speaker Melissa Mark-Viverito, community organizations and residents that East Harlem needed a local plan—a plan rooted in local
concerns and local ideas and initiatives—before the City set out an approach to rezoning.

Speaker Mark-Viverito, based on her commitment to participatory governance and inclusive planning, convened a steering committee of local stakeholders to establish a process for a holistic community-based plan. Working with the Speaker’s Office, project partners Manhattan Community Board 11, Community Voices Heard and Manhattan Borough President Gale A. Brewer took a leading role in fostering this process as we set out to accomplish the following goals:

- Collect and organize community concerns and ideas in order to influence City agencies’ planning processes and rezoning efforts
- Create a human capital development plan that focuses on the advancement of East Harlem residents
- Develop approaches to preserve existing affordable and public housing and generate new, permanently affordable housing
- Develop new tools for preservation of culture, economy and neighborhood character
- Create a needs assessment that takes into account East Harlem’s current and future community
- Develop implementable recommendations that reflect community input
- Provide a model for other communities and neighborhood planning efforts
- Build a base of engaged residents ready to advocate collectively for community needs

Through the guidance of a Steering Committee composed of representatives from community organizations, the East Harlem Neighborhood Plan has evolved through a series of eight large public meetings, which have averaged almost 180 people per session, approximately 40 meetings to develop the objectives and recommendations around the 12 key themes, several informal meetings to gather more feedback and to provide more information on the ideas being discussed, community-based surveys and online comments. The planning process has also included meetings with agencies to test and gather feedback on the objectives and recommendations.

The East Harlem Neighborhood Plan (EHNP) is structured in the following way:
• An Introduction to the East Harlem Neighborhood Plan;
• A historical overview of the East Harlem community;
• Chapters based around the Community Visioning Workshops, with sections detailing the strengths, challenges, and key objectives and recommendations tied to the 12 key themes;
• An Action Plan defining the approach to bringing about implementation of the objectives and recommendations and holding the City accountable to them;
• A glossary of terms and acronyms used in this report; and
• Appendices containing the East Harlem Neighborhood Plan Process Guide, additional supporting research, outlines and notes from the community workshops, and information and notes from various feedback sessions.

The following page highlights the priority objectives identified by East Harlem community members from among the total of 61 objectives developed by the 12 EHNHP subgroups. Priorities were identified using a combination of online survey responses and voting via tokens at the Final Community Forum on January 27, 2016. The top two most voted objectives were selected per subgroup. These broadly suggest the critical places to focus attention on implementation, but not at the expense of a comprehensive understanding of how the 61 objectives and 232 recommendations presented in this report interrelate and are ultimately effective together.

As a result, following through on the myriad of recommendations in this Plan will require continued organization and input from within the East Harlem community as well as a need for responsiveness to this Plan on the part of the City. In many respects, the East Harlem Neighborhood Plan offers a new paradigm in neighborhood planning. Spurred on by both the City’s decision to rezone East Harlem and the dramatic changes already underway, this Plan provides both an ambitious and realistic path forward for City agencies to act on. Since the objectives and recommendations are integrated, this Plan urges a similarly holistic response from the City.

There is a useful precedent to explore. Following Superstorm Sandy, the City responded by establishing the Mayor’s Office of Recovery and Resiliency to coordinate interagency efforts to plan for the protection of New York City neighborhoods. While the impetus may be different than a disaster recovery effort, given the many challenges in East Harlem and impending change, the East Harlem Neighborhood Plan demands a coordinated implementation process that brings together local and City efforts.
## PRIORITY OBJECTIVES

The priorities highlighted here were identified using a combination of online survey responses and voting via tokens at the Final Community Forum on January 27, 2016. The top two most voted Objectives were selected per subgroup.

The online survey was developed by D21, an online polling platform. The objectives poll had 60 respondents, 47 of whom identified as residents of East Harlem, and 16 of whom identified themselves as working in East Harlem. The majority of residents were from zipcodes 10035 and 10029.

Community members that attended the Final Community Forum were given a set of 15 tokens when they signed into the event. The tokens were used at subgroup stations for participants to identify their top 15 objectives. The tokens were color-coded by type of attendee—Resident, Worker, or Visitor. Each subgroup station had numbered jars for each objective. Participants were able to register their priority objectives by putting their tokens in the corresponding jar. A total of 2,792 tokens were cast at the event. 66% of the tokens came from residents, and 27% came from those who work in East Harlem.

<p>| Arts &amp; Culture | ✓ Preserve the unique cultural history of East Harlem. |
| Open Space &amp; Recreation | ✓ Ensure public open space meets the needs of East Harlem residents now and in the future. |
|  | ✓ Leverage public site development to create sufficient park space for East Harlem residents now and in the future. |
| Schools &amp; Education | ✓ Align specialized programs and services with the needs of East Harlem schools, and increase funding to support them. |
|  | ✓ Create more diverse pathways to careers and college. |
| Pre-K, Daycare &amp; Afterschool | ✓ Ensure that programming is high quality, consistent, and well-funded. |
|  | ✓ Improve existing pre-K, daycare and afterschool facilities, and ensure that quality spaces are created within new buildings. |
| NYCHA | ✓ Ensure efficient, high quality repairs on NYCHA developments. |
|  | ✓ Improve safety and security on NYCHA developments. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Preservation</td>
<td>✓ Protect rent stabilized units. Prevent de-stabilization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Preserve vacant, underutilized and distressed properties for affordable housing development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Businesses, Workforce &amp; Economic Development</td>
<td>✓ Increase quality employment opportunities for East Harlem residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Protect and enhance the viability of East Harlem’s small businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing Development</td>
<td>✓ Increase the amount of affordable housing with deep and varied levels of affordability in any new development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Expand affordable housing tools and resources to increase affordable housing in new development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning &amp; Land Use</td>
<td>✓ Preserve important East Harlem buildings and reinforce neighborhood character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Allow for increased density in select places to create more affordable housing and spaces for jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Environment &amp; Energy</td>
<td>✓ Improve East Harlem’s energy resiliency and independence. Increase access to renewable energy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Improve East Harlem air quality—reduce congestion and mitigate vehicle emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>✓ Reduce violence and invest in youth empowerment in East Harlem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Ensure alternative approaches to quality of life issues, in addition to policing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Seniors</td>
<td>✓ Allow for East Harlem seniors to age in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Improve access to healthy, affordable, quality food.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why Now?

East Harlem is one of the first four neighborhoods prioritized for rezoning, as part of Mayor de Blasio’s Housing Plan to construct and preserve 200,000 units of affordable housing by 2025.

Rezoning a neighborhood, especially to create more housing, presents opportunities as well as major challenges. In response to existing concerns East Harlem residents have about changes in the neighborhood and how a potential rezoning could accelerate these changes, the Plan’s Project Partners, New York City Council Speaker Melissa Mark-Viverito, along with Manhattan Community Board 11, Community Voices Heard, and Manhattan Borough President Gale A. Brewer, initiated a community-based planning process.

The East Harlem Neighborhood Plan sets a unique precedent for community input in rezonings. In East Harlem, community-defined needs and solutions have resulted in a neighborhood plan that precedes the conventional process of land use changes in New York City. Usually, public input is limited, narrow in scope, and comes after a plan has already been developed by government agencies. In contrast, the East Harlem Neighborhood Plan seeks to create a more holistic process based on community-defined needs prior to the City’s rezoning study. This neighborhood plan will inform the City’s zoning proposal and leverage resources to achieve broader neighborhood planning goals.
Goals

In order to provide the public and City with priority objectives and recommendations that represent the community, the Project Partners established a set of goals for the Neighborhood Plan:

1. Collect and organize community concerns and ideas in order to influence City agencies' planning processes and rezoning efforts.
2. Create a human capital development plan that focuses on the advancement of East Harlem residents.
3. Develop approaches to preserve existing affordable and public housing and generate new, permanently affordable housing.
4. Develop new tools for preservation of culture, economy and neighborhood character.
5. Create a needs assessment that takes into account East Harlem’s current and future community.
6. Develop implementable recommendations that reflect community input.
7. Provide a model for other communities and neighborhood planning efforts.
8. Build a base of engaged residents ready to advocate collectively for community needs.
### COMMUNITY VISIONING WORKSHOPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introductory Community Forum</td>
<td>May 20</td>
<td>400 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Culture</td>
<td>June 4</td>
<td>125 Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space &amp; Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools &amp; Education / Pre-K, Daycare &amp; Afterschool</td>
<td>July 1</td>
<td>85 Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYCHA / Housing Preservation</td>
<td>July 29</td>
<td>150 Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Businesses, Workforce &amp; Economic Development</td>
<td>September 10</td>
<td>120 Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing Development / Zoning &amp; Land Use</td>
<td>October 22</td>
<td>175 Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Environment &amp; Energy / Safety / Health &amp; Seniors</td>
<td>November 21</td>
<td>83 Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Community Forum</td>
<td>January 27</td>
<td>350 Participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUBGROUP LEADS

- **Arts & Culture**
  - El Museo del Barrio
  - New York Restoration Project

- **Open Space & Recreation**
  - Renaissance Charter High School for Innovation

- **Schools & Education**
  - Harlem RBI

- **Pre-K, Daycare & Afterschool**
  - Johnson Houses Tenant Association

- **NYCHA**
  - Union Settlement Association

- **Small Businesses, Workforce & Economic Development**
  - Lott Community Development Corporation

- **Affordable Housing Development**
  - CIVITAS

- **Zoning & Land Use**
  - WE ACT for Environmental Justice

- **Transportation, Environment & Energy**
  - Office of City Council Speaker Melissa Mark-Viverito

- **Safety**
  - New York Academy of Medicine

- **Health & Seniors**

---

**EAST HARLEM NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN**
The Neighborhood Plan aims to express values and priorities as well as concrete recommendations. It balances community input with statistical background information and targets different ideas and concepts at particular entities and agencies with the ability and resources to fulfill them.

The plan includes a combination of short- and long-term programs, capital projects and policies that preserve the cultural diversity of East Harlem and support the ability for long-term residents to stay in the neighborhood and enjoy the benefits of neighborhood change.

The Planning Process

The Neighborhood Plan considers anticipated future growth in East Harlem and has utilized a broad community development framework to address the development of human capital and enhancements to quality of life. Recommendations were developed through the following process:

A. Input from community visioning workshops formed the basis of the recommendations

The planning process was underpinned by a large public kick-off event, six topic-specific community visioning workshops, and one large final community forum. In addition, Project Partners and Facilitators conducted varied informal engagement throughout the planning process. The six community visioning workshops were made public to all residents of East Harlem, and each one focused on a different topic or set of topics. The workshops were an opportunity for members of the community to share ideas, needs, dreams and concerns about East Harlem. Input from the workshops directly informed the work of the topic subgroup.

B. Topic subgroups developed objectives and recommendations

The topic subgroups were comprised of neighborhood leaders, local organizations, City agencies, and city-wide advocacy and technical assistance groups. Subgroups were responsible for integrating the findings of the community visioning workshops into a framework for developing objectives and recommendations. Because subgroup members were either based in East Harlem or do valuable work in the neighborhood, they brought meaningful expertise, perspective and shared resources to this process. Each subgroup was headed by an East Harlem Neighborhood Plan Steering Committee member.

The draft objectives and recommendations subject for approval were produced and reviewed following at least three subgroup meetings, a public visioning session, a meeting with relevant agencies and the deliberation of the subgroup leads.

C. The Steering Committee approved objectives and recommendations

The draft objectives and recommendations were presented to the Steering Committee for formal approval in the weeks following the community visioning workshops and subgroup meetings. The Steering Committee voted to approve proposed objectives and recommendations put forward by each subgroup.

16 out of the 21 Steering Committee members were required to approve a recommendation for it to move forward, and opposing members were allowed to note their objections to a recommendation in the report text.
Additional Engagement

In addition to public visioning sessions and informal engagement sessions, Community Voices Heard collected over 500 surveys between June and December 2015 from residents at visioning sessions, online, through door-to-door outreach, canvassing, and at various community spaces. Survey results can be found in the appendix of this report.

Throughout December 2015 and January 2016, CB11 hosted eight public presentations where subgroup recommendations were presented at corresponding CB11 subcommittees. The subcommittee chairs and members, as well as the general public, were given an opportunity to provide feedback. Subgroup leads have incorporated some of this feedback into their corresponding chapters. The appendix also includes a full list of recorded comments from the CB11 sessions.

In January 2016, the Project Partners collaborated with D21 (a digital voting platform) to create thirteen online polls, where the public was able to prioritize from among the 61 objectives and 232 recommendations put forward by the EHNP subgroups. There was a limited response rate on the subtopic-specific polls. The objectives poll had just over 60 respondents. A summary of that data is located in the appendix of this report. Community Voices Heard opened their office to the community for two evenings before the final community forum, giving the public another method of engaging with the recommendations. CVH publicized this through their network, and distributed 8,000 postcards advertising their open house.

To further inform residents about the plan, the Manhattan Borough President’s Office (MBPO) held a session with five Faith Based Leaders on October 27. On November 2, DREAM Charter School held a workshop for 7th and 8th graders, which was attended by 142 students and 7 parents/guardians. Project Partners solicited community ideas at their offices and attended street fairs to spread the word about the planning process.

Finally, all relevant presentations, reports, research, announcements and photographs related to the EHNP were posted to www.EastHarlemPlan.nyc. The website will remain live and continue to act as a resource for the community during and after the City-led rezoning.

The EHNP process was conducted in a relatively compressed time period. The Steering Committee was given the opportunity to produce a community-driven plan in advance of DCP’s study of the neighborhood. Along with this opportunity came the responsibility to be timely and responsive. As a result, a process that could have taken years was condensed to approximately 10 months.

While engagement was more robust than most similar processes, additional time and resources could have allowed even greater reach. Also, while all objectives and recommendations were translated to Spanish, and Spanish translation was available at all of the eight public meetings, more time and resources could have allowed more effective reach to Mandarin-speakers and monolingual Spanish speakers in the community.
East Harlem In Conversation

Ray Tirado
East Harlem Resident

“This is a community that’s been around for a long time. I don’t wanna move from here. I love it, I’ve lived here all my life, and hopefully I will retire in this community here and be a voice in my community.”

Pearl Barkley
East Harlem Resident

“The neighborhood has gone through a lot in the past 50 years and now the fight is, ‘If you want to come back in and develop, you have to do it for the people in the community first.’”

Beverly Pabon
East Harlem Resident

“We want to stay here, and we need affordable housing and small business to stay here.”

Keith Massey
East Harlem Resident & Community Board 11 Board Member

“A lot of us earn only under, maybe, thirty thousand dollars, so it’s [the current Mandatory Inclusionary Housing proposal] not for us.”

Photos courtesy of Meerkat Media Cooperative

Introduction
HISTORY

East Harlem has historically been an important home for immigrants to New York City, with a rich cultural heritage and an enduring legacy of social justice activity. It has also been defined as a place undergoing constant change, known for its dynamic shifts in technologies, politics and physical fabric over the years. The creation of the elevated lines in the late 19th century, the rampant development of tenement housing that extended into the early decades of the 20th century and the urban renewal of the mid-20th century have all played critical roles in the transformation of the neighborhood. As the City begins to consider rezoning parts of East Harlem, it is important for the current community to have a voice in any upcoming change and to create mechanisms that allow for the continuity of what makes the neighborhood unique.

At the end of the 19th century, East Harlem was the best served neighborhood by inexpensive transportation in Manhattan. The extension of Third Avenue through northern Manhattan, the railroad along Fourth Avenue (later Park Avenue) and the Second Avenue Elevated (“El”) all contributed to this distinction. Around this time, Italian immigrants were migrating to the neighborhood from the overpopulated Lower East Side, replacing Irish and German communities. Various Jewish educational institutions also thrived, some up through the 1950’s.

The new transportation connections sparked real estate speculation and unbridled construction that would house working-class families for years to come. Over forty years, developers built approximately 65,000 apartments. Waves of immigrant communities displaced earlier settlers. Italian immigrants resided primarily east of Third Avenue and became the
largest such community in the country. Segments of East Harlem were deemed “Italian Harlem” and “Jewish Harlem.”

East 116th Street evolved into a dense commercial corridor serving the neighborhood’s multi-ethnic populations. Under the Park Avenue viaduct between 111th and 116th Streets, pushcart vendors congregated to sell goods. In 1936, Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia legitimized the activity and helped to create La Marqueta. It was only after World War II that East Harlem got the nickname Spanish Harlem. The continued arrival of newcomers from Puerto Rico, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Panama, Mexico, and many other Latin American countries made El Barrio the predominant Spanish-speaking community in the United States outside of Puerto Rico. These communities and a growing African-American population replaced many Italians and Eastern Europeans, many of whom had begun to move out to suburban areas. Its residents included some of New York’s most famous artists and musicians such as Tito Puente, Ray Barretto, Julia de Burgos, and Langston Hughes.

By the middle of the 20th century, East Harlem boasted 210,000 residents, almost twice today’s population. The racially segregating practice of redlining led to deterioration of housing stock. These conditions made it a primary target for federal “slum clearance” and a model area for urban renewal. In the 1940s and 1950s, NYCHA demolished much of the older housing stock and replaced it with modern high-rise housing projects that complied with federal housing standards. The construction of these high rises amidst surrounding open space accelerated in the years after World War II, replacing large tracts of tenements, brownstones, community spaces and small businesses. By 1965, a quarter of East Harlem’s residents were estimated to be living in public housing developments. The neighborhood was one of the hardest hit areas in the 1960s and 1970s as New York City struggled with deficits, race riots, urban flight, gang warfare, drug abuse, crime and poverty. Tenements were crowded, poorly maintained and frequent targets for arson.
This era spurred political movements among East Harlem’s Latino and African-American communities, who joined together with clergy and settlement houses to protest the destruction of their neighborhoods. Parents demanded higher quality education for their children, including curriculum that was responsive to diverse cultural heritages. In 1969, community-based groups helped to decentralize the Board of Education and began participating in structuring school curricula and programming. The Young Lords—a social activist group—promoted neighborhood empowerment as part of wider national struggles for civil rights. Institutions like El Museo del Barrio also grew out of the activism of this time.

Recent years have been marked by continuing organization and advocacy, active community gardening groups, vibrant arts and dance groups, a focus on mini-schools and the emergence of several locally inspired charter schools. East Harlem continues to be a racially diverse neighborhood, with a 46% Latino/Hispanic and 30% African-American population. As it has been throughout its history, East Harlem continues to be a primarily working-class neighborhood.

Up until 2006 and following the national recession, property values in East Harlem rose along with those in the rest of New York City. There has been an increase in market rate housing construction, including luxury condos and co-ops. Although East Harlem continues to produce new rent stabilized units as well, it is losing older units from rent stabilization at a faster rate than it produces new ones. A comparison between 2000 and 2010 census data for East Harlem show that the African-American population of East Harlem has declined, while the number of white, Mexican and Asian residents (mostly Chinese) have grown significantly.
Sources:
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/East_Harlem#Decline
EAST HARLEM NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

INTRODUCTORY COMMUNITY FORUM

Community Education Forum — Kick-off Event

May 20th, 2015
6:30–8:30pm
at El Museo del Barrio
400 participants
The Community Education Forum was the kick-off event that served to inform residents about Housing New York, Mayor de Blasio administration’s plan to preserve and develop 200,000 units of affordable housing over the next ten years and the impetus behind the proposed East Harlem rezoning. Participants also tackled rezoning—how a rezoning typically works and how the East Harlem neighborhood planning process was developed to create a community-based rezoning plan uniquely defined by the needs, desires and priorities of the East Harlem community. Participants learned about Neighborhood Planning & Rezoning Basics. Neighborhood residents and Community Voices Heard (CVH) members performed a skit that modeled different perspectives within a planning process, highlighting opportunities and tensions in a conversation about neighborhood change. Audience members commented on their passions, dreams and concerns during a question and answer session. And, finally, Project Partners and Steering Committee members gave an overview of the various subgroup topics and next steps for each.
COMMUNITY VISIONING WORKSHOP #1

Arts & Culture / Open Space & Recreation

June 4th, 2015
6:30–8:30pm
at Hunter College
Silberman School of Social Work
125 Participants
The first community visioning workshop focused on Open Space & Recreation and Arts & Culture and was led by New York Restoration Project and El Museo del Barrio. Participants identified strengths and challenges for each topic during the small group discussion. For Open Space & Recreation, participants discussed park utilization, recreational needs, increasing density and the related impact on open space, resiliency and park system connectivity. For Arts & Culture, participants had conversations about arts programming relevant to the East Harlem community and resource and space needs for local artists and arts organizations.

"I value the long-standing culture, the art murals, La Marqueta, cafes, community gardens, the history and the people, the heart of NYC."

"What makes East Harlem special for me is the multicultural community. I value the richness of the culture in our community."

*From EHNP survey respondents*
East Harlem has a rich cultural history, drawing from its legacy as a neighborhood of immigrants and as a home to many well-known artists. The area was the first major Latino immigrant neighborhood in the city, was once the center of the Italian-American community, and has housed thriving Jewish and African-American communities. This legacy is not just historical; today many people refer to the area as “El Barrio,” and there are new waves of Chinese and Mexican immigrants arriving.
East Harlem, well-known for its contributions to music, such as salsa, Latin jazz, mambo and hip-hop, and its iconic murals, is full of arts and cultural institutions that provide stability and longevity to the cultural ecosystem of the neighborhood. These organizations operate at many different scales and meet many different needs. Another resource is the stock of the architecturally and culturally significant buildings that reflect the neighborhood’s unique history and are important to residents.
MUSEUMS & GALLERIES
1 El Museo del Barrio
2 Islamic Cultural Center
3 Keep Rising to the Top
4 La Casa de la Herencia Cultural Puertorriquena
5 Museum of the City of New York
6 The Poets Den Gallery and Theatre
7 Casa Frela Gallery
8 MediaNoche Gallery
9 The Taller Boricua

CULTURAL SITES
10 National Black Theatre
11 Christopher’s (former Latin music dance club)
12 Webber Meat Market
13 Lucky Corner
14 Casa Latina Music Store
15 Patsy’s Pizzeria and Restaurant
16 Former PS 83
17 Former Cosmo Theater
18 Italian Savings Bank
19 Democratic Club of 16th Assembly Dist.
20 Hudson Valley National Bank
21 Our Lady of Mt. Carmel
22 Ben Franklin HS
23 PS 102
24 Jefferson Park Methodist Church
25 Rao’s Restaurant
26 La Marqueta
27 Graffiti Hall of Fame
28 First Spanish Methodist Church
29 Eagle Theatre (Closed)
30 PS 109
31 Harlem’s Colonial African Burial Ground Sacred Site
32 Park Palace (former Latin music dance club)

LANDMARKED DISTRICT
LANDMARKED PROPERTIES
33 Church of All Saints
34 Parish House and School
35 17 East 128th Street House
36 St. Andrew’s Church
37 Langston Hughes House
38 Mount Morris Bank Building
39 Fire Hook & Ladder Company No. 14
40 NY Public Library 125th St. Branch
41 Watch Tower
42 The Harlem Courthouse
43 Thomas Jefferson Play Center
44 NY Public Library Aguilar Branch
45 St. Cecilia’s Convent
46 St. Cecilia’s Church
47 Public School 72 (now Julia de Burgos Latino Cultural Center)
48 28th Police Precinct Station House
49 Fire Engine Company No. 53
50 Museum of the City of New York
51 St. Nicholas Russian Orthodox Cathedral
52 Lucy D. Dahlgren House
53 Manhattan Country School

MURALS & MOSAICS

YOUNG LORDS ACTIVISM SITES
While the artistic and cultural resources of the neighborhood are considerable, there are challenges for the neighborhood to retain them as it grows and changes. However, preserving these assets in East Harlem is a priority for the community.

- Local artists and arts and culture organizations struggle to identify sufficient financial resources and support services. These groups lack an overarching coalition that could advocate for space, sources of funding, and other forms of support. Without these resources, it is difficult to sustain the arts and cultural network.

- Artists and arts organizations struggle to find affordable places to live, create and display their work. As development pressures rise, spaces that were previously affordable to arts and cultural activities are increasingly out of reach. Without focused strategies to support artists and cultural activities, these affordability challenges will only intensify.

- Many buildings in the neighborhood that capture the unique historical and cultural significance of East Harlem are threatened by new development and physical change. Residents risk losing representations of their heritage as the neighborhood gentrifies. As changes to the built environment occur, it will be important to pursue strategies that help to reinforce the character of the community.

- Both within the community and city-wide, there is a lack of familiarity with the cultural resources and artistic production taking place in East Harlem. Without such an understanding, the historic and cultural resources of the neighborhood are more vulnerable to threats, and opportunities to attract visitors to the neighborhood may be lost.

To protect and promote the rich arts and cultural resources of East Harlem, the neighborhood plan has six objectives (see the following page).
OBJECTIVES & RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Ensure that financial resources and support services are available to sustain local arts and culture organizations and local artists.

   1.1 Work closely with the Department of Cultural Affairs (DCLA) to create a central arts advocacy entity to serve as a resource for East Harlem arts and culture organizations and individuals. This entity will serve as an arts and culture coalition, and should share common goals and objectives. Include a diversity of coalition partners including Local Development Corporations, local business leadership and non-arts oriented community institutions and organizations.

   1.2 Study the feasibility of and funding needs to expand the use of existing underutilized and non-traditional spaces in East Harlem for community arts and cultural programs.

     Reach out to organizations where this underutilized space exists, i.e. Heckscher Theater at El Museo, Theater at Poets Den, Red Roof Theater. Discuss providing these spaces to dancers and artists for a nominal fee when not in use.

2. Create affordable artist housing, as well as new spaces for community organizations and programming.*

   2.1 Give first priority usage of artists spaces in newly developed and existing spaces to local artists living within or who have a history of working within CB11.

   2.2 Create a new dance hall and movie theater. Engage with theater companies that may be interested in opening a new location in East Harlem.

* A joint recommendation for increasing affordable artist live/work spaces in East Harlem is located in the Affordable Housing Development chapter, Recommendation 2.4.

3. Expand opportunities for local artists to produce commissioned work in East Harlem.

   3.1 Advocate for the Percent for Art program in private projects.

   3.2 Advocate for more use of local artists in the Percent for Art program.

Related to precedent on page 30
4. Preserve the unique cultural history of East Harlem by harnessing historic landmarks and representing El Barrio’s narrative through the public realm.

4.1 Establish a process to identify culturally significant structures in East Harlem and a method to preserve and celebrate them. Establish a landmarking process that does not impede the development of affordable housing. Some key locations are identified on the map on page 26.

4.2 Develop a unified signage and multimedia program for East Harlem, branding it as a key destination in the city. Establish a cultural wayfinding walk or El Barrio hall of fame that pays homage to the past and present artistic and historic influences of the neighborhood.

5. Create greater awareness both internally and externally of the cultural production currently taking place in all of East Harlem.

5.1 Host a comprehensive community events calendar that advertises all arts and cultural programming in East Harlem. Utilize an outdoor kiosk bulletin board to promote programming and events.

5.2 Work more closely with the following organizations and initiatives to streamline promotion of East Harlem arts and cultural programs: East Harlem Community Alliance, Visit El Barrio, NYC & Co.

6. Develop arts programming that meets the needs of the local community while also attracting visitors to East Harlem.

6.1 Create an East Harlem Theater District for off-Broadway performances.

6.2 Continue to expand East Harlem arts and culture into existing programming at NYC Parks, DOE, NYCHA, small businesses and other cultural institutions (ex—film screenings, open mics, music festivals, poetry readings).

6.3 Identify resources to further support increased arts and cultural programming at the La Marqueta site and leverage East Harlem cultural festivals and large events to increase tourism (ex. ethnic pride events, food festivals and fairs, coordinated late/free nights at local museums, establishment of an East Harlem Latin Jazz Festival connected to programming at the National Jazz Museum in Harlem).
**South Bronx Cultural Corridor**

In 2001 the Bronx Council on the Arts (BCA) designated a mile-long strip of the Grand Concourse as an area with a high concentration of cultural activity and branded it the South Bronx Cultural Corridor. It has been dubbed the “Gateway to the New Bronx” and demonstrates arts-based economic development in the South Bronx. BCA’s goals for the corridor are to attract visitors, increase commercial activity and engage the community in a variety of South Bronx cultural events.

This precedent relates to objectives 4, 5 and 6

Source: http://www.bronxarts.org/southbronxculturalcorridor.asp

---

**Naturally Occurring Cultural Districts – New York**

Naturally Occurring Cultural Districts – New York (NOCD–NY) emerged from a series of roundtable conversations between 2010 and 2011, when artists, activists, creative manufacturers, non-profit groups and policy-makers convened to discuss the role that arts and culture play in strengthening New York City communities. By late summer 2011, NOCD–NY grew into a working alliance, generating a sustained commitment and city-wide platform for revitalizing New York City from the neighborhood up. It is tasked with advocating for policies, promoting the value of local practice, collaborating on programs and compiling research on the work of the cultural community.

This precedent relates to Recommendation 1.1

Source: http://nocdnyn.org
7 Yarn bombing public art project by Naomi/Random Acts of Generosity, with Hope Community Inc. on 104th St in background © Kate Milford, 2016
8 Casa Latina Music Shop © Kate Milford, 2016
9 Adrian Roman aka Viajero’s Libre Mural (MonumentArt Festival) © Kate Milford, 2016

Arts & Culture
Open Space & Recreation
The open space geography of East Harlem is unique among many New York City neighborhoods. While the edges of the neighborhood are flanked by two important city-wide parks, Central Park and Randall’s Island, and two neighborhood parks, Marcus Garvey Park and Thomas Jefferson Park, the center of East Harlem is dotted with playgrounds and community gardens that reflect the neighborhood’s history and cultural heritage. East Harlem also has access to an active waterfront with the potential to become a world-class destination for local residents and the city at large. The renovation and maintenance of open space in East Harlem is supported by the NYC Department of Parks & Recreation, private conservancies, land trusts, ‘friends of’ groups, non-profits and other City agencies.
Despite these considerable open space assets, there are also challenges, which will be exacerbated as the neighborhood continues to grow. Recognizing and responding to these challenges will improve the quality of life for current and future residents. The findings from the community visioning workshop and open space subgroup meetings focused on the following challenges:

- On a basic level, the amount of open space in East Harlem is insufficient. While New York City has a standard of 1.5 acres of open space per 1,000 residents, New Yorkers for Parks has set a higher goal of 2.5 and has found that there are 2.9 acres of open space per 1,000 residents city-wide. Without Randall’s Island or Central Park, East Harlem falls well below this benchmark with only 0.77 acres of open space per 1,000 residents. If the northeast corner of Central Park is included, the number climbs to 1.45 acres per 1,000 residents.

- Numerous community gardens are threatened and under-resourced, and in some cases are not open or programmed for wider public use. Loss of these open spaces is a threat to the community.

- With so much of the open space located at the neighborhood’s edges, it is critical to overcome the physical and psychological barriers to using these parks. In the case of Randall’s Island, Harlem River Park and the waterfront esplanade, there is a need to create better access to recreational spaces. Programs and improved lighting can also make Central Park feel more connected to East Harlem residents.

- East Harlem is vulnerable to climate change and extreme weather events, with inundation during Superstorm Sandy affecting many residents. Open space design needs to incorporate resiliency while also ensuring that public access is improved, not curtailed by storm surge protections.

- Many parks in East Harlem need better maintenance and staffing. In the community visioning workshop, many open spaces were identified as assets with the caveat that they needed better maintenance in order to maximize their value and meet the needs of residents.
OBJECTIVES & RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Ensure public open space meets the needs of existing residents and keeps pace with an increasing population.

1.1 Strategically preserve and create open space that strives for 2.5 acres/1,000 residents for existing and future East Harlem residents.

1.2* As density increases, ensure that open space is created with new developments as part of a zoning special district. Work with developers to create a Community Benefits Agreement (CBA) that funds a program to train and hire East Harlem residents for maintenance and stewardship of these open spaces. ••

*This recommendation relates to the Garden District proposal in Recommendation 3.5 in the Zoning & Land Use chapter.

1.3 Work constructively with City agencies and private land managers including conservancies, land trusts, ‘friends of’ groups, and non-profits to ensure open space maintenance and staffing in parks and community gardens is proportional to the number of people using the space, especially during peak season. Increase staffing during the summer season.

1.4 Conduct a needs assessment for comfort stations, recreation centers, and ballfields in East Harlem.

1.5 Build a comfort station at Harlem River Park.

2. Leverage City-owned sites and public affordable housing development resources to create enough park space to accommodate existing and future East Harlem residents.

2.1 Seek opportunities on City-owned land for open space creation. With increased density comes the likelihood that land values will rise, leaving agencies unable to afford private property for new parkland.

2.2 Conduct a feasibility study of the potential for ferry access along entire East River waterfront, with Pier 107 as a potential access point.

2.3 Restore Pier 107 as a public open space. ••

2.4 Conduct a study of where streetends can be developed to add more open space to the East Harlem community. Areas of consideration can include 117th, 118th and 119th Streets and the small streets around Thomas Jefferson Park. Pilot the SummerStreets program at these locations to test the street closure in a temporary way.

2.5 Open more school playgrounds during off-hours for community recreation, and explore opportunities to incorporate stormwater management infrastructure in playground renovations. ••

2.6 Leverage city and private sector programs and resources to support open space development: Neighborhood Plaza Program, GreenThumb Garden Coalitions initiative.

•• Related to precedent on pages 38–39
3. Integrate stormwater management strategies through open space design to better prepare East Harlem for threats from climate change.

3.1 Require developers to manage 1" of storm-water runoff from all impervious surface area on their site.

3.2 Ensure all Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) Tributary Areas that overlap with the boundaries of CB11 become Priority CSO Tributary Areas for DEP in FY17.

3.3 As part of a Priority CSO Tributary Area, DEP should identify and study existing underground streambeds along East Harlem streets and through large properties working with other agencies like NYCHA to prioritize green infrastructure at these locations.

3.4 Take a comprehensive planning approach to waterfront resiliency, incorporating prior and ongoing planning efforts to create green/natural buffers along the water’s edge in East Harlem and achieve overlapping benefits to the public from flood and storm surge protection.

4. Remove cultural and psychological barriers to using parks.

4.1 Create new and leverage existing funds and partnerships to expand open space programing in East Harlem.

4.2 Improve outreach and communications for park programming by developing an inventory, shared calendar, and outreach strategy for East Harlem programs and permitting.

5. Remove physical barriers to parks and open space throughout East Harlem.

5.1 Provide increased lighting and tree pruning around light sources throughout East Harlem public open spaces, prioritizing spaces along the Park Ave. viaduct (particularly 111th Street), Marcus Garvey Park, and NYCHA developments. Lighting options should include LED, solar and pavement.

5.2 Make sidewalks, parks, and other open spaces ADA compliant and convenient for seniors and caregivers with young children. Prioritize Park Ave. viaduct, Harlem River Park, 96th Street and FDR, and Marcus Garvey Park.

5.3 Improve neighborhood wayfinding and create unified open space signage that includes parks, GreenThumb gardens and NYCHA properties.

5.4 Improve the structural conditions of the East River Esplanade.

5.5 Improve accessibility to existing connections to Randall’s Island, and study additional ways to improve access (footbridges, bus routes, ferry service).
“Park improvement districts” are patterned after business improvement districts, with the power to impose a real estate transfer tax to generate revenue to support specific parks, especially signature parks. The Maryland State Parks system is supported by a 0.5% real estate transactions tax, while Battery Park City parks are supported by rental revenue, and this support favorably impacts rental rates. The Chicago Loop Tax Increment Financing District was enlarged to incorporate and fund Millennium Park.

This precedent relates to Recommendation 1.2
Source: ny4p.org/research/other-reports/or-altrevenue10.pdf

While there are hundreds of Jointly Operated Playgrounds (JOPs) across the city, the vast majority of schoolyards are not used for play after school hours. In 2007, PlaNYC identified hundreds of schoolyards across the city that could be opened or renovated for after-hours use, via the Schoolyards to Playgrounds program. The NYC Department of Parks & Recreation works with the Department of Education and the nonprofit Trust for Public Land to improve many of the schoolyards through capital improvements, including play equipment, painted sports surfaces, trees, and benches.

This precedent relates to Recommendation 2.5
Source: nycgovparks.org/greening/planyc/schoolyards
Pier 107 Restoration

This project includes the partial demolition of the unsafe above-grade concrete structure atop the pier, the selective repair of existing handrails and surfaces, and the installation of easily-removable and lightweight shade structures, benches and other elements.

DPR has met with stakeholders to determine the scope of work for the project. They are now developing the design for the site.

West Harlem Piers

In 1998, WE ACT for Environmental Justice partnered with Manhattan Community Board 9 to organize the Harlem-on-the-River Project. Their goal was to develop a community-driven plan that would both increase access to the Harlem waterfront and raise interest in one of Northern Manhattan’s neglected neighborhoods. Working with over 200 residents, elected officials and representatives from the NYC Parks Department, WE ACT submitted a community vision plan for the waterfront to the NYC Economic Development Corporation in 1999. As a result, EDC scrapped its requests for proposals for commercial development at the site and developed a master plan based on the Harlem-on-the-River community plan. On May 30, 2009 the park was officially opened as the West Harlem Piers Park.

This precedent relates to Recommendation 2.3
Source: http://www.weact.org/west-harlem-waterfront-park

This precedent relates to Recommendation 2.3
Source: nycgovparks.org/planning-and-building/capital-project-tracker/project/7211

OPEN SPACE & RECREATION
COMMUNITY VISIONING WORKSHOP #2

July 1st, 2015
6:30–8:30pm
at Hunter College Silberman School of Social Work

85 Participants

Additional Youth and Family Engagement:
November 2nd, 2015
Dream Charter School
7th and 8th graders workshop
142 students
7 parents/guardians

Schools & Education / Pre-K, Daycare & Afterschool
The second Community Visioning Workshop focused on Pre-K, Daycare and Afterschool (led by Harlem RBI), and Schools & Education (led by Renaissance High School for Innovation). Participants had a chance to discuss both youth programs and the state of schools and education in the small group portion of the session. They were first asked to identify strengths and challenges for each topic. For youth programs, participants had more in depth conversations focused on the condition of facilities, leveraging the rich network of community-based organizations, what services are most important, and what programs are missing from the neighborhood. For Schools & Education, participants discussed how to create more diverse pathways to careers and college, how to align services and programs with student need, integrating technology into schools and what types of partnerships are needed in schools.

Additionally, Dream Charter School hosted a workshop with 142 of their 7th and 8th grade students and some of their parents/guardians. Participants talked more generally about what makes East Harlem special, what they think is missing from the neighborhood and brainstormed ideas about how to improve the neighborhood.

“I am concerned with the amount of violence, gangs and having more productive programs for young teens, increasing mentoring programs and finding jobs for those that come out of jail.”

*From EHNP survey respondents*
Youth—0-24 year olds—make up 33 percent of East Harlem’s population, and the opportunities provided through schools, daycare and afterschool programs in East Harlem are of fundamental importance to their lives. East Harlem, which is in DOE’s District 4 and a small portion of District 5, has many young people who need activities and engagement that extend beyond a standard K-12 education curriculum. School-based mentorship, along with career and college support, provides an opportunity for students to think about and prepare for the future. East Harlem has a number of organizations, including cultural and service groups, which help bridge school-life with these types of support structures in the broader community.

1 PS 83 © Luis Munoz Rivera
2 Harlem RBI / Dream Charter School © Paul Rivera, Courtesy Perkins Eastman / Sarah Mechling-Perkins Eastman
3 Our Lady Queen of Angels School, 229 E 112th St © Kate Milford 2016
4 Pre-school program, Courtesy of Boys & Girls Harbor
East Harlem also has a variety of long-standing programs that meet a variety of needs for pre-K, daycare and afterschool, often offered in multiple languages, and through partnerships with local cultural institutions and community organizations. These are all important to young people’s education and development. Based on research by organizations such as the Center for Public Education, children who participate in pre-K and afterschool programs are more likely to be successful, both inside and outside of school.
While there are many successful programs in East Harlem that provide valuable services, the community visioning workshop and subgroup meetings identified a number of areas that could be improved to better serve East Harlem’s youth today and in the future:

- DOE’s efforts to broaden and diversify school curriculum should be further encouraged, including expanding the focus on STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) and including more arts, music, culture, local history, special education programs, financial education and vocational training with exposure to career options.

- Specialized services and programs that schools do offer may be resource-limited or misaligned with specific local needs. Students needing this specialized support suffer from these limitations. On a broader level, students often need more support for college and career pathways. Challenges in education have a significant effect on outcomes; only 18 percent of East Harlem students graduated college-ready in 2011.

- School facilities face significant capital and capacity limitations, which can lead to overcrowding and increased competition between schools for resources. DOE and SCA continue to make important upgrades and advancements to facilities in the district, but more remains to be done. Some pre-K, daycare and afterschool program facilities need repairs, while others lack access to a diversity of spaces for different types of activities. Common needs include access to outdoor and recreational spaces, and more spaces for flexible uses like music, art and libraries.
• Outside of school, there are difficulties to ensuring that students receive the best education that they can. Disconnects between family life and school can undermine education and attainment. Not all families feel engaged in their children’s education due to factors like lack of outreach, family education attainment, and language barriers. Given those barriers, parents often miss out on information about what’s happening for their children in school, and as a consequence, time at home does not supplement what students are learning at school as much as it could.

• There is a need for center-based programming for infants and children from 0-3 years old, as well as improved coordination between childcare and pre-K programs.

• Pre-K, daycare and afterschool programs can increase their impact by more effectively partnering with existing community-based organizations. These partnerships can provide a greater breadth of programs and strengthen the neighborhood network.

• Pre-K, daycare and afterschool programs also have gaps in their services. The hours of the facilities sometimes do not reflect the needs of those who use them, and there is a need for more programs to serve families with infants and toddlers.

---

### EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF POPULATION 25 AND OVER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less than High School Degree</th>
<th>HS graduate or Associate's</th>
<th>Bachelor's</th>
<th>Graduate or Professional Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Harlem</strong></td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manhattan</strong></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NYC</strong></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2010 Census PUMA
As part of the planning process, a survey was released to all public school principals in District 4, which encompasses a majority of the public schools in East Harlem. We asked principals to prioritize specialized programs by level of importance to their students and the needs of the district. The Schools & Education subgroup used this information as the basis of Recommendation 1.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOP SERVICE NEEDS IDENTIFIED BY PRINCIPALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Social Emotional Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Academic Remediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Literacy Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Mobile Computer Labs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Funding for Social Workers, Psychologists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Professional Development for Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Restorative Justice Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  Adult Education Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  Health, Medical Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Wrap-Around Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 SAT/ACT Prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Autism Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOP CAPITAL NEEDS IDENTIFIED BY PRINCIPALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Technological Enhancements—Hardware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Playground Redevelopment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Auditorium Upgrades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Air Conditioning Retrofits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Electrical work to sustain current and future technology in the building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Bathroom Upgrades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Electrical work for A/C unit installation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  Technological Enhancements—Software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  Library Upgrades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Technological Enhancements— Broadband and Phone Lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Science Lab Upgrades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Safety Systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 24 principal surveys were collected.
OBJECTIVES & RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Align specialized programs and services with the needs of East Harlem schools, and increase funding to support them.

1.1 As part of the planning process, a survey was released to all public school principals in District 4, which encompasses a majority of the public schools in East Harlem. We asked principals to prioritize specialized programs by level of importance to their students and the needs of the district. Based on the results of this survey, resources and funding should be prioritized for the following programs in the district (in order of importance):

- Social & emotional services
- Academic remediation
- Literacy programs
- Mobile computer labs
- Funding for social workers & psychologists
- Restorative justice practices

1.2 Create more Community Schools in East Harlem school districts. Ensure that any new school built as a result of the rezoning is structured as a Community School.

2. Create more diverse pathways to careers and college.

2.1 Increase the number of schools that offer Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs in East Harlem. Work with the Office of Postsecondary Readiness (OPSR) at the Department of Education to provide adequate guidance to East Harlem schools as they seek to fulfill the necessary elements for a new CTE program, including identifying adequate classroom and shop space, resources for equipment, materials and consumable supplies, and a teaching core able to teach the necessary amount of students.

2.2 Expand programs for early exposure to college by ensuring that the Mayor's “College Access for All” initiative reaches all East Harlem schools. This program will include expanded exposure to college for middle school students. All middle schools will begin to create college visit programs for all students and expanded curriculum at middle and high school will provide students with opportunity to gain exposure and support to plan for post high school college and careers.

Related to precedent on page 51
3. Develop external partnerships and pull partnerships into schools.

3.1 Develop an East Harlem resource guide that schools can use to establish partnerships with CBOs and service providers, and that CBOs and service providers can use to find schools.

3.2 Enlist the resources of the NYC Office of Postsecondary Readiness and the Center for Youth Employment in the Office of Workforce Development to actively link interested high schools to East Harlem Workforce Development organizations and CBOs that can provide services to schools.

3.3 As the NYC Department of Youth and Community Development Summer Youth Employment Program is expanded to the school year, ensure that the 2016–2017 pilot is expanded to at least one East Harlem program.

4. Address significant capital and capacity needs facing East Harlem schools.

4.1 Increase the number of high schools that have open non-competitive admissions policies in East Harlem.

4.2 Perform electrical work to sustain current and future technology in East Harlem school buildings, such as computer labs, broadband internet, phone service, and air conditioners. Begin with an initial allocation to PS108, located along the Park Ave. viaduct. The school lacks the electrical capacity to run A/C’s in the summer, nor can they open their windows due to the noise from the viaduct.

5. Expand professional development opportunities for educators in East Harlem.

5.1 Increase funding for teacher training in East Harlem schools.
6. Improve existing pre-K, daycare and afterschool facilities, and ensure that quality spaces are created within new buildings.

6.1 Prioritize pre-K, daycare and afterschool facilities for repairs or relocation based on a comprehensive inventory and prioritization study of these facilities in East Harlem.

6.2 Encourage expanded shared-use agreements between pre-K, afterschool and daycare programs and schools, institutions of higher learning and hospitals to access facilities after hours and during off hours (computer labs, media centers, gyms, libraries, playgrounds, indoor pools, etc.). Additionally, these spaces should be affordable to rent so as to not prohibit programs from taking advantage of these joint agreements.

6.3 Improve internet and phone infrastructure in East Harlem pre-K, daycare and afterschool facilities.

7. Create more center-based programs for 0–3 year olds.

7.1 Expand Universal Pre-K initiatives to include 0–3 year old programming.

8. Ensure that programming is high quality, consistent, and well-funded.

8.1 Support the following three initiatives from the Campaign for Children policy platform: (a) Implement universal access to full-year, full-day early childhood education; (b) Ensure salary parity for equally credentialed staff in the public school system and early care system; (c) Provide a sufficient per-child rate to ensure quality standards are met.

9. Create greater awareness of existing programming.

9.1 Increase the amount of afterschool program seats in East Harlem.

9.2 Document existing available afterschool programming and share this information with the community, both online and in hard copy. Ensure this information is available in multiple languages including Cantonese, Mandarin, Spanish and French.
Community Schools

The research-based Community School model has a proven track record of improving academic achievement. Community schools are matched to an effective community-based organization and a full-time in-school Community School Coordinator. The model creates strong partnerships to provide social services, counseling and mental health support, targeted academic interventions, and to engage entire families and communities as part of a holistic approach towards elevating educational outcomes. The NYC Community Schools Initiative, an effort of Mayor de Blasio's administration to re-imagine the City’s school system, will create approximately 100 new fully-developed Community Schools over the next several years.

The City faces several challenges as it tries to create high-quality community schools across the system, including data tracking and academics. Experts agree that school staffers and outside service providers must plan and work together to pull off the community-school model, and that requires sharing data about individual students’ needs and their performance in class and afterschool programs.

This precedent relates to Recommendation 1.2
Sources: http://www1.nyc.gov/site/communityschools/index.page
http://ny.chalkbeat.org/2015/05/04/now-aiming-for-200-community-schools-city-unveils-a-plan-to-get-there/#.VmXzO7grLcs
COMMUNITY VISIONING WORKSHOP #3

NYCHA / Housing Preservation

July 29th, 2015
6:30–8:30pm

at Johnson Houses Community Center

150 Participants
The third community visioning workshop focused on Affordable Housing Preservation, led by El Barrio’s Operation Fight Back (EBOF), and NYCHA, led by the Johnson Houses Tenant Association. Participants were invited to choose which of the two topics they preferred to discuss during the small group portion of the workshop. For both topics, participants were asked to identify strengths and challenges. For Housing Preservation, participants had in-depth conversations about tenant harassment, affordability, displacement, neighborhood change and the physical conditions of housing in East Harlem. For NYCHA, participants had in-depth conversations about repairs and maintenance in public housing developments, safety, economic empowerment for public housing residents, how open space within NYCHA developments could be better utilized, concerns about development on NYCHA land and what meaningful resident engagement in decision making looks like.

Visioning Session Summary

- 61% of EHNP survey respondents say they are concerned with: **DISPLACEMENT** of poor, working class & seniors
- 63% of EHNP survey respondents say they are concerned with: **RISING COST OF HOUSING**
Public housing has been a significant part of the East Harlem community for the last 65 years. Growing out of local activism and the leadership of politicians such as Fiorello LaGuardia, who represented the area in Congress, East Harlem became the epicenter of urban reform in New York City. East River Houses was the first public housing built in East Harlem, with Jefferson Houses and Johnson Houses being built in the following years. By 1965, a quarter of all East Harlem residents lived in public housing (Samuel Zipp, p. 260).
As a result of this focus on urban renewal, East Harlem today has the greatest concentration of public housing in Manhattan, with almost 30% of East Harlem residents living in New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA)—owned properties. Public housing developments contain considerable open space where residents exercise, play and relax. They also provide many meeting places, support services and other important facilities. With such a large stake in the neighborhood, the strengths and assets of NYCHA housing have a major impact on the neighborhood. The neighborhood has an active community of tenant leaders/activists, in part because of the density of public housing, tenant associations and community-based organizing groups that focus on improving housing conditions, preserving public housing and creating community action and organization around a range of local concerns.
NYCHA’s General Fund deficit in 2015: $74M
5-year major capital needs as of 2015: $17B

Average repair times in all NYCHA developments

December 2014: 28 days*
December 2015: 47 days*
NYCHA Target: 15 days**

Open work orders on NYCHA properties city-wide

December 2014: 103,000
December 2015: 139,000

* Source: NYCHA Metrics Public Housing Charts 2016
** Source: NYCHA Minutes of Board Meeting 11/26/2014
The Neighborhood Plan addresses several challenges that NYCHA residents identified. Key challenges are described below:

- NYCHA has undergone a series of Federal and State budget cuts over the last two decades, resulting in significant disinvestment in NYCHA buildings and operations. Some East Harlem NYCHA developments have over 1,000 open work orders. Ensuring repairs in NYCHA homes are carried out efficiently and effectively is a major issue—one that NYCHA residents and tenant associations have been actively advocating and organizing around.

- Improving communication between NYCHA management and residents is critical. Specifically, NYCHA residents need to have a strong voice in how NYCHA developments are managed and how future plans are developed. NYCHA residents emphasized the importance of influencing how the NextGen NYCHA plan, which includes potential new residential construction on NYCHA developments in order to generate funds for NYCHA building repairs and to create affordable housing, is being rolled out. While some residents at the Visioning Workshop opposed development on NYCHA vacant land, others were open to the possibility, if residents were adequately informed, engaged in dialogue about condition constraints and possible solutions, and were able to vote on whether or not development on NYCHA property was the right answer for their particular development.

- As families that live in NYCHA developments change over time, it may become harder to accommodate growing households or for seniors to downsize and move into accessible units locally within the NYCHA community they know. More attention to this issue is required in order to serve local needs and maintain community ties and cohesion.

- Elected officials and NYCHA have taken significant steps to ensure that NYCHA residents are safe within their own buildings and on their developments. More can be done to encourage strong communication within the NYCHA community, new approaches to policing developed in conjunction with the New York Police Department, and addressing physical design and operational issues around lighting and building entrances.

- A critical concern is the high rates of unemployment among young people living in NYCHA. As a result, it is critical to continue to strengthen NYCHA’s workforce training initiatives and provide access to jobs that lead to careers through activities such as the Jobs Plus Program.
OBJECTIVES & RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Ensure that repairs are made on NYCHA developments efficiently and using high quality workmanship.

1.1 Create a more effective and transparent Optimal Property Management Operating Model (OPMOM) program if and when it is expanded to East Harlem developments. Improve training of managers to listen to the needs of their residents. Improve relations between managers and central NYCHA divisions. Allow for weekend and overnight repairs. Provide managers more flexibility in whom they may call for repairs.

1.2 Establish an East Harlem pilot where unions agree to a trial shift system for after hours and weekend repairs in East Harlem NYCHA developments.

1.3 Bring the NYCHA One Call program (where NYCHA repair task times and employees are digitally tracked) to all East Harlem NYCHA developments.

1.4 Return to previous system of district-wide annual budgeting sessions with NYCHA staff and resident leaders twice a year.

1.5 Conduct annual inspections of units in East Harlem NYCHA developments in order to (a) anticipate a timeline for future repair needs, and (b) conduct repairs on the spot during those inspections whenever feasible. Ensure that annual inspections are decoupled from identifying violations.

2. Improve safety and security on NYCHA developments.

2.1 Make another round of investment to enhance security at targeted East Harlem developments, modeled after the $101 million fund allocated in December 2014 by the Mayor and the District Attorney to the 15 most violent developments in NYC. With input from residents, focus the funds on infrastructure improvements (lighting, cameras and layered access), and violence reduction programming.

2.2 Reintroduce the Safety and Security Task Force in NYCHA and ensure meaningful partnerships with NYPD, DA, CBO’s, City Hall, Law Dept., resident watch supervisors and NYCHA residents.

2.3 Formalize the community policing engagement approach being undertaken at Johnson Houses across East Harlem developments. There should be a joint effort between NYPD and residents to initiate this program/process.
3. Improve NYCHA administrative transitions and their effects at the development level.

3.1 Formalize a communication protocol between former and newly appointed leadership and resident associations when there is a transition. Inform district chairs as soon as any major administrative changes at NYCHA are made. Ensure that projects and programs already allocated or underway from a prior administration are retained whenever possible.

4. Improve engagement, communication, and information provision to NYCHA residents.

4.1 Work with TA leaders to develop a resident and community engagement strategy around major decision making, including returning to the model of monthly meetings with superintendents and managers. Include District Managers in an effort to pass information to the District Manager’s supervisor at NYCHA’s main office.

4.2 Inform individual residents if their home has been identified through the NextGen Plan as (a) one of the 6,380 public housing units in scattered-site developments that could be converted to project-based Section 8, or (b) one of 8,313 public housing units in properties where the cost of rehabilitation exceeds the cost of new construction (“obsolete units”) and where these could be converted to project-based Section 8 through a combination of RAD and HUD Tenant Protection Vouchers.

5. Create mechanisms for resident involvement in decision-making around development on NYCHA land.

5.1 Allow residents in public housing developments in East Harlem to decide, after a robust and authentic community engagement process, whether or not they want to permit new residential construction on their development sites.

5.2 If infill does go forward in a development:

5.2.1 Ensure that revenues generated by development are funneled into on-site development improvements, with the development directly impacted being the first recipient of those revenues.

5.2.2 Create a governance structure (comprised of a combination of NYCHA residents, TA’s and community organizations) to advise on and monitor the spending of revenues generated by infill development.

5.2.3 Provide for NYCHA resident input into levels of affordability for development, as well as siting, design, density, unit types and parking.

5.2.4 Prioritize a percentage for homeless placement in newly created units.

5.2.5 Prioritize a percentage for senior placement in newly created units.

* Oppose: Community Voices Heard
6. Create opportunities for economic empowerment for NYCHA residents.

6.1 Provide workforce training opportunities for NYCHA residents and ensure that information about opportunities and courses are distributed in a timely manner (at least 6 months in advance).

6.2 Provide opportunities and spaces to support resident entrepreneurship (e.g. an incubator program in East Harlem NYCHA spaces; expanded links with SBS for additional business development support).

6.3 Provide job training for NYCHA residents interested in seeking employment opportunities within their own or nearby developments and give preference to NYCHA development residents when hiring.

6.4 Bring broadband and wifi access to all East Harlem NYCHA developments. One potential model is the Red Hook Houses initiative where the Open Technology Institute helped set up a wireless mesh throughout the development.

7. Improve NYCHA open spaces.

7.1 Improve and activate NYCHA open spaces where feasible (set away from the buildings) and build stronger connections to other green spaces within the neighborhood through wayfinding. Consider passive recreation (e.g. seating and benches), active recreation (playgrounds or ball courts), and urban agriculture (e.g. community gardens, Concrete Safaris). Build a stewardship plan into any improved open spaces that encourages participation and leadership of residents, particularly youth.
Participatory Budgeting

Participatory budgeting (PB) is a different way to manage public money and to engage people in government. It is a democratic process in which community members directly decide how to spend part of a public budget.

Though each experience is different, most follow a similar basic process: residents brainstorm spending ideas, volunteer budget delegates develop proposals based on these ideas, residents vote on proposals, and the government implements the top projects.

Participatory budgeting started in NYC in 2011 with four council members, including Speaker Melissa Mark-Viverito, and $4 million. It has since grown to 28 participating districts and over $35 million. There is also an initiative poised to start for PB in NYCHA, wherein residents will be able to decide directly how money targeted to NYCHA developments will be spent.

A similar process to PB could be utilized for NYCHA resident decision-making, such as around infill development and how to allocate funds raised through any infill development.

On Point Security NYCHA Cooperative

In July 2015, NYCHA and Citibank announced “Doorways to Opportunity,” a multi-partner initiative that provides public housing residents across New York with access to employment opportunities, free financial counseling and entrepreneurship training in partnership with community organizations. The collaboration included the launch of the first worker cooperative for NYCHA residents, On Point Security, where employees are also business owners. The security firm will serve and protect the expanding Hallets Point neighborhood.

Housing affordability is central to the quality of life in East Harlem, as well as essential to its history. Today, about eighty percent of all people in East Harlem live in some form of regulated housing. East Harlem, like many parts of New York City, experienced significant housing abandonment and neglect throughout the 1970s. The City intervened with affordable housing services and programs, as well as support for a not-for-profit affordable housing development and management infrastructure that would nurture this housing. In East Harlem alone, hundreds of millions of dollars were spent on gut renovations and new construction of affordable housing in response to this era of abandonment and neglect.
Today, with East Harlem losing more and more of its affordable housing stock, this important community asset is significantly threatened. Over the last several years the neighborhood has lost approximately 360 rent–regulated units per year as various rent subsidy programs in buildings reach the end of their terms. Over the next 15 years, an estimated average of 280 units per year will be lost. This situation places many long-term East Harlem residents—many of whom are already marginalized and disenfranchised—in danger of losing their homes and being forced out of their community.

While building new affordable housing is important, it is critical to maintain the large stock of affordable housing that already exists in East Harlem. Affordability of housing is very important to residents; they identified it as one of their top priorities for the future of their community. The neighborhood also has a strong network of community organizations dedicated to producing and protecting affordable housing, and benefits from a recent infusion of resources for tenant legal services from the City.
Despite these strengths, there are many challenges to preserving affordable housing in East Harlem.

- Tenant harassment often goes hand-in-hand with the loss of affordable housing. Renters of affordable units face threats of harassment and eviction or neglect when their buildings and units need maintenance. To effectively preserve affordable housing and keep tenants in their homes, the problems with maintenance and tenant harassment must be addressed.

- Access to affordable units is also uncertain. If lottery programs are not managed transparently and fairly, residents may not have real access to affordable units in their own neighborhood.

- Beyond direct threats to housing preservation, it is important that other neighborhood amenities remain affordable. True neighborhood affordability encompasses both residential costs and the costs of goods and services necessary to meet the needs of daily life.

- There are issues with buildings in East Harlem being warehoused, rather than being used productively for affordable housing, as those owners wait for shifts in development trends. East Harlem residents want to address warehousing and free up this stock for affordable housing production.

- There are issues with quality of housing in East Harlem. Housing preservation also means keeping units that are affordable up to code and in good, quality condition.

- A sizable portion of affordable units are within multi-family buildings omitted from rent-stabilization and a targeted strategy must be created to prevent losing these units to rising rents fueled by improving conditions and speculation.

- State regulation is one primary way to preserve rent-regulated housing not created as the result of zoning or tax incentives. That situation sometimes limits the ability of the city to use legislation to preserve affordable units.
# Objectives & Recommendations

## 1. Ensure appropriate enforcement of tenant rights to prevent harassment.

1. **Ensure that legal aid funding is extended following the 3-year program currently in place.**

1.1

1.2

1.3

1.4

1.5

1.6

1.7

• • Related to precedent on page 69

Clinton District. Include funding for CBOs organizing along with the designation, as CBOs are often assisting and reporting on behalf of tenants in harassment incidents.

1.8

Improve the mechanism by which rezonings are announced in a neighborhood, and by which communities can prepare themselves against harassment before a rezoning takes place, such as through required additional community forums and workshops. Include funding for CBOs and developers to host these forums and workshops.

## 2. Preserve affordability of current rent stabilized units and prevent unit destabilization.

2.1

2.1.1 *

2.1.2

2.1.3

* Oppose: Community Voices Heard

Related to precedent on page 69
2.2 Clearly define illegal Airbnb activity, and improve the enforcement of regulations by proactively utilizing data, to protect the community's existing stock of rent regulated housing from being used inappropriately.

2.3 Remove barriers to not-for-profit affordable housing developers to protect (and create) affordable housing in East Harlem, such as through: (a) Lowering HPD RFP equity requirements for not-for-profit organizations; (b) Providing a discount on water and sewage charges if the developer is providing units at income bands at or below 50% of AMI.

2.4 Create greater incentives for private sector investment in not-for-profit affordable housing development, such as by increasing tax incentives made available to investors and, in return, ensuring the provision of additional community benefit services by the developer.

2.5 Consider the location of existing affordable units (both regulated and unregulated) as a central decision factor in establishing a rezoning area boundary.

3. Better prepare East Harlem residents for affordable housing lotteries.

3.1 Provide resources that enable individuals applying for housing lotteries to pull together required documentation. Simplify documentation that is needed and expand the forms of documentation that are acceptable.

3.2 Require private developers to hire a local third party organization to conduct lottery counseling and marketing, and require proper compensation for these services.

3.3 Mandate that housing lotteries have detailed information made available at the construction site, including a nearby location of where to pick up a lottery application.

3.4 Establish a neighborhood-wide housing preparedness clinic that holds regularly scheduled sessions, so that tenants are well-prepared for lotteries.

3.5 Create a community input process for establishing criteria for housing lotteries for special populations (senior, artist, homeless, etc.), and ensure that HPD requires and properly funds selected developers to adhere to the criteria.

4. Improve Agency information-sharing to identify tenant harassment.

4.1 Create an information-sharing agreement between CBOs and HPD/DOB to share tailored data sets on affordable housing, building violations, and harassment. Use CASA/HPD information-sharing in the Bronx as a precedent.

4.2 Train East Harlem CBOs to synthesize the tailored data sets they are obtaining from HPD/DOB.

5. Preserve the use of vacant, underutilized, and distressed land/properties for affordable housing.

5.1 Pilot the Urban Homesteading Assistance Board’s recommendations for the City’s tax liens policy in...
OBJECTIVES & RECOMMENDATIONS

East Harlem. For rental housing where there is outstanding tax debt, pursue one of the following policies: (a) City enters into a payment plan with existing owner that includes rent regulation of exiting units, or (b) for owners that continue to not pay outstanding tax debt, the City initiates foreclosure and uses the existing Third Party Transfer program to transfer the buildings to an affordable housing provider. Ensure that the City continues to withhold tax debt on low income cooperatives from the lien sale in favor of working with the cooperators on a plan to stabilize those units.

5.2 Support the growth of a community land trust (CLT) in East Harlem by recommending that the City commit to transferring a small list of City-owned buildings, at-risk HDFCs, vacant/distressed properties, and under-utilized public land in East Harlem to CLT stewardship, and provide up-front financing to support the preservation of low-cost housing, in partnership with proven nonprofit affordable housing developers. Experienced, locally-based nonprofit affordable housing developers should also have representation on the CLT board. ●●

5.3 Create a city-wide unused/underutilized property registry. Pilot the registry in East Harlem. Include information about expiring stabilization programs.

5.4 Use EDC/HPD acquisition funds to purchase warehoused properties that would be conveyed to an affordable housing developer through an RFP process.

5.5 Study the establishment of a special district for fee capture on the transaction of air rights to preserve existing affordable housing.

6. Ensure housing is in a good state of repair and better enforce the requirements of the warrant of habitability.

6.1 Pilot the following specific initiatives in East Harlem:
— Have HPD initiate housing court actions on any building where over a certain number of violations exist (the typical definition for statutory distress is 4 or more B&C housing code violations per unit).
— Have HPD refuse to forgive fines when a building meets a certain threshold based on the number of violations, their severity, and how long they’ve existed.
[Exempt HDFC’s and non-profit owner groups from these initiatives.]

6.2 Endorse the Stand for Tenant Safety Coalition Legislative Platform to Reform the Department of Buildings. The Stand for Tenant Safety Coalition Legislative Platform is included in Appendix C of this report.

6.3 Require DOB and HPD to coordinate prior to any DOB vacate order; and refer tenants to legal aid in these circumstances.

6.4 Support the oversight work of the Tenant Harassment Prevention Task Force by including more representation on the task force of East Harlem community CBOs. In addition, seek that the Task Force place additional focus on and enforcement resources into the neighborhoods undergoing rezoning.

7. Maintain affordability of neighborhood amenities.

7.1 Preserve retail affordability for local small businesses by making additional loans and grants available, and through studying the potential for a retail rent stabilization program.

●● Related to precedent on page 69
**Special Clinton District**

One of the primary examples of effective anti-displacement measures in a rezoning is the Special Clinton District. Located west of the Theater District in Midtown Manhattan, the special district includes height limits, anti-demolition measures for existing housing, protections against tenant harassment, and requirements specifically related to preserving the neighborhood’s mix of incomes. In order to demolish or significantly alter a building, a landlord has to prove to the City that she or he has no history of tenant harassment. Otherwise, the landlord is required to create affordable housing. Another feature is that the Special District extends well beyond the actual area that was rezoned. This is important, because real estate speculation is not limited to rezoned lots, but occurs within a much larger area.

Despite its strengths, there is room for improvement in the approach the Special Clinton District employs. This designation, though powerful, does not assist tenants in market-rate units, since landlords can rid themselves of such tenants without harassment tactics. Landlords can still legally offer buy-outs to tenants in rent-stabilized units. The approach can also be viewed as punishing bad landlords without effectively preventing their actions from occurring in the first place. It is therefore important that additional and complementary strategies are employed to ensure that this anti-harassment policy can more fully and immediately benefit tenants.

*This precedent relates to Recommendation 1.7*
Source: Association for Neighborhood Housing and Development, Urban Justice Center

**Cooper Square Community Land Trust (CLT)**

Community Land Trusts (CLTs) are nonprofit organizations—governed by a board of CLT residents, community residents and public representatives—that provide lasting community assets and permanently affordable housing opportunities for families and communities. One of the preeminent land trusts in New York City is the Cooper Square Community Land Trust.

In response to an urban renewal project proposed by Robert Moses in 1959, the Cooper Square Committee (CSC) organized the community to create their own plan to preserve existing housing and build new low-income units. After advocating for their “Alternate Plan” for ten years, it became the first community-initiated plan New York City ever adopted. In 1991, CSC established the Cooper Square Mutual Housing Association (MHA) to manage 303 multifamily residential units on land owned by the Cooper Square Community Land Trust. The cost to join the MHA was, and still is, $250. Community Land Trusts are just one form of limited-equity housing meant to facilitate home ownership for low-income families and permanent affordability.

*This precedent relates to Recommendation 5.2*

**HOUSING PRESERVATION**
COMMUNITY VISIONING WORKSHOP #4

Small Businesses, Workforce & Economic Development

September 10th, 2015
6:30–8:30pm
at Children’s Aid Society
120 Participants
The fourth Community Visioning Workshop focused on Small Businesses, Workforce & Economic Development and was led by Union Settlement. Participants first discussed strengths and challenges of current neighborhood conditions as they relate to the Workshop topics. Participants then completed a mapping activity, identifying where people shop in the neighborhood at different times of day, where development should occur and where people feel safe and unsafe. Participants also had in-depth conversations and brainstormed solutions around small business needs, workforce development and how to create access to high-quality jobs for East Harlem residents.

**Visioning Session Summary**

What type of workforce development would you like to see in East Harlem?

- **81%** want to see growth of LOCAL JOBS with LIVING WAGES
- **69%** want to see CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS
- **40%** think JOBS and TRAINING are MISSING
- **61%** want to see GROWTH of UNION JOBS
While primarily a residential neighborhood, East Harlem has a large number of businesses and nonprofits that together employ over 40,000 individuals. The neighborhood’s many employers reinforce the cultural, ethnic and economic diversity in the neighborhood. The small businesses offer goods and services that residents need at prices they can afford, and there are major hospitals and museums, as well as many smaller nonprofits, that provide a broad range of employment opportunities.

East Harlem has an active workforce with many more who are seeking work. Many people work outside East Harlem due to its transportation links, but there are also opportunities for greater employment with local organizations and possibilities for capturing East Harlem’s entrepreneurial energy through innovative incubators such as La Marqueta.
Workforce & Economic Development
There are 40,000 local jobs in East Harlem.

The community visioning session identified some of the key challenges.

- Some of the commercial corridors have sections that lack continuous, vibrant activity. There is an opportunity to change land use and zoning to address these areas.

- Despite being a diverse and historically significant neighborhood, East Harlem has not capitalized on NYC’s strong market for tourism, which could strengthen the economy of the neighborhood. East Harlem’s many restaurants and cultural institutions, through a collaborative approach, could create local jobs.

- Workforce development programs that aim to create a competitive workforce have the potential to do more. Many community members are unaware of the resources that could help them find the type of job they want, and there may be additional opportunities to leverage relationships with employers throughout the neighborhood.

- Potential new development should bring construction jobs and permanent jobs for local residents, along with increased commercial activity. When new development and new commercial activity does come to the neighborhood, local residents often miss the opportunity to benefit, and the recommendations aim to help capture these opportunities.

- Rising commercial rents are a major challenge, and small businesses are also threatened by big box stores that can reduce their base of local shoppers. Support programs for small businesses exist but could be strengthened.

- There is a need for good jobs to come into the neighborhood and the ability to connect local residents to jobs that pay living wages, have good benefits and offer opportunities for career advancement.
OBJECTIVES & RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Increase quality employment opportunities for East Harlem residents.

1.1 Where possible require developers to set local hiring targets for East Harlem residents, and giving East Harlem residents the first opportunity to interview for positions. The Community Board, Borough President and Council Members can advocate for these actions on projects they review.

1.2 Create a better mechanism for overseeing developer performance on their agreements to hire East Harlem workers (e.g. requiring developers seeking public approval to provide quarterly reports on local hiring to the Community Board, Borough President and Council Members, as well as to the local workforce development provider network, which can track and post those reports). Add community and union oversight to assure quality hires. Make quarterly reports public.

1.3 Encourage local employers, including building management companies, to hire local residents. This can be accomplished by providing funding to a local workforce development provider network that facilitates local hiring by identifying, screening and referring local residents to employers seeking to hire locally, as well as to developers looking to build in East Harlem. Ensure local workforce development providers have good track records for connecting people to jobs and ensuring that they are quality jobs.

1.4 Work with labor unions to build pre-apprenticeship programs for East Harlem residents and workforce development partnerships with pathways to union jobs.

2. Enhance the skills of East Harlem residents, which will allow them to succeed in the workforce.

2.1 Provide more funding to workforce development programs in East Harlem, with a focus on career training, not just entry-level jobs, and encourage connections to actual jobs being created.

2.2 For all public projects (with a threshold to be established for when this requirement is triggered), other than affordable housing projects already benefiting from subsidies, there should be a 1% set-aside for local job training programs, modeled on the “Percent for Art” requirement.

2.3 SBS should open a satellite Workforce 1 center in East Harlem and should build connections between that center and major East Harlem employers. Workforce 1 should also coordinate with local community-based organizations and trades unions to ensure good connections to employers. Secure additional funding for programming and staffing at this center in order to provide career training and job placement services specifically for youth in East Harlem aged 16-24.

2.4 Work to ensure that HRA’s job readiness and placement efforts are coordinated and integrated with other job training programs in East Harlem.

2.5 Increase funding for programs that help local residents learn English, obtain their high school equivalency degree, become citizens or prepare for college.

Related to precedent on page 79
3. Protect and enhance the viability East Harlem’s small businesses.

3.1 Amend existing zoning to permit additional commercial spaces on the second floor, provided that such commercial spaces do not displace rent controlled or rent stabilized apartments.

3.2 Amend existing zoning to limit the width of certain commercial spaces, which will preclude “big box” stores from moving into those locations in order to encourage small businesses.

3.3 Provide multi-year funding to establish and sustain merchants’ associations on East 116th Street and East 125th Street, with the ultimate goal of establishing a Business Improvement District (BID) if found to be warranted.

3.4 Increase funding for programs that provide assistance to local small businesses in consultation with the small businesses themselves.

3.5 Have SBS conduct a Commercial District Needs Assessment (CDNA) along the main commercial corridors in East Harlem.

4. Increase overall economic activity in East Harlem.

4.1 Utilize zoning to encourage further development to bring in more businesses and business activity. Potential locations for development include East 125th Street, the NYCHA “superblocks” along the existing commercial corridors, Park Avenue, Madison Avenue and the Harlem River waterfront. Ensure that any waterfront development retains public access to the waterfront.

4.2 Bring NYCHA and NYCHA residents to the table and make sure that NYCHA’s “NextGen” plans proceed only in a manner that is consistent with the priorities of the East Harlem Neighborhood Plan.

4.3 Create incentives such as the Department of Finance’s Relocation and Employment Assistance (REAP) program and use organizations such as a merchant’s association or BID if warranted to attract new types of businesses to open in East Harlem (e.g., hotels, movie theaters, cultural venues, bowling alley, business clothing stores).

4.4 Provide funding for a local group to encourage local businesses, non-profits and other organizations to purchase goods and services within East Harlem.

4.5 Take steps to enhance the safety and cleanliness of the commercial corridors by including better lighting, more waste receptacles and more frequent sanitation pick-ups.

5. Attract more tourists and other visitors to East Harlem.

5.1 Add wayfinding signs to better assist visitors.

Additional tourism-related recommendation can be found in the Arts & Culture subgroup recommendations.
La Marqueta

Located under the elevated Metro North railway tracks between 111th - 119th Streets of Park Avenue, “La Marqueta” has served as a resource of iconic cultural heritage to the East Harlem community since its formation as an innovative public marketplace in 1936. In its heyday of the 1950s - 60s, over 500 vendors operated out of the facility, providing a vital social, health, cultural and economic destination for Latinos and New Yorkers across the city. The market is currently home to several small vendors and the small business incubator Hot Bread Kitchen.

Efforts to recapture the community benefit of the market include La Marqueta Retoña initiative, sponsored by the Speaker's office, bringing new life to the market by sponsoring regular cultural and culinary programming, live music events, weekly open air food markets, poetry nights and pop-up artisan vendors that have attracted hundreds of local residents and visitors each week. Recognizing this 21st century market must now have multiple policy goals, NYCEDC has partnered with Placeful, a local non-profit organization that fosters investment in community space through socially responsible partnerships, to redevelop the market and provide a greater variety of community benefits. In addition to retail sales of produce, prepared and unprepared foods and other goods, we anticipate additional local programs in health & nutrition, arts & culture, business incubation, and job training.
Since 2012, the Special Upper West Side Enhanced Commercial District along the neighborhood’s major avenues has preserved the diverse, small business character in the Upper West Side. Extending along portions of Amsterdam, Columbus and Broadway Avenues, the District limits the size of storefronts to ensure that the blocks have a diversity of retail frontages and requires transparent storefronts to enliven views from the street. Together, these special district regulations protect the character of the Upper West Side’s commercial corridors, stop the proliferation of large bank facades and protect the diverse retail frontages along the area’s shopping corridors.

This precedent relates to Recommendation 3.2


The East Harlem Talent Network was created through a collaboration between the East Harlem Community Alliance, STRIVE, the Upper Manhattan Empowerment Zone and Mt. Sinai Hospital, to build relationships with local employers and encourage local hiring. The Talent Network identifies local employers that understand the value of investing in their business by investing in the community they serve. The Talent Network also works to identify local quality, skilled candidates to screen and refer to local employers.

This precedent relates to Recommendation 2.1, 2.3
COMMUNITY VISIONING WORKSHOP #5

October 22nd, 2015
6:30–8:30pm
at Dream Charter School
175 Participants

Additional Engagement:

- Zoning and Density Trade-Offs Workshop
  April 7th
  at Community Voices Heard
  31 Participants

- Zoning and Density Trade-Offs Workshop
  October 20th
  at Lincoln Houses
  15 participants

- Zoning Education Forum
  September 30th
  at P.S. 133 Fred R. Moore School
  30 Participants

- Zoning and Density Trade-Offs Workshop
  October 22nd
  at Johnson Houses
  10 participants
The fifth community visioning workshop was focused on Affordable Housing Development, led by Lott Community Development Corporation, and Zoning & Land Use, led by CIVITAS. Attendees participated in four different activities that facilitated in-depth topic discussions. The first mapping activity was used to identify places that participants liked and disliked within East Harlem. In addition, the conversation asked the group to highlight concerns and provide suggestions related to specific areas in the neighborhood. The second activity allowed participants to grapple with the trade-offs involved in the development of affordable housing on privately owned land and allowed participants to make decisions around the levels of housing affordability. The third activity was a survey of participant preferences for development on different types of publicly owned land. The fourth activity was a survey of priorities for community facilities that could come with both public and private development.

Additionally, four zoning education sessions were held, one led by the Manhattan Borough President’s Office, and three led by the Center for Urban Pedagogy. These sessions were designed to be a primer for the Community Visioning Workshop to help inform participants in greater detail about zoning—how it works and what the trade-offs of increased density are.

54% of Workshop Survey respondents said they’d take more buildings if those apartments are AFFORDABLE for LOCAL RESIDENTS.

A copy of all workshop activities and responses, including this survey, can be found in the Appendix.
Affordable Housing Development

For the last 70 years, East Harlem has been a focal point for affordable housing in New York City. This housing stock, which includes public housing and other subsidized homes, needs to be protected. The preservation of existing affordable housing is a critical strategy, but there will continue to be a substantial number of homes that will fall out of subsidy programs every year. In addition, the need for affordable housing in East Harlem continues to grow. Participants in the community visioning workshop placed a tremendous emphasis on the creation of more affordable homes so long as the infrastructure and community resources are in place to manage the additional population and only if these homes are truly affordable to neighborhood residents.

1 Draper Hall under construction, Courtesy of Dattner Architects
2 Harlem RBI—Dream Charter © Sarah Mechling, Courtesy of Perkins Eastman.
3 El Barrio’s Artspace PS109, containing 89 units of affordable live/work housing for artists © Kate Milford 2016
While East Harlem residents expressed wariness of the market pressures in the neighborhood, the area’s current market strength can be leveraged to generate more affordable housing development. In addition, there are several public sites that could be transformed into new affordable housing with neighborhood amenities.

East Harlem, due to its history of affordable housing provision, also has considerable institutional capacity within the neighborhood to advocate for and pursue deeper affordability through innovative housing models. The East Harlem Neighborhood Plan seeks to utilize this capacity for both preservation and creation of affordable housing.

Without a rezoning that mandates that affordable units be built along with the added density, East Harlem will continue to see a loss of ~282 subsidized units/year due to expiring affordability programs.

Source: CB11 analysis, using RPA affordable housing database, John Krauss rent stabilization data, and NYC PLUTO database.
WAYS TO PRODUCE AFFORDABLE HOUSING

1. Rezoning of private sites
2. Developing publicly-owned sites with current or changed zoning
3. Developing on NYCHA land

WHAT IS MANDATORY INCLUSIONARY HOUSING (MIH)?

Mayor de Blasio’s administration has proposed an MIH program with two options that would be determined when a neighborhood goes through a rezoning. It would require private developers to provide affordable housing with any market rate development in a rezoned area.

WHAT IS AMI?

Housing affordability levels are based on a benchmark AREA MEDIAN INCOME (AMI). NYC AMI includes the five boroughs and some neighboring counties.

AMI is $77,700 for a family of three.

EAST HARLEM AMI LEVELS


Proposed MIH Option 1
Less total affordable units but deeper affordability

Proposed MIH Option 2
More total affordable units but with less affordability

Source: US Census ACS 2007-2011 5 year estimates. Based on census tracts approximately within boundaries of CB11. Income limits are for a three-person household (HUD 2015)
Despite these considerable neighborhood assets, the community also faces some challenges around the development of affordable housing:

- While the neighborhood has a significant amount of existing affordable housing, there is still an important unmet need for more affordable places to live.

- On top of this, the neighborhood loses existing affordable housing every year as units fall out of rent stabilization and subsidy programs. East Harlem is expected to lose 282 affordable units on average per year between 2014 and 2029.

- Just as important as the actual number of affordable units is the level of affordability at which they are set. Affordable housing programs set the price of the unit based on New York City’s area median income (AMI), which is not reflective of East Harlem’s median household income. Affordable units that are to be built according to the City’s Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH) plan are not necessarily affordable to many existing residents.

- East Harlem is already becoming less affordable as the development of market rate units pushes up prices in the neighborhood. These new developments are typically not affordable to East Harlem’s residents.

- The demand to establish higher rents can lead to the harassment of existing tenants and real estate market speculation, such as warehousing of vacant properties.

- Development and increased density without concurrent investment in infrastructure and neighborhood services can lead to overburdening when existing infrastructure is not able to handle the increased demands.

In addition to affordable housing loss, our process looked at Total Severe Housing Need in East Harlem.

We defined this need as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entering Homeless Shelters</td>
<td>626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households Severely Burdened by Housing Costs (Rent + Own)</td>
<td>10,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 of Severely Overcrowded Households (&gt;1.5 persons per room)</td>
<td>758</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= **12,000 Households**

OBJECTIVES & RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Increase the amount of affordable housing with deep and varied levels of affordability in any new development.

1.1 The community’s goal is to build off of the affordability that will be required on private rezoned sites under the MIH policy (proposed at 25% affordable housing at 60% AMI, or 30% at 80% AMI) with a recommendation of 100% affordable on public sites. These efforts combined will enable at least 50% of the new housing on private rezoned and public sites to be affordable at a variety of low- and moderate-income levels.

1.2 For the 50% affordable housing, establish targets of low and moderate AMI bands that relate to the neighborhood medians and establish a target that at least 20% of the affordable units are at or below 30% of AMI.

1.3 Ensure the enforcement of regulatory agreements that outline affordability requirements. Empower tenants and CBOs to be involved in such enforcement. Work with HPD to make regulatory agreements more accessible to the public, and provide annual reports to Community Board 11, City Council and the Manhattan Borough President’s Office.

1.4 Assure permanent affordability in the units created through Mandatory Inclusionary Housing and developed on public sites.

1.5 Aim to achieve total new development of affordable housing that exceeds the estimated current loss of rent regulated housing (which projects forward to an approximate loss of 280 units per year for the next 15 years) and addresses a significant portion of the severe housing need documented in East Harlem, which includes the percent of the local population that is homeless, overcrowded, and severely rent burdened.

1.6 Establish a special district along portions of 3rd, 2nd and 1st Avenues that allows for a voluntary density bonus on top of (and in conjunction with) a potential rezoning with Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH) so that greater levels of affordability can be reached. [This recommendation assumes a potential rezoning with MIH to R9 and a “bump-up” for the voluntary density bonus.] Consider application of this special district concept to portions of Madison, Lexington and Park Avenues. Additional study is needed to establish how much additional affordability can be built in and retain financial viability.

1.7 Study the establishment of a linkage between a potential voluntary density bonus and a policy on construction workforce that requires living wages, local hiring and certified apprenticeship programs.

1.8 Ensure that construction jobs for affordable housing production pay living wages, advance local hiring, and provide certified apprenticeship programs so that East Harlem residents can be ensured well-paying and safe work environments, with long-term career opportunities.

2. Expand affordable housing tools and resources to increase affordable housing in new development.

• Related to case study on pages 88-89
2.1 Exclusively public sites that can be redeveloped, with or without a change in zoning designation, should be built with 100% affordable units, and these units should be required to reach deep and varied levels of affordability up to 130% of AMI, and to establish a target of at least 20% of the units at or below 30% of AMI.

2.2 If residents decide that new infill development is appropriate for their NYCHA development, create additional affordable housing on available NYCHA sites in conjunction with active engagement with the development residents. (This recommendation relates to NYCHA Recommendation 5.1.)

2.3 Explore the potential for adaptive re-use, co-location and development of underutilized buildings for affordable housing and other community uses.

2.4 HPD should provide more affordable artist live/work spaces through its programs in East Harlem. Locate these spaces in appropriate areas as part of potential rezoning, such as along the Park Avenue viaduct (allow artist live/work housing to use commercial FAR should the area be rezoned).

2.5 Encourage HPD to work with the community to identify sites and funding to create more affordable housing for seniors.

2.6 Seek to create more supportive housing, and ensure that it is built in conjunction with experienced non-profit supportive housing providers for those groups most in need in the district, as identified by the Community Board.

2.7 Increase the amount of City subsidy available to reach deep levels of affordability.

2.8 For Requests for Proposals for public sites:
   2.8.1 Require maximum and deep affordability.
   2.8.2 Require permanent affordability strategies.
   2.8.3 Require that developments meet community-defined program and design requirements, including those for open space and community facilities, and housing for the homeless.

2.8.4 Encourage that HPD require involvement of locally-based non-profit developers/owners.

2.8.5 Explore the potential for the conveyance of vacant and underutilized City-owned land to a community land trust.

2.9 Encourage private developers to work with the East Harlem community (non-profit developers, community-based organizations, service providers, the Community Board, et al) to ensure that all new developments meet community needs and priorities.

2.10 Make community preference in affordable housing a requirement of development in East Harlem.

3. Implement tools to address displacement of residents and business owners.

3.1 Adopt anti-harassment measures to discourage the displacement East Harlem residents.

3.2 Discourage speculation and encourage community-centric development with an anti-warehousing policy, and an investor/purchaser transfer tax.

3.3 Encourage the leasing of ground-floor commercial space to local small business owners through coordinated outreach to landowners and landlords. Ensure that DCP, HPD, EDC and SBS coordinate efforts and resources to strengthen strategies for small business creation and retention along commercial corridors in East Harlem.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT
PUBLIC SITE CASE STUDY

LAND OWNERSHIP IN EAST HARLEM

CITY owned: 21%
NYCHA owned: 23%
Privately owned: 56%

THE NEED FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN EAST HARLEM IS LARGE

No single tool can produce all of the affordable housing that is needed in East Harlem. Many tools must work together, they include:

— Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH)
— Density Bonus
— Subsidy
— Publicly-Owned Sites
— NYCHA Infill (should residents approve)

PUBLICLY-OWNED SITES

Building on publicly-owned sites can dramatically reduce the cost of developing affordable housing by reducing or eliminating the cost of land. The resulting reduced total development cost makes it possible for the project to include a greater total amount of affordable units and deeper levels of affordability.

— 100% affordable
— City can better control mix of uses, total affordable units and affordability levels

SANITATION PARKING LOT
123RD STREET + LEXINGTON AVE.

This site is owned by the City of New York and is currently being used by the Department of Sanitation to park their trucks. This site is being used as a case study to illustrate what might be possible on City-owned sites. There are no currently known development plans for this particular site. The diagrams are meant to represent possible building configurations on the site—they are not meant to reflect any particular design.
SCENARIO MASSINGS FOR SANITATION PARKING LOT

Option A:
R7-2 | As-of-right

# of Apartments (100% affordable): 85
Commercial SF: 0
Community Facility SF: 7,750
Open Space SF: 4,040

Option B:
R8A MIH | Max. Affordable Housing

# of Apartments (100% affordable): 195
Commercial SF: 4,500
Community Facility SF: 0
Open Space SF: 7,300

Option C:
R8 MIH | Max. Community Facility

# of Apartments (100% affordable): 140
Commercial SF: 5,500
Community Facility SF: 54,100
Open Space SF: 6,400

Option D:
R8 MIH | Max. Open Space

# of Apartments (100% affordable): 189
Commercial SF: 5,500
Community Facility SF: 5,500
Open Space SF: 15,400
Zoning & Land Use

Zoning sets requirements for every piece of land in the city. Land is divided into different types or “zones.” Each zone has a specific set of rules that dictate how that land can be used and how much can be built upon it. A change in zoning can be done by the City to encourage new development, to alter the land uses as demand shifts, or to protect the character of areas. Currently, the City has proposed zoning that will require affordable housing where greater density is being encouraged, with specific rules detailing how much and where affordable
housing is built. This proposal, Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH), would set requirements of 25% or 30% of the total new homes be affordable in areas that are being rezoned. Without the introduction of this policy, developers have no obligation to provide new affordable units. As the previous section on Affordable Housing has indicated, there is ongoing development in East Harlem with an increasing loss in recent years of affordable homes.

East Harlem is rich in places that residents value—community gardens, historic buildings, walkable streets and other neighborhood landmarks. In addition, East Harlem has a considerable amount of affordable housing, with almost 80% of the homes in East Harlem being rent-regulated in some fashion.
2003
- Change in zoning along major corridors from R7-2 to R8A (to limit building height to 80 feet)
- Change in zoning along midblocks from R7-2 to R7A / R7B (FAR from 3.44 to 4.0 or 3.0)
- No affordable housing requirement

2008
- Creation of higher density commercial districts
- Encourage higher density affordable housing with optional bonuses
The community visioning workshop collected clear feedback that residents would accept increased density in appropriate locations in exchange for real, varied and deep affordable housing. As the neighborhood evolves, residents also want to ensure they will continue to have the services and amenities they value. The workshop made clear that increased density should be encouraged in areas where it is most appropriate, such as wide corridors and near subway stations.

The 2013 Park Avenue rezoning study conducted by CB11 and CIVITAS illustrates how zoning can help address a broad set of neighborhood challenges. The study proposed using zoning to activate the area along the viaduct, transforming it into a mixed-use corridor with new activity. The plan also proposed an early precursor to the current MIH program by requiring new development in Inclusionary Housing districts to include affordable housing at varied levels of affordability. The proposal received widespread support, and the community felt that this proposal needed to be re-engaged.

Below are the challenges that have been cited in relation to considering rezoning in East Harlem:

- While zoning must allow for new affordable housing development, this increased density presents a potential threat to the existing neighborhood. Zoning should only allow density in places that are able to accommodate it and should protect the neighborhood character and specific important structures in other areas.

- Neighborhood change, new development and added density can put a strain on existing infrastructure, exacerbating East Harlem’s need for more amenities and services—schools, community facilities, transportation and others—to serve a growing population.

- Zoning must allow for new development that is affordable to residents and balances any market rate development with new affordable homes. Otherwise, it could reinforce displacement.
TARGETED REZONING AREAS

- Potential rezoning areas were identified in order to test their capacity to produce housing units over a 15-year period. Areas selected included portions of the wide commercial corridors, including a section of Park Avenue proposed by CB11 for rezoning in 2013, and sizeable publicly-owned lots.

- The areas selected largely avoided lots with existing residential units. Underbuilt lots were considered where built FAR divided by the zoned maximum FAR equaled 50% or less. Low-use lots such as parking lots, vacant lots and underbuilt or obsolete non-residential lots were considered. Playgrounds and urban gardens were avoided.

A) Preservation zoning districts
- Contextual zoning (R7A or lower contextual districts) to preserve areas with unique local characters such as building heights, facades and ground floor activities

B) Portions of 1st, 2nd and 3rd Avenues from R8A to R9A or R9
- Rezoning on widest commercial avenues
- Minimum upzoning to trigger Mandatory Inclusionary Housing
- Potential for 350 total units per year

C) Park Avenue between 115th and 132nd Streets
- Make better use of space next to the viaduct
- Mixed use zoning to create commercial and/or light industrial space, and to trigger Mandatory Inclusionary Housing
- Potential for 80 total units per year
D) Portions of Lexington and Madison Avenues and 116th Street
- The minimum upzoning needed to trigger Mandatory Inclusionary Housing is from R7-2 to R7D for Lexington Ave. & 116th St. and require ground floor commercial uses
- Upzoning from R7-2 to R8 or R8A on Madison Ave
- Potential for 100 total units per year

E) Transit-oriented zoning districts
- Create high density and mixed uses around the MetroNorth Station, 125th St Lexington Ave line stop and the future 2nd Avenue Subway Terminus
- Rezone Park Ave. from 122nd to 124th Street, and 126th to 128th Street to C6-2 or C6-3D, which are commercial equivalents of R8 and R9D.
- Rezone Lexington Ave. from 122nd Street to 124th Street to R7D or C4-4D (R8A equivalent).
- Rezone 3rd Ave. from 122nd to 124th Street, excluding Taino Towers area, to C6-3 or C6-4, the residential equivalents of which are R9 and R10.
- Rezone west side of 2nd Ave. from 123rd to 124th Street, to a combination of C6-3 and C6-4.

F1) Public Sites (R8A/R10)
1) Urban Assembly School
2) 111th–112th Block
3) Sanitation Parking Lot
4) District 11 Sanitation Lot
5) Police Station Parking Lot
6) HRA East Harlem Multi-Service Ctr
- The public sites have not yet been approved for redevelopment
- Proposed rezoning, such as R8A on narrower streets and R10 on wider streets with 100% affordable units

F2) Pipeline Sites
7) Lexington Gardens
8) East River Plaza
9) Coop Tech
10) Draper Hall Ph 1 & 2
11) La Promesa Ph 1
12) MEC – East 125 St Development
13) East 126 Street Bus Depot
- Pipeline sites are areas that the City is also working toward developing, with agreed plans for the sites.
There is a potential for 400 total units per year on public and pipeline sites.
The community’s goal is to build off of the affordability that will be required on private rezoned sites under the pending MIH policy currently before the City Council (presently requiring unit set asides at 25% affordable housing at 60% AMI, or 30% at 80% AMI.) Per the community response, the Plan also recommends 100% of units to be affordable on public sites.

These efforts combined will enable at least 50% of the new housing on private rezoned and public sites to be affordable at a variety of low- and moderate-income levels.

If approved by NYCHA residents of that development, infill on NYCHA properties would contribute to the 50% affordability target.
PARK AVENUE BETWEEN 115TH AND 132ND STREETS

Make better use of space next to the viaduct by upzoning to include light industrial and commercial spaces on at least the first three stories and to trigger Mandatory Inclusionary Housing for the residential stories above. This would allow uses that are less likely to be disturbed by the viaduct noise, like commercial food preparation facilities, and artist live/work spaces.

PORTIONS OF 1ST, 2ND AND 3RD AVENUES NORTH OF 115TH ST AND SOUTH OF 112TH ST

On 1st, 2nd, and 3rd Avenues, the widest commercial avenues in the neighborhood, the recommendation is to rezone to the minimum upzoning required to trigger MIH, which is from R8A to R9A or R9.

PORTIONS OF LEXINGTON AVE AND 116TH ST

On portions of Lexington Ave. and portions of 116th St., the recommendation is to rezone to the minimum upzoning required to trigger MIH, which is from R7-2 to R7D. This designation would require ground floor commercial uses.

PORTIONS OF MADISON AVE

On portions of Madison Ave., the recommendation is to upzone from R7-2 to R8 or R8A.
OBJECTIVES & RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Preserve important East Harlem buildings and reinforce neighborhood character.

1.1 Preserve areas with unique East Harlem neighborhood characteristics through rezoning, such as 116th Street east of 3rd Avenue, Madison Avenue between 126th and 132nd Streets, and midblock areas. The subgroup discussed indicators of significant neighborhood character, such as particular façade treatments/colors, architectural style, design of midblocks including building entries, neighborhood gardens, ground floor activities and storefronts, skyline, and locations where important historical and cultural events took place.

1.2 Protect buildings and sites with significant local and cultural heritage by considering landmark status or ensuring they are rezoned into preservation districts. This will depend on context and neighboring zoning. Buildings and sites for consideration for local heritage or landmark status include the Cosmo Theater (116th Street), the building featuring the Zapatista mural (117th Street), the building featuring De La Vega’s homage to Picasso (111th Street), the Casa Latina Music Store (116th Street), the 1st Spanish Methodist Church (111th Street), La Marqueta, Harlem’s Colonial African Burial Ground Sacred Site, Public Housing, and others.

1.3 Study the creation of historic districts in areas such as Pleasant Avenue, 116th Street east of Park Ave., the corner of 106th and Lexington Avenue, and Pleasant Village (along E. 119th Street between 1st Avenue and Pleasant Avenue).

1.4 Redefine the Transit Land Use Special District, which was mapped in 1973 along 2nd Avenue and has remained unchanged since. In addition to adjusting their current locations to reflect the current Second Avenue Subway station plan, the Special District itself should be rewritten to include the following:

1.4.1 Urban design guidelines to ensure that sidewalks are unobstructed for larger pedestrian flows and that built form enhances local character.

1.4.2 Incentivize connectivity to help manage future pedestrian flows. Encourage new buildings to connect directly to new subway stations where possible, promote seamless underground connections between existing and new subway lines and between subways and MNR lines, and address connections to express buses.

1.4.3 Evaluate the potential for creating a mechanism around the 125th Street intermodal hub that would capture value from significantly greater density to be used for improvements to the historic station, station plaza, and public space, street, and under-viaduct areas within close proximity to the hub.

1.4.4 Incentivize opportunities for mixed-use development along 125th Street that incorporates requisite 2nd Avenue Subway infrastructure, including vent shafts, entrances, exits, passageways, etc.
2. Allow for increased density in select places to create more affordable housing and spaces for jobs.

(See pages 92–93 for more details)

2.1 A rezoning to create more affordable housing should consider the widest avenues (3rd, 2nd and 1st Avenues) for increased density. Potential zoning districts discussed through this planning process include the commercial equivalents to R9 or R9A to trigger MIH.

2.2 A rezoning to create more commercial and/or light industrial space should consider Park Avenue between 115th and 132nd Streets due to the street’s proximity to the rail viaduct. One potential zoning designation discussed through this planning process is an option that considers a 7.2 FAR non-residential district paired with an R7-2 MIH district of 4.6 FAR, which would leave 2.6 FAR for non-residential uses at the base of a building.* Another option discussed considers an M1-6 district (10 FAR) with an R8 MIH district (7.2 FAR), which keeps total FAR limited to 10 and would keep the difference between non-residential and residential FAR below 3 FAR.

(This option acknowledges that the 7.2 FAR non-residential zone does not currently exist and either a new district or the language of the special district would need to be designed to accommodate this pairing of FARs.)

2.3 A rezoning should consider higher density commercial districts around the Metro-North Station, the 125th Street Lexington Avenue line express stop, and future 2nd Avenue subway terminus in the area outside the 125th Street Special district. Specifically:

2.3.1 Park Avenue from 122nd Street to 124th Street, and from 126th Street to 128th Street, currently zoned as C8-3, M1-2, M1-4, and R7-2. The potential zoning districts discussed during the planning process were C6-2 and C6-3D, which are commercial equivalents of R8 and R9D.

2.3.2 Lexington from 122nd Street to 124th Street. R7D was discussed for most of the length of Lexington Ave. south of 124th Street, but C4-4D (R8A equivalent) was discussed as an option for the portion from 122nd Street to 124th Street.

2.3.3 * 3rd Avenue from 122nd Street to 124th Street, excluding the Taino Towers portion of that area, is currently zoned as C4-4, but considering transit access and the existing large-scale Taino Towers, this area was discussed for C6-3 or C6-4, the residential equivalents of which are R9 and R10.

2.3.4 * 2nd Avenue from 123rd Street to 124th Street, west side of street, currently zoned as R7-2 was also discussed for C6-3 and C6-4 due to its proximity to Taino Towers and transportation access.

2.4 * A rezoning should target the west side of Madison Ave. between 107th and 110th Streets, 102nd and 106th Streets and 96th to 98th Streets. Much of lower Madison Avenue is currently lined with large institutional or height factor buildings. The targeted areas are generally the portions of lower Madison with less intense uses, which can accommodate more intense uses than the current R7-2 allows. The zoning districts discussed through this planning process were R8 or R8A. This portion of Madison Ave. is about 80 feet wide and large enough to accommodate 7.2 FAR.

* Oppose: Community Voices Heard
2.5 A rezoning should target Lexington Ave. between 115th and 124th Streets, and 98th and 112th Streets. At only 75 feet wide, Lexington is not an appropriate location for much more intense uses than the current R7-2 zoning allows. With an intact and vibrant commercial character along portions of the Avenue, an R7D mapped with a commercial overlay would require commercial uses in the base of new buildings, reinforcing Lexington Avenue’s character. Along with R7D, other zoning districts discussed through this planning process were R8 or R8A. R7D allows an FAR of 5.6. R8 or R8A allow FARs of 7.2.

2.6 A rezoning should target the midblocks of 116th Street from Madison to 3rd Avenue, which at 100 feet wide is an appropriate place for increased density. Currently zoned R7-2 and R7A with commercial overlays, an upzoning that would better suit its current character is an R7D district with a commercial overlay that would require ground floor commercial uses and allow buildings at 5.6 FAR. This district should protect the character of the street with a height limit, and ensure active ground-floor uses in keeping with the existing character of the street. The eastern portion of 116th was remapped in 2003 as a preservation district (R7B), and no changes should be considered in that area.

2.7 Further study is required for the potential for zoning alterations along lower Park Avenue south of 112th Street, where the stone viaduct presents a unique urban design condition.

2.8 Further study is required for the potential for a contextual zoning designation along 5th Avenue north of 111th Street to 142nd Street, with consideration for both sides of the avenue.

2.9 Existing height factor housing developments have been excluded from most zoning recommendations. This exclusion is not an endorsement of the existing “tower-in-the-park” zoning. As with lower Park Avenue and upper Fifth Avenue, further study is required for these areas.

2.10 Other city-owned public sites that are potential redevelopment sites for affordable housing should be developed at higher densities, such as R8A on narrower streets and R10 on wider streets.

2.11 Any potential rezoning should eliminate minimum parking requirements.

3. Improve and create more services and amenities for the East Harlem community through any new development on private and public sites.

3.1 Create an Enhanced Commercial District on portions of 3rd, 2nd and 1st Avenues which would require: that the first 30 feet of ground floor frontage in new development be for commercial or community uses; that at least 50% of the ground floor frontage be occupied by retail uses; that residential lobbies be limited to 25-foot frontage widths; that curb cuts would be limited to side streets to maintain safe and vibrant sidewalks; and that 50% of the frontage on the avenues be transparent.

3.2 Require the Department of City Planning, the Department of Education, ACS and School Construction Authority to adequately project the impacts of new development on school seat requirements and establish opportunities for new early childhood education and school facilities to be built in the base of new developments. Approaches for making student projections should include detailed analysis, such as the clear definition of school building capacities based on current surveys. Require coordination around and appropriate timing of development of school facilities as units are developed.
3.3  
Leverage any potential rezoning to replace aging and inadequate school facilities with new facilities developed at the base of new developments and the redevelopment of the aging school sites for new affordable housing and financing of the new school facility.

3.4  
Require that community facilities, including early childhood education, afterschool, community space, artist space, and workforce training centers do not count towards FAR in order to encourage the creation of these spaces, such as through a special district mechanism.
   — Institute a height cap, FAR limit or discretionary permit requirement to ensure community facility spaces do not exceed a certain size.
   — Require developers to create a plan that establishes the link between community needs and community facilities created through a combination of analysis and community-based feedback (including a recent district needs assessment and community surveys)
   — Require that these community facilities be built in advance of the construction of a majority of the associated units.

3.5  
Establish an East Harlem Garden District that would create public and programmed community gardens that would support youth and senior activities as part of a potential rezoning and approach to open space. [A potential subdistrict area could cover the area between Park and Pleasant Avenues, between 111th and 120th Streets where there is already a significant density of community gardens.]

3.6  
Require that East Harlem infrastructure—including power, telephone, sewer, and water—be upgraded to improve the basic functioning and connectivity of the existing community and for any future population increase.

---

**ZONING & LAND USE**

---

**PRECEDENT**

The Theater Subdistrict Core of the Midtown Special District allows the transfer of floor area from landmarked Broadway Theaters to receiver sites in other parts of the district. The Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) harnesses the development rights of land that a city wishes to keep undeveloped and allows that floor area to be transferred so that development can occur in another location. These transfers allow for the preservation of open spaces and historic landmarks, while allowing urban areas to expand and increase in density. The TDR concept utilized in the Theater Subdistrict Core is similar to several others in New York City—East Midtown Subdistrict, West Chelsea Special District, South Street Seaport Subdistrict and Section 74-79 of the zoning resolution that allows the transfer of floor area from Landmarks. The Zoning & Land Use subgroup recommendation to establish an East Harlem Garden District (3.5), as well as the Arts & Culture subgroup recommendation to create a Theatre District (6.1) could take elements of the TDR approach used in Midtown.

This precedent informs the concept of an East Harlem Garden District (Recommendation 3.5)
COMMUNITY VISIONING WORKSHOP #6

Transportation, Environment & Energy / Safety / Health & Seniors

November 21st, 2015
10am–1pm
at New York Academy of Medicine
83 Participants
The sixth and final Community Visioning Workshop focused on Health & Seniors, led by New York Academy of Medicine; Transportation, Environment & Energy, led by WE ACT; and Safety, led by Office of City Council Speaker Melissa Mark-Viverito. All small groups participated in a mapping activity that focused on site-specific questions relating to all the different topics: for example, how people get around the neighborhood, where people have difficulty navigating and where people feel safe or unsafe. Then, half the small groups had more conversations about Safety, Transportation, Environment, and Energy. They discussed topics like violent crime, policing and alternatives to policing, youth engagement, air quality, improving pedestrian safety and creating a more resilient neighborhood in the face of climate change. The other half of the groups participated in more in-depth activities about Health & Seniors that dealt with understanding the social determinants of health and designing a healthier and more accessible built environment by looking specifically at grocery stores and public spaces.

"I am concerned that many EH residents will no longer be able to afford fruits/veg/healthy foods when high income families and expensive stores move into the neighborhood."

*From EHNP survey respondents*
The community workshop and the subgroup meetings emphasized ways of exploring the links between transportation needs, the energy demands of transportation and East Harlem homes and the growing demand for the neighborhood to become more resilient.

Transportation,
East Harlem is a well-connected neighborhood, which means that the reliance on public transportation is helpful for reducing carbon emissions. Residents can choose from a number of existing transit options including bus, subway and Metro-North rail. The connectedness of the neighborhood is going to increase further as planned developments come online in the next few years. MTA is designing the second phase of the 2nd Avenue subway line, which will pass through East Harlem, and CitiBike has plans to expand its service area northward to 125th Street.
72% 
East Harlem residents

56% 
city-wide residents

commute to work by public transportation

Ridership at Harlem–125th Street station rose 55% between 2002 and 2013, much of which included reverse commuters—city residents accessing jobs in the suburbs

Source: Census ACS 3-year 2013
Source: NYCEDC

LOCATION OF SECOND AVENUE SUBWAY STOPS

- 8.5 route miles
- 16 new stations
- 1 renovated station
- 2 services: Q, T
- Linked to existing Q line
- Transfers to other rail lines

EAST HARLEM NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN
The area can do more to improve the local environment and to mitigate climate change through a cultivation of renewable energy sources that encourage resiliency. Listed below are some broad challenges facing East Harlem:

- While East Harlem has strong transportation links to the rest of the City and wider metropolitan areas, crosstown traffic is difficult and the buses are slow and overcrowded.

- Street design improvements are needed to reduce sidewalk congestion and improve pedestrian and bicyclist safety. These design improvements are particularly vital so seniors and visually impaired residents can use the streets safely.

- East Harlem has some of the poorest air quality in the city, resulting in air quality problems that contribute to local health problems. These issues are exacerbated by vehicular congestion along the major avenues and 125th Street.

- Reducing congestion will also help address the need to reduce carbon emissions. With large areas of the neighborhood existing within the flood plain, East Harlem must prepare itself for climate change adaptation, particularly from rising waters and storm surges.

- The neighborhood has poor access to Randall’s Island, a major open space asset for the community, and other open spaces along the waterfront. Improving connectivity to Randall’s Island would significantly increase the amount of easily accessible open space for residents.
OBJECTIVES & RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Capitalize on the planned implementation of the Second Avenue Subway and improve the ability of East Harlem public transit users to access jobs, services, cultural facilities and educational opportunities.

1.1 Create a multi-modal transit hub that connects between the Second Ave Subway (SAS), the 125th Street MetroNorth Station and the Lexington Ave Line, which also considers buses and taxis. Incorporate this hub and connection as part of the SAS Phase 2 Design Process through a dedicated community engagement session that leads to design guidelines for the physical connections.

1.2 Ensure that there is engagement with business owners who will be impacted by future Second Ave Subway (SAS) construction to limit displacement and loss of business.

2. Improve the mobility of seniors and the visually impaired with increased and dedicated public transit options and streetscape infrastructure.

2.1 Conduct a service assessment and survey of Access-A-Ride to identify issues and develop solutions to improve wait times and provide on-time service. Potential solutions for improving service may extend beyond more funding, such as to resolving issues around how MTA contracts its vehicles, an improved voucher system, and ride-sharing.

2.2 Identify funding to install bus shelters on 5th Avenue along its entire length in the district, prioritizing the installation of shelters along Central Park. (This may require working with residents and the Central Park Conservancy around issues of historic character and appropriate design.)

2.3 Locate CityBench program installations in areas that provide respite for seniors, along NYCHA developments, commercial and cross-town corridors, and near Naturally Occurring Retirement Communities like Franklin Plaza. Coordinate locations with the District Public Health Office’s proposed walking trail and other cultural wayfinding initiatives.

2.4 Address safe access for the visually impaired via the piloting of the Vision Enhancement Community Project (VECOMP) in key areas including 125th St, 116th St, 5th Ave and Madison Ave; adjacent to Mount Sinai and Metropolitan Hospitals; and areas around senior center locations throughout CB11.

3. Increase overall pedestrian safety within CB11.

3.1 Require DOT and MTA to jointly conduct a comprehensive study of the Park Avenue Viaduct running from 102nd Street to the Harlem River Drive, with a primary focus on pedestrian safety.

3.2 Fund a study of DOT’s Safe Routes to School (SRTS) program at all school sites in East Harlem, and implement where possible.

3.3 Improve connectivity of bike paths in the northeast corner of the district (between 124th and 127th, along both 2nd and 1st Avenues).
4. Improve air quality in East Harlem by reducing congestion and mitigating vehicular emissions.

4.1 Institute a pilot enforcement program to reduce congestion at key intersections and along key commercial corridors. Reduce vehicular idling (school buses, trash trucks, taxis, double-parkers).

4.2 Modify parking and loading/unloading regulations (such as via implementing rush hour regulations) along 125th St. between 1st Avenue and 5th Avenue, with the purpose of speeding up cross town bus times and improving air quality. Establish a similar set of recommendations for commercial deliveries to improve the efficiency of commercial truck traffic along East Harlem’s other primary commercial corridors (116th Street, 106th Street, Lexington Avenue, and 3rd Avenue).

4.3 When bus or sanitation depots are redeveloped within East Harlem, require that new buildings meet or exceed LEED Gold standards.

4.4 Encourage passive building design standards in the rezoning area and develop incentives for developers to pursue passive building construction.

4.5 Relocate the M10 Sanitation Garage at 110 East 131st St. (at the intersection of Lexington & Park Ave) to a more suitable location within Community Board 10. The M10 Garage only serves residents of CB10, but is located within CB11.

4.6 Relocate the existing M11 Sanitation Garage from 543 East 99th St. (between 1st & 2nd Ave, where it is adjacent to both healthcare and residential uses), to a more suitable location.

5. Improve the energy resiliency and independence of East Harlem residents by increasing access to non-fossil fuel based renewable energy.

5.1 Explore the possibility of incorporating a special zoning district to allow for the generation of non-fossil fuel renewable power for community use and sale back to the grid as a revenue generator, to facilitate the development of a microgrid.

5.2 Pilot a microgrid initiative at NYCHA’s East River Houses and Metro North Plaza, Metropolitan Hospital, and several schools in the southeast part of the district.

5.3 Working in consultation with both NYCHA and NYCHA residents, develop and install energy storage infrastructure on NYCHA property (within a microgrid pilot area) to facilitate the following objectives: 1) greater resiliency and reliability in the event of a blackout; 2) the reduction of the need for dirty peaker plant energy; and 3) generate revenue for NYCHA. The batteries can be used to store energy from off-shore wind facilities, with power purchased through the NYC Bulk Transmission System. Study the feasibility of siting enough storage infrastructure to reach 30mW of energy storage capacity.

6. Reduce waste generated in East Harlem and improve the effectiveness of sanitation operations in commercial corridors in East Harlem.

6.1 Improve sanitation along commercial corridors in East Harlem by installing more waste receptacles and providing more frequent sanitation pick-ups.

6.2 Set up a demonstration project in East Harlem NYCHA developments to evaluate NYCHA Recycles! Program and NYCHA resident-driven recycling initiatives.
Safety

East Harlem is well-organized to address many of the safety challenges confronting its residents. The neighborhood has several involved institutions and community-based organizations and good ties between community affairs officers and enforcement officials that can work together to address the range of challenges, including issues around crime, homelessness, mental illness and drug use, a sense of safety on busy streets and in public parks and challenges between police and residents.
As the City moves on from the previous stop and frisk policies, community policing strategies can build connections and trust between the community and law enforcement, and resident involvement can support security in particular places. Physical improvements can also help to improve the sense of safety in key locations. This plan will advocate for policy, program and capital changes to make East Harlem safer.
East Harlem has its own specific issues related to the neighborhood’s unique physical and social conditions.

- The design of the NYCHA developments—towers in the park, lacking commercial frontage—and other affordable housing developments in East Harlem such as Franklin Plaza, the presence of “warehoused” unoccupied buildings and the more remote areas of the East River waterfront has meant that there are several areas in the neighborhood that feel unsafe because there are no “eyes on the street” and there is a lack of lighting and other critical design features.

- Most NYCHA developments have developed their own respective "gangs" over the past decade, many of which are in conflict with each other, ensnaring many young people and leaving residents isolated in and around their NYCHA developments for fear of encroaching on conflicting "turf."

- Truck traffic and taxi drop-offs have created unsafe areas for pedestrians, and there is a need for solutions on busy through streets and around the MetroNorth station.

- While the potential for strong collaboration exists between the police and local groups, more extensive neighborhood-specific training and deeper local partnerships and increased community policing approaches are needed to make efforts work properly.

- Services for job training, mental health, domestic abuse and drug use need to be assessed in terms of availability and effectiveness in order to address underlying social conditions.

- Vulnerability from storm surge and other extreme events is a potential threat to the neighborhood, and there should be clear response systems and protections put in place.
OBJECTIVES & RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Improve district-wide emergency preparedness and ensure that residents and business owners know how to access resources in the event of a disaster.
   
   1.1 Provide guidelines in multiple languages for sheltering in place and for evacuation procedures for vulnerable populations. Target senior centers, public housing developments, community centers, schools, and other public buildings for posting these guidelines. Give priority to buildings located in the flood zone.

   1.2 Create a Long Term Recovery Group in East Harlem. Ensure that the Long Term Recovery Group has funding to conduct the following tasks in preparation for a potential future disaster/event: establish information/resource hubs within the district, develop a strategy for information dissemination, identify protocols for residents, create a transportation plan for evacuation.

   1.3 Explore the possibility of creating an evacuation center that can better serve CD11 at PS 198/PS 77, which is located just south of the district on 96th Street between 3rd and Lexington Aves.

2. Invest in the empowerment of East Harlem youth as a primary tool of violence reduction in the district.

   2.1 Expand programming for high-risk youth and their families to other areas in the district, and ensure that after-hours programming is made available. Consider starting with expanding and diversifying programming at Corsi Houses and at the Thomas Jefferson Recreation Center.

   2.2 Invest in deepened, positive police engagement in NYCHA by funding more community-based police training initiatives.

3. Ensure that there are alternative approaches to addressing quality of life issues that affect vulnerable populations in addition to policing efforts.

SAFETY

●● Related to precedent on page 115
3.1 Identify a location for a Diversion Center, a facility that, instead of incarcerating individuals with low-level offenses, will connect them to mental health, shelter, or other social services. Ensure that police officers have training to respond to these cases. Mental health, shelter, or other social services. Ensure that police officers have training to respond to these cases.

4. Make physical improvements to increase resident safety within public places.

4.1 Develop specifications for improving the quality of lighting in key areas of East Harlem. Consider more careful siting of lighting, and relocate lighting that is currently obscured by street trees.

4.2 Provide strengthened protections for East Harlem cyclists and pedestrians interfacing with construction sites. Ensure that DOT works closely with its sister City agencies (Department of Design and Construction, Department of Buildings, Department of Environmental Protection, and Parks) to coordinate enforcement and ensure compliance with safety. For particularly large or complex construction sites, consider placing trained pedestrian traffic managers in the field, who will focus on bicycle and pedestrian safety in and around major construction projects.

4.3 Improve lighting within Marcus Garvey Park, Thomas Jefferson Park, and along the East River Esplanade.

4.4 Increase Parks Enforcement Patrol (PEP) within Harlem River Park, Marcus Garvey Park and Thomas Jefferson Park.

4.5 Take steps to enhance the safety of East Harlem commercial corridors. Potential initiatives include (a) increasing the quality of lighting along commercial avenues and (b) relocating the M35 bus stop from the corner of Lexington Avenue and 125th Street.
Mayor’s Action Plan for Neighborhood Safety

The Mayor’s Action Plan (MAP) for Neighborhood Safety committed $210.5 million in July 2014 to strengthen neighborhoods and reduce violent crime at the 15 NYCHA developments that account for nearly 20 percent of all violent crime in public housing. The investment aims to ensure that housing developments are well lit, well monitored and secure. $89 million will go towards infrastructure improvements, interior and exterior security cameras, camera connections to NYPD networks, new doors, layered (keyfob) access and improved exterior lighting. $12 million will fund public safety data collection, analysis and programming, such as community surveys, analysis of the impact of community centers in improving public safety and an evaluation of the developments’ physical design to identify improvements that would reduce crime. 1

LES Ready

Lower East Side Ready is a collaboration between community groups and institutions to ensure that the neighborhood is prepared for future emergencies. LES Ready provides a place for coordination and collaboration among many different groups, and the partnership works to disseminate disaster preparedness information and assist the neighborhood in long-term resiliency after Superstorm Sandy and long into the future. 2

This precedent relates to Recommendation 1.2
2  http://lesready.org/mission-statement/

This precedent relates to Recommendation 2.1, 2.2
Health & Seniors

1 Juice Bar inside Associated Supermarket, 128 E 116th Street © Kate Milford 2016
2 Mt. Sinai Hospital © Kate Milford 2016
3 Seniors at Washington Houses © John McCarten / New York City Council
4 East River Esplanade © Kate Milford 2016
A person’s zip code is the greatest predictor of their health. As a foundation for quality of life, health is shaped by every domain of public policy from economic development to transportation, crime, education and housing. In East Harlem, there is a rich network of dedicated community organizations, healthcare providers and academic institutions devoted to improving the health of the community by making homes free and clear of mold, providing seniors support for aging in place, advocating for food security and increasing access to medical care.
16.8% of East Harlem residents are 60 and over.

40.1% are living alone.

31.9% have difficulty with their mobility.

35.5% don’t speak English as their primary language.

42% of East Harlem seniors are living in poverty.

40.1% are living alone.

76 years

Upper East Side

85 years

70% of residents report their own health as good.

92% of residents report their own health as good.

35.5% don’t speak English as their primary language.

NYC Average

75

36

EAST HARLEM NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Source: 2008-2011 ACS 3-year PUMS, compiled by DFTA


Source: 2008-2011 ACS 3-year PUMS, compiled by DFTA
Despite having such assets, East Harlem has sub-par health outcomes.

- Life expectancy in East Harlem is 76 years, one of the shortest in the city, and is plagued by various health disparities including asthma, heart disease, diabetes and infant mortality.

- Additionally, East Harlem has some of the highest rates of hospitalizations related to asthma, psychiatric issues, substance abuse and violence in the city. Addressing these issues require multiple actions, including environmental efforts to improve air quality and mold, efforts to strengthen community care-taking and changes to the built environment.

Older people have helped make New York City the incredible city it is today. They built our infrastructure, led social justice movements, made major advances in health care and technology and fueled our thriving economy. Older East Harlem residents are a part of this legacy and are key to preserving the history and culture of the community.
OBJECTIVES & RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Create a local food system in East Harlem to improve access to healthy, affordable and quality food.
   
   1.1 Amend the Food Retail Expansion to Support Health (FRESH) program to allow for a variance for food cooperatives and nonprofit grocers to be eligible for zoning and tax incentives under the program. 

   1.2 Establish a year round comprehensive farmer’s market in La Marqueta that is affordable to residents and businesses.

   1.3 Increase funding and expansion of food box programs. Ensure that new pick-up sites are evenly distributed throughout East Harlem utilizing Grow NYC’s 6 block radius threshold.

   1.4 Increase food production/manufacturing and commercial kitchen spaces through light industrial zoning in East Harlem (see zoning rec 2.2). This would include establishing wash, chop & bag facilities that can cater to schools, senior centers, and other places that regularly prepare large quantities of food as part of their programs.

2. Improve health service coordination and access.
   
   2.1 Identify capital support for the Neighborhood Health Action Center, including assisting community organizations with building out the spaces that they will operate.

   2.2 Increase funding for HIV prevention programming & services in East Harlem. Increase the number of supportive housing units for those living with HIV/AIDS and/or make this cohort the primary set aside for supportive housing units in East Harlem.

   2.3 Conduct feasibility study to determine the placement and number of new Federally Qualified Health Centers (FQHC’s) and Primary Care Clinics in East Harlem with a focus on the geographic middle of district boundaries.

   2.4 Designate East Harlem as a priority community for the rollout of Direct Access NYC to ensure that East Harlem residents who are immigrants have access to the myriad of services, programs and initiatives under Direct Access NYC, including more translation services at neighborhood health facilities for Cantonese, Mandarin, Spanish and French speakers.

   2.5 Decrease the number of uninsured residents through equitable distribution of health insurance navigator programs.

   2.6 Select East Harlem as a priority neighborhood for the rollout of Thrive NYC initiatives including: Mental Health First Aid Training, NYC Mental Health Corps, Youth Mental Health First Aid.

•• Related to precedent on pages 122-123
3. Create a neighborhood environment that allows for seniors to age in place comfortably.

3.1 Create an Aging Improvement District boundary designation building off the Neighborhood NORC (Naturally Occurring Retirement Communities) designation definition. The density and number of persons over age 50 in a given area is to be considered. Businesses, development projects, etc. would be encouraged through use of existing incentives to make physical plants, services, goods age-friendly. Example: businesses in an age-friendly district would be allowed to use SBS storefront improvement funds to make age-friendly physical improvements. Note: The Mayor’s Age-friendly NYC Commission should do this.

3.2 Prioritize built environment improvements called for in the East Harlem Age-friendly Neighborhood Action Plan, including ensuring the pedestrian plaza at 125th St. and Park Ave. is inclusive of older adults in its design and on-going programming.

3.3 For affordable units created on privately owned sites through MIH, ensure that they are built with accessibility features that cater to seniors, and that preference for some percentage of units is given to seniors.

4. Enhance the built environment to promote health.

4.1 Work with NYCHA to ensure that proper connections are made through its waterfront developments leading to the Randall’s Island footbridge at 103rd Street. Wayfinding, markings, and signage are required to identify routes from First Avenue, as well as dedicated bicycle and pedestrian routes and pavement and sidewalk improvements. While NYCHA must provide these on its property, DOT can provide technical assistance and design guidelines for greenway connections. Coordination is also needed with NYCHA to ensure that scaffolding does not obscure route across 102nd St.

4.2 Establish a Health District in East Harlem centered around the Neighborhood Health Action Center. Health districts are places where healthy choices are the easiest ones to make. They are places to heal, work, and live where new ideas on improving healthcare and public health can be developed, tested, and disseminated. A health district holistically connects the community to hospitals, health department offices, healthy food and commercial options, health-related incubators and technology, and career training.

4.3 Establish a multi-generational playground in East Harlem that has options for seniors and adults. Explore solutions to current DPR regulations preventing seniors from using seating near playgrounds.

5. Foster safe and healthy living environments.

5.1 Encourage the adoption of the Active Design Guidelines: Affordable designs for Affordable Housing as an industry standard in East Harlem.

5.2 To the greatest extent possible, renovation and new construction should implement health-promoting practices including building envelope restoration; new heating, electrical, and ventilation systems; air sealing; new insulation and exterior cladding; window replacement; Energy-Star fixtures and appliances; asbestos and mold abatement; apartment gut retrofits; low volatile organic chemical and moisture-resistant materials; exercise enhancements; and indoor no-smoking policy.

The EHNP Steering Committee has recommended that a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) be conducted on subsequent ULURP processes, transportation plans, and NYCHA infill projects in East Harlem. More details on the HIA recommendation are outlined on pages 126–127 of this report.
Multi-generational Playgrounds

Multi-generational playgrounds and outdoor gyms serve as places where children, adults and seniors of varying abilities can spend time outdoors, exercise and practice a healthy lifestyle. These playgrounds feature equipment traditionally used for children, and mix in senior and adult-friendly equipment.

The multi-generational approach to outdoor play is spreading across the nation. This concept is in part borrowed from cities in China and Europe, where outdoor fitness areas for adults have become routine. The Green Heart playground in Hull, Yorkshire is an especially unique type of playground where users can charge cell phones, power lights at the workout station and even contribute power to nearby buildings.3 Closer to home, Macombs Dam Park in the Bronx features a state of the art adult playground, complete with comprehensive workout areas and equipment with moving pieces.4

This precedent relates to Recommendation 4.3

Active Design Guidelines

Active design means harnessing the interior and exterior built environment to promote physical activity and a healthier population. Active design can be as simple as constructing buildings to facilitate users taking the stairs instead of the elevator. The Center for Active Design compiles strategies into Active Design Guidelines,1 which promote active transportation options, greater physical activity within buildings, better spaces for active recreation and increased access to fresh food options.2

This precedent relates to Recommendation 5.1
1 http://centerforactivedesign.org/guidelines/
2 http://centerforactivedesign.org/ourapproach

[References and images as per the original text]
In late 2015, Mayor de Blasio announced the launch of Direct Access NYC, based on the report by the Mayor’s Task Force on Immigrant Health Care Access. Direct Access, set to begin in 2016, seeks to provide reliable and more easily accessible health care opportunities for foreign-born residents who are uninsured and susceptible to poor health. The program seeks to increase the cultural and language competencies within the healthcare system, increase awareness of coverage options and increase accessibility to healthcare services.1

This precedent relates to Recommendation 2.4

New York City’s Food Retail Expansion to Support Health (FRESH) program aims to increase access to fresh and nutritious foods in underserved parts of the city. The city designates FRESH-eligible areas, meaning that zoning and financial benefits are available for projects that bring grocery stores to designated neighborhoods. Since the program’s launch in 2009, 20 projects have been approved.2 Together, they will provide approximately 590,000 square feet of grocery store space, retain 500 jobs and create 940 new jobs.3 The FRESH program surveyed customers in these new stores: 96 percent of respondents believe that the new store increased their access to fresh produce, and 80 percent of customers agree that they now purchase more fruits and vegetables.4

This precedent relates to Recommendation 1.1
3 http://www.nycedc.com/program/food-retail-expansion-support-health-fresh
The Final Community Forum was part large-scale report back, part community celebration and part open dialogue. The event showcased all of the objectives and recommendations developed by each subgroup. Community members had the opportunity to prioritize and give feedback on each of the 61 objectives and 232 recommendations previously voted on and approved by the Steering Committee. The session began with an overview and background presentation about the EHNP process that outlined the way recommendations of the plan were developed and approved. Participants then walked through El Museo del Barrio to individual stations for each of the 12 neighborhood planning topics to talk to the subgroup leads, read through the objectives and recommendations and prioritize their top objectives. A Q&A session was also held with a panel of Project Partners, Steering Committee Members and Subgroup participants. The evening wrapped up with food, drinks and music by local East Harlem musical phenomenon, Zon del Barrio.
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

The Steering Committee wishes to see a more expansive environmental impact analysis framework for any Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) related to a zoning text or mapping amendment in the East Harlem community. The broader framework should take into account qualitative information, use the CEQR process as an educational and engagement opportunity with the community, and institute a feedback model for compliance and implementation of mitigation measures.

The purpose and need of the environmental review should explicitly cite and include the objectives of the East Harlem Neighborhood Plan, specifically the overarching goal of a vibrant, thriving, livable and affordable East Harlem. The findings should be analyzed from the perspective of the positions laid out in East Harlem Neighborhood Plan.

In addition to requesting an enhanced EIS be conducted, a supplementary integrated impact study should be completed as part of any proposal for East Harlem, utilizing quantitative and qualitative tools. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the potential for non-traditional unanticipated impacts and serve as a guide to bolster the respective subgroup objectives and gauge the impact on vulnerable sub-populations.

Standards for public engagement should go beyond the minimum requirements laid out in the CEQR manual and should use the process as an opportunity to ensure a more comprehensive proposal.

- In order to fully engage the community, a minimum of two scoping sessions should be held, one during the day, one at night, with childcare provided, and scoping sessions should have translation services available. The noticing of these sessions should be sent to local neighborhood papers and a good-faith effort made to flyer NYCHA developments and major transit hubs.

- Updates during the environmental review process should be provided on a regular basis by meeting with the Community Board and providing updated handouts available in multiple languages.

1. Recommendations for an Integrated Impact Statement

ECONOMIC IMPACTS

Examine how the recommendations may impact local businesses, neighborhood income distribution, human capital, employment, and real estate prices.

HEALTH IMPACTS

Examine how recommendations may impact community health using a social determinants of health perspective; including how access to goods, services, employment, safe and affordable housing, as well as open space contributes to the general well-being and health for the residents of East Harlem.
SOCIAL IMPACTS
Examine the impact of the recommendations on social factors such as gang and youth violence, child development, mental health and social capital.

EQUITY ASSESSMENT
Examine whether recommendations will have differential impacts on vulnerable sub-populations such as people who are homeless, physically disabled, and racial/ethnic minorities.

HOUSING AFFORDABILITY IMPACTS
Analysis of how new development will affect housing affordability for low-income residents.

WATER AND SEWER INFRASTRUCTURE
Assessment of water and sewer infrastructure should be enhanced with community surveys on existing water pressure conditions, frequency of sewage problems, sidewalk or street flooding et al to identify existing gaps in infrastructure investment and maintenance in addition to the need for additional capacity analysis.

PUBLIC HEALTH
Analysis should consider local smoking rates, activity level, availability of health care, and perceptions regarding availability of health care, active design, general well-being, acceptance and treatment of those with mental health concerns, or those in other vulnerable populations such as the elderly, those with terminal diseases such as AIDS, members of the LGBTQ community, and those who are homeless.

HOUSING AFFORDABILITY IMPACTS
Analysis of how new development will affect housing affordability for low-income residents.

2. Recommendations for an Enhanced Environmental Review

SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS
Establish baselines regarding displacement, warehousing of existing residential units, neighborhood specific business challenges, and housing rents in the informal market.

Assess the impacts of development on construction workforce job quality, living wages, local hiring, absence of prevailing wage requirement and the availability of apprenticeship programs.

Study job generation as a result of the rezoning and how job and economic sector growth is benefitting local residents as compared to people outside of the immediate area.

HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES
An assessment of eligible historic and cultural resources should be developed in direct consultation with the community, and such list should be used as the enhanced baseline for analysis for impacts.

NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER
Definition and baseline should be informed by community input and expanded to include cultural and demographic identities, and mitigation measures to indirect or adverse impacts should be created with consultation by the community. Information collected during the community visioning sessions that noted exact locations or areas that contribute to the neighborhood character should be incorporated.

CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS
Consider as part of the baseline existing 311 calls regarding enforcement, work without a permit, emergency demolition permits, and other quality of life concerns. In cases where the soft analysis reveals sites adjacent or proximate to schools, senior care, or daycare centers and analysis is not triggered by the minimum thresholds set out in the CEQR manual, but the time frame for construction, noise and air impacts will correspond with operational hours and days, then a full analysis and mitigation measures consideration should be conducted.

LAND USE AND PUBLIC POLICY
Analysis should acknowledge that a change in administration may alter the public policy goal of affordable housing, and speak to mitigation measures to ensure long-term implementation of the target affordability levels established elsewhere in this plan.
East Harlem residents, workers, business owners, religious and civic leaders have invested many years into the safe and healthy growth and development of their neighborhood. In May of 2014, Mayor Bill de Blasio released Housing New York, a plan to preserve and construct 200,000 units of affordable housing in all five boroughs over the next ten years. A cornerstone of the Plan is the re-zoning of several neighborhoods for increased density to facilitate housing development. East Harlem is one of those neighborhoods.

Between April 2015 and January 2016, thousands of East Harlem residents, workers and friends came out to participate in, provide input for and quite literally shape the East Harlem Neighborhood Plan (EHNP)—a community-based plan that proactively sets forth a comprehensive vision for the equitable, healthy, sustainable development of the neighborhood. The Community Action Plan identifies what needs to be done, by whom and how in order to ensure government accountability to community residents as the City develops and implements an East Harlem re-zoning plan.

Objectives

1. Ensure that the development of any City re-zoning plan for East Harlem aligns with the community-driven East Harlem Neighborhood Plan (EHNP);
2. Advocate for the adoption of the East Harlem Neighborhood Plan and for particular recommendations within it before, during and after the ULURP process;
3. Advocate for EHNP recommendations to be adopted in planning documents that emerge from other East Harlem entities including but not limited to: Community Board District Needs Statements, DCLA Cultural Development Plans, participatory budgeting project proposals and federal, state and city agency capital and expense budgets targeted for the community;
4. Monitor the implementation of an East Harlem re-zoning to ensure that EHNP capital, programmatic and policy recommendations are realized in a timely and equitable way—understanding that to maximize effective impact, recommendations across topic areas must be adopted and implemented;
5. Monitor the implementation of key elements of the plan—like local hiring and affordable housing production—and ensure that contractors and developers meet the objectives laid out in the plan, and then are held accountable if they don’t.
6. Establish a set of metrics to evaluate the short- and long-term impacts of a re-zoning plan on the East Harlem neighborhood, and have the ability within the re-zoning plan and implementation to respond to negative impacts;
7. Provide for regular and ongoing engagement with and input from the East Harlem community.
A. We recommend that a local oversight body, with deep roots in and representative of the diverse constituencies within the East Harlem community be established to ensure that any City re-zoning action and neighborhood plan align with the community-driven recommendations of the EHNP.

The EHNP Steering Committee established to shepherd the EHNP process is well placed to play an oversight role given their deep investment in the process, the community, and knowledge of the EHNP recommendations. Moving forward, there is an opportunity to identify and include additional voices on the current Steering Committee, such as small business owners and neighborhood residents. It is also an opportunity to ensure that all future Steering Committee meetings are open to the public.

Regular meetings between the Local Oversight Body and City agency representatives leading up to and during the ULURP process will be critical. To ensure the adoption and implementation of a wide range of EHNP recommendations, meetings will include not only those agencies most directly involved in a re-zoning process—DCP, HPD, EDC—but also DOE, DOHMH, DCLA, SBS, and DEP among others.

In order to ensure the success of the ongoing work of the Steering Committee, operational support must be funded. A model of a successful local oversight body is the Hunts Point Monitoring Committee, which grew out of the expansion of the Wastewater Treatment Plant. In that case, DEP funded an agency liaison, a Committee coordinator, and a consultant to support the research and writing needs of the Committee.

The Steering Committee will:

✓ **PARTNER:** Work with the City to implement EHNP recommendations.
✓ **INFORM:** Create opportunities for regular updates to the EH community and for feedback on the operations and strategies of the Community Action Plan.
✓ **ADVOCATE:** Push for EHNP recommendations to be adopted by the City through any re-zoning or planning documents developed by other East Harlem or government agencies.
✓ **EVALUATE:** Establish a set of metrics by which to evaluate the impact of re-zoning action—both before and after implementation.

✓ **MONITOR AND ADVOCATE TO ALLEVIATE THE IMPACT:** Guide and monitor the implementation of mitigation measures supplied by the Final East Harlem EIS, provide additional mitigation recommendations produced by the Integrated Impact Statement leading up to and during ULURP. After completion of the disclosure document, energy should be focused on getting private and public sector actors to comply with the mitigation recommendations for future development.
What Could Community-based Oversight Look Like?

Facilities Monitoring Committees—Hunts Point, Newtown Creek, Croton Facility

The expansion of three Wastewater Treatment Plants—at Hunts Point, Newtown Creek and Croton in Van Cortlandt Park—triggered the formation of Facilities Monitoring Committees. The City Council ULURP approval of the expansion of the wastewater treatment facilities required the formation of the Monitoring Committees, in line with the 1989 Fair Share doctrine of the New York City Charter. Fair Share furthers “the fair distribution of the burdens and benefits associated with city facilities...” Historically, unwanted city facilities like waste transfer stations, bus depots, and shelters have been concentrated in low-income communities. The Fair Share doctrine works to ensure that the city’s poorer neighborhoods are not saturated with unwanted facilities.

In the case of Hunts Point, six community members were appointed to the Monitoring Committee—two by the Borough President, two by the local City Council member, and two by the Congressional representative of the district. NYC DEP paid for an agency liaison and a consultant—in this case, New Partners for Community Revitalization—to write reports and perform necessary research to support the Committee’s understanding and analysis of the expansion of the Wastewater facility and its impact on the community.

The Hunts Point Monitoring Committee met regularly for 5 to 7 years. Monthly meetings were held during the day and were officially public, although not advertised. Over the lifetime of the Committee, a handful of public town hall meetings were also held. In addition to regular meetings, the Committee issued formal comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and other testimony related to the expansion of the facility.

B. The Local Oversight Body / Steering Committee will play a critical role in advocating for and ensuring accountability to the East Harlem community on an agency-by-agency basis. However, to ensure the long-term, effective implementation of a comprehensive Neighborhood Plan in East Harlem, we recommend that the Administration identify an office of City government capable of coordinating the implementation of these recommendations across various agencies, recognizing that many of the recommendations are relevant to agencies that are not typically associated with neighborhood re-zonings (i.e. DCLA, ACS, DYCD, DOE, HRA, DOHMH, NYPD, DFTA, DOT etc.). Such an office will ensure the long-term, effective implementation of a comprehensive Neighborhood Plan in East Harlem as well as other neighborhoods to be re-zoned as part of the Housing New York initiative.

A model for cross-agency coordination and government accountability for major investment in the built environment is the Mayor’s Office of Recovery and Resiliency (ORR). Charged with ensuring the successful implementation of major, post-Sandy infrastructure investment, ORR coordinates multiple City agencies, elected officials and local stakeholders in those neighborhoods most directly impacted by the storm.

The Housing New York Plan contemplates an $8.2 billion investment of public funds over ten years. It also lays out a new way of doing planning and re-zoning in New York City—in a way...
What Could City-wide Oversight Look Like?

The Mayor’s Office of Recovery and Resiliency (ORR)

In March 2014, Mayor de Blasio established The Mayor’s Office of Recovery and Resiliency (ORR). ORR is charged with overseeing and implementing the resiliency initiatives laid out in One New York: The Plan for a Strong and Just City and A Stronger, More Resilient New York (SIRR). These recommendations include: strengthening coastal defenses, upgrading buildings, protecting infrastructure and critical services and making “our homes, businesses, and neighborhoods safer and more vibrant.”

ORR, housed in the Mayor’s Office, and reporting directly to First Deputy Mayor Anthony Shorris, oversees more than $20 billion of initiatives including capital projects, planning studies, policy reform and legislation designed to protect the city’s most vulnerable neighborhoods from future severe weather events. Their charge is to ensure that infrastructure investments are multi-functional, strengthening the long-term physical and social resiliency of New York City’s neighborhoods.

ORR coordinates the work of city, state and federal agencies, works with elected officials and Community Boards, local businesses, civic and religious groups and community-based organizations, to ensure a coordinated effort and the efficient and equitable implementation of investments.

Current projects overseen by ORR include: East Side Coastal Resiliency project in Lower Manhattan, Red Hook Integrated Flood Protection System feasibility study, and the USACE South Shore Staten Island and Rockaways Reformulation Study, among many others.

C. Finally, we stand behind the City Council Speaker’s proposed Neighborhood Commitment Plan—a way for the City Council to track commitments for housing, schools, infrastructure and other City services and programs included in rezoning plans in East Harlem as well as other neighborhoods. The Commitment Plan would accompany a rezoning proposal and serve as a tool for the City Council to keep tabs on promises made to communities and hold agencies accountable through Council oversight following ULURP approval.

Comprehensive, community-driven neighborhood plans like that proposed in East Harlem require a City—community feedback loop to ensure that commitments made are commitments kept in the long-term. A local oversight body, Citywide government office and City Council Commitment Plan together will ensure that we all work together to foster the equitable growth and development of our neighborhoods.
A CALL TO ACTION

Project Partners, Steering Committee members, Subgroup participants, and all local residents, workers, and business owners will:

- Spread EHNP goals, priorities and recommendations throughout the East Harlem community;
- Ensure that EHNP information is understandable and widely available;
- Make clear pathways between EHNP recommendations and community action to ensure their adoption and implementation;
- Encourage other community organizations to refer to the EHNP goals when crafting their own community investment strategies.

Project Partners, Steering Committee members, and Subgroup participants will:

- Actively use their own web platforms for dissemination, as well as the EastHarlemPlan.nyc website;
- Hold regular public meetings at convenient hours that provide an update on rezoning and action plan activities;
- Hold open steering committee meetings;
- Provide the opportunity for new organizations to join the EHNP Steering Committee;
- Provide the opportunity for new organizations and interested individuals to join subgroups.

Project Partners and Subgroup Leads will:

- Hold regular meetings with relevant City agencies on the subgroup recommendations;
- Report back the content of those meetings to the East Harlem community.
City Agencies + Elected Officials:

- Clearly delineate those EHNP recommendations that are and are not incorporated in the City re-zoning action;
- Provide regular updates and reports to the public on development and implementation of the Plan;
- Regularly report, in person, to the respective Community Board 11 committees and Full Board meetings;
- Provide written updates on Plan accomplishments and ongoing progress, posted online and/or widely distributed through existing information channels; and
- DCP provide regular report backs to the community in addition to regular subgroup / monitoring committee meetings with DCP on the rezoning / ULURP.

The EHNP lays out a comprehensive roadmap for equitable neighborhood development. The Plan reflects an integrated vision for the future of East Harlem. It is essential, therefore, that recommendations across topic areas (zoning, affordable housing development, economic development, education, health + seniors, etc.) and recommendation type (capital, program and policy) are adopted and implemented.

East Harlem community members must remain involved throughout the life of any City re-zoning plan to ensure the implementation of those projects, programs and policies that address community-defined priorities. In addition, the Plan itself must remain a living document. As development occurs, the neighborhood ecosystem will evolve and change. The policies, projects and programs included in the Plan must respond to reality on the ground, including results from the evaluation of Plan impacts and outcomes.

EAST HARLEM ESTIMATED ULURP TIMELINE

- DCP Scoping Hearing: SPRING 2016
- ULURP certification: FALL 2016
- ULURP complete: SUMMER 2017
- Implementation of rezoning plan

Check in with eastharlemplan.nyc for up to date information.
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**KEY TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS**

**AMI**
Area Median Income is used to determine the rents for affordable housing units. The AMI for NYC is currently $77,700 for a family of three.

**FAR**
Floor area ratio controls how large buildings can be based on their zoning lot size. The higher the FAR, the larger the building can be.

**Zoning**
Sets requirements for every piece of land in the city including what uses can be in a building and a building’s size and shape.

**Density**
The number of people who live in a given area.

**MIH**
Mandatory Inclusionary Housing is a proposal in NYC that would require new development in areas that have been rezoned to provide on-site affordable housing.

**Open space**
Any open piece of land that is undeveloped (has no buildings) and is accessible to the public, usually for recreational purposes (i.e. parks, community gardens, playgrounds, public seating areas and public plazas).

**EIS**
An Environmental Impact Statement is a document that describes the impacts on the environment as a result of a proposed action, such as a rezoning or development. It also describes the impacts of alternatives as well as plans to mitigate the impacts.

**CBOs**
Community based organizations are representative of a community or a significant segment of a community and are engaged in meeting human, educational, environmental, public safety, and/or community needs.

**Community Benefits Agreements (CBAs)**
CBAs are legally enforceable private contracts between a developer and local community organizations. In exchange for community support, the developer will provide certain benefits such as local hiring, dedicated community space, or other items the community is able to negotiate.

**Tenant harassment**
Tenant harassment is the willing creation, by a landlord or his agents, of conditions that are uncomfortable for one or more tenants in order to induce willing abandonment of a rental contract.

**Community Land Trust (CLT)**
Community land trusts are nonprofit, community-based organizations designed to ensure community stewardship of land. The trust acquires land and maintains ownership of it permanently. It enters into a long-term, renewable lease instead of a traditional sale.

**NextGen NYCHA**
A part of Mayor de Blasio’s affordable housing plan, NextGen NYCHA is a ten-year long-term strategic plan that details how NYCHA will create safe, clean, and connected communities for residents and preserve New York City’s public housing assets for the next generation.

**Uniform Land Use Review Process (ULURP)**
The official NYC public review process for all proposed zoning map amendments, special permits and other actions. ULURP sets a time frame and other requirements for public participation at several levels, from Community Boards to the City Council.

**Workforce1**
A service provided by SBS that prepares and connects qualified candidates to job opportunities. Workforce1 programs help build relationships with hiring businesses and connect qualified candidates to opportunities.

**Business Improvement District (BID)**
A defined area within which businesses are required to pay an additional tax (or levy) in order to fund projects within the district’s boundaries. The BID can also draw on other public and private funding streams.

The Project Partners of the East Harlem Neighborhood Plan would like to make a point to acknowledge the unremitting efforts of our facilitators, WXY and Hester Street Collaborative. Without their technical guidance and thoughtful approach to community engagement, this process would not have been as successful. The hard work and passion of several planners and interns from both WXY and Hester Street Collaborative enabled us to create a roadmap for East Harlem’s future, truly reflective of the needs and desires rooted in the community.

A special thank you to the many individuals who represented organizations on the Steering Committee and Subgroups, donating countless hours of their time to ensure the success of this process. The Project Partners would also like to acknowledge El Museo del Barrio, Hunter College, Children’s Aid Society, Johnson Community Center, Harlem RBI/Dream Charter School, and New York Academy of Medicine for generously donating their spaces in order to accommodate the hundreds of participants who came out to our workshops. Most importantly of all, we owe our sincere gratitude to the East Harlem community members who participated in this process, helping us to reinvigorate the meaning of community-based planning.
Fight for our families, our communities & ourselves.