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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Affordable housing designated for artists is an essential component of making a city thrive and flourish, not only for artists but also for the people that inhabit and visit cities. In New York City, there is a severe lack of affordable artist housing, which creates a variety of impacts on the arts, culture and economy of our city. This report provides a well-researched assessment of how affordable artist housing has been created around the United States and locally in New York City. The Artist Housing Studio in the Urban Policy and Planning Graduate Program at Hunter College has compiled research from critical US cities, which has provided insight to answer three guiding questions:

1. What is the definition of an artist when applied to affordable artist housing?
2. Where has affordable housing for artists been successful?
3. How can affordable housing be legally designated for artists based on an occupation?

Artists are essential to the creation of a vibrant city. Their work and presence make neighborhoods attractive to residents, business, and tourists alike. Their impacts and effects that they have on a space are in great demand, but affordable housing for artists and creative placemakers is not often provided in the places where they are needed most. Nationally, affordable housing is in short supply, and greatly needed especially in large metropolitan areas. Across the country, where cities are a grappling with the task to create affordable housing, affordable housing designated specifically for the artists that make the cities valuable places to live is often overlooked.

Artists have special needs based on their work. More commonly unable to derive stable income from their work, identifying housing options and securing affordable housing with intricate financial processes is difficult. In consideration that artist needs are specific, often requiring specialized spaces, from black box theaters, to darkrooms, rent on such spaces is unaffordable and difficult to find.

Study Background

Based on five months of research, the Artist Housing Studio has developed a collection of case studies based on nationwide metro areas. We divided the United States into six geographic regions and identified different cities that we felt had qualities that we could draw from. Through our case studies, we found a variety of innovative strategies on how others approached the creation of affordable artist housing. We looked into their definitions of an artist, the financial tools used to develop these properties, and the role or non-role each municipality took in creating affordable artist housing.
Case Studies

We focused on cities and organizations that have lead the nation in the creation of artist housing, or had compelling local issues that warranted their inclusion. From the east coast to the west coast and the places in between, we found that a few major cities were making a concerted effort in to create and establish affordable artist housing. Through our case studies, we found an assortment of different strategies and financial mechanisms that were used. The Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) and Tax Increment Financing (TIF) were commonly utilized to spur the development of affordable artist housing.

Findings

Cities that were intentional in their creation of affordable artist house were most successful. This entailed:

- Creating broad definitions of what qualifies as an artist
- Maximizing available tax credits, as well as finding creative means to finance development
- Creating partnerships between city and local organizations or developers to break down barriers between the local artist community and the city
- Incentivizing growth. Some examples include city created certifications for Artists, or connecting grassroots artist communities with non-profit developers.
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In the United States, there is a short supply of affordable housing, affecting people from all walks of life, including artists. With housing costs severely outweighing low salaries, people are struggling to live where they want and need. In March 2017, the National Low-Income Housing Coalition used data obtained from the 2011-2015 American Community Survey to create the report, “The GAP: A Shortage of Affordable Homes,” which measures the availability of rental housing affordable to extremely low income (ELI) households and other income groups. The report found that “the United States has a shortage of 7.4 million affordable and available rental homes for ELI renter households.”\(^1\) The report also highlights that not all of the millions of homes that are deemed affordable are available to those most in need; at least 3.5 of 7.5 million affordable homes are occupied by households of higher incomes.

In large metropolitan areas, particularly New York City, there is not enough affordable rental housing stock to keep up with the demand for housing. A report released by NYU Furman Center entitled “2017 National Rental Housing Landscape” found that, “rents continue to rise in almost every metro, and rose the most in already high metros.”\(^2\) The report found that the households of higher socio-economic backgrounds are increasingly more likely to live in rental housing, thus making rental housing more competitive and affordable rentals more scarce. The number of rent burdened households, where households pay more than 30% of their incomes on rent, is higher now than past decades. Data also show that higher income metros have higher rents.

Despite this difficult housing landscape, New York City is still attracting new residents. By 2030, New York City will have an estimated population of over 9 million people.\(^3\) Housing this influx population puts a strain on the existing housing stock and leads to skyrocketing rents. Unfortunately, as housing costs have increased, salaries have remained low and stagnant. In New York City, where the Area Median Income (AMI) is used to determine how affordable housing is, the AMI is much higher than the actual incomes of households that severely need affordable housing.

The lack of affordable housing has created a myriad number of negative impacts, including the displacement of rent burdened New Yorkers. In his book, Tenants Under Siege: Inside New York City’s Housing Crisis, Michael Greenberg states:

> Rent-stabilized apartments are disappearing at an alarming rate: since 2007, at least 172,000 apartments have been deregulated. To give an example of how quickly affordable housing can vanish, between 2007 and 2014, 25 percent of the rent-stabilized apartments on the Upper West Side of Manhattan were deregulated.\(^4\)

\(^1\) The National Low Income Housing Coalition, 2017  
\(^2\) New York University Furman Center 2017  
\(^3\) Durkin 2016  
\(^4\) Greenberg 2017
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The 2017 figures should not be compared to previous years, because of a change in the definition of extremely low income.

Source: NLIHC tabulations of 2015 ACS PUMS data.
With a diminishing stock of rent-stabilized apartments, New Yorkers are getting pushed out and displaced to distant corners of or outside the City. New Yorkers are increasingly living farther from work, school, entertainment, and their social networks.

Smart growth advocates believe it is best to live close to where you work. Benefits of living close to where you work go beyond shorter commute times and extend to include a deeper investment in the development and growth of one’s community. As New Yorkers are spending more time commuting to work in neighborhoods disconnected from the communities in which they live, the city becomes more fragmented and the strong identities or qualities that make neighborhoods vibrant become weakened. Artists are also impacted when they are not able to live close to where they work. Providing artists with affordable housing in communities where they live and work can also strengthen the social cohesion and identity of a community. As an additional benefit, arts and culture can engage individuals and communities that traditionally have been excluded from the civic decision-making process and create a platform for those communities to participate.  

New York City is globally known as a cultural capital, with a thriving arts and entertainment scene that attracts tourists from all over the world. Artists are a population that is essential to maintaining the City’s arts, culture, and vibrancy. Over 60 million tourists visit New York City annually, many of whom come to experience all of the arts and entertainment the city has to offer, from Broadway shows to the Metropolitan Museum of Art. Artists play a critical role in ensuring the success of the City’s tourist and creative economies.

In New York City, there is a lack of affordable housing designated for artists. The dearth of affordable housing is a national problem, but given the importance of the arts to New York City, the lack of affordable artist housing is an especially glaring issue. New York City attracts residents and visitors because of its vibrant art and cultural scene, but many artists themselves struggle to stay and thrive in the City.
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THE PROBLEM

FEDERAL AND TOP 4 LARGEST MUNICIPALITY CULTURAL BUDGETS

Houston Mayor’s Office of Cultural Affairs
Chicago Department of Cultural Affairs and Special Events
Los Angeles County Art Commission
NYC Department of Cultural Affairs
Federal Government [NEA, NEH, Smithsonian]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOU</td>
<td>$0.375M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHI</td>
<td>$29.9M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>$93.0M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYC</td>
<td>$323.9M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FED</td>
<td>$991.9M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROBLEM

What is the economic value of THE ARTS?

- **$698 Billion** What the arts contribute to the U.S. economy
- **$334.9 Billion** Total compensation of arts and culture workers
- **$105 Billion** Total capital investments in arts and culture
- **$869 Billion** Contribution to GDP from copyright-intensive industries
- **62** Number of additional jobs created for every 100 from new demand for the arts

Affordable artist housing is necessary for building an equitable and inclusive cultural landscape in New York City. A recent study by the City University of New York’s Guttman College exposed a dire lack of diversity within New York City’s arts scene. The Guttman study found that 80 percent of artists represented in New York City’s top commercial galleries are white, 68 percent are male and nearly 33 percent graduated from Yale University. Apart from visual arts, New York City’s cultural arts institutions, such as non-profits and museums, also do not reflect the demographic diversity of the city. A 2016 study released by NYC Department of Cultural Affairs (DCLA) found that “New York City’s cultural workforce is 61.8 percent white, 35.4 percent minority groups, and 53.1 percent female, while the city’s residents are 33 percent white and 52 percent female, according to the 2010 U.S. Census.” The study’s data were summarized from over 1,000 surveys from organization receiving city funding. The study also found that in cultural organizations, people of color were more likely to serve in lower paying retail, security, and custodial positions, rather than in higher-wage leadership, managerial, or curatorial roles. Lower-income artists and lower-income minorities who work in the arts are more likely to be displaced by skyrocketing rents, thus exacerbating existing diversity issues. While affordable artist housing is critical for laying down the bricks for a more equitable and inclusive cultural arts scene, it also acts as a social tool and building block for communities.

As mentioned earlier, the arts play a massive economic role in New York City, with the City’s nonprofit arts and cultural sector alone contributing an eight-billion-dollar impact. The entire creative and cultural sectors of NYC are estimated to have 21.2 billion dollars in economic impact. “Creative New York,” a 2015 report released by the Center for an Urban Future, highlights the growth of the creative sector comparatively to other traditional sectors. Although the technology sector has grown more rapidly in recent years, and industries such as healthcare and retail have more jobs overall, the creative sector arguably provides New York City with its greatest competitive advantage. In 2013, New York City was home to 8.6 percent of all creative sector jobs in the nation, up from 7.1 percent in 2003. New York City’s creative sector is growing, but its artists are struggling to stay. In a city where artists contribute so much to economic success, it is critical that artists are in turn supported with access to affordable artist housing within their own neighborhoods.

Beyond economic and cultural reasons, there are also public health, safety, and welfare reasons for ensuring affordable artist housing. In cities where rents far exceed the means of income, artists may turn to informal or unsafe housing in order to live. In Oakland, California artists found a makeshift home in a loft also known as the Ghost Ship. In addition to living
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quarters, the loft also functioned as a performance space for emerging and underground musicians. In December 2016, thirty-six lives were lost in a devastating fire that broke out in the Ghost Ship during an electronic music performance. A former warehouse converted into live/work lofts, this type of unregulated housing is common and popular among artists living in major metropolitan areas. Warehouse lofts in formerly industrial areas tend to be spacious and light-filled, ideal for multi-disciplinary work and many versatile uses. When converting loft spaces into living spaces in disinvested neighborhoods, rents tend to be much cheaper than traditional apartments or homes, thus making them even more attractive for the struggling artist. Unfortunately, the tragedy in Oakland could have potentially been avoided if city officials provided more affordable artist housing. In New York City, the loft board has emerged as a city department that oversees and regulates the use of former industrial warehouses and live/work spaces for artists. While the loft board is a small step in the right direction, more needs to be done at the municipal level to include artist designated housing in affordable housing projects.

Without an increase in affordable artist housing units, artists will continue to struggle to live and work comfortably in New York City. Artists are not only important economic drivers, but influential cultural makers. Without artists, New York City’s vibrant cultural scene would cease to exist.

Artists are increasingly vulnerable when it comes to securing stable and affordable housing in New York City. There are several reasons for this, including the city-wide dearth of affordable housing stock, the NYC Human Rights Law’s stipulation against occupational preference in affordable housing developments, and the unique challenges associated with artistic income. Additionally, the creation of affordable artist housing over other types of affordable housing may be perceived as controversial due to concerns of gentrification and displacement.

As previously discussed, the lack of affordable housing impacts the ability for artists to thrive in New York City. Artists also face additional challenges to accessing available affordable housing because of the NYC Human Rights Law, which prohibits occupational preferences for affordable units. This law is unique to New York City and prevents developments from directly targeting artists. This law and its impact on artist housing in the City will be discussed at length in the NYC Legal Framework section.

In addition to these challenges, artists also often have episodic and fluctuating income, which makes accessing existing affordable housing more difficult. Depending on the type of art they engage in, artists may have periods of infrequent or less lucrative work. Effort spent working on projects does not always equate to the income received. Income inconsistency and fluctuation often leads to economic instability for working artists. Due to this income fluctuation and instability, it is common for artists to find multiple sources of income. Only 15 percent of artists live solely off their work and rely on their artistic endeavors as their primary source of income; most have supplementary jobs in service or other industries. Even with multiple income sources, many artists still struggle to make enough to live comfortably; in fact, 11 percent of artists live below the poverty line. On average, artists make only $10,000 a year off their art. If they do manage to generate income working in a creative industry rather than directly from their art, creatives tend to make less than the national median wage.

Exacerbating struggles with low wages, many artists find it difficult to take advantage of affordable housing programs due to financial circumstances unique to the artist population. As previously mentioned, artistic income is often sporadic or unstable, making it difficult to officially document for purposes of eligibility for affordable housing initiatives. An inability to prove a steady income can make it difficult for artists to obtain city-operated affordable housing. Conversely, an artist may receive payment for their work in a lump sum as compensation of work performed over a long period of time. When using standard methods of annual income calculation, it will appear that the artist makes too much money to qualify for affordable housing. These unique circumstances are not indications of an artist’s ability to pay rent within an affordable housing program, nor should they exclude this population from access to the benefits of affordable housing. The unique
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CHALLENGES
financial situations of artists should not deny them the right to fair affordable housing.

The lack of affordable housing options is propelling artists and creatives to leave the city in droves. One of the largest art collectives in New York City recently departed to Detroit, which has been attracting artists for years due to its affordability and excess space. The current affordable housing that is being created does not adequately serve the affordability and space needs for artists. Beyond their economic importance, artists also engage in creative placemaking that makes their communities attractive for both current residents and visitors. While there is often a perception that affordable artist housing can lead to gentrification and displacement, thoughtfully integrated affordable artist housing can have positive impacts on neighborhoods.

Artists need to be saved from extinction in the very city that reaps the benefits from their work. New York City needs to prioritize the creation of affordable artist housing.

**NYC Legal framework**
Understanding the legalities preventing the provision for affordable housing for artists in New York City is key to being able to fully navigate the law and provide affordable housing opportunities for a unique demographic of New Yorkers. Affordable Housing for artists is something that would benefit the entire city. It would advance our economy and ensure that a huge economic contributor to the city’s success, the arts, would remain in the city by housing artists with fluctuating and episodic incomes. Denying opportunities for those most in need was not the original intent of the Human Rights Law that prevents discrimination in housing. These rules, however, are currently preventing developers from providing affordable housing exclusively for artists. The New York City legal system is complex, but there is the possibility to amend the law. The Actors Fund has had some success navigating around the regulations with legal marketing practices and partnerships with developers with common goals.

**Legal Structure**
Providing affordable housing in New York City is no easy feat. After the funding is established, the legalities are another hurdle that has to be overcome by developers. In the city, the legal framework includes navigating through Federal, State, and City regulations. Federal and State regulations, as far as we have concluded, do not have legal issues that prevent developers in New York City from providing housing exclusively for artists or any single occupation.

New York City, like any municipality, is governed by a series of rules and regulations. In 1665, the State of New York first granted New York City the power of self-government by charter. The Charter, which is the equivalent of the City’s Constitution, can be revised by local law. Legislative power is vested in the City Council under the NYC Charter. City
Council bills, called Intros, are referred to committees, and committees decide whether or not to present the Intro to the full City Council for a final vote. Intros that are passed by the City Council and approved by the Mayor become local laws. Next, the City Record is the official journal of the New York City government. The City Record publishes local laws, City Council actions, mayoral executive orders, selected court decisions, rules proposed and adopted by city agencies, and notices of meetings and hearings. City Council Members are allowed to publish reports, hold hearings, and issue brief papers that are included with local laws and are referred to as “bill jackets”. Aside from local laws, agencies and departments are allowed to establish Rules which are issued as Titles. Lastly, New York City agencies and departments issue administrative decisions. Agency decisions are cataloged on the Center for New York City Law.

The Human Rights Law is Title 8 of the Administrative Code of the City of New York and prohibits discrimination in employment, housing, public accommodations, retaliation, discriminatory harassment, and bias-based profiling by law enforcement. Protected classes under the Human Rights Law include age, citizenship status, color, disability, gender, gender identity, marital status, national origin, pregnancy, race, religion/creed, sexual orientation, and status as a Veteran or Active Military Service Member.

History of the Human Rights Law
The Human Rights Law was established in 1955 by Mayor Robert F. Wagner. The City Council established the Commission on Intergroup Relations on July 1 under Local Law 55 to replace the original Committee on Unity. In 1962 the committee was renamed the Commission on Human Rights. In 1965, Local Law 55 and Local Law 80 were amended and combined into Local Law 97, the Human Rights Law of the City of New York (Chapter I, Title B, later Title 8, of the Administrative Code of the City of New York). This amendment greatly expanded the Commission’s powers of investigation and enforcement, and extended the Commission’s jurisdiction to prosecute discrimination based on race, creed, color and national origin in employment, public accommodations and housing, as well as commercial space. Amended in 1984, the Private Clubs Bill, Local Law 63, prohibited discrimination by private clubs with more than 400 members. Protection on the basis of citizenship and alien status was added, and jurisdiction over housing discrimination was extended to include protection of lawful occupation and persons with children. According to John Mangin, of NYC Department of City Planning’s Council Division, New York City’s Housing and Preservation Department (HPD) is negotiating amendments to the Human Rights Law to better operate in the intent of the law and permit affordable housing for those most in need.
CHALLENGES

Implementation | Enforcement
Legal obligations are not avoidable and enforcement, or accountability, is primarily monitored through the awarding of financial tools. HPD works together with a variety of public and private partners to achieve the City’s affordable housing goals of supporting New Yorkers with a range of incomes, from the very lowest to those in the middle class. HPD accomplishes these goals through a combination of loan programs, tax incentives, disposition of City-owned land, tax credits, and other development incentives. During the planning, design, and construction phases of development, HPD works with developers to ensure that projects are designed and built in keeping with the agency’s standards for quality construction, environmental sustainability, and cost containment. In the case of City-owned sites awarded to developers through HPD’s RFP process, the agency also secures public land use approval for site development prior to disposition.

Developers can use these resources to learn more about HPD’s requirements, services, and forms that apply to the development process. Those who are new to the development process and/or are seeking assistance evaluating real estate development opportunities can consult HPD’s Pre-Qualified List or Owner’s Representatives to seek an NYC-based firm with prior experience working with HPD and HDC.

In addition to HPD enforcing the non-discriminatory intent of not allowing occupational preference, the Department of Buildings enforces these laws through their permit application process.

Processes to Amend the Law
Amending the law is as much a political process as it is a legal process. It takes a movement to gain the political traction to label a cause worthy enough to write it into law. Amendments to the law Human Rights Law would be quite the undertaking, but may be a worthwhile long-term goal in the effort to make provisions for affordable artist housing in NYC easier. In an interview with Chris Carroll of the Musicians Union, he suggested that the Local Law would need to be amended. The political climate in which an amendment would be feasible would be one in which an organization would have the political support of number of like-minded organization that could have a number of goals, but must share in the common goal of obtaining affordable housing for artists. According to Mr. Carroll, “There isn’t a politician or union who wouldn’t support affordable housing.”
# Affordable Artist Housing In The United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Affordable Housing Complexes</th>
<th>City Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>998,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>8,550,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Portland, Maine</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>632,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Houston, Texas</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2,296,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Phoenix, Arizona</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1,583,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Las Vegas, Nevada</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>623,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Albuquerque, New Mexico</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>559,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Charlotte, North Carolina</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>827,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Anchorage, Alaska</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>298,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Los Angeles, California</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>3,971,883</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The studio began its research by reviewing materials provided by the Actors Fund, including CreateNYC: A Cultural Plan for New York City and Creative Placemaking by Ann Markusen and Anne Gadwa (2010). The studio looked at the history of the Actors Fund and how the organization has served the interests of artists. Additionally, the studio read Loft Living by Sharon Zuki, which gave us a significant overview of the history of artist’s housing issues in New York City.

Next, we surveyed the state of Affordable Artists Housing in the United States by dividing the country into six geographic regions and making a systematic review of affordable artist housing in each region. We looked through topical academic databases to seize the main challenges of the issue. We also looked for relevant newspaper articles, organizations’ websites, press releases, and government and city in order to measure the issue of affordable housing for artists at both the local and city-scale.

The studio also tried to get in touch with significant stakeholders throughout the country through different means (phone, mail, in person). We visited both Actors Fund New York sites including the Schermerhorn site and the Friedman Residence to learn about their dynamics. Many interviews helped us to build a comprehensive view of the New York framework, including ones with Daniel Arnow and Barbara Davis from the Actor Fund, the Department of City Planning John Mangin, and Christopher Caroll a former Actors Fund worker and link to the artist’s union American Federation of Musicians.

Our research led us to survey the most often utilized financial tools to implement affordable artist housing, including the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit, Tax Increment Financing, and private funding. We also surveyed the very definition of an artist by looking at a wide spectrum of different definitions that had to be examined and classified within a global scale.

After our initial research, we then picked a small number of cities for in-depth case studies. We picked the selected cities by the successes of their artist housing plans and projects. We felt that New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Boston, New Orleans, Miami, and Miami Beach offered the most to learn from. We also looked at Seattle and Portland, although we felt there efforts could be covered more briefly. Through our research, we also determined that it would be beneficial to look closely at the work of three organizations: Meta Housing Corporation, which is a for-profit corporation, and Actors Fund and Artspace, which are both nonprofit organizations.
The Actors Fund was created in 1882 to serve those working professionally in film, theater, television, music, opera, radio and dance. The fund offers programs that are tailored to the unique needs of these professions. Since its inception, the Actors Fund has provided a safety net for those working in these creative industries. Recognizing the precarious nature of work in the acting industry, the Actors Fund seeks to provide artists with the tools needed to guarantee a dignified life while they pursue their art. In addition to housing, the Actors Fund provides critical services for the acting and performing arts community, including support services, financial counseling, senior care, parenting resources, and health insurance. These services allow the Actors Fund to be on the pulse of what the creative community needs to stay vibrant.

Properties
The Actors Fund helps to create affordable housing for artists across the United States. In New York City and Los Angeles, the Fund has four complexes that provide affordable housing and services for the artist community. The Schermerhorn in Brooklyn, the Dorothy Ross Friedman Residence in Manhattan, the Lillian Booth Actors Fund Home in Englewood, New Jersey, and the Palm View in West Hollywood, California have all been created by the Actors Fund.
The complexes created by the Actors Fund offer space for residents to work and social services, including financial and wellness services, for artists. In Manhattan, the Friedman Residence has 178 units of supportive housing. The Friedman Residence offers supportive services to seniors and people living with HIV and AIDS. All residents are eligible to take part in informational seminars, and they are able to receive referrals for community services, entitlement programs, support groups, health education, and coordination in their home care and medical needs. In Brooklyn, the Schermerhorn is a 217-unit building that provides residents with a performing arts space, enabling the community at large to witness their talents. Supportive health services, such as support groups for chemical dependency, are also offered. In New Jersey, Lillian Booth Home offers older members of the community a secure home to retire in peace, away from the intensity of the city. Medicare and Medicaid support is offered, taking away the burden from these individuals who have dedicated the vast majority of their lives to the arts. In California, The Palm View is similar in operational style to the Friedman Residence. It is a supportive housing building for artists who have been diagnosed with HIV/AIDS or have a disability. This 40-unit residence helps steer the creative community towards the support they need and allows them to continue to pursue careers in the arts. These residences help guarantee a home for art in hectic cities like New York and Los Angeles.

The Actors Fund is an essential resource to the acting and performing arts community. Creative urban dwellers can turn to their programs in time of need; their safety net allows artists to take risks and create the art our society needs to thrive. Their housing programs are pivotal to ensuring the next generation of artists can afford to live and work in New York City, and they also provide for those who have put in a lifetime of time and effort into the arts community. The Actors Fund is one of many creative organizations that make New York City the cultural center of the world.

Artspace is a nonprofit organization that uses the tools of real estate development to create affordable live/work spaces for artists. Based in Minnesota and active for 38 years, Artspace has created artist developments in 20 states across the United States; the organization has created over 2,000 live/work units and millions of square feet of non-residential community and commercial space. Artspace often rehabilitates old historic buildings into new artist spaces, but the organization has also constructed new developments specifically for artists. Artspace uses a broad definition of artist for their eligibility requirements: artists are individuals who have made a sustained commitment to their craft, are excited about participating in both the community of the building and the neighboring community, and are comfortable living in a building that may be noisier, more lively, and more social than other rental properties. Artspace also features an Artist Selection Committee dedicated to the selection of artists to ensure that artists meet their eligibility requirements.

Funding
Artspace has been instrumental in the fight to secure public funds and tax cuts for the development of affordable artist housing. Artspace frequently uses LIHTC to fund their developments. Artspace is able to use these funds for artist housing because after being audited and attacked by the Internal Revenue Service for violating the general public use requirement of the tax credit law by using LIHTC with an artist...
preference, Artspace successfully built a coalition of stakeholders to advocate for an amendment to the tax credit law.\textsuperscript{18}

For both Artspace and cities around the country, the ability to use LIHTC and other federal tax cuts for developments with an artist preference became an effective tool to attract and retain artists while still complying with fair housing laws. Artspace’s fight for the artist preference in affordable housing allowed for the proliferation of artist developments throughout the country. Artspace developments are funded by a large variety of donors, including public and private foundations, financial institutions, and charitable contributions dedicated to art and culture. Artspace often utilizes LIHTC, Historical Preservation Tax Credits, Community Development Block Grant funds, and private financing to rehabilitate or construct their properties. Artspace is currently an owner or co-owner of over $500 million in properties.\textsuperscript{19}

In addition to property development, Artspace offers consulting services for artist communities or organizations who are looking to improve existing facilities or identify new ones. Artspace also offers an Arts Market Survey, which gauges the size and nature of the market for affordable live/work spaces, and an online toolkit, which offers practical advice and tools for community organizations or artists looking to develop art spaces.


Meta Housing Corporation, based in California, is a for-profit housing development corporation that was established in 1993. Since then, Meta Housing Corporation has developed more than 6,400 residential units - mainly focused on community based affordable and mixed-income apartment communities. Their successful strategy is built upon securing and leveraging state and federal tax credits, such as LIHTC, and arranging complex finance structures that ensure the highest and best use of available funds. Self-described as having a strong sense of advocacy and interest in innovation, Meta Housing Corporation builds relationships with public, private and community partners on all of their projects. They are best known for creating housing complexes for seniors as well as artists. While they have been able to legally provide artist designated housing that they call “arts colonies,” their other projects have included a “much-needed grocery store in South Los Angeles, adaptive reuse of a nine-story bank building in Chinatown for senior housing, housing for veterans and formerly homeless individuals and families, [and] many other transit-oriented and inclusionary housing developments.”

Affordable housing in the United States is not paid for directly by the federal government as it was in the past. Housing for working people is created using a cornucopia of financial tools and programs. In New York City, there are housing laws and initiatives that help spur the creation of affordable housing. Market-based solutions help house a population of New Yorkers who could not afford to live in the city without assistance.

The concept of using the market for the creation of affordable housing led to the creation of tax subsidies and block grants to spur growth rather than directing funding by the state. The Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) was first introduced by the federal government in 1986. It is a tool used by for-profit and not-for-profit developers to create housing.

It was rolled out at the same time as the homeowner mortgage subsidy, which allows homeowners to write off the interest on their mortgage. In the 1970’s the federal government spent 50% of all housing subsidies on affordable construction. By 2005 that number had fallen to 20%.

The federal government also uses block grants to create affordable housing. Block grants are lump sum payments given to municipal governments to pay for programs. Block grants are not the most effective finance tool (they are meant only to supplement the amount spent on housing, or other services), but in reality, are used in lieu of municipal dollars. The two largest block grants given to the city by the federal agency of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) are the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), and the HOME grant. The HOME grant is a tool used by the city to subsidize down payments for first-time homeowners. The CDBG is given to municipalities by HUD.
to create affordable housing. The use of market based solutions is a creative choice in financing affordable housing. New York State offers tax incentives to create affordable housing. One of those is the 421-a tax abatement. It is a tax policy that was created in 1971 to spur development in underutilized areas of the city. It is meant to create more affordable housing by allowing developers to create new buildings but not pay taxes on the improvement on the land. The exemptions last 10, 25, and 35 years. These exemptions can be renegotiated at the end of the period to preserve affordable housing. This is one of the strategies being used by the de Blasio administration to preserve 120,000 units of affordable housing.

The economy in certain parts of New York City began to rebound in the 1980’s. Lawmakers observed that the 421-a was in danger of becoming a giveaway to developers, they moved to create Geographic Exclusion Areas (GEA). The first GEA was in Manhattan from 14th street to 96th street from east to west. Soon all of Manhattan, Greenpoint, and Williamsburg in Brooklyn was added. To build in a GEA and use the 421-a 25 – 30% of all units must be affordable. This helped make sure that newly constructed buildings were helping in the effort to provide affordable housing for working New Yorkers.

Affordability in the United States is dictated by area median income (AMI). AMI is a metric that was created by the
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Federal agency, HUD (Housing and Urban Development) to measure the affordability of an area. AMI sets the standard for what counts as affordability in a given area and offers options on affordability based on median income. In New York, the median income for a family of 4 is $95,400. “Deeply Affordable” housing is created at 30% of AMI or $28,620 for a family of 4.32

Critics of AMI point out that it considers the median income of a metro region rather than the immediately surrounding area. This means that a low-income area such as Mott Haven in the South Bronx is compared to an extremely wealthy neighborhood such as Rye in Westchester. This artificially inflates levels of affordability, which disproportionately harms the low-income families purported to be assisted by affordable housing programs, and drives displacement. For AMI to gauge true affordability for all New Yorkers, the parameters of its calculation need to be reconsidered.33

Within NYC, the Department of Housing Preservation and Development has programs to address affordable housing. One is called the Neighborhood Construction Program. This program funds the creation of infill affordable housing up to 30 units per building. The units can be in any income band up to 165% of AMI. To facilitate construction, the city sells property to developers at very low rates. A borrower must be a Housing Development Fund Corporation (HDFC) and can be in partnership with for profit-developers.34 The project does not need to serve incomes in the lowest band. Another program is the New Infill Homeownership Opportunities Program. It is a homeownership program that creates new affordable housing to spur mixed income communities. It aims to offer homes at the 90% AMI level. The resident purchases the home and promises to live there for 20 years in exchanged for a reduced price and no real estate taxes.35 These programs help to address the affordable housing crisis in our city.

Other innovative ideas are occurring around the United States to spur the development of affordable housing. Tax Increment Financing (TIF) is a tool used primarily outside of New York City (but has been used to spur development here) to promote development in economically underutilized areas. An economic development project is financed through TIF. The public improvement project is created, and the city collects the same amount of taxes it did if the property had not been developed. Any future tax revenue, which is now greater because the property has a higher value, is diverted into the project to fund its activity. Chicago has used TIF extensively and New York is experimenting with it at

---

Hudson Yards. This value capture strategy allows a city to retain revenue and promote development at no cost to the tax payers. Strategies like this can be the key to creating more affordable housing in New York.

Affordable housing in New York City is being addressed through incentives and tax abatements. Using private development to spur growth in affordable housing is difficult by necessary in the current political climate. The financial tools outlined are essential to any solution to solving the affordable housing crisis in New York.

---

The studio divided the United States into six geographic regions and then researched artist housing policies, plans, and developments within those regions. Research was conducted for each region to determine if there were active affordable housing policies and plans targeting artists and if there were any thriving artist housing developments within those states. Although major cities were of greater interest because of their comparability to New York City, suburban and rural areas within these states were also researched. Current municipal policies or plans...
for affordable housing targeting artists were only found in some states, but artist housing developments were found in a variety of states. Every artist housing development found utilized public funding in some way; common forms included federal LIHTC or state funds. The research conducted in the six different regions led our studio to focus on the artist housing policies and development work of seven cities: New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Boston, New Orleans, and Miami and Miami Beach. Additionally, the studio surveyed the cities of Seattle and Portland, which are briefly covered in this section.
For decades, New York City has been a premier destination for painters, sculptors, dancers, and musicians from across the globe. The City, however, risks losing its artists if it does not provide subsidized housing and more exhibition and studio space to support the creative class. Affordable housing in New York City has been an ongoing process of legalities. Housing New York is a comprehensive plan issued by the Mayor Bill de Blasio Administration that documents how the mayor plans to preserve and provide affordable housing for New Yorkers by promoting homeless, senior, supportive, and accessible housing. The de Blasio Administration was able to amend the Zoning Resolution and introduce vehicles for private developers to provide affordable housing for the marginalized through Zoning for Quality and Affordability and Mandatory Inclusionary Housing. In addition to private developers, the public sector provides affordable housing through the New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA).

Affordable Housing for Artists
In 2015, Mayor de Blasio established the Department of Cultural Affairs (DCLA), which sought to promote the cultural community and their impact on the city. In celebration of the cultural amenities the City has to offer and the artists who bring value and economic prosperity to the City, DCLA released CreateNYC, a cultural plan that states that 97% of New Yorkers value the
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In his 2015 State of the City speech, Mayor de Blasio’s promised the creation of 1,500 affordable units for artists by 2025 to help preserve the dynamic culture of the City. Support for the proposal was found in the words of Maria Torres-Springer, the Commissioner of NYC Housing Preservation and Development (HPD).

At HPD, we see the development of affordable housing as an opportunity to meet the broader needs of communities, including the creation of space for arts and culture to flourish. As we continue to advance the goals of the Mayor’s Housing New York plan, we look forward to partnering with DCLA and taking advantage of the many synergies to build on New York City’s long history as a mecca for artists and the arts.

Although there are many strategies to provide affordable housing in New York City, artists often have trouble finding affordable housing because of their episodic and fluctuating incomes. Organizations, such as the Actors Fund, have tried to help applicants in the arts industry navigate the application process and documentation of their income as a strategy to help make artists more viable candidates for public affordable housing.

Applicants and Application Process
Affordable housing opportunities are available to anyone who can meet the income requirements. New York City has made information on how to apply easily accessible on their website, NYC Housing Connect. On the site, applicants can fill out a basic application with current housing information, income, and assets. In addition to an easily accessible application, the City has also gone to great lengths to prevent housing discrimination. The Human Rights Law in New York City prevents discrimination in housing, including on the basis of occupation. Because of this exception, developers cannot give preference to groups based on occupation, such as artists. Although artists may apply to eligible properties, there are no opportunities exclusively for this unique group. New York City’s law is currently the only one of its kind in the country that explicitly prohibits occupational preference. Although there are legal impediments to providing affordable housing exclusively for artists, New York City has had a few successful projects targeting artists. Most often, legal, affordable housing for artists is established under Loft Laws and as Joint Living-Work Quarters for Artists, where construction codes are provided exclusively to allow artists to have studio space and living quarters in the same unit. These laws are only applicable, however, in a few zoning districts in SoHo.
The Westbeth project in Manhattan attempted to answer the dual need for studios and housing. Named for its location on West and Bethune streets in West Greenwich Village across from the Hudson River Piers, the building was originally the Bell Telephone Laboratory, a massive structure with neo-Renaissance detailing where sound-on-film was developed and the first public demonstration of television was given.41

Development
While the disappearance of most of New York City’s lofts is due to real estate developers interest in more profitable uses for these sites, Westbeth paradoxically owes its existence to one of the best-known of these developers, William Zeckendorf, Sr. Long aware of the need for low-rent housing for artists, Mr. Zeckendorf had for many years considered the Bell building ideal for this purpose. In the spring of 1967, when the building was offered to him for $2.5 million, he immediately agreed to the purchase. Mr. Zeckendorf then telephoned Roger Stevens, Chairman of the National Council on the Arts and Government, who accepted the invitation to partner with the team to move forward with the project with alacrity.42

Building Residents
The resident population is comprised of painters, sculptors, printmakers, craftsmen, ceramicists, architects, film-makers, photographers, composers, musicians, singers, dancers, choreographers, writers, poets, playwrights, actors, directors,
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mask-makers, jewelers, and designers of everything from industrial wares to stage lighting.

**Application Process**

When it opened in 1970, all Westbeth tenants received a one-year lease, but no one was expected to stay for more than five years. The choice of tenants was based on two criteria: the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) regulations on maximum annual income ($7,150 for one person to $11,750 for a family of five or six) and proof that applicants were serious artists. Three letters of reference from teachers or recognized artists were also required. Applications were evaluated by a small group of Westbeth sponsors who included artists in every field, museum directors, critics, West Village community leaders, and others.

**Building and Tenant Details**

Westbeth is a 625,000 square foot, 13 story building with high ceilings, large windows, heavy-load-bearing floors, and a theater.

The building features 383 loft-type units. Most include studio space as part of the residence area and are unpartitioned except for bathroom and kitchen. Because of FHA regulations, apartment assignments are based on family size, which often leads to a disservice to artists; these regulations may lead to a mask-maker with three children having more space than a painter of gigantic canvases who is married to a sculpture, but has no children. Adding to these complications, the FHA originally required a certain turnover in tenants. The FHA later removed their requirement of tenant turnover and tenants were allowed to remain in their units indefinitely. The waiting lists are currently closed.

**Funding**

Mr. Zeckendorf turned the building over to the National Council on the Arts and Government at a cost; the Council and the Kaplan Fund each made a $750,000 grant to the Westbeth Corporation to close contract and begin renovation. The $12 million needed for the acquisition and conversion was provided by FHA mortgage financing, a mixed blessing, since the low interest rate carried with it myriad requirements for family groups, tenants over 65, and decorative niceties, which, in this case, were detrimental to the project’s purpose. With this innovative funding spearheaded by Joan Davidson of the J. M. Kaplan Foundation, and Roger Stevens of the National Endowment for the Arts, however, the team was able to act as pioneers in the establishment of affordable housing for artists.
El Barrio’s Artspace PS109 was developed through a partnership with local community organization El Barrio Operation Fightback. The project successfully transformed an abandoned public school building into an arts and housing facility. The project was funded both publicly and privately; nearly half of the funds came from LIHTC and local housing and arts grants, with the remaining funds coming from the Ford Foundation, the Warhol Foundation, JPMorgan Chase, the Rockefeller Foundation and other large foundations. After its development, 53,000 people applied to live in the building. To combat gentrification, Artspace claimed it would reserve 50% of the units for current East Harlem residents. The development was still met with criticism, however, from critics who believed that the development
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was too expensive and a misuse of federal, state, and city funds because the construction budget came out to $580,000 per household.⁴⁹ Some applicants also questioned the fairness of the lottery system and the demanding financial proofs required for the application.

Some of the criticism leveled at PS109 is a more universal complaint about artist housing: the perceived notion that artist housing development selection processes favor white applicants. When nearly 80% of working artists are white, issues of inequalities, representation, and gentrification are bound to surface.⁵⁰ One 2016 study by the University of Minnesota Law School examined four affordable artist housing projects containing a total of 870 units in Minnesota and found that the occupants were 80% white.⁵¹ This study purports that the pricing practices and capricious artist-selection processes of artist housing developments tend to favor white sophisticates over more traditional residents of public housing. The study also claims that a gentrification process occurs through the adaptive reuse of historic buildings in neighborhoods that guarantee tax credits to developers. These issues are not unique to Artspace or PS109, but they are an undeniable part of the narrative of affordable artist housing in both New York and the United States at large.


housing, they do not directly recognize the need to provide affordable housing specifically for artists. The Affordable Housing Partnership for Artists appears to be the only City-led initiative to make affordable housing available for artists; unfortunately, it was only a brief program lasting from 2014 to 2015 and funded by a National Endowment for the Arts Grant. Los Angeles, however, is unique in that it has eight artist colony residences independently developed by Meta Housing Corporation, as well as other affordable housing projects designated for artists.

Role of the City
Out of the nation’s largest 100 metropolitan regions, the Los Angeles region is the most expensive housing market in the country when comparing median rents to median incomes. According to the U.S. Census Bureau’s 2012-2016 American Community Survey, nearly 62% of Los Angeles renters are rent burdened, spending 30% or more of their income on rent. To combat the severe issue of rent burden, the City of Los Angeles has dedicated one of their public goals to reduce the number of rent-burdened households by at least 10 percentage points by 2025 and 15 percentage points by 2035. In addition to the Los Angeles pLAn, Mayor Garcetti released his own “Executive Directive 13 (ED13), Support for Affordable Housing” in October 2015. This directive of the mayor is a direct response to Los Angeles’s growing housing crisis. In this directive, Mayor Garcetti set goals to permit the building of 100,000 new housing units by 2021 and build or preserve at least 15,000 affordable units for low-income households by 2021. ED13 also established a cabinet composed of Department of City

Similarly to other large cities, Los Angeles has a severe lack of affordable housing. The City of Los Angeles and its Mayor Eric Garcetti have emphasized that the “availability and affordability of housing are among the most visible and important economic issues facing Angelenos today.”52 Los Angeles’ pLAn targets the need to create and preserve affordable housing and outlines concrete goals, including the creation of 100,000 new housing units by 2021 and the reduction in the number of rent-burdened households by at least 15 percent by 2035. While the Los Angeles pLAn and specific directives created by Mayor Garcetti address the need for affordable

Planning staff, Department of Building and Safety staff and Housing and Community Investment Development staff to implement policies that streamline the process for construction of rehabilitation of affordable housing projects. The city of Los Angeles also has a designated Affordable Housing Commission:

The Affordable Housing Commission consists of seven members, appointed by the Mayor, who advise the City’s leadership around affordable housing issues and rent control. Specifically, the Commission makes policy recommendations to address the city’s housing needs, including preserving and creating housing opportunities; reviews government’s plans and budgets to ensure they conform to City housing policy; and encourages cross-sector partnerships to promote the preservation and production of housing.

The City of Los Angeles seems committed to their goals to provide and preserve affordable housing. While ensuring affordable housing specifically for artists does not seem to be the City’s main priority, affordable housing in general certainly is.

In 2013, the City of Los Angeles Department of Cultural Affairs (LA DCA) received a National Endowment for the Arts “Our Town” Grant. The award, totaling $75,000, was invested in the “Affordable Artists’ Housing Partnership” (AAHP). The AAHP was a “program designed to provide access to affordable artists’ housing in Los Angeles, and...


create a replicable strategy for use in other communities." The AAHP, later changed to the Affordable Housing Partnership for Artists (AHPA), was ultimately created in 2014 and terminated after only one year in 2015. The LA DCA hired the Actors Fund to inform arts and entertainment professionals about available affordable housing in the community. Another essential part of the AHPA was providing education and training on how to effectively apply to available affordable housing. The work the Actors Fund provided focused mainly on three properties that were completed during the duration of the program:

As part of a federal housing initiative, those three property developers set aside 20% of their units at affordable rents, or 191 total affordable units. AHPA provided three-hour trainings on the application process to more than 900 participants over the course of the year. Of the 191 units available, 51 ultimately were rented to arts and entertainment professionals. The difference between the affordable rents charged to these artists and the market rate rents of the units totaled more than $1 million per year for the 51 artists and their families.

While the LA DCA did not continue AHPA, the fact it existed at all shows the City of Los Angeles places value on the creative economy and the arts and entertainment sector. An effort to educate and provide

The ACE/121 is a property located in downtown Glendale, California. It was built in 2017 by Meta Housing Corporation in collaboration with Western Community Housing, Inc. and the City of Glendale Housing Authority. The project was funded by utilizing the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee, which provides developers with federal and state tax cuts, including LIHTC. ACE/121 is a modern style, 70-unit building with one, two, and three bedroom floor plans. The building complex is 100 percent affordable and is designated specifically for artists and their families. The ACE/121 was Meta Housing Corporation’s second family arts colony. ACE/121 was also constructed using sustainable green principles and was built to LEED Silver standards. The property itself features on-site community spaces, art STUDIOS, gallery spaces, and a sculpture garden. Local community arts organization, EnGage, partners with the building to offer free professional-level arts activities and classes on an ongoing basis. An arts related entrance of the property connects the Ace/121 community with the Arts & Entertainment District to the West.

While the ACE/121 boasts impressive facilities, the project received community pushback over the selection process for new tenants. The selection process was based on a point system that ranked potential tenants, taking into consideration whether they were artists already working or living in Glendale. The points system prioritized artists who already lived in Glendale over artists that worked in Glendale but did not live there. Although Glendale city staff defended that the point system “was...
designed to be nondiscriminatory and in accordance with federal fair housing laws," many felt it was unfair because “taxpayers everywhere, not just Glendale residents, paid for the grant funding going into the project.”

Developed in San Pedro, California’s thriving Downtown Arts District in 2017, PacArts is Meta Housing Corporation’s first family arts colony. PacArts is a fully affordable, 49-unit apartment community featuring one, two, and three-bedroom rental units ranging in price from $500 to $1,300. PacArts features six ground floor live/work units, as well as professional-grade art studios and art gallery spaces. Every resident is an artist. Those who live in this new community were selected based upon submission of artistic works. The project, which cost $20 million dollars, was financed with 9% tax credits and funds from the Community Redevelopment Agency of Los Angeles.¹

Completed in 2009, Arbor Artist Lofts is a 21-unit housing development in Lancaster, California that provides affordable housing for working artists. The project, part of the City of Lancaster’s strategy to transform its struggling downtown into a regional hub for culture and the arts, received the 2010 American Institute of Architects/HUD Secretary’s Award for Creating Community Connection. Arbor Artist Lofts was a catalyst for the revitalization of downtown Lancaster, which earned a 2012 National Award for Smart Growth Achievement in the Overall Excellence category from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Public financing for the $5.1 million project came from the sale of low-income housing tax credits allocated by the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee. The units at Arbor Artist Lofts are available to households earning 60 percent or less of the AMI. To ensure the units are available to artists, potential residents must present a portfolio of their work and demonstrate that at least half of their income comes from the sale of their art.59

Located in West Hollywood, California, The Palm View is a 40-unit apartment complex that has provided homes to low-income people with disabilities since 1998. The Palm View consists of three buildings surrounding an outdoor courtyard, and is a collaborative project between The Actors Fund, the West Hollywood Community Housing Corporation (WHCHC), Housing for Entertainment Professionals, and various funders. While the buildings are managed by WHCHC, many of the residents are entertainment professionals referred to the property by the Actors Fund. The project was funded with $4 million of LIHTC and additional funding from the Actors Fund, the City of West Hollywood, the Community Development Commission of the County of Los Angeles, Citibank, F.S.B., and the Enterprise Social Investment Corporation. WHCHC also provides The Palm View residents with social services.60

---

A powerful economic and cultural hub, Chicago also faces similar affordability issues for artists as New York City and Los Angeles. In an attempt to combat rising unaffordability, Chicago has turned to using several tools, including Tax Increment Financing, LIHTC, rezoning, and numerous development partnerships. The City also conducts TIF pilot programs and works actively with artist community organizations.

**Overview**

Chicago, Illinois is the economic and cultural center of the Midwest. The City has a population of 2,705,000 residents and is located within the Chicagoland metro region, which has nearly ten million people. Chicago has also been known as an active urban planning hub because of its famed street grid, City Beautiful Movement, and school of architecture. Today, Chicago faces a dearth of affordable housing in a volatile housing market, which has suffered from dramatic changes in the last decade. After a boom period that triggered rising levels of home ownership and property values, Chicago saw a collapse of the housing market that led to a rise in foreclosures, rents, and distressed communities. Like many cities across the United States, Chicago is a city of renters with 56.2% of renter households close to the city center and lakefront. Many of these renters are rent burdened and struggling financially.

**Role of the City**

To combat these affordability issues, the City of Chicago has developed several initiatives and plans. The City’s Affordable Chicago initiative provides affordability resources and social services for low-income individuals, seniors, and families. Chicago developed a housing plan entitled “Bouncing Back: Five Year Housing Plan: 2014-2018”, which aims to strengthen the housing market by outlining policy initiatives and providing production estimates for more than $1.3 billion in spending to create, improve, and preserve more than 41,000 units of housing. Chicago also is a part of a comprehensive regional plan entitled “GO TO 2040”, which urges the city to maximize the use of its vacant and underutilized commercial and industrial properties for affordable housing and to decrease the number of rent-burdened households by providing more affordable units. Lastly, Chicago also has an Affordable Requirements Ordinance. The ordinance

---


requires residential developments that are 10 or more units that receive city financial assistance or involve city-owned land to provide 10-20 percent of their units at affordable prices. The ordinance is also required if a zoning change is granted or if the development is a “planned development” within the downtown area. For-sale units must be affordable to households at or below 100% AMI and rental units must be affordable to households earning up to 60% AMI for 30 years. Developers, however, could get out of the requirements if they paid a fee of $100,000 per required unit to the City’s Affordable Housing Opportunity Fund. In 2017, to improve the Affordable Requirements Ordinance, the Chicago City Council approved a three year pilot program in gentrifying areas that ended the option.

The hope is that these two areas, the Milwaukee Corridor Pilot Area and Near North/Near West Pilot Area, will see an increase in affordable housing units.

Chicago is a large cultural hub with almost 10 million visitors per year and more than 500 festivals; the City also has 60,000 jobs generating $2.2 billion dollars in the creative industry. Developed by Chicago’s Department of Cultural Affairs, the 2012 Chicago Cultural Plan aims to foster creativity within the arts and states the goal of attracting and retaining artists and creative professionals. The plan focuses on recognizing, supporting, and enhancing vibrant cultural districts and stresses the important of allocating housing to preserve the diversity of income levels in these cultural and artist districts. The plan also advocates for artist and creative spaces by recommending updated zoning, building codes, and license regulations to encourage artist live/work spaces and by encouraging the use of Tax Increment Financing (TIF) funds towards affordable artist housing and live/work spaces.64

In addition to its plans and legal tactics, the City of Chicago has used TIF to encourage affordable housing development. TIF has been a heavily used tool in Illinois since its adoption by the Illinois General Assembly in 1977. This locally controlled economic development tool has been applied to 250 TIF districts in Illinois.65 While it has been widely used in Chicago, this tool has been criticized by some studies arguing that the surplus of funds that could be used to alleviate the affordable housing problem has instead been given to private developers. Critics argue that too many TIF-funded units have been dedicated disproportionately to higher income households and properties within the Central Business District.


The Shops and Lofts 47 is a $46 million project with 96-units housed in five separate buildings in the Bronzeville TIF district, which is designated as a TIF district until 2022. It was developed by the nonprofit developer The Community Builders using $12.1 million in LIHTC, $20 million in bonds, and $13 million dollars in TIF funds. The development has over 30,000 square feet of mixed-use space including some affordable artist live/work rental units and art gallery space. The Cornerstone Apartments, also located in the Bronzeville TIF and developed by The Community Builders, offers fourteen rental units with an artist preference. These units are available to artists earning up to 80 percent of the AMI. Cornerstone Apartments was funded with $2 million in TIF funds and $9.5 million in LIHTC.

KLEO Art Residences is an upcoming project that will be located in the Washington Park TIF district, which is designated as a TIF district until 2038. This $23.4 million project will be developed as part of a partnership between the private developer Brinshore Development and the nonprofit KLEO Community Life Center. The project includes ground floor retail and 58 units designated for artists and their families making 60% AMI. This development will be built on two parcels of land purchased from the city for $1 a piece, and will be funded in part through $1.5 million in LIHTC and $6.4 million in TIF funds. This development will utilize public and private partnerships, including active city investment in redevelopment.

In addition to municipal actions, local initiatives by community-based organizations and civic groups have often led the effort for affordable housing for artists and performers. In 2005, the Chicago Artists Resource launched a website called Space Finder. The organizational website is dedicated to a diverse community of artists and provides information on housing, education, and cultural opportunities to over 80,000 people every month. This resource is aimed at building vibrant and accessible artistic communities. The thousands of people who use this site show its value as a resource tool for artists looking for housing.

The Chicago Artists Coalition is another organization of artists advocating for artists' rights and support and visibility in Chicago's cultural landscape and economy. Their advocacy work was critical to the formation of Chicago's Department of Cultural Affairs, the development of Chicago Artists Month, and the passing of the Percent for Art Ordinance, which requires 1.33% of new construction or renovation budgets for public buildings goes to a public art fund dedicated to the commission, purchase, and maintenance of public art. The Chicago Arts Coalition was the first to offer a residency with a curatorial component to artists with its HATCH Projects, which is still active today.

Formed in 2010, the Chicago Neighborhood Initiatives (CNI) aims to coordinate resources, economic development, and neighborhood revitalization efforts in Chicago’s low-to-moderate income neighborhoods. CNI is currently working on a project with Artspace and PullmanArts, a local group of artists, to create and develop an affordable 38-unit artist housing development in the Pullman neighborhood which will feature live/work units and 2,000 square feet of community space intended for use as a gallery, meeting place, and community space. The $18 million project is slated to break ground in spring 2018 and will be funded in part by $14 million in LIHTC and Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credits.

---


Boston is a striking example of artistic community empowerment in the U.S.A. The City is actively facing affordability issues and helping the artistic community thrive, as best seen in the artist housing developments in the Fort Point Art Community neighborhood. Boston is an example of a city where actions to keep artists thriving are happening at both the municipal and the grassroots level.

Overview
Boston is a dynamic city of 673,000 with a strong innovative attitude; artists are considered a catalyst for growth. The Greater Boston metropolitan region, which has a population of almost 5 million people, is built around creative and academic industries. Like many cities, Boston also suffers from important challenges including a high cost of living and gentrification. In the City of Boston, more than half of Boston tenants are rent-burdened; approximately 81,945 low-income households spend more than 30% of their income on rent or a mortgage. Moreover, 51,760 of those households are considered to be severely cost-burdened.71

Role of the City
By 2030, Boston will reach more than 700,000 residents. To plan for this population increase, the City of Boston released a housing plan in 2017 entitled Housing a Changing City: Boston 2030. The plan aims to create 53,000 new units of housing at a variety of income levels: 44,000 units of housing for the 71 “Affordable Housing in Boston,” City of Boston, accessed December 15, 2017. https://www.boston.gov/sites/default/files/affordable-housing-boston.pdf
workforce, 5,000 units of housing for senior citizens, and 4,000 units to stabilize the market and bring rents and housing prices under control. In addition to workers, seniors and low-income residents, the plan also mentions a priority for artist housing for emerging artists and young entrepreneurs, who provide economic vitality to their neighborhoods. The plan also mentions the challenges of artist housing and gentrification and recommends a fair distribution of units across the city to limit gentrification effects. To combat rising housing costs, the Boston Housing Authority (BHA) also provides public housing and other affordable housing options through Section 8 vouchers that help thousands of Bostonians acquire affordable housing. The subsidized housing program allows renters to pay 30% of their income towards rent with the subsidy covering the rest. To be eligible to Section 8, household income must be less than 50% or 80% AMI, based on household size. Another tool used to reduce the cost of developing affordable housing is providing state and local grants and low-interest loans to developers.

In 2016, the City of Boston also released a cultural plan entitled Boston Creates Cultural Plan. This cultural plan emphasizes the important role of the art community in the city’s dynamism. Recognizing that the City has not yet reached its full creative potential, the plan outline several goals, including keeping artists in Boston and attracting new ones, recognizing and supporting artists’ essential contribution to creating and maintaining a thriving, healthy, and innovative city. One of the strategies to pursue this goal is to “identify and pursue opportunities for affordable artist housing and presenting and production spaces.”

To achieve this goal, the plan notes that the City should look into increasing affordable housing stock and explore new housing models supporting artists, including mixed-constituency housing, artist cooperatives, and university partnerships. Another important strategy is to create an inventory, and promote the use, of existing City and privately-owned spaces and that buildings that can be used for individual artists. The plan also makes the case for encouraging artists to stay and thrive in Boston:

Artists help make Boston a more livable city. Artists drive a vibrant ecosystem of festivals, public art, galleries, performance spaces, not-for-profits, youth arts programs, and pop-up retail. Artists also function as small businesses by providing creative economy jobs and services for Boston residents. The work and endeavors of local artists dramatically enhance the quality of neighborhoods for both the people who live there and people who visit.
The City of Boston has also created a robust Artist Certification program, which was launched as a way for artists to easily prove their eligibility for artist housing. The Artist Certification is a letter from the Mayor’s Office of Arts and Culture and the Boston Planning & Development Agency confirming the recognition of the artist by a committee of peers as a working artist. The certification is effective for eight years, after which it must be renewed. Artists may be active in a variety of fields including visual arts, performing arts, literary arts and multidisciplinary arts. Applications for the certificates are reviewed quarterly and decisions are based on the evidence of a recent body of work offered to the public or documentation of previous work. Additionally, automatic certification is given to artists that have been awarded the following awards within the last three years: the Massachusetts Cultural Council Artist Fellowship, the Boston Foundation Brother Thomas Fellowship, the Boston Cultural Council Artist Fellowship, or the City of Boston Emerging Artist Award. Currently, around 1,000 artists hold a current Artist Certification from the City of Boston.

The Artist Certification program is utilized to ensure that only artists occupy artist spaces within the ArtistSpace program. The ArtistSpace program was developed by the Boston Planning & Development Agency in 2002 and aims to develop and preserve artist spaces within the city. The initiative is based on collaboration with other city agencies, including the Mayor’s Office of Arts and Culture and the Department of Neighborhood Development. ArtistSpace does not build or manage artist housing, but it actively encourages developers to create income-restricted units for artists. ArtistSpace encourages projects that promote spaces that are permanently dedicated to artists, are located in zones that do not support traditional family housing, and offer live/work spaces for rent or purchase. ArtistSpace also helps people connect with existing housing by marketing artist developments on their website. ArtistSpace broadcasts opportunities and acts as a facilitator of a list of more than 150 privately-managed spaces. The Boston Planning & Development Agency also works with developers to create more artists housing, and monitors compliance of artist housing that has income restrictions.
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The most important organization in the City is the Fort Point Arts Community (FPAC), which is a 30-year old community nonprofit located in the Fort Point neighborhood that advocates for artists and develops affordable live/work spaces. Two of the artist developments developed by FPAC are limited equity artist co-ops. Although these two developments are only for visual artists, the limited equity co-op model allows the housing to stay affordable over the long-term and ensures that only artists occupy the space. All members of the co-op must be primary residents of the building, which ensures investment in the property, and if members choose to sell their property, prices are negotiated to keep the units affordable.
The Artist Building at 300 Summer Street, which opened in 1995, is a self-governing artist-owned live/work cooperative for visual artists in downtown Boston. Developed by FPAC, the residence offers 47 live-work units. To live at the property, visual artists must show proof of a recent body of work and have an education in visual arts, a past exhibition or a recommendation from a recognized professional artist. The cost of the live/work units is calculated according to the Maximum Transfer Value (MTV) as defined in the building by-laws. Monthly charges are comprised of a debt fee, a cooperative fee, a monthly payment on a share loan, and homeowner insurance. Although these costs may appear overwhelming for artists with fluctuating incomes, the co-op model allows artists to experience ownership and stability.

The Midway Artist Studios, developed in 2005, are also located in the Fort Point Neighborhood. The 200,000 square foot space is comprised of three contiguous renovated warehouse buildings and consists of 89 affordable live/work units. Midway Artist Studios is the last remaining artist rental building in Fort Point. Since 2014, the building has been owned by artists from the Midway Artist Collective, allowing them to permanently rent the units to artists. The studios are overseen by a board of directors whom are elected by the artist residents. Artists are selected to live in the residents by the board based upon their need, income, artistic work, and whether or not they have Artist Certification.79

Somerville is located in the suburbs of Boston in close proximity to Harvard University and MIT. As some artists struggle to find affordable housing in Boston, Somerville offers an increasingly attractive alternative. Somerville has a thriving arts scene, and the City has taken innovative steps to try to create and maintain affordable artist housing. The City has instituted new zoning laws that encourage the production of live/work spaces and arts-related developments by offering developers density bonus incentives for affordable housing and creating an arts district overlay. The Somerville Arts Council also maintains a list of available artist housing and offers an artist certification program similar to Boston’s Artist Certification.  

Following the devastation of Hurricane Katrina in 2005, the City of New Orleans has taken concrete steps towards developing, implementing, and maintaining affordable housing, including affordable housing targeted towards artists and cultural workers. The City of New Orleans has built upon community-led housing advocacy efforts to develop a city-wide affordable housing plan, “Housing for a Resilient New Orleans”, which calls for the preservation and production of 7,500 units by 2021. This plan also focuses on increasing affordable workforce housing by targeting specific populations, including artists, cultural bearers, and their families. In addition to the City, both nonprofit and private developers have been successfully utilizing public tax credits and funding to develop affordable artist housing projects. Currently, there are at least seven successfully operating affordable artist housing developments offering artists’ vitally important places to live, work, and create.

Overview

In the decade since Hurricane Katrina left 80% of the city underwater, New Orleans has made significant strides in its recovery, becoming one of the fastest growing cities in the country. With this growth has come challenges, including changing demographics, housing insecurity, and stagnant wages. One of the greatest problems facing New Orleans is a lack of affordable housing; 80% of subsidized affordable housing suffered major or severe damage from Hurricane Katrina, and many New Orleanais struggle today with obtaining and maintaining affordable housing units.  

The City of New Orleans has recognized this issue and taken concrete steps to plan for the preservation and development of more affordable housing, including affordable artist housing. Additionally, within New Orleans, several independent and nonprofit developers have taken advantage of publicly subsidized tax credits to build affordable artist housing developments. These developments have provided affordable housing for a variety of artists across the city and show the possibilities for successful development and implementation of artist housing.

There are currently no legal restrictions to creating affordable artist housing in New Orleans. As outlined in a provision to Section 42 of the Internal Revenue Code in the 2008 Housing and Economic Recovery Act, real estate developers in these cities would be able to obtain Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) for developments with preferences that favor tenants “who are involved in artistic or literary activities.”

Role of the City and Community Groups
In recent years, the municipal government of New Orleans and community collaboratives have taken deliberate steps to preserve and produce more affordable housing units, including units targeted toward artists and cultural workers. In 2015, a grassroots community-led housing coalition, HousingNOLA, was founded to address the housing needs of New Orleans over a ten period. HousingNOLA was led by the Greater New Orleans Housing Alliance (GNOHA), an advocacy collaborative of community development corporations and housing builders focused on the preservation and production of affordable housing.

HousingNOLA grew from a community vision to a 10-year partnership between community leaders and public, private, and nonprofit organizations to solve the affordable housing crisis. HousingNOLA’s 2015 Strategy and Implementation Plan called for the preservation and production of 11,580 additional affordable units in New Orleans by 2025. In partnership with the City of New Orleans, HousingNOLA vowed to create 3,000 affordable housing opportunities by 2018 and 2,000 by 2021. Of these 5,000 units, 2,000 would be rental, 1,500 would be for homeownership, and 1,500 would be for people with special needs.

In HousingNOLA’s 2017 Annual Report Card, the collaborative noted that an objective was added to the plan to “engage artist and culture bearer communities to collect data and develop policy recommendations that support their identified housing needs.” The report card noted that HousingNOLA has already started to work on this new objective by beginning dialogue with...
Building upon the original groundwork of HousingNOLA, Mayor Mitch Landrieu and his administration developed “Housing for a Resilient New Orleans”, a strategic affordable housing policy document, in 2016. “Housing for a Resilient New Orleans” vowed to build or preserve 7,500 affordable housing units by 2021, with a goal of 4,000 units by 2018 and another 3,500 units by 2021. The plan called for the city to increase its affordable housing stock by building on city-owned property and other public land, rezoning tax-adjudicated properties in targeted neighborhoods, and using “priority bids” at sheriff’s auctions and public sales. Notably, the plan also specified a focus on increasing affordable housing opportunities for New Orleans’ workforce by targeting two specific populations: service workers, artists, and culture bearers, who may require a deeper housing subsidy, and teachers, educators, and public safety officers. To support the development of workforce housing for these populations, the plan outlines four specific actions for further action: creating a sustainable source of funding to support workforce housing, building partnerships with the Finance Authority of New Orleans (FANO) to leverage its Expand to Homeownership Grant Program, engaging local employers about offering “live-near-your-work” incentive programs, and continuing to work with the Regional Transit Authority (RTA) to ensure that public transit serves areas with higher concentrations of affordable housing and transit-dependent populations. “Housing for a Resilient New Orleans” notes that accomplishing its five-year goal of 7,500 units will require an annual investment of $17.3 million, $7 million of which must be contributed by outside public or private resources each year. As of the first quarter of 2017, 24 affordable units had been developed under the plan. It is unclear if any of these units were targeted specifically to the artist population.

Active Organizations and Developments:
In addition to community and municipal organizations, private and nonprofit developers have also sought to address demand for affordable housing, including housing targeted specifically to artists. New Orleans features several successfully operating affordable housing developments for artists, all of which were built post-Hurricane Katrina using some combination of federal tax credits and other public and private funds. Seven of the most prominent affordable artist housing projects are the Bell Art Space Campus (currently in development), Musician’s Village, St. Joe’s Loft, Blue Plate Artist Lofts, Bywater Art Lofts, Bywater Art Lofts 2, and Ashe Cultural Arts Center. Most of these developments are live/work spaces featuring affordable units targeted toward artists, including musicians, performers, and cultural performers, and onsite performance or studio spaces.
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Developed through a partnership with the City of New Orleans, Artspace, and Providence Community Housing at a cost of $37.4 million, the Bell Artspace Campus project was funded through LIHTC and Historic Preservation Tax Credits, a $600,000 bridge loan from the City, and six philanthropic donors, including the Ford Foundation and JPMorgan Chase Foundation. The property was originally purchased through the Housing Authority of New Orleans through the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development’s Choice Neighborhoods Initiative, and then the property was transferred to ArtSpace Projects, Inc. When completed, the Bell Artspace Campus in Treme will feature 79 live/work units, making it the largest affordable housing project targeted towards artists in New Orleans. The campus will feature studio, one-bedroom, and two-bedroom apartments for low to moderate income artists, cultural workers, and their families who make 30 to 60% of the AMI. The artist preference for this development applies to any applicant who can demonstrate a commitment to the arts; to qualify, an artist’s creative work does not need to be the person’s occupation or source of income. There is also no geographic preference, so current New Orleans’ residents do not get priority for housing.

In addition to Bell Artspace Campus, Bywater Art Lofts, Bywater Art Lofts 2, and Blue Plate Artist Lofts are all affordable artist housing projects developed by the same private developer, HRI Properties. These developments range in size from 30 to 37 affordable one- and two-bedroom units and they are funded by a combination of LIHTC, Historic Preservation Tax Credits, and other private funds. HRI Properties does not have a standing definition for an artist, although they market their units towards working artists earning 30 to 60% of the AMI. When Bywater Art Lofts first opened, 196 artists applied for 37 units, showing the high demand for affordable artist housing.90

All the properties also feature common studio or gallery spaces. Another successful privately developed project is St. Joe’s Lofts, a 61-unit development featuring a mix of fifty affordable artist housing units and ten market rate units. The project cost $9.8 million and was funded in part by LIHTC because it met the requirements of the State and Federal Historic Preservation Offices, the Historic District Landmark Commission, and the Louisiana Housing Finance Authority.91 Artists seeking to live in St. Joe Lofts must submit a working portfolio to a jury from the property management team; if their artwork is approved, they may be eligible for the lofts. St. Joe Lofts also feature a gallery space and courtyard garden.

The Musician’s Village, developed by Habitat for Humanity, is located in the Lower 9th Ward and features 72 single family homes, 5 two-family homes, and a music center. First developed in 2006, the Musician’s Village provided zero interest loans and worked with its applicants to address financial concerns. In order to qualify for the homes, applicants had to be musicians and agree to complete 350 volunteer hours at the Village. Due to the hardship of Katrina and producing financial documents, many local musicians, however, did not have the financial ability or credit to qualify for these homes. An arguably more successful model for a nonprofit-developed project is the Ashe Cultural Arts Center. Ashe Cultural Arts Center, which is operated by nonprofit Efforts for Grace and funded through LIHTC and other public loans, markets their affordable units to artists, cultural bearers, and social activists. They do not use an artist definition because they believe so many New Orleanians make their living as cultural bearers. Under an agreement with the City of New Orleans, the Arts Center has committed to keeping two thirds of their units affordable.

As shown by the policies and plans of the City of New Orleans and the recent production of various publicly and privately developed affordable artist housing developments, New Orleans is actively engaged in the issue of affordable artist housing. The most successful affordable artist housing projects have utilized federal tax credits and private and public funds to develop targeted artist housing throughout the city.
Despite a desperate need for affordable housing for people of all economic and social backgrounds, the cities of Miami and Miami Beach have failed to implement meaningful and successful policies and plans to develop and maintain affordable housing. Within this broader failure, the two cities have also been unsuccessful in creating affordable artist housing. Inaction by the government, stagnancy by community organizations, and disinterest by developers have all contributed to an inhospitable environment for the development of new affordable housing, including housing specifically targeted to artists. Unfortunately, there are no current success stories to emulate in Miami and Miami Beach.

The Miami metro area is the most cost-burdened rental market in the country, with 64% of residents spending 30% or more of their income on rent.\(^4\) Despite the region’s affordability crisis, the two cities of Miami and Miami Beach have largely failed to address the lack of affordable housing. Within this broader failure to develop affordable housing, attempts to create and maintain affordable artist housing through policies and zoning incentives have also roundly failed. There are currently no legal restrictions to creating affordable artist housing in Miami and Miami Beach. As outlined in a provision to Section 42 of the Internal Revenue Code in the 2008 Housing and Economic Recovery Act, real estate developers in these cities would be able to obtain Low-Income Housing Tax Credits for
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developments with preferences that favor tenants "who are involved in artistic or literary activities." 95 There are no additional legal restrictions within the jurisdictions of Miami or Miami Beach that would impede affordable housing developers from preferencing artists in buildings utilizing public funding or tax credit mechanisms.

**Role of the City**

The municipal governments of the City of Miami and Miami Beach have approached the possibility of affordable artist housing in different ways. Before 2017, the City of Miami did not have any official policies, plans, or proposals that focused on the creation, development, or maintenance of affordable housing, including artist housing. In 2017, the City released an updated Miami Comprehensive Neighborhood Plan, which included a goal to “incentivize sustainable, affordable housing solutions while continually improving the quality of life for all who live in the City of Miami”. Within this plan, the City wants to ensure that forty percent of the housing stock built under affordable and attainable mixed-income programs is reserved for workforce housing. 96 Although this goal does not specify who would be eligible for workforce housing, it is possible that artists may one day be an eligible group for this type of housing. The City also has a Miami Arts and Entertainment Council that promotes the importance of the arts, but it plays no official policy role. Currently, there are no other clear municipal policies or plans targeting artist housing.

In comparison to the City of Miami, Miami Beach has played a more active, if equally unsuccessful, role in attempting to establish affordable artist housing. In 2011, the City of Miami Beach Comprehensive Plan for 2025 was released with a goal of building 16,000 affordable units in nine years. In 2017, the goal was downgraded from 16,000 units by 2020 to 6,800 units by 2030 due to lack of progress. 97 Currently, only two apartment complexes in Miami Beach are designated for workforce housing for households earning less than $72,500. One of these developments targets educators, public safety personnel, and municipal workers, and the other development, still under construction, will target artists. Miami Beach also established the Collins Park Arts District Overlay in 2016 to replace the Cultural Arts Neighborhood District Overlay established in 2007. The Cultural Arts Neighborhood District Overlay (CANDO) was originally created to encourage artist housing for artists and culturally arts workers. CANDO applied to Miami Beach’s Collins Park neighborhood, which housed the Bass Museum of Art, Miami City Ballet, and the New World Symphony. This overlay district had zoning incentives that allowed developers to bypass certain Floor Area Ratio (FAR) regulations if they set aside a certain number of commercial work spaces or affordable rentals or condos for artists and cultural arts workers. To qualify for affordable housing, people had to meet certain financial requirements and they either had to be employees of cultural arts...
organizations or artists “who created art as an occupation or work in an art-related nonprofit field, which sponsored, created or exhibited art.”

Despite the voluntary zoning incentives offered by the City, building affordable artist housing failed to entice developers, and no units were built within the district. CANDO was eventually replaced by the Collins Park Arts District Overlay, which took away all affordable artist housing incentives in favor of encouraging arts-related businesses and entertainment. By shifting their focus from encouraging the development of artist housing to arts entertainment, Miami Beach waved a white flag in the battle to encourage affordable housing development.

While the dearth of affordable housing in general remains a hot topic in the cities of Miami and Miami Beach, there are currently no successfully operating affordable artist housing developments or local community initiatives, nonprofits, or community-based organizations working specifically on artist housing. In 2017, Arc+, a local nonprofit focused on bringing architecture and public policy together, worked with Florida International University architecture students to identify artist housing needs in Miami Beach. This relationship, however, has not yet resulted in any actionable policy documents or projects. Within the greater Miami-Dade County, there has been a push for artist live/work housing in the City of Hialeah. Although the Hialeah Arts District was established in 2015, an affordable artist housing project has yet to be developed.

Unfortunately, when it comes to developing and maintaining affordable artist housing, the City of Miami and Miami Beach offer little to emulate.
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Seattle and Portland are major cities in the United States that are also dealing with rising costs and dwindling affordable housing supplies. Both cities, however, lack efficient public policies for affordable artist housing. Although some private artist developments exist, broader municipal efforts are largely nonexistent.

Seattle
Seattle is a seaport city of 700,000 people. It is one of the fastest-growing American cities, but it is also increasingly unaffordable. In Seattle, 41% of renter households have income at or below 50% AMI and 21% of renters are highly cost-burdened. In 2015, the City Council commissioned a Housing Affordability and Livability Agenda (HALA) with a goal of building or maintain 20,000 affordable units over the next ten years to alleviate the lack of affordable units. The plan mentions that housing should be affordable for all, including artists, but does not specify any specific strategies for the production or maintenance of artist housing. Furthermore, Seattle’s 2017 Program for Supporting Cultural Space Development mentions a need for the creation of mixed-use development with cultural space, but does not specify goals for artist housing.101

One of the only initiatives benefitting artists was launched at the state scale. In 1991, created a program called Building for the Arts, which awarded grants to performing arts centers, art museums, and cultural organizations for up to 20 percent of eligible capital costs for the acquisition, construction, and/or major renovation of capital facilities. One of the significant artist housing projects to come out of this program was the Tashiro Kaplan Artist Lofts, which opened in 2004. Located in Seattle’s Pioneer Square Historic District, the project was developed by Artspace and Pioneer Square Community Association. It has 50 affordable live/work units and an art gallery. The units within Tashiro Kaplan Artist Lofts are income-restricted; half of the units are for artists earning less than 50% AMI and half are for artists earning less than 60% AMI.102

Portland
Portland is the largest city in Oregon with an estimated population of 600,000. About 60% of Oregon’s population lives in the Portland metropolitan area, which has two million inhabitants. The city is often considered one of America’s greenest cities and is known for its progressive urban planning strategies, including its urban growth boundary. The urban growth boundary (UGB) was implemented in 1979 by an innovative democratic and regional governance The Metro Council. The UGB aims to protect farmland and rural areas from leapfrog development by allowing development inside the boundary and limiting development outside. These development limitations have led to affordability issues, with Portland suffering from a rise in property values, a rise in rents, and a lack of diversity.

estate prices have doubled between 1998 and 2008. In 2016, the City of Portland passed its first-ever affordable housing bond, committing $258 million toward the creation of 1,300 affordable housing units. The plan includes a section on priority populations, which does not include artists, but instead focuses on those who are homeless, most at risk for homelessness, or are facing imminent displacement.

In 2009, the City of Portland released Act for Art: The Creative Action Plan for the Portland Metropolitan Region. This plan aimed to strengthen cultural infrastructure, improve access to the arts and arts education, and invest in creative talent. The plan mentioned an objective to support artists by supporting collaborations between housing organizations and the arts and identifying opportunities for more live/work spaces. Follow up on the plan’s goals, however, was sparse, and it is unclear if any positive developments came out of the plan. The majority of artist housing in Portland is privately developed and owned. Developers have lobbied for city-wide zoning and development incentives to help spur the creation of new properties for artists, but no new policies have been enacted.
Based upon the case study research, four best practices from around the United States emerged as critical for the successful development and implementation of affordable artist housing:

**Application of Broad Artist Definitions**

Policies, plans, and developments that use broad artist definitions attract a wider range of artists than those that use limited definitions; narrow definitions for artist housing may limit the diversity of eligible artists. Additionally, artist definitions that do not require artists to earn income from the sale of their art also increases the types of artists eligible for housing, including those who create art as a hobby. P.S. 109/El Barrio in East Harlem, which successfully operates in New York City, features a broad definition of artist and does not require residents to derive an income from their art.

**Utilization of Available Federal & State Tax Credits**

Every single successful affordable artist housing development across the country has utilized some form of federal or state tax credits. These tax credits incentivize developers to build affordable units specifically designated for artists. At the federal level, LIHTC and Historic Tax Preservation Tax Credits are frequently used for artist housing funding. State funding, such as funds distributed through the California Tax Allocation Committee, can also play a significant role.
Development of Strong and Diverse Coalitions

Strong and diverse coalitions play a pivotal role in getting and keeping affordable artist housing on the political agenda. Effective community and organizational coalitions can put pressure on key stakeholders, such as local officials, to prioritize affordable artist housing. In New Orleans, the Greater New Orleans Housing Alliance effectively fought for a city-wide prioritization of affordable housing issues, including the preservation and production of affordable housing; their grassroots work directly led to a partnership with the city and the production of the Housing for a Resilient New Orleans plan.

Importance of Strong City Leadership

The importance of strong municipal leadership cannot be understated. The most successful affordable artist housing projects thrive in places with active and supportive city leadership. In Los Angeles, the City of Lancaster built affordable artist housing as part of a downtown revitalization strategy. In Boston, the City spearheaded the ArtistSpace initiative, which helps create and maintain live/work spaces for artists. In Chicago, the City encourages developers to utilize TIF to build affordable artist housing. Cities that prioritize affordable housing in their policies and support local affordable housing coalitions and grassroots organizations offer great examples of what government can accomplish in the fight for the preservation and production of affordable artist housing.
In New York City, affordable housing for artists is essential. The housing market is tight, with the vacancy rate hovering around 4 percent. New York City remains an attractive place for artists, and the economy depends on them. The city has taken steps to create affordable housing for artists, namely their partnership with the non-profit El Barrio Fights Back, and the creation of the P.S. 109 in East Harlem. Innovative strategies that include the city partnering with non-profits, other grassroots groups, and local universities are proven to be effective in creating affordable housing across the nation. New York City has a chance to use this model, as well as others in their mission to create 1500 units of affordable artist housing across the city.

Artist housing must be a deliberate choice by municipal governments if it is to be a success; a city that leaves the creation of affordable units to the private market is doomed to fail. Our research has shown that cities that create systems and procedures to spur the development of affordable artist housing through the use of innovative tax programs and the maximizing of financial tools create more units of housing than municipalities that do not. This has been extremely effective in Chicago. The creation of a broad definition of an artist can help streamline the paperwork and bureaucracy that makes applying for artist housing so difficult. In Boston, the city has created a procedure where an artist is certified by the city and it qualifies the applicant for affordable spaces to live and work. This helps cut through much of the red tape that makes applying for affordable housing as an artist so difficult. Municipalities that work hand in hand with non-profits and grassroots groups have created artist housing that is of no cost to the tax payer like in Lancaster, California. In Miami, the city failed to spur economic development or guide the creation of affordable housing, for artists, or anyone, and have failed completely. Their lack of success is proof that a city must be deliberate in its creation of affordable housing for artists.
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In 2015, Mayor Bill de Blasio committed to the creation of 1,500 artist housing units by 2026. To accomplish this, city officials set the goal of developing 150 units of artist housing each year for ten years. In 2017, the City financed 24,536 affordable homes, 5,300 of which were posted through the City’s housing lottery system. If New York City sustains this affordable housing production, designating 150 units for artists each year would represent only 2% of the housing stock being built. When put into perspective, the creation of 150 units for artists is a feasible task.

To achieve this goal of creating 150 affordable units for artists per year, the Studio has created a toolkit that explores how to map the location of units, finance the units, market the units to artists, and explore the community impacts of units. The toolkit presents a framework for incrementally building 1,500 units by 2026. The goal of this toolkit is to allow for a sound and systematic method to determine the best geographic locations for the development of affordable artist housing.

The mapping tool allows for the ability to effectively map the 150 units and beyond by evaluating a multitude of data layers relevant to both artists and housing development. The data layers allow the greatest opportunity to keep artists in their current locations, establish new cultural districts, and create artistic hubs throughout the city. These layers offer an opportunity for a comprehensive, citywide analysis of key development factors.
New York City is a global city and the home of innovation, art, and culture. There are artists spread across the five boroughs. To better understand where artists live and work, the Studio looked at available data on artists. The two most comprehensive datasets available on NYC Open Data were from 2009 and 2016. In 2009, there were large concentrations of artists in Manhattan, especially on the Upper West Side, Hell’s Kitchen, Chelsea, and the Upper East Side. In the Bronx, there were less artists; those who lived there resided in the South Bronx and North Central Bronx. In Queens, there were artist concentrations in Astoria, Jackson Heights, Elmhurst, Kew Gardens, and Ozone Park. In Brooklyn, there were many artists in Bay Ridge, Bath Beach, Gowanus/Carroll Gardens, Prospect Heights, Windsor Terrace, and Canarsie. Staten Island had very low percentages of artists who were spread across different neighborhoods on the island. In 2016, there were large concentrations of artists as a total percentage of the population in many neighborhoods across New York City. Some of these neighborhoods differed from 2009. In Manhattan, there were higher concentrations in Washington Heights, the Upper
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West Side, Chelsea, Hell’s Kitchen, and the Upper East Side. In the Bronx there were low levels of artists spread across the borough, with more artists in the Bedford Park area and the South Bronx. In Queens, artists lived in Astoria, Jackson Heights, and Elmhurst. In Brooklyn, there were artists in Bay Ridge, Gowanus, Prospect Heights, Canarsie, and Windsor Terrace. In Staten Island, there were still low levels of artists spread across the borough.

From the years 2009 to 2016, there were fewer neighborhoods with high percentages of artists (neighborhoods where at least 40% of their population identifies as working in an arts-related field). In 2009, there were 20 neighborhoods with populations that were at least 40% artists. In 2016, that number dropped to 15 neighborhoods. In the area of Hunters Point South, where we seek to place 150 units, the number of artists dropped from 15,000-25,000 artists to less than 15,000 artists in 2016. This shows the great need for artist housing in New York City.
This map displays the net percent change in artist populations in New York City by neighborhood tabulation area from the year 2000 to 2015. The color indicators are red or green. Red indicates a decreased number of artist residents in that neighborhood tabulation area from zero to negative 63.28 percent change. Green indicates an increased number of artist residents in that neighborhood tabulation area from 0.01 to positive 11.16 percent change. The red areas indicate neighborhoods that experienced a decreased number of at least 1,500 of artists that were displaced from that neighborhood from 2000 to 2015. The green areas indicate neighborhoods that experienced an increased number of over 1,700 artists that moved into that neighborhood. The Artist Housing Studio evaluated potential site areas for an initial 150 affordable artist housing units; the neighborhood tabulation areas of these six potential sites are outlined in red. Between the year 2000 to 2015, all potential site areas except for West New Brighton-New Brighton-St. George, also known as the North Shore of Staten Island experienced a positive percent growth of artist residents.
The studio looked at all cultural institutions and organizations that have been identified by the Department of Cultural Affairs within New York City. These included both private and public cultural organizations across the five boroughs. These organizations helped determine where artists work and where cultural amenities are located within New York City.
The studio looked at all art galleries that have been identified by the Department of Cultural Affairs within New York City. These included galleries across the five boroughs, many of which catered to visual artists. These galleries helped determine where artists work and where cultural amenities are located within New York City.
The studio researched the concept of naturally occurring cultural districts (NOCDs). Naturally occurring cultural districts are clusters of cultural entities, activities, and artistic individuals that form organically in neighborhoods. These districts support and build upon existing neighborhood cultural assets rather than relying on imported assets from outside the community. NOCDs thrive because of the support and capacity of local grassroots community and cultural organizations. The Social Impact of the Arts Project (SIAP) identifies two important impacts of NOCDs: clustering has a positive impact on cultural production because artists and other cultural entrepreneurs interact, learn, compete, and test...
NATURALLY OCCURING CULTURAL DISTRICTS (continued)

Out ideas on one another, and high concentrations of cultural activities can have positive spillover effects on communities.¹⁰⁹ NOCDs have the potential to increase social and cultural capital and connect local artists and organizations because they are built on locally empowered leadership and collaboration. The studio looked into some of the NOCDs in New York City, including Corona, St. George, Hunts Point, and Fort Greene, as well as the NOCD-NY working alliance, to get a better understanding of the ways local artist clusters can impact the cultural capital and capacity of neighborhoods.

The studio looked at NYC Housing Preservation and Development Request for Proposals (RFPs) that were currently open, under review, or recently designated from March 2017 to March 2018. By analyzing the City’s open RFPs and recently designated projects, the studio aimed to find trends in project proposals, types, locations, funding streams, and initiatives. As of March 2018, there were four open RFPs through RFP, including two for Next-Generation NYCHA projects and two for Section 8 Project-Based Vouchers (PBVs) for rehabilitation and new construction projects for lease. One of the NextGeneration NYCHA RFPs is for a mixed-income housing development at the La Guardia Houses; the other is for three NextGeneration NYCHA senior affordable housing developments at Baruch Houses, Bushwick II, and Sotomayor Houses as part of the Seniors First initiative.110

LOCATING AFFORDABLE ARTISTS HOUSING

AVAILABLE AFFORDABLE UNITS

NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND PRESERVATION RFPs (continued)

Based on submissions under review and recently designated projects from 2017 to the present, several trends for affordable housing development in New York City have emerged. HPD has been primarily posting RFPs for NextGeneration NYCHA projects, affordable housing projects for seniors, and affordable housing projects that include units for formerly homeless individuals and families. Many of the projects under review fall within Mayor de Blasio’s Seniors First and NextGeneration NYCHA initiatives. Some of the project locations also tend to be in neighborhoods that have been rezoned. Overall, the RFPs call for a variety of different affordable developments. RFPs for larger-scale affordable housing developments, such as the Hunters Point South parcels, may be ideal locations for affordable artist housing due to the sheer size and variety of units that could be designated.

HPD RFPs by Neighborhood Tabulation Area

This map shows NYC Housing Preservation and Development Request for Proposals (HPD RFPs) by Neighborhood Tabulation Area. These HPD RFPs are RFPs that were either open, under review and submission, or recently designated between March 2017 and March 2018. These RFPs include all projects that feature some element of affordable housing, including NextGeneration NYCHA and Housing New York 2.0 projects. The neighborhoods of the Lower East Side and Mott Haven featured the most RFPs, although Long Island City and Far Rockaway also each had one RFP within their boundaries.
To determine transit access for a potential affordable artist housing site, the studio examined subway lines, railroad lines, bus lines, ferries, bike lanes, and bike paths by neighborhood tabulation areas. In neighborhoods that featured HPD RFPS, the studio focused on a half-mile radius around the RFPS to determine the most accessible transit options.
The Studio researched special zoning districts throughout New York City to determine if there were any areas zoned specifically for the arts. These special districts provide specific relief or incentives for developments within their boundaries. New York City currently has nine special districts that incentivize the development of cultural assets, including Special Governors Island District 134-00, which incentivizes educational and cultural uses such as the arts, music, and dance. Special 125th Street District 97-00, which incentivizes the creation of visual and performing arts space, Special Hudson Yards District 93-00, which encourages non-permanent culture, festival, and exhibit facilities, exhibits, festivals, and events, Special Downtown Brooklyn District 101-00, which permits increased floor space for community facilities, Special Midtown District 81-00, which preserves, protects, and
enhances the character of the Theater Subdistrict, and the Special West Chelsea District 98-00, which encourages and supports the growth of arts-related uses in West Chelsea.\textsuperscript{111} While none of these zoning special districts explicitly incentivize housing for cultural workers or artists, they provide useful information for the areas of the City that incentivize the development of cultural assets.

The Studio looked at neighborhoods that have been targeted for rezoning by Mayor De Blasio’s Housing New York and Housing New York 2.0 plans. Under the City’s Mandatory Inclusionary Housing rule, developers building in every upzoned neighborhood must provide a percentage of housing at affordable rates, with rent levels defined according to a set of options. Currently, four neighborhoods have been rezoned under the plan, including East Harlem, East New York, Downtown Far Rockaway, and Greater East Midtown. Greater East Midtown is the only neighborhood that was rezoned for commercial purposes and does not include affordable housing plans. Flushing West is the only neighborhood whose rezoning plan has been withdrawn. Currently, the neighborhoods of Inwood, Jerome Avenue, and Bay Street have rezoning proposals in the approval process. Rezoning proposals are currently anticipated for five more neighborhoods: Bushwick, Chinatown, Gowanus, Long Island City, and Southern Boulevard.\textsuperscript{112}


2016 Data from the Department of City Planning (DCP) was used to create a choropleth map depicting the number of vacant land owned by HPD organized by neighborhood tabulation area. A white-to-black gradation indicates areas within New York City that either have no HPD-owned vacant land or have a high density of it.
The Department of Buildings (DOB) issues thousands of permits for construction annually. From 2000-2017, the DOB issued 151,837 building permits for Alteration Type 1 and New Building construction that contained residential units. According to data released by HPD, the number of affordable units generated from 2014-2017 were 10,199 units. These units were counted towards the affordability goals set by Mayor De Blasio’s Housing NYC Plan.
To determine expected and unexpected characteristics of neighborhood tabulation areas, the Studio researched current land uses prevalent throughout New York City. Land use refers to the activity occurring on the land (sometimes compatible and other times incompatible with zoning regulations) and the structures that occupy it. The city categorizes land use in eleven categories, including residential, retail, commercial, industrial, parks, and vacant land. An analysis of the current land use in New York City would reveal trending areas or growth potentials based off certain uses being in proximity with one another. All five boroughs contain the eleven categories of land use, but they all differ in the quantity of parcels for each category.
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ANALYZING THE NEIGHBORHOODS
Locating the 1,500 units promised by Mayor de Blasio is not an easy task. If there could be affordable units mandated on every block, that would be ideal for everyone, artist or not, but that is not a feasible scenario in our current political and market economy. A focused strategy to siting the units across the five boroughs, however, can provide a pathway to creating these units. With the implementation of Mandatory Inclusionary Housing, there are now more opportunities than ever to provide affordable housing, specifically for artists.
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STEP 1:
ANALYZE WHERE ARTISTS LIVE

2009 ARTIST POPULATION

2016 ARTIST POPULATION

ARTIST POPULATION NET CHANGE
ARTIST POPULATION
First, knowing where artists currently live is a key factor in locating where more affordable units need to be made available. No one wants to be displaced. Although artists can be susceptible to displacement because of their fluctuating income, knowing where they live and using that as a key identifying measure of where more affordable units should be located is a powerful tool.

ARTIST NET CHANGE
Tackling the issue of providing places where artists can afford to live requires knowing where they are living, working, and moving to throughout the city. Mapping the net change of the number of artist in neighborhoods provides a solid understanding of where you can preserve and/or encourage artist placemaking that preserves where artists currently are located and/or draws artists to a neighborhood. Neighborhoods where there is a decrease of artist population are places where the fight against displacement is prevalent. The neighborhoods where there is a net increase in the number of artists show there is a larger number of available units for artists.
STEP 2:
ANALYZE WHERE ARTISTS WORK
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CULTURAL INSTITUTIONS/GALLERIES
Cultural institutions and galleries are indicators of where artists work. Mapping where people work allows the ability to see where there are correlations andadjacencies that may address the challenge of artists having longer commute times. When artists live where they work, they are able to impact their neighborhood in ways that are quantitatively and qualitatively beneficial. Although cultural institutions and galleries are not exact indicators of all of the places where artists work, this is the information that is currently available to the public through NYC Open Data.

CULTURAL ASSETS/INSTITUTIONS BY NEIGHBORHOOD TABULATION AREA
This map displays the density of cultural institutions by New York City neighborhood tabulation area. The color ranges from light beige to light blue to royal blue, dark blue and black. The beige areas indicate neighborhoods without any cultural institutions. Lightest blue indicates areas with one cultural institution. Royal blue indicated neighborhoods with two cultural institutions, dark blue indicates neighborhoods with three and black indicates neighborhoods with four or more cultural institutions. The Artist Housing Studio evaluated potential site areas for an initial 150 affordable artist housing units; the neighborhood tabulation areas of these six potential sites are outlined in red. The North Shore of Staten Island, Far Rockaway in Queens, and Mott Haven in the Bronx represent about half of the potential sites we evaluated - all have between zero and one galleries total in their respective NTAs. Fort Greene in Brooklyn has between two and six galleries. The Lower East Side in Manhattan hosts between seven and eighteen galleries. Hunters Point, the NTA selected for the Artist Housing Studio’s proposed 150 units of affordable artist housing, also falls in the mid-range of the spectrum, hosting between seven and eighteen galleries.

GALLERIES BY NEIGHBORHOOD TABULATION AREA
This map displays the number of galleries by neighborhood tabulation area. The color ranges from grey to light purple to a deep dark purple, indicating the range of the number of galleries by neighborhood tabulation area from zero (grey) to over 200 (darkest purple). The Artist Housing Studio evaluated potential site areas for an initial 150 affordable artist housing units; the neighborhood tabulation areas of these six potential sites are outlined in red. The North Shore of Staten Island, Far Rockaway in Queens, and Mott Haven in the Bronx represent about half of the potential sites we evaluated - all have between zero and one galleries total in their respective NTAs. Fort Greene in Brooklyn has between two and six galleries. The Lower East Side in Manhattan hosts between seven and eighteen galleries. Hunters Point, the NTA selected for the Artist Housing Studio’s proposed 150 units of affordable artist housing, also falls in the mid-range of the spectrum, hosting between seven and eighteen galleries.
STEP 3:
ANALYZE WHERE THERE’S POTENTIAL FOR CITY SPONSORED AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS
HPD RFPs
Mayor De Blasio’s administration outlined the desire to provide 150 units for artists each year over the next 10 years. The toolkit is organized to tackle providing affordable housing for artist in the short term by reserving affordable units for artist in projects that are already currently in the development process. NYC Economic Development Corporation (EDC) in partnership with the HPD provides development projects throughout the city, most of which are mixed use developments with affordable housing components. These HPD RFPS are an excellent start to identify current affordable housing development projects that may fit artist housing needs.

TRANSIT
Since the ultimate goal is to reduce artists travel time to work, the proximity of the units to public transportation is important to addressing the current issue of the lack of cultural equity and places for artists to work throughout the five boroughs. Presently, locating the units near public transit will lower commute times. Additionally, in the future, artists that live near transit could contribute to cultural district.

ACCESS TO TRANSIT BY NEIGHBORHOOD TABULATION AREA
This map shows transit access by NTA; the transit access displayed in this map is confined to subway lines. The map shows the 25 subway lines that run through the five boroughs and highlights the subway lines found within the six focus areas. The neighborhoods of Long Island City, Lower East Side, and Fort Green show the most significant transit access in terms of diversity of subway lines.
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STEP 4:
ANALYZE WHERE THERE’S FUTURE POTENTIAL FOR PRIVATE AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS

DOB PERMITS

LAND USE

NYC HPD OWNED VACANT LAND
HPD OWNED VACANT LAND
The six potential sites are also outlined in red. As shown in the map, North Shore and Downtown Far Rockaway do not contain any HPD-owned vacant land. Mott Haven, Hunters Point, Fort Greene, and the Lower East Side have a low amount of HPD-owned vacant land, constituting between one to eight lots. Data from DCP shows that the majority of HPD-owned vacant land is primarily located in undeveloped and “trendy” parts in northern and eastern Brooklyn, northern Manhattan, and southern Bronx. Of the potential sites, only Mott Haven, Hunters Point, Lower East Side, and Fort Greene have a concentration of soft sites ready for analysis and future development.

DOB PERMITS
Permits for construction were also layered, but eventually found to not be useful in identifying areas for artist affordable housing development. The key to providing affordable housing for artists is partnering with developers in the early stages of development when the financing is considered. Analyzing DOB Permits, as a future tool, can be useful to maximize the opportunities for providing affordable housing in development projects at every stage.

LAND USE:
Understanding land use has the potential to largely influence many planning and policy decisions in order to address raising housing or commercial stock equally throughout the city. Identifying trends of where certain use categories are amalgamating throughout the city during a specific time-period can quantitatively validate and fuel decisions such as large rezonings.

INCOME PROFILES
Analyzing neighborhood income profiles can be helpful in determining if a development would fit within the existing socioeconomic neighborhood context. Special attention should be paid to the socioeconomic profiles of neighborhoods, and proposed developments should be created with the benefit of current neighborhood residents in mind.
Legend

Hunters Point - LIC
Train Station
Hunters Point South RFP
Cultural Institution
Gallery
Special Districts
Neighborhood Rezonings
HPD Owned Vacant Land
IMMEDIATE UNITS: MAPPING 150 UNITS IN HUNTERS POINT

Hunters Point offers a snapshot of many of the issues facing artists living and working in New York City. It also, however, offers a solution. To analyze the neighborhood, nine criteria were selected to create a comprehensive view of Hunters Point and its feasibility as a site for the creation of artist housing:

- The change in artist population from 2009 to 2016
- Artist net change
- Cultural institutions in the area
- Galleries
- Naturally Occurring Cultural Districts
- Open HPD RFPs
- Access to transit
- Area zoning
- A history of rezonings and neighborhood studies

Hunters Point was traditionally an industrial area, but due to recent rezonings in 2001 and 2008, the area has dramatically changed. Hunters Point is a residential neighborhood characterized by high rises and new construction in former manufacturing parcels. From 2000 to 2009, 2,369 housing units were built, comprising 19.2% of all housing within the greater Hunters Point area. As, once an industrial sprawl full of storage warehouses and taxi depots, Long Island City has seen remarkable change in the past two decades.
From the year 2009 to 2016, the number of artists that lived in the Sunnyside/Woodside NTA—where Hunters Point is located—dropped. In 2009, there were over 40,000 people living in the NTA that were employed in the arts, and by 2016, that number had dropped to below 24,000. This represents a loss of at least 15,000 artists in five years from the Hunters Point area. Within Hunters Point, there are many cultural institutions (performance centers, theaters, and museums) and galleries, which makes it an attractive place for affordable artist housing. Even with a wealth of galleries and cultural institutions, however, it is not a naturally occurring culturally district. The area of Hunters Point does have an open RFP from HPD that calls for the creation of gallery space and arts programming in partnership with local arts group, Flux Factory, making it an ideal development to incorporate artist housing. The area is rich in transit option, including access to the subway, bus, ferry, Long Island Rail Road, and bike lanes. Hunters Point also has many different land use types from manufacturing to residential, and has been rezoned before, most recently in 2008. Each of these facts points to Hunters Point as an optimal site for the housing of 150 affordable artist units.
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CULTURAL INSTITUTIONS & GALLERIES

TRANSIT

HUNTER’S POINT FULL ANALYSIS
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LONG TERM: PARTNERING WITH PRIVATE DEVELOPERS TO MAP 1,500 UNITS

In the long term, it is possible to use the criteria listed above with future private developers to find other areas that are ripe for development of affordable housing for artists. Not every criterion must be present—this is not the case in Hunters Point—but it is a best practice for many of the criteria to be filled. This will allow private development to cross subsidize the affordable units with market rate units, which will lead to success in the long term.

HPD-OWNED VACANT LAND
Hunters Point currently has four HPD-owned vacant lots located towards the south-west corner of the site. Because of their location on the waterfront’s edge, it is highly unlikely for the lots to be individually used as sites for new affordable housing for artists. The lots are located fairly close to the Hunters Point South RFP, however, and these four lots should be deemed as potential soft sites for future development.

DOB PERMITS
There have been approximately 2,629 DOB permits for residential use issued in Hunters Point between the end of 2017 and the beginning of 2018. The data reveals that new private developments are appearing in only two major regions in Hunters Point due to the dividing nature of the rail tracks running diagonally through the NTA. The two clusters are centering on either the cultural districts region of Hunters Point or the western side of the NTA, which is more residential in character.
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DOB ISSUED RESIDENTIAL PERMITS

ZONING DISTRICTS

SPECIAL DISTRICTS

REZONING
Source: 2010-2014 American Community Survey, US CENSUS DATA
HUNTER'S POINT INCOME PROFILE
The economic characteristics of Hunters Point was also taken into consideration as we identified the best location to cite an immediate 150 units of affordable housing designated for artists. The Hunters Point- Sunny Side - Maspeth neighborhood tabulation area (NTA) of Queens is generally perceived as working middle class. The bulk of households, 42 percent, earn between $35,000 and $100,000. A considerable 28 percent earn over $100,000 annually, whereas only 20 percent earn under $24,999 annually. Only 9 percent receive Food Stamp/SNAP benefits. The median household income is $61,736 and the mean household income is more reflective of upper middle class at $83,022.113

THE FINANCING TOOL

For affordable artist housing to become a reality in New York City, a certain number of units must be set aside through Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH). The finance tool calls for at least 2% of all affordable units to be set aside for artists in every MIH-zoned project. A development could be up to 50% of the building or up to 150 units. It is not recommended that projects contain more than 150 units of artist housing as this would infringe on the ability to spread the units equitably across the five boroughs. In Hunters Point, there is an opportunity to place 150 units of affordable artist housing in a neighborhood that is ripe for creative placemaking. In the long term, this tool can be used to create 150 units of artist housing a year for 10 years which achieves Mayor de Blasio’s goal of 1500 units of affordable artist housing being built in New York City.
### The Financing Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Floors</th>
<th>SqFt</th>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Affordable Units for Artists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far Rockaway Redevelopment</td>
<td>Beach 21st St, Far Rockaway, NY 11691</td>
<td>Queens, DTFR</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42,500</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>C4-2</td>
<td>38 - 45</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baruch Houses</td>
<td>605 FDR Drive, New York, NY 10002</td>
<td>LES</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>R7-2</td>
<td>217 - 260</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Guardia Houses</td>
<td>250 Madison St, New York, NY 10002</td>
<td>LES</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18000</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>R7-2</td>
<td>125 - 150</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaview Healthy Community</td>
<td>460 Brielle Ave, Staten Island, NY 10314</td>
<td>North Shore</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,611,268</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>R3-2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunters Point South</td>
<td>54-48 2nd St, Long Island City, NY 11101</td>
<td>Hunters Point</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>61,187</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>R-10</td>
<td>280 - 336</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betances V Houses</td>
<td>530 E 144th St, Bronx, NY 10454</td>
<td>Mott Haven</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>R6</td>
<td>37 - 45</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betances VI Houses</td>
<td>537 E 146th St, Bronx, NY 10455</td>
<td>Mott Haven</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45,500</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>R8/C1-4</td>
<td>25 - 30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyckoff Gardens</td>
<td>185 Nevins St, Brooklyn, NY 11217</td>
<td>Boerum Hill</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>R8/C2-4</td>
<td>125 - 150</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hunter’s Point South Development**

*Image 67*
The marketing component of affordable housing developments is an intricate process between the developer, the marketer, and the potential tenant. During the negotiation of the financing, the developer identifies the demographic of the tenant that would be best suited for the project. The marketer is then involved in establishing the application, promoting and advertising the development, reviewing the submitted applications, and selecting the tenants to continue through the application process.

Conceptually, the marketer would have the most direct influence on who would be involved in the creative placemaking, and would need to be an entity that believed in planning with cultural competency. Currently, HPD has a network in which applicants can complete and submit housing applications on an internet-based platform. The marketing team could consider advertising the available housing opportunities primarily on HPD’s Housing Connect website. Additionally, the marketing team should consider tapping into the neighborhood cultural assets network to advertise and attract the local artists who are already active in the community.
Marketing for the 1,500 units would be unique to each development project. The fabric of our city is made up of different threads that are knit together to create a vibrant pattern. This results in neighborhoods that differ from block to block. Thus, the marketing team would need to engage the community through workshops and community board meetings to survey who lives in the neighborhood, which artists live there, and what opportunities there are to build a network of people and resources. Every stakeholder would have different interests depending on the project, the location and the other stakeholders involved. By using the mapping tool, the marketer could use local cultural assets as intermediaries for recruitment.

For example, in Hunters Point, there are a myriad of cultural assets that could serve as intermediaries or recruitment agents for the development project. In order to preserve the artistic community within the neighborhood, the local cultural assets should be the first to receive marketing materials. Since HPD is partnering with the developers, advertising should be allowed on the Housing Connect website; subscribers could receive email notifications of the project and availability of affordable units for artist. Once the applications are received, the marketer would abide by current charter rules that mandate 50% of the applications considered should be residents in close proximity to the project. Marketing outside of the neighborhood would require extending the network of cultural assets to other cultural centers throughout the city.

IDENTIFYING ELIGIBLE ARTISTS

The artists that can apply to live in the affordable units must be chosen based on merit. In order to apply for artist housing, an artist will be chosen and certified by a review board with a selection process that is to be determined by New York City Department of Cultural Affairs (DCA). An application process should be created and modeled off the process created by the City of Boston’s Department of Cultural Affairs. The process would include selecting and certifying artists, who, after being certified, would receive an identification number that can be used for affordable artist housing applications.

Case for Artist Certification and Examples
The artist certification process is one that is used by cities to certify artists to qualify for affordable artist spaces to live and work. The specifics of the artist certification process varies and applies differently in each city, as cities have developed their artist certification processes in ways that accommodate their city’s specific needs. We have examined three different artist certification processes in New York City, Jersey City, and Boston.

New York City

The City of New York currently has an artist certification process for professional artists joint living-working in lofts that are zoned for manufacturing in the NoHo and SoHo neighborhoods of Manhattan:

"Under applicable state legislation and the City’s Zoning Resolution, certification as a working artist is necessary in order for an individual to qualify for joint living-working space in the M1-MA and M1-MB zoning districts (SoHo NoHo). This permits fine artists working on a professional level who demonstrate a need for a live/work loft to reside in specific lofts zoned for manufacturing. Pursuant to the City’s Zoning Resolution, the Department of Cultural Affairs has been designated as the certifying agency."

The current artist certification process in New York City is extremely limiting, as it only applies to artists living-working in Soho and Noho. The artist-in-residence zoning law was passed over 40 years ago in 1971 and only provides protective coverage for 200 commercial lofts. The lofts are allowed to be used as residential as long as a “certified artist” occupies the space. Artists make up a large percentage of the work force in New York City, fueling our creative economy and maintaining the city as the culture capital of the world. The number of artists protected under the City of New York’s exclusionary artist certificate is very minuscule and ineffective. Artists applying for the certification process must undergo the review of two judges who review factors such as whether or not the artist is:

- Currently engaged in and demonstrates a serious, consistent commitment to their art;
- Engaged in an art form or occupation that can be considered (and is pursued) as a “fine art”;
- Committed to the art form or occupation as their primary vocation;
- Demonstrates intent to use joint living-work quarters for the purpose of carrying out their art. The applicant is also required to provide samples of their work and answer questions about their educational background, provide reasons behind needing a large space for their art, etc.


AWARDING AFFORDABLE ARTIST HOUSING

According to an article released by Street Easy, the artist approval process is finicky and unpredictable:

"New York Magazine cites choreographers and filmmakers as having received approval, while dancers, actors and musicians have been rejected. Further, the New York Times cites a photographer’s rejection on the basis that their work did not show enough “focus, quality and commitment,” as yet another indication of a finicky approval process.”116

Jersey City

Jersey City’s artist certification process is managed and operated by Jersey City’s Artist Certification Board (ACB). The ACB is comprised of five commissioners who are appointed by the mayor to review and approve or deny artist certifications. JC’s artist certification qualifies artists to apply for affordable artist housing or reside in a live work space.117 Much of the affordably priced artist housing is located in new luxury loft buildings located in the Powerhouse Arts District, formerly known as the Work and Live District Overlay (WALDO). The WALDO ordinance of 1996 was a result of an approved zoning ordinance by the Jersey City Municipal council. The ordinance established an eight-block area in Jersey City to be a designated live/work community strictly for artists.118

The ACB’s definition of an artist is “a person regularly engaged in fine arts as a career and not as a hobby. An artist is committed to his or her work, has a body of work that demonstrates the development of that art, and intends to pursue that work for the foreseeable future." The board also states that art created by artists need not be their main source for income. The ACB judges potential certified artists by six points:

1. Commitment to the fine arts as a career
2. Need for a large loft space

AWARDING AFFORDABLE ARTIST HOUSING

3. An arts education
4. Current body of work
5. Exhibition record
6. References from other artists or art professionals

Generally, if an artist is able to meet at least 3 of the required points, they are approved. Documentation of the necessary points are critical to the evaluation process. The final review of artists approved by the ACB is performed by the Jersey City Planning Board who has the authority to make the final approval of the artist’s certification or reject the board’s recommendation.

Boston

Similarly to NYC DCA’s CreateNYC Plan, Boston Creates Cultural Plan displays concerted efforts to keep and attract new artists to Boston. This is heavily supported by the City of Boston’s Artist Certification which qualifies an artist for affordable live and work artist spaces for up to eight years. Boston’s Artist Certification provides a letter from the Mayor’s Office of Arts and Culture and the Boston Planning and Development Agency confirming the recognition of the artist by a committee of peers and is “certified” as a working artist. Applications are based on the evidence of a recent body of work offered to the public or documentation. Applications are accepted and reviewed quarterly and are reviewed by a “Peer Review Panel” that are selected from a pool of Boston artists and arts professionals. The artist certification has been created to ensure that only artists occupy artist spaces within the ArtistSpace program, which is a city-wide initiative to develop new spaces permanently dedicated to artists and preserve existing affordable spaces for artists. There are currently over 1,000 artists certified in Boston.119

IMMEDIATE ARTIST CERTIFICATION TOOLKIT RECOMMENDATION FOR NYC

In order to qualify for an affordable artist housing unit, the applying head of household must be vetted through an artist certification process. After researching and reviewing the Jersey City and Boston case studies on artist certification processes, the Artist Housing Studio recommends the following for implementing an artist certification in the affordable artist housing application process in New York City:

- Artist Certification should be required in order to qualify for affordable artist housing in a new housing development.
- Prior to releasing an open call to artists for affordable housing units, the development, in collaboration with HPD/the City of New York, would employ a peer review panel comprised of established artists and arts professionals that either live or work locally to the housing development. The review panel should reflect the diversity and socioeconomics of the community. Review panelists should receive a clear job description of the role and receive a stipend for their efforts. HPD, in collaboration with the developer, should host multiple open house information sessions for artists looking to gain more information about the housing development, requirements for income, and the artist certification process. Multiple information sessions should be hosted on various dates and times to accommodate be inclusive of artists who have varying work schedules. Dates and times of information sessions should be released.
and widely shared well in advance to the scheduled sessions, as to notify the public at large.

- There should be a realistic application deadline considering that applying artists will need to compile documentation showing eligibility to apply. Artists will need to submit:
  - Brief statement expressing the need for affordable artist housing and how they will benefit.
  - Brief statement discussing the nature of their work.
  - Proof of Income, in relation to eligibility requirements.
  - Evidence of a recent body of work offered to the public or documentation.
  - Two recommendations (from peers or arts based institutions or organizations).
  - CV that includes any shows/exhibitions or residencies.

- In the marketing stages of releasing an open call for affordable artist housing, the public will be notified how many units are available as well as an open application window. For example, artists may apply between May 1 and May 31, 2018. The number of artist applicants able to apply will be capped proportionately to the number of available units. Applications accepted for review will be accepted on a rolling basis until the cap is met. This cap will
ensure that the review panel is not overwhelmingly tasked with reviewing a massive volume of applications. For example, if there are 150 affordable artist housing units available, no more than 450 applicants will be accepted (three times the number of units available). The chances that one would be accepted, if all 450 applicants are qualified, would be one in three.

- If there are 10 panelists, each panelist would be tasked with reviewing 45 applicants each. Panelists would be given a timeframe to which they would need to review and approve the artist for certification. Modeled off the Boston case study, artists should expect to receive notification about their artist certification up to one month from the accepting applications close date (in the example above, by June 30, 2018).

- It would be made clear from the beginning that artist certification does not guarantee a unit in the development, but would certify the artist as eligible for affordable artist housing. Once an artist is certified by the City of New York, they could potentially apply for new affordable artist housing opportunities that become available and streamline their application process, as they would not need to go through the vetting.

- Artists that are certified would then be selected through a lottery process to be approved for one of the 150 units designated for artist housing in the development.

**Housing Connect**

New York City residents looking to apply for affordable housing must create a profile through the HPD’s Housing Connect. Housing Connect is the City’s platform to monitor applicant selection through a lottery process and for residents seeking housing to search and apply for affordable housing. The platform requires applicants to upload documents verifying income, status and household details. Housing Connect displays a listing of new affordable housing developments that use a portion of public funds, thus making some units of those developments designated as affordable for qualifying applicants. There are preferences to applicants residing in the community board of the new development and preferences that are provided to city employees, veterans, seniors, and/or disabled applicants. Once an announcement is released about a new housing development, applicants may request an application, and submit all of their verifying documents.

**Local Review Board**

Until the city develops a citywide process for the certification of artists, it is suggested that a local review board be created for each project. This board would be comprised of local artists, members of the development team, local not-for-profits, community-based organizations, and relevant city officials. This board will inspect the work that is put forth by cer-
tified artists. The artists will apply for artist housing and then submit their work to the review board after being chosen by a lottery system. The review board will analyze the work of those who have applied up until a certain deadline as chosen for the development. The hope is that as many artists as possible are certified in this window. This process could be supervised by NYC DCA.
The process to apply for artist housing should be a collaborative effort between HPD and DCA, who would work to administer the program. As it stands, affordable housing is decided by a lottery system run through Housing Connect. To qualify for an affordable home through Housing Connect, information is collected about the applicant and sent to HPD. For an artist who wishes to apply, HPD would need to add a separate category in a drop-down menu allowing an artist to identify themselves. They would then be prompted to enter their ID number and their application would be submitted. If they did not have an ID number, the artist would check a box for information on how and when to apply for artist certification from a local review board. The housing would then be awarded through the same lottery process currently in place.

For artist certification, the ID number is not permanent. Every 10 years the artist would need to resubmit their work for continuing certification. In that process, not only would their work be reviewed, but also their commitment to the community as demonstrated by whether or not they displayed their work locally, organized local art clinics, or were members of their local review board. In this way, the artist is as much a part of the community as possible.

**Community Boards**

New York City community boards are the bedrock of our local democracy. The community boards are where the neighborhood can come together to discuss the real issues that impact the daily lives of residents. The work that is done helps to inform local elected officials about where the community wants to place their focus in the coming year. A community board creates a district statement of needs every year. In this document, the board indicates where they would like to see funding distributed in their area. NYC Department of City Planning compiles these needs statements into a borough wide statement of needs and uses it for community planning. For help in understanding what communities are in-
intered in artist housing, the city should compile all community board needs statements and compile them by borough so that they are easily attainable. It can then be deduced which communities find affordable artist housing to be a priority.

In 2013, Manhattan Community Boards 1, 2, 3, 4, 9 and 11 mentioned the arts and artists. The most common thread was a fear of losing artists, art, and culture due to displacement and gentrification. Each community board wrote about specific culture institutions and their issues. In 2013, Community Board 9 (CB 9) was in the process of rezoning a large chunk of the neighborhood for the expansion of Columbia University. They called for special funding for artists. In 2018, CB 1 called for funding for an arts center in their neighborhood. CB 2 called for more funding to be allocated to the arts in their area, while CB 4 mentioned a concern about the loss of artists due to displacement. Additionally, CB 9 asked for funding for an artisan market for artists.

In Queens, the borough wide needs statement did not explicitly mention artists in their needs statement. In the Bronx, the borough wide needs statement called culture, artists, and art a “B” priority, in a ranking system that went to E. In Brooklyn, CB 2 mentioned artist organizations working in the districts, CB 2 and CB 17 asked for funding for arts and cultural non-profits. In Staten Island, art was not mentioned.
Unlike the other components of our artist housing toolkit, the “community tool” serves more as recommendations for best practices and ways to connect the influx of artists positively into the community fabric of the development. The community tool is unique due to the fact that it is quite continuous and isn’t defined by short or long-term implications.

As mentioned earlier in the report, artists play a crucial role in ensuring the success of the City’s tourist and creative economies. Beyond their economic importance, artists also engage in creative placemaking that can enhance communities for both current residents and visitors. Placemaking promotes ownership and connection to community spaces, making public areas more attractive and unique. Artists approved for artist designated affordable housing should be required to engage or collaborate with local community groups, nonprofits, and community boards to ensure that projects represent the existing fabric of the community. In addition to becoming a certified artist, the studio recommends a once yearly community workshop or event facilitated by the artist as a stipulation for lease renewal. Thoughtfully conceived and executed arts projects or workshops that involved multiple community stakeholders can result in placemaking, increased social capital, and increased cultural capital and diversity.

While there is often a perception that affordable artist housing only leads to gentrification and displacement, thoughtfully integrated affordable artist housing can have widespread positive impacts on neighborhoods and community residents. A two-year study by researchers at the School of Social Policy & Practice at the University of Pennsylvania found a relationship between the presence of cultural resources in a neighborhood and key aspects of social wellbeing, especially in less advantaged neighborhoods. The study showed that low- and middle-income residents across New York City who had greater access to cultural resources experience better education, security, and health outcomes compared to residents in neighborhoods with similar economic and social demographics but fewer cultural resources. While the arts and cultural assets are obviously not the only factors that enhance neighborhoods, they do contribute to the overall "neighborhood ecology that promotes wellbeing."120

A 2016 report by ArtPlace America also found the intersection between the arts, culture, and housing to be prominent. According to the report’s author, communities use the arts in six ways: “to articulate often invisible housing challenges, to nourish individuals and communities who have experienced trauma through housing, to help organize housing campaigns, to bridge disparate neighborhood residents, to stabilize vulnerable communities, and to generate economic development for communities who are structurally barred from access to capital.”121

CREATIVE PLACEMAKING & AFFORDABLE ARTISTS HOUSING

The arts have great potential to uplift communities, and the artists living in and fighting for these communities should have the same access to affordable housing.

As the Actors Fund and the City of New York seek to develop more affordable artist housing, it is critical to apply cultural competency to neighborhoods targeted for new development. Potential community impacts must be considered.

Affordable housing designated for artists comes with many positive community benefits, such as creative placemaking and growth of the creative economy. There is a generally expressed concern, however, that artists may fuel displacement and spur gentrification. Regular engagement with the community surrounding the newly designated artist housing would be a positive way to integrate the new influx of artist residents. Collaboration with a longstanding and well-established community organization that demonstrates a strong sense of cultural competency for the socioeconomic demographics of the community is also recommended. One such recommendation is to collaborate with or provide city funding to a local community organization in order to facilitate a community arts based project that requires the participation of new artist residents and longstanding residents of the community. It is through such activities that the influx of artist residents can become aware of cultural and social nuances in the community. Through this exposure and collaboration with longstanding community members, it is a goal to develop a sense of cultural competency among the new artist constituency. As creative placemakers, artists must be culturally competent in order to
honor the true values of the community into which they are moving.
“Creating NYC: Map Your ArtLife” Wikimap Tool

Through months of research, the Artist Housing Studio recognized that the data that currently exists for “where artists work” in New York City is inadequate. The data was not sufficient in holistically understanding where artists work. We found that the data New York City is using to determine where artists work is only based on cultural assets that are formally recognized by the city. This largely excludes artist studios, DIY performance and gallery spaces, informal artist collectives, non-incorporated artist working spaces and even band practice studios. We sought to fill in the gaps of this research using community participation.

In order to cultivate large numbers of participation, the Studio developed an online participatory map using Wikimapping. Wikimapping is an online participatory tool that can be used by communities or stakeholders to map data. Within one week of launching our Wikimap titled “Creating NYC: Map Your ArtLife,” over 60 artists participated in mapping where they work, where they live, and the arts and cultural spaces that they recognize and define for themselves. Engaging the artist community in New York City was something that the studio highly valued in their work, however, working within a city-wide framework, it was challenging to determine best methods for participation. We determined that creating a digital participation tool would be the most effective way to gather data on artists city-wide. We do recognize the inequity when it comes to online tools and the exclusion it poses for those who may not have access to the internet. Given the time and scope of our studio, Wikimapping was the best prac-
"Creating NYC: Map Your ArtLife" is a data mapping project that seeks to collect open data on artists based in New York City. Participating in the mapping involves sharing information about where you work, where you live, cultural institutions you are aware of, places where you engage in arts-related activities and spaces where you feel foster arts and culture.

Your input is invaluable in understanding the artist population in New York City. It is our hope that with a better understanding of this community, we can best analyze how to serve the artists that contribute so much to this cultural capital of the world.

To get started, click on <Welcome>. You may remain anonymous. If you choose to input your e-mail, your information will not be shared without your permission.

To add to the map, zoom into the area that you live or work in. Click on <Map My ArtLife>. Depending on what you’d like to map, select a green pin and drop it accordingly on the map. You may add as many data points as you wish.

If you have any questions about the scope of this project, you may contact Jen Chantres at jmc9488@gmail.com. Thank you for your participation!
The "Creating NYC: Map Your ArtLife" Wiki-map can be accessed at the following link: https://bit.ly/2HBCXu7.

We believe our wikimap to map data on where artists work is highly valuable and could potentially serve to inform the siting of affordable artist housing in New York City for the long term. It is our recommendation that the City of New York continue to engage community participation of the artists in order to gather critical data to inform the site selections of future affordable artist housing. If the City were to continue using and collecting data on this wikimap, we would ultimately develop a more complete understanding of where artists work as well as the arts spaces that are not currently formally recognized by the City of New York.

Unlike the other components of our artist housing toolkit, the "community tool" serves more as a recommendation for best practices that can be used to positively weave the influx of artists into the community fabric.
The key to success for the implementation of the toolkit is the partnership between New York City, such as DCA, DCP, and HPD, and private developers to use this tool to identify where affordable artist housing should be placed in the city. The application of the financial tool kit will broaden the definition of an artist. The local review boards will have the ability to judge the creative culture that they would like to foster in their community and with so many varying opinions, the definition of an artist will be made broader. The close partnership of the city with the developers will lead to more cooperation, and hopefully the system will grow stronger through the constant incorporation of new data, including the updating of NYC’s ZoLa tool, a new wikimap, or an app. This toolkit is a way to bridge the divide between city government, community boards, housing developers, and artists themselves to foster creative placemaking and create a more affordable New York.
HOUSING TOOL KIT

THE MARKETING TOOL

THE COMMUNITY TOOL
CONCLUSION

Affordable artist housing is essential in every city invested in supporting their arts-based economy. Artists spur economic development through creative placemaking that can be used to reinvigorate a local economy. Their creations attract new residents, tourists, and economic development to an area, which helps the existing community. In New York City, their influence on bettering the city cannot be understated.

The lack of affordable housing for artists in urban areas is a significant problem. The artist has specific needs that cannot be addressed through traditional affordable housing mechanisms and, therefore, they warrant specific treatment from municipal governments. Their infrequent income, income from gifts or other non-traditional sources, as well as their need for work space creates hurdles that are difficult to overcome when applying for traditional sources of affordable housing. When combined with the lack of affordability in the private market, these factors mean that government must step in to help artists find affordable housing.

The time to develop artist housing is now. The creation of affordable artist housing is critical to ensuring the continued blossoming of New York City’s creative economy. The Artist Housing Studio has developed this Toolkit to provide a feasible approach to providing 1,500 units of affordable artist housing over the course of the next ten years in New York City. By focusing on mapping, marketing, financial, and community components, toolkit users can find the best geographic locations for new artist housing to ensure that any new developments equally benefit both artists and communities.
HUNTER’S POINT SOUTH DEVELOPMENT |
Immediate Implementation of 150 Units of Affordable Artist Housing
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R4-1

R4-1 contextual districts, permit only one- and two-family detached and semi-detached houses. Despite a narrower minimum lot width of 25 feet for detached homes, houses in R4-1 districts tend to be larger than those in R3-1 districts because of the higher floor area ratio (FAR) of 0.75 plus an attic allowance. The perimeter wall may rise to 25 feet, compared to 21 feet in R3-1 districts, before sloping or being set back to a maximum building height of 35 feet. Sections of Middle Village in Queens and Bay Ridge in Brooklyn are R4-1 districts.

Two side yards that total eight feet must be provided for a detached residence. There is no minimum width for each side yard but there must be eight feet between buildings on adjacent zoning lots. One four foot side yard is required for each semi-detached residence, which must be on a lot at least 18 feet wide. Zero lot line buildings permitted in R4-1 districts, require only one eight foot side yard. Front yards must be at least 10 feet deep and at least as deep as an adjacent front yard but need not exceed a depth of 20 feet. Parking must be within the side or rear yard or in a garage. An in-house garage is permitted within a semi-detached house, or in a detached house if the lot is 35 feet or wider. One off-street parking space is required for each dwelling unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Front Yard</th>
<th>Rear Yard</th>
<th>Side Yards</th>
<th>Lot Coverage Max</th>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>Perimeter Wall/Building Height MAX</th>
<th>Required Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detached Semi-Detached</td>
<td>10 ft</td>
<td>30 ft</td>
<td>1 4 ft</td>
<td>4 ft</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>25/35 ft.</td>
<td>1 per DU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero Lot Line Detached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data sourced from the New York City Department of City Planning Zoning Handbook 2011
R5 districts allow a variety of housing at a higher density than permitted in R3-2 and R4 districts. The floor area ratio (FAR) of 1.25 typically produces three-and four-story attached houses and small apartment houses. With a height limit of 40 feet, R5 districts provide a transition between lower- and higher-density neighborhoods and are widely mapped in Brooklyn, Queens and the Bronx. Portions of Windsor Terrace and Ocean Parkway in Brooklyn are R5 districts.

To ensure compatibility with neighborhood scale, the maximum street wallheight of a new building is 30 feet and the maximum building height is 40 feet. Above a height of 30 feet, a setback of 15 feet is required from the street wall of the building; in addition, any portion of the building that exceeds a height of 33 feet must be set back from a rear or side yard line. Detached houses must have two side yards that total at least 13 feet, each with a minimum width of five feet. Semi-detached houses need one eight foot wide side yard. Apartment houses need two side yards, each at least eight feet wide. Front yards must be 10 feet deep or, if deeper, a minimum of 18 feet to prevent cars parked on-site from protruding onto the sidewalk. Cars may park in the side or rear yard, in the garage or in the front yard within the side lot ribbon; parking is also allowed within the front yard when the lot is wider than 35 feet. Off-street parking is required for 85% of the dwelling units in the building, but requirements are lower for income-restricted housing units (IRHU) and are further modified within the Transit Zone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Front Yard</th>
<th>Rear Yard</th>
<th>Side Yards</th>
<th>Lot Coverage Max.</th>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>Perimeter Wall/Building Height MAX</th>
<th>Required Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>10 ft</td>
<td>30 ft</td>
<td>2 5 ft 13 ft</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
<td>30/40 ft</td>
<td>85% of DU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 8 ft 8 ft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 8 ft 15 ft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
R6 zoning districts are widely mapped in built-up, medium-density areas in Brooklyn, Queens and the Bronx. The character of R6 districts can range from neighborhoods with a diverse mix of building types and heights to large-scale “tower in the park” developments such as Ravenswood in Queens and Homecrest in Brooklyn. Developers can choose between two sets of bulk regulations. Standard height factor regulations, introduced in 1961, produce small multi-family buildings on small zoning lots and, on larger lots, tall buildings that are set back from the street. Optional Quality Housing regulations produce high lot coverage buildings within height limits that often reflect the scale of older, pre-1961 apartment buildings in the neighborhood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Height Factor</th>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>Open Space Ratio</th>
<th>Sky Exposure Plane</th>
<th>DU Factor</th>
<th>Required Parking</th>
<th>Required Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.78 - 2.43</td>
<td>27.50-37.50</td>
<td>Starts at 60 ft.</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>70% of DU</td>
<td>25% of IRHU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lot Coverage</th>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>Base Building Height</th>
<th># of Stories</th>
<th>DU Factor</th>
<th>Required Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic QH</td>
<td>30 ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusionary QH</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
R7 districts are medium-density apartment house districts mapped in much of the Bronx as well as the Upper West Side in Manhattan and Brighton Beach in Brooklyn. The height factor regulations for R7 districts encourage lower apartment buildings on smaller zoning lots and, on larger lots, taller buildings with less lot coverage. As an alternative, developers may choose the optional Quality Housing regulations to build lower buildings with greater lot coverage.

Regulations for residential development in R7-1 and R7-2 districts are essentially the same except that R7-2 districts, which are mapped primarily in upper Manhattan, have lower parking requirements.

Height factor buildings are often set back from the street and surrounded by open space and on-site parking. The floor area ratio (FAR) in R7 districts ranges from 0.87 to a high of 3.44; the open space ratio (OSR) ranges from 15.5 to 25.5. As in other non-contextual districts, a taller building may be obtained by providing more open space. For example, 76% of the zoning lot with a 14-story building must be open space (3.44 FAR × 22.0 OSR). The maximum FAR is achievable only where the zoning lot is large enough to accommodate a practical building footprint as well as the required amount of open space. The building must be set within a sky exposure plane which, in R7 districts, begins at a height of 60 feet above the street line and then slopes inward over the zoning lot.

Off-street parking is generally required for 60 percent of a building’s dwelling units in an R7-1 district and 50 percent in an R7-2 district, but requirements are lower for income-restricted housing units (IRHU) and are further modified in certain areas, such as within the Transit Zone and the Manhattan Core, or for lots less than 15,000 square feet in R7-1 districts. Off-street parking requirements can be waived if 5 or fewer parking spaces are required in R7-1 districts, or if 15 or fewer parking spaces are required or if the zoning lot is 10,000 square feet or less in R7-2 districts.

The optional Quality Housing regulations in R7 districts utilize height limits to produce lower, high lot coverage buildings set at or near the street line. With floor area ratios that are equal to or greater than can be achieved in height factor buildings, the optional Quality Housing regulations produce new buildings in keeping with the scale of many traditional neighborhoods in the East Village and upper Manhattan, the west Bronx, and sections of Queens and Brooklyn.

The optional Quality Housing regulations for buildings on wide streets outside the Manhattan Core are the same as in R7A districts. The maximum FAR is 4.0 and the base height before setback is 40 to 75 feet with a maximum building height of 80 feet, or 85 feet if providing a qualifying ground floor. The maximum FAR on narrow streets and within the Manhattan Core is 3.44, and the base height before setback is 40 to 65 feet with a maximum building height of 75 feet. The area between a building’s street wall and the street line must be planted, and the building must have interior amenities for residents pursuant to the Quality
Housing Program.
Off-street parking is generally required for 50 percent of a building’s dwelling units, but requirements are lower for income-restricted housing units (IRHU) and are further modified in certain areas, such as within the Transit Zone and the Manhattan Core, or for lots less than 15,000 square feet in R7-1 districts. Off-street parking requirements can be waived if 5 or fewer parking spaces are required in R7-1 districts, or if 15 or fewer parking spaces are required or if the zoning lot is 10,000 square feet or less in R7-2 districts.

Higher maximum FAR and heights are available for buildings participating in the Inclusionary Housing Program or that provide certain senior facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>Open Space Ratio</th>
<th>Sky Exposure Plane</th>
<th>DU Factor</th>
<th>Required Parking</th>
<th>Required Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.87-3.44</td>
<td>15.5-25.5</td>
<td>Starts at 60 ft.</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>60% of DU</td>
<td>15% of IRHU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rear Yard</th>
<th>Lot Coverage</th>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>Base Height</th>
<th>Building Height</th>
<th># of Stories</th>
<th>DU Factor</th>
<th>Required Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic QH</td>
<td>30 ft.</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>40-65 ft./40-75 ft.</td>
<td>75 ft.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>50% of DU / 15% of IRHU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusionary QH</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>40-75 ft.</td>
<td>135 ft.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C1-C2

C1-1 through C1-5 and C2-1 through C2-5 districts are commercial overlays mapped within residence districts. Mapped along streets that serve local retail needs, they are found extensively throughout the city’s lower- and medium-density areas and occasionally in higher-density districts.

Typical retail uses include neighborhood grocery stores, restaurants and beauty parlors. C2 districts permit a slightly wider range of uses, such as funeral homes and repair services. In mixed buildings, commercial uses are limited to one or two floors and must always be located below the residential use.

When commercial overlays are mapped in R1 through R5 districts, the maximum commercial floor area ratio (FAR) is 1.0; when mapped in R6 through R10 districts, the maximum commercial FAR is 2.0. Commercial buildings are subject to commercial bulk rules.

Overlay districts differ from other commercial districts in that residential bulk is governed by the residence district within which the overlay is mapped. All other commercial districts that permit residential use are assigned a C2-4 specific residential district equivalent. Unless otherwise indicated on the zoning maps, the depth of overlay districts ranges from 100 to 200 feet.

Generally, the lower the numerical suffix, the more off-street parking is required. For example, in C1-1 districts, typically mapped in outlying areas of the city, a large food store would require one parking space for every 100 square feet of floor area, whereas no parking is required in C1-5 districts, which are well served by mass transit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C1-2</th>
<th>C2-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial FAR within R1-R5</td>
<td>All district have a commercial FAR of 1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial FAR within R6-R10</td>
<td>All district have a commercial FAR of 2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of Overlay District</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Accessory Parking PRC-8</td>
<td>1 per 300</td>
<td>1 per 1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX | ZONING DISTRICTS

Hunters Point South

M1-2 M1 districts range from the Garment District in Manhattan and Port Morris in the Bronx with multistory lofts, to parts of Red Hook or College Point with one- or two-story warehouses characterized by loading bays. M1 districts are often buffers between M2 or M3 districts and adjacent residential or commercial districts. M1 districts typically include light industrial uses, such as woodworking shops, repair shops, and wholesale service and storage facilities. Nearly all industrial uses are allowed in M1 districts if they meet the stringent M1 performance standards. Offices, hotels and most retail uses are also permitted. Certain community facilities, such as hospitals, are allowed in M1 districts only by special permit, but houses of worship are allowed as-of-right.

In M1-5A and M1-5B districts mapped in SoHo/NoHo, artists may occupy joint living-work quarters as an industrial use. Other than M1 districts paired with residence districts in Special Mixed Use Districts, M1-5M and M1-6M districts (by special permit) and M1-D districts (by authorization or certification) are the only manufacturing districts in which residences are permitted. However, in M1-6D districts, residential use may be allowed as-of-right on zoning lots under certain conditions.

In M1-5M and M1-6M districts, mapped in parts of Chelsea, space in an industrial building may be converted to residential use, provided a specified amount of floor area is preserved for particular industrial and commercial uses.

Floor area ratios in M1 districts range from 1.0 to 10.0, depending on location; building height and setbacks are controlled by a sky exposure plane which may be penetrated by a tower in certain districts. Although new industrial buildings are usually low-rise structures that fit within sky exposure plane, commercial and community facility buildings can be constructed as towers in M1-3 through M1-6 districts. In the highest density manufacturing district, M1-6, mapped only in Manhattan, an FAR of 12 can be achieved with a bonus for a public plaza. Except along district boundaries, no side yards are required. Rear yards at least 20 feet deep are usually required, except within 100 feet of a corner.

Parking and loading requirements vary with district and use. M1-1, M1-2 and M1-3 districts are subject to parking requirements based on the type of use and size of an establishment. For example, a warehouse in an M1-1 district requires one off-street parking space per 2,000 square feet of floor area or per every three employees, whichever would be less. Parking is not required in Long Island City or M1-4, M1-5 and M1-6 districts, mapped mainly in Manhattan. Requirements for loading berths of specified dimensions differ according to district, size and type of use.

M1-2/R6 M2 districts occupy the middle ground between light and heavy industrial areas. The four M2 districts, with different floor area ratios (FAR) and parking requirements, are
mapped mainly in the city’s older industrial areas along the waterfront. M2-1 districts, for example, are mapped along much of Brooklyn’s Red Hook and Sunset Park waterfronts. Manhattan’s Hudson River piers, including the Passenger Ship Terminal and many municipal facilities, are within M2-3 districts.

Required performance standards in all M2 districts are lower than in M1 districts. Except when M2 uses border on a residence district, higher levels of noise and vibration are allowed, smoke is permitted and industrial activities need not be entirely enclosed. The FAR is 2.0 in M2-1 and M2-3 districts and 5.0 in M2-2 and M2-4 districts. The maximum base heights before setback is 60 feet in M2-1 and M2-3 districts; and 85 feet in M2-2 and M2-4 districts.

Parking requirements vary according to use and are the same as for the M1 and M3 districts. M2-3 and M2-4 districts, mapped only in Manhattan, are exempt from parking requirements, as are M2 districts in Long Island City. Loading berth requirements differ according to district, type of use and size of establishment.
M3-1
M3 districts are designated for areas with heavy industries that generate noise, traffic or pollutants. Typical uses include power plants, solid waste transfer facilities and recycling plants, and fuel supply depots. Even in M3 districts, uses with potential nuisance effects are required to conform to minimum performance standards.

Like M2 districts, M3 districts are usually located near the waterfront and buffered from residential areas. Large M3 districts are mapped along the Arthur Kill in Staten Island, along the East River shore of the South Bronx, and along the Gowanus Canal in Brooklyn. Smaller M3 districts, such as portions of Astoria, are located along the waterfront in all five boroughs and accommodate public utilities.

The two M3 districts, both with a maximum floor area ratio (FAR) of 2.0 and a maximum base height before setback of 60 feet, differ only in parking requirements. M3-1 districts are subject to the same parking requirements as M1-1, M1-2, M13, M2-1 and M2-2 districts; M3-2 districts, found only in Manhattan, are exempt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rear Yard</th>
<th>Lot Coverage</th>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>Base Height</th>
<th>Building Height</th>
<th># of Stories</th>
<th>DU Factor</th>
<th>Required Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corner</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic QH</td>
<td>30 ft.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>40-65 ft./40-75 ft.</td>
<td>75 ft./80-85 ft.</td>
<td>n/a / (8)</td>
<td>680 DU / 50% of IRHU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusionary QH</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>40-75 ft.</td>
<td>135 ft.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R8
Apartment buildings in R8 districts can range from mid-rise, eight- to ten-story buildings to much taller buildings set back from the street on large zoning lots. This high density residential district is mapped along the Grand Concourse in the Bronx and on the edge of Brooklyn Heights. R8 districts are also widely mapped in Manhattan neighborhoods, such as Washington Heights. New buildings in R8 districts may be developed under either height factor regulations or the optional Quality Housing regulations that often reflect the older, pre-1961 neighborhood streetscape.

The floor area ratio (FAR) for height factor development in R8 districts ranges from 0.94 to 6.02; the open space ratio (OSR) ranges from 5.9 to 11.9. A taller building may be obtained by providing more open space. In the diagram, for example, 64% of the zoning lot with the 17-story building must be open space (6.02 FAR x 10.7 OSR). Thus, the maximum FAR is achievable only where the zoning lot is large enough to accommodate a practical buil-
ding footprint as well as the required amount of open space. There are no absolute height limits; the building must be set within a sky exposure plane which, in R8 districts, begins at a height of 85 feet above the street line and then slopes inward over the zoning lot.

Off-street parking is generally required for 40 percent of a building’s dwelling units, but requirements are lower for income-restricted housing units (IRHU) and are further modified in certain areas, such as within the Transit Zone and the Manhattan Core, or for lots less than 15,000 square feet. Off-street parking requirements can be waived if 15 or fewer parking spaces are required or if the zoning lot is 10,000 square feet or less.

The optional Quality Housing regulations in R8 districts utilize height limits to produce lower, high lot coverage buildings set at or near the street line. With floor area ratio (FAR) equal to or greater than can be achieved using R8 height factor regulations, the optional Quality Housing regulations produce new buildings in keeping with many of the city’s established neighborhoods.

The maximum FAR on narrow streets is 6.02, and the base height before setback is 60 to 85 feet with a maximum building height of 115 feet. On wide streets outside the Manhattan Core, the FAR rises to 7.2, and the base height before setback is 60 to 95 feet with a maximum building height of 130 feet, or 135 feet if providing a qualifying ground floor. The street wall of the building must extend along the width of the zoning lot and at least 70% of the street wall must be within eight feet of the street line.
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Higher maximum FAR and heights are available for buildings participating in the Inclusionary Housing Program or that provide certain senior facilities. The area between a building’s street wall and the street line must be planted and the building must have interior amenities for residents pursuant to the Quality Housing Program. Off-street parking requirements are the same as for height factor buildings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Height Factor</th>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>Open Space Ratio</th>
<th>Sky Exposure Plane</th>
<th>DU Factor</th>
<th>Required Parking</th>
<th>Required Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.94-6.02</td>
<td>5.9-11.9</td>
<td>Starts at 85 ft.</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>40% of DU</td>
<td>12% of IRHU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|| Lot Coverage | FAR | Base | Building Height | # of Stories | DU Factor | Required Parking |
|---------------|-------|------|-----------------|--------------|-----------|-----------------|
| Basic QH      | 30 ft. | 65%  | 60-85 ft/60-95 ft | 115 ft/130-135 ft | n/a/13 | 680 | 40% of DU/12% of IRHU |
| Inclusionary QH | 7.20  | 60-105 ft | 215 ft | 21 | |

R8A
The contextual Quality Housing bulk regulations, which are mandatory in R8A districts, typically result in high lot coverage apartment buildings of roughly 12 to 14 stories, set at or near the street line. Limitations on the base height and maximum building height of new buildings ensure compatibility with existing buildings on the street. Parts of DUMBO in Brooklyn and West Chelsea in Manhattan are R8A districts.

The floor area ratio (FAR) in R8A districts is 6.02. Above a base height of 60 to 85 feet, the building must set back to a depth of 10 feet on a wide street and 15 feet on a narrow street before rising to its maximum height of 120 feet. If providing a qualifying ground floor, the maximum base height is 95 feet, and the maximum height is 125 feet. On a wide street, the street wall must extend along the entire width of the zoning lot and at least 70% of the street wall must be within eight feet of the street line. The area between a building’s street wall and the street line must be planted and the building must have interior amenities pursuant to the Quality Housing Program.

Higher maximum FAR and heights are available for buildings participating in the Inclusio-
nary Housing Program or that provide certain senior facilities.

Off-street parking is generally required for 40 percent of a building’s dwelling units, but requirements are lower for income-restricted housing units (IRHU) and are further modified in certain areas, such as within the Transit Zone and the Manhattan Core, or for lots less than 15,000 square feet. Off-street parking requirements can be waived if 15 or fewer parking spaces are required or if the zoning lot is 10,000 square feet or less. Off-street parking is not allowed in front of a building.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rear Yard</th>
<th>Lot Coverage</th>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Building Height</th>
<th># of Stories</th>
<th>DU Factor</th>
<th>Required Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corner</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>30 ft</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>60-85 ft</td>
<td>n/a / (12)</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusionary</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>60-105 ft.</td>
<td>140 (145) ft.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R8B

R8B contextual districts usually present the same unified blocks of “brownstone” rowhouses as R5B and R6B districts but the higher floor area ratio (FAR) of 4.0 creates a taller building that is commonly found on the narrow side streets of the Upper West Side and the Upper East Side in Manhattan. The mandatory Quality Housing bulk regulations encourage new six-story apartment buildings, with a setback at the top story, that fit in well with the rows of 19th century houses.
The base height of a new building before a setback is 55 to 65 feet. The maximum building height is 75 feet. Many buildings are set back from the street with stoops in shallow front yards. To maintain the traditional streetscape, curb cuts are prohibited for zoning lot frontages less than 40 feet. The street wall of a new building, on any lot up to 50 feet wide, must be as deep as one adjacent street wall but no deeper than the other. On lots with at least 50 feet of frontage, the street wall must be no closer to the street line than the street wall of an adjacent building. Street walls need not be set back beyond 10 feet. Buildings must have interior amenities for residents pursuant to the Quality Housing Program.

Off-street parking is generally required for 50 percent of a building’s dwelling units, but requirements are lower for income-restricted housing units (IRHU) and are further modified in certain areas, such as within the Transit Zone and the Manhattan Core, or for lots less than 15,000 square feet. Off-street parking requirements can be waived if 15 or fewer parking spaces are required or if the zoning lot is 10,000 square feet or less. Off-street parking is not allowed in front of a building and any open area between the street wall and the street line must be planted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rear Yard</th>
<th>Lot Coverage</th>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>Base Height</th>
<th>Building Height</th>
<th># of Stories</th>
<th>DU Factor</th>
<th>Required Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corner</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 ft</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>55-65 ft</td>
<td>75 ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C6-2
C6 districts permit a wide range of high-bulk commercial uses requiring a central location. Most C6 districts are in Manhattan, Downtown Brooklyn and Downtown Jamaica; a C6-3D district is mapped in the Civic Center area of the Bronx. Corporate headquarters, large hotels, department stores and entertainment facilities in high-rise mixed buildings are permitted in C6 districts.

C6-1, C6-2 and most C6-3 districts, typically mapped in areas outside central business cores, such as the Lower East Side and Chelsea, have a commercial floor area ratio (FAR) of 6.0; the C6-3D district has an FAR of 9.0. C6-4 through C6-9 districts, typically mapped within the city’s major business districts, have a maximum FAR of 10.0 or 15.0, exclusive of any applicable bonus. Floor area may be increased by a bonus for a public plaza or Inclusionary Housing.

C6-2A, C6-3A, C6-3X and C6-4A are contextual districts with maximum building heights. C6-3D and C6-4X districts allow towers above a building base; special rules determine the tower’s height and articulation. All other C6 districts allow towers to penetrate a sky expo-
C6 districts are widely mapped within special districts. C6-4.5, C6-5.5, C6-6.5 and C6-7T districts are mapped only within the Special Midtown District and have unique floor area ratios and bonus rules. C6-1G, C6-2G, C6-2M and C6-4M districts are mapped in Chinatown and Chelsea and in the Special Garment Center District, and have rules for the conversion of non-residential space to residential use.

C6 districts are well served by mass transit, and off-street parking is generally not required, except within the C6-3D district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Equivalent FAR</th>
<th>Permitted Signs</th>
<th>Required Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General R8 6.0</td>
<td>5 Times front-age None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C6-4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Equivalent FAR</th>
<th>Permitted Signs</th>
<th>Required Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General R10 10.0</td>
<td>5 Times front-age None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M1-4

M1 districts range from the Garment District in Manhattan and Port Morris in the Bronx with multistory lofts, to parts of Red Hook or College Point with one- or two-story warehouses characterized by loading bays. M1 districts are often buffers between M2 or M3 districts and adjacent residential or commercial districts. M1 districts typically include light industrial uses, such as woodworking shops, repair shops, and wholesale service and storage facilities. Nearly all industrial uses are allowed in M1 districts if they meet the stringent M1 performance standards. Offices, hotels and most retail uses are also permitted. Certain community facilities, such as hospitals, are allowed in M1 districts only by special permit, but houses of worship are allowed as-of-right.

In M1-5A and M1-5B districts mapped in SoHo/NoHo, artists may occupy joint living-work quarters as an industrial use. Other than M1 districts paired with residence districts in Special Mixed Use Districts, M1-5M and M1-6M districts (by special permit) and M1-D districts (by authorization or certification) are the only manufacturing districts in which residences are permitted. However, in M1-6D districts, residential use may be allowed as-of-right on zoning lots under certain conditions.
In M1-5M and M1-6M districts, mapped in parts of Chelsea, space in an industrial building may be converted to residential use, provided a specified amount of floor area is preserved for particular industrial and commercial uses.

Floor area ratios in M1 districts range from 1.0 to 10.0, depending on location; building height and setbacks are controlled by a sky exposure plane which may be penetrated by a tower in certain districts. Although new industrial buildings are usually low-rise structures that fit within sky exposure plane, commercial and community facility buildings can be constructed as towers in M1-3 through M1-6 districts. In the highest density manufacturing district, M1-6, mapped only in Manhattan, an FAR of 12 can be achieved with a bonus for a public plaza. Except along district boundaries, no side yards are required. Rear yards at least 20 feet deep are usually required, except within 100 feet of a corner.

Parking and loading requirements vary with district and use. M1-1, M1-2 and M1-3 districts are subject to parking requirements based on the type of use and size of an establishment. For example, a warehouse in an M1-1 district requires one off-street parking space per 2,000 square feet of floor area or per every three employees, whichever would be less. Parking is not required in Long Island City or M1-4, M1-5 and M1-6 districts, mapped mainly in Manhattan. Requirements for loading berths of specified dimensions differ according to district, size and type of use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>Permitted Signs</th>
<th>Required Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen-eral</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5 Times front-age</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C1-5 and C2-5 Overlays

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commercial FAR within R1-R5</th>
<th>All district have a commercial FAR of 1.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial FAR within R6-R10</td>
<td>All district have a commercial FAR of 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of Overlay District</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Accessory Parking PRC-8</td>
<td>1 per 1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mott Haven - Port Morris, South Bronx

The Mott Haven - Port Morris neighborhood tabulation area of the Bronx is one of the poorest districts in the nation, with 38% of their population living below the poverty line and earning less than $14,999 annually. Higher income households make up less than 10% total, with less than 5 percent earning over $100,000 annually. Less than 1 percent of the households earn over $200,000 annually. 54% of Mott Haven’s households receives Food Stamp/SNAP benefits. The median household income is $20,334 and the mean household income isn’t significantly higher at $31,585.

Lower East Side, Manhattan

The Lower East Side neighborhood tabulation area of Manhattan is primarily low-income. Nearly 28 percent of the households earn less than $14,999 annually and nearly 16% earn between $15,000 and $24,999 annually. Higher income households make up a fair share of the population with 18 percent earning over $100,000 annually. Nearly 6% earn over $200,000 alone. 35.5% of the LES households receive Food Stamp/SNAP benefits. The median household income is $31,273 and the mean household income is nearly twice that at $61,257. This reflects the greater number of high-income households in the LES that live side by side to those in poverty.

Far Rockaway - Bayswater, Queens

The Far Rockaway - Bayswater neighborhood tabulation area of Queens is generally working class and middle-income. Nearly 25 percent of the households earn less than $14,999 annually and nearly 14% earn between $15,000 and $24,999 annually. Higher income households make up a fair share of the population with 18 percent earning over $100,000 annually. Nearly 4% earn over $200,000. 37% of Far Rockaway’s households receives Food Stamp/SNAP benefits. The median household income is $41,916 and the mean household income is slightly higher at $59,418.

West New Brighton - New Brighton - St. George, Staten Island

The St. George neighborhood tabulation area of Staten Island is mostly middle-income. The income of the households is generally balanced among the different income brackets. 15 percent earn below $10,000 annually, 10 percent earn between $15,000 to $24,999, 10 percent earn between $35,000 to $49,000 and 24 percent earn over $100,000. 28.5% of St. George’s households receive Food Stamp/SNAP benefits. The median household income
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is $48,439 and the mean household income is slightly higher at $64,533.

Fort Greene, Brooklyn

The Fort Greene neighborhood tabulation area of Brooklyn is generally perceived as upper middle class. At least 30 percent of households earn $100,000 or more annually. Almost 26 percent of households earn under $24,999 and nearly 22 percent receive Food Stamp/SNAP benefits. 44 percent earn between $25,000 and $99,999 annually. The median household income is $61,990 and the mean household income is more reflective of upper middle class at $86,002.