



# Gentrification and Rezoning Williamsburg-Greenpoint

## *Community Development Studio*

Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy  
Rutgers University

Leah Apgar  
Afton Enger  
Latanya Harry  
Edward Leimbach  
Caroline McCarthy  
Ana Murteira  
Emilio Panasci  
Emily Schelling

Craig Cipriano,  
Kim Hahn  
Kyeongsu Kim  
Jason McCann  
Sarina Mohan  
Elizabeth Nash  
Lena Ranieri  
Aaron Todd

## **Teaching Assistant**

Andrew Szwak

## **Instructor**

Kathe Newman

Spring 2007

## INTRODUCTION

The 2007 Spring Community Development Studio worked in partnership with the New York Community Council, a coalition of advocacy organizations, that is concerned about the rapid pace of gentrification and development. The coalition asked for our assistance to develop a report about development subsidies, affordable housing, commercial and industrial change, and residential displacement in New York City.

We 1) examined housing development subsidy programs 2) explored how much select developments receive in subsidies and how much affordable housing is produced and for what income groups 3) compared the affordable housing developed with the average income of the community in which it is built 4) examined the extent to which local residents are displaced from these neighborhoods, and 5) examined change to commercial and industrial areas. We examined city policies and explored development in Williamsburg-Greenpoint. **SLIDE**

## WILLIAMSBURG-GREENPOINT

In the 1960s and 1970s Williamsburg-Greenpoint suffered severe disinvestment. The Brooklyn Queens Expressway sliced through the communities and waste transfer sites and sewage treatment facilities brought noxious uses to the waterfront. Industrial businesses disappeared as deindustrialization took its toll, and residents and commercial businesses fled. Residents believed that the city too had walked away, focusing resources on other communities. Since then gentrification and more recently rezoning have been transforming Williamsburg and Greenpoint. First we will discuss gentrification and then we'll turn to rezoning. **SLIDE**

Gentrification is the class based transformation of a neighborhood that alters neighborhood character and often produces residential, cultural, and business displacement. Williamsburg has been a prime target for gentrification. Artists seeking affordable live work spaces and an alternative to the commercialization of the Lower Manhattan art scene turned to Williamsburg as early as the 1970s. This community expanded, opening galleries, shops, and restaurants giving the neighborhood a bohemian feel. Hipsters followed. **SLIDE**

A mere one stop away from the Lower East Side on the L train, the Northside and Bedford Avenue was the initial epicenter of gentrifying Williamsburg. This map shows the increase in people entering subway stations between 1998 and 2006. Note the dramatic increase in entrances at the Bedford Avenue Station. The area surrounding the Bedford Ave stop quickly became home to restaurants and community spaces that drew new residents. As you can see, the Bedford Avenue and Lorimer Street stops experienced the greatest increase, a 72 and 81 percent increase in annual ridership,

respectively. Gentrification expanded outward towards the waterfront, North into Greenpoint, into East Williamsburg along the “L” line and into South Williamsburg (New York City Department of Transportation, 2007). **SLIDE**

As the 90s wore on, bohemian Williamsburg became an ever more alluring neighborhood drawing hipsters and developers who are transforming the neighborhood from a community of predominantly low rise houses to one marked by thin high rise condos locals refer to as “fingers” with units in the million dollar range. Halsted Property describes the Williamsburg it’s selling: “Williamsburg pulsates with art, culture, and nightlife. Holland Tunnel, Pierogi 2000, and Ch’i Art Space are just a few of the many galleries that command center stage in today’s progressive art scene. Pete’s Candy Store hosts weekly poetry readings and literary discussions. After hours, the neighborhood sizzles.” (Halsted Property 2007 <http://schaeferlanding.com/galleries.html>)

Indeed, Williamsburg does “sizzle.” Gentrification has transformed the neighborhood bringing new residents, galleries, cafes, bookstores, restaurants, bars, condos, and more and more hipsters. But does Williamsburg “sizzle” for everyone? These same forces have rapidly increased housing prices, reduced housing vacancy to less than 2 percent, transformed the commercial corridors, and packed the “L” trains. Locals worry that they have also displaced residents, businesses, and culture. **SLIDE**

A new younger wealthier population is calling Williamsburg home. The percentage of residents between the ages of 20 and 29 has grown. Between 1998 and 2004 the median income of renters increased by 12 percent. Housing prices have soared pricing homeownership out of reach of many Williamsburg families. Williamsburg-Greenpoint has the third highest appreciation rate of 2-4 family homes of all community districts. In fact, sale prices have surpassed values in New York City, where the median income for 2-4 family homes is \$20,000 lower. Rents have also increased. One local real estate agent estimates average market rate rent at \$1,462 in 2005, a 43 increase percent since 1991 (New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey, 1998, 2004; Kline Reality, 2006; Furman Center, 2005). **SLIDE**

Here is a map of median household income by census tract which shows that incomes are higher in Greenpoint and the Northside. Residents need an income of \$49,840 to afford the average market rate rent of \$1,276. The average median income of renters is only \$31,200. It is not surprising that more than one-fifth of the households spend in excess of half their income for rent (NYCHVS, 2004). **SLIDE** The darker areas on the map show census tracts with the highest rent burden. Higher levels of rent burden are prevalent on the South Side and in East Williamsburg. Even homeowners have trouble affording housing. About one third of homeowners spend more than 60 percent of their income on housing. **SLIDE** And 19 percent of households live in overcrowded conditions. As we can see from the map, the South Side and the lower

portion of Williamsburg are more adversely affected (U.S. Bureau of the Census 2000). These neighborhoods are home to Hasidim, Latinos and recent immigrants. **SLIDE**

It would be hard to miss the changes in Williamsburg-Greenpoint today. The neighborhoods are awash in new residential construction. Between 1998 and 2004 building permits authorized 4,695 new units, almost a six fold increase from the previous period (New York City Department of Buildings, 2007 accessed from Furman Center). Some might suggest that the new construction offers some optimism to relieve overcrowding, but the new construction, with condos that sell in the millions, are a far cry from the needs of many of the neighborhood's existing residents. **SLIDE**

## REZONING

In May 2005, the city approved a comprehensive rezoning of Greenpoint-Williamsburg which was part of a city-wide effort to increase housing opportunities and revive New York's waterfronts as an economic asset. "Rezoning" is defined as changing the zoning designation in an area to allow for different uses and densities. The rezoning in Greenpoint-Williamsburg increased allowable densities on the waterfront and reduced allowable densities upland. This map shows the change in land use. You can see the manufacturing districts in purple on the old zoning map and how those changed to residential districts shown in yellow on the new zoning map. **SLIDE**

In crafting the rezoning, the City differentiated two areas of Greenpoint-Williamsburg: waterfront and upland. This map shows the waterfront in green and upland in yellow. The green indicates planned open space, including the existing McCarren Park on the lower right. **SLIDE** Before the rezoning, the waterfront was zoned for manufacturing and industrial use and residential use was generally prohibited within a few blocks of the East River. Now, dense residential development is the norm. This map shows the new residential and mixed use areas in yellow on the waterfront. Upland, manufacturing, residential, and commercial uses had long coexisted in mixed-use districts. Some of these areas were replaced by residential districts where new industrial uses are prohibited. In other cases, upland industrial districts were replaced by mixed-use districts where residential uses are now allowed. In general, the amount of space zoned for industry decreased while the amount of space zoned for residential use increased. Within the new residential districts, commercial overlays promote the commercialization of corridors such as Bedford Avenue. **SLIDE**

While tall high-rises are now permitted on the waterfront, "contextual zoning districts" were mapped onto upland areas. The City promoted contextual districts as protective of neighborhood character, with height and bulk limits lower than the old zoning and consistent with the low-rise street wall of the neighborhood. The map on the left shows that the old zoning allowed industrial and residential uses. The map on

the right shows the current zoning, wherein industrial uses are not allowed and residential uses have been downzoned. The contextual districts are located on the Northside of Williamsburg and part of Greenpoint. Residential districts on the Southside and in East Williamsburg are not protected by contextual zoning, which allows developers to build higher than the existing building heights. In addition, taller buildings have been built within the contextual districts because they were grandfathered. **SLIDE**

During the rezoning process, community advocates campaigned for more affordable housing and mandatory inclusionary housing. The North Brooklyn Alliance, a coalition of local businesses, religious institutions, and community-based organizations, fought for a mandatory 40 percent of the new units to be affordable. What they got instead was a voluntary plan that relied on market-based incentives. Inclusionary housing, or inclusionary zoning, is the coupling of income-restricted housing with market-rate development. It requires the developer to contribute to the stock of affordable housing units in the same area where that developer is profiting from the sale of market-rate housing. New York City has had an inclusionary housing program in the highest-density residential districts of Manhattan since the 1980s, allowing developers to increase the height and bulk of their buildings, and thus their profitability, in exchange for providing affordable units. **SLIDE**

This map shows the area zoned for the new inclusionary housing program in Greenpoint-Williamsburg. Different zoning bonuses are offered to developers who include affordable housing, depending on whether their new developments are located on the waterfront (shown in blue) or upland (shown in yellow). The inclusionary zoning program allows developers to increase their FAR, or floor area ratio, or to receive height bonuses in exchange for building affordable housing. FAR is total floor area divided by the zoning lot area. For example, if a lot is 5,000 square feet a total of 10,000 square feet can be built with a FAR of 2.0. **SLIDE**

Sites on the waterfront have special regulations for height, bulk, floor area distribution, street scape, and waterfront access. This chart shows the maximum FARs and heights for a variety of zoning districts on the waterfront. Depending on the district, developers are given a 27%, 13% or 33% density bonus. Different levels of affordability are required depending on the density bonus received. Generally, between 7.5% and 20% of floor area must be affordable for households at 80% of area median income, or AMI (New York City Department of Planning, 2005). **SLIDE**

This chart shows FARs and height limits for the zoning districts in the upland area. Again, depending on the zoning district developers are given a 10% or 33% density bonus and developers must provide 20% of floor area affordable for households at 80% AMI. In the upland area, the affordable units can be located either on-site or off-site and via either new construction or preservation of affordable units (New York City Department of Planning and Housing Preservation Development, 2005). **SLIDE**

Developers have seldom taken advantage of the program in Manhattan, because it cannot be combined with the other housing development subsidy programs available. The City sought to make an inclusionary housing program in Greenpoint-Williamsburg that would be more attractive to private developers. There are 4 essential differences between the City's old inclusionary program and the new one in Greenpoint-Williamsburg. First, affordable units do not need to be spread evenly throughout the buildings. This allows developers to charge more for market-rate units on higher floors increasing the cross-subsidy for the affordable units. Affordable units may also be built off site. Second, developers can use other subsidy programs in combination with the inclusionary program such as the low-income housing tax credit and tax-exempt bond financing. Third, developers may fulfill their inclusionary housing commitments by preserving existing units of affordable housing. Fourth, the City expanded its 421-a tax exemption exclusion area to the Greenpoint-Williamsburg waterfront. This means that to get the 20 to 25 year exemption, developers must build affordable housing (Salama, Jerry, Michael Schill, and Jonathan Springer, 2005).

The City-wide 421-a program grants developers property tax savings to encourage the development of housing. Under this program, individuals are exempt from paying any increase in property taxes that may result from new construction; essentially, the tax rate is frozen. Within the exclusion area, however, developers are required to build affordable housing in order to receive the tax exemption. When the waterfront area of Greenpoint-Williamsburg was rezoned for residential use, the 421-a exclusion area was extended to the waterfront. At the end of this year, the exclusion area will be further expanded to include all of Greenpoint-Williamsburg. **SLIDE**

In addition to the Inclusionary Zoning program, an Anti-Harassment program was included as another component of the Greenpoint-Williamsburg rezoning. In response to the concerns of Community Board 1 and the City Council, current residents are protected through anti-harassment provisions. Tenant harassment is an attempt by property owners to drive out tenants in order to raise rents for future tenants or to sell the property to developers. It may include failure to make repairs, respond to complaints, and protect the area from drug dealers. The Department of Housing Preservation and Development, or HPD, will not issue permits for construction or demolition to a landlord with a history of tenant harassment. Within the anti-harassment area, landlords making major renovations or demolition are required to submit a Certification of No Harassment to HPD. Anti-harassment provisions included in the rezoning were modeled after those of the Special Clinton District in Manhattan. The City is currently seeking a local community-based organization to educate tenants on their legal rights in Greenpoint-Williamsburg and within the anti-harassment area. **SLIDE**

The rezoning has significantly accelerated the pace of residential development in Greenpoint-Williamsburg. An increase in allowable densities and heights has

changed the scale of development, particularly on the waterfront. Additionally, the rezoning triggered a substantial increase in the cost of land. In 2005 the Furman Center reported that land costs went up 500% since 2002 in anticipation of the rezoning. In the midst of these changes, developers were offered incentives to include affordable housing along with their new market-rate developments. Incentives take the form of density and height bonuses with the inclusionary zoning program; tax exemptions with the 421-a program; and numerous government subsidies. **SLIDE**

## **NEW RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

To better understand the pace, type, and location, we researched new construction and rehabilitation developments, and identified 84 in Greenpoint-Williamsburg. We gathered information on the number of units and stories, building type, affordability level, size of units, and location of the development. We determined that some developments do not match the current scale, unit type, cost and character of Greenpoint-Williamsburg. **SLIDE**

This is a list of websites where we found information on new developments. As can be seen, this was a very complex and piecemeal process. We submitted a Freedom of Information Act request for additional information on some of the developments. Some files had been lost and we found that the requesting process is not well-coordinated among City agencies. All-in-all, gathering this information required some creativity and perseverance. **SLIDE**

These maps show the location of new developments. The map on the left shows new development by stories, where larger dots indicate taller buildings. The largest dot indicates 16 or more stories. The map on the right shows new development by units, where larger dots indicate more units. The largest dot indicates 100 or more units. Most of the new developments are located upland in Williamsburg. Since the rezoning, only one waterfront development, Northside Piers, is in the process of being built. An additional development, The Edge, is planned. Schaefer Landing is located on the waterfront, but was built prior to the rezoning. Many developments advertise that they are located “on the waterfront,” when they are actually located 1-2 blocks from the waterfront. It is expected that additional developments will be built on the waterfront in the next several years. **SLIDE**

We found that most of the developments are for homeownership. Several developments are “loft style” or multi-story duplexes, and many buildings include one or two penthouse units. The luxury component of these units was often emphasized. You may notice that we don’t have some information for many of the buildings. This information isn’t available in some cases because building designs haven’t been finalized, permits haven’t been issued, or other issues are in play. **SLIDE**

Building heights ranged from 4 to 16 stories, with the majority under six stories. The shorter buildings may potentially blend in better with the existing neighborhood structures. However, the renderings and photos found on many websites suggest a more modern, and thus out of context, façades. **SLIDE** Most of the developments have fewer than 30 units. Only five developments have more than 100 units. Many of the new buildings are in-fill developments located in the upland area on smaller lots, where contextual zoning limits their height and bulk. Unit types range from studios to three-bedrooms. Of the developments that we were able to identify unit size, 51% of the units are 2-bedrooms and 43% are 1-bedroom. As most of the units are smaller, developers are targeting singles and couples rather than large families. **SLIDE**

### *WATERFRONT*

The three major waterfront developments in Greenpoint-Williamsburg are Schaefer Landing, Northside Piers/ Palmer's Dock, and The Edge. These waterfront developments are larger than upland developments because the land parcels are bigger. The incentives and subsidies available to developers of waterfront properties under the rezoning were designed with these larger sites in mind. **SLIDE**

Schaefer Landing was completed in 2005 prior to rezoning and includes 215 owner-occupied luxury units and 140 rental units affordable for families earning up to 60 percent of AMI. A public esplanade provides waterfront access and Watertaxi service is available at the Schaefer Landing dock. **SLIDE** The development is located outside the waterfront 421-a exclusion area; therefore, the developer could receive the 421-a tax benefits as-of-right without producing affordable housing. The Williamsburg community lobbied extensively for the affordable units which were made possible because the developers received a significant discount on the land, money for environmental cleanup and other City funds. **SLIDE**

Northside Piers is a market rate development in construction on the waterfront with an expected occupancy date of October 2007. Northside Piers will include more than 900 units in three towers. Northside Piers is located in a combined R6/R8 zone, which is shown on the map. **SLIDE** Northside Piers has taken the floor-area bonus under the Inclusionary Housing program. This density bonus in the combined R6/R8 zone allows for an FAR increase of 27%. Land use plans show that the total floor-area ratio of the project is 4.7, which is over the maximum of 3.7 without taking the bonus. **SLIDE**

So, who is this development for? Like many of the developments, Northside Piers is being heavily marketed. With the advertisements geared towards young, chic, well-to-do individuals, Williamsburg is portrayed as the "new Manhattan". The "artsy" character of the neighborhood is also used in the marketing materials. Importantly, many of the developments are advertising the fact that residents will not have to pay



property taxes due to the 421-a tax exemption program. These marketing materials display a perception or vision of Greenpoint-Williamsburg that differs, in some cases significantly, from the current character and current views of long-term residents.

**SLIDE**

In the Northside Piers viewbook, potential residents are featured, showing the amenities of both the development and Williamsburg as they might be used by these people. The viewbook is organized by time of day, with each time corresponding to one of these model residents. The “6am” resident is an artsy middle-aged woman. The next resident, representing “9am,” is a young woman. She values the investment she is creating by living in Northside Piers that comes partly from the brand name of Toll Brothers. She also finds satisfaction in “being one of the first to move to the Williamsburg Waterfront.” **SLIDE** A young family of four is featured for “3pm.” Unlike other model residents, this family is not new to Williamsburg, suggesting that upper-income neighborhood families are potential buyers. A young man represents “8pm” and, as suggested by the accompanying photos and map destinations, is a true foodie who appreciates the various restaurants and shops in Williamsburg. **SLIDE** The last resident, who apparently enjoys the nightlife of Williamsburg, is a young, hip, blonde woman. **SLIDE**

Palmer’s Dock is the affordable component of Northside Piers. **SLIDE** Palmer’s Dock will include 113 affordable apartments, which will satisfy the 421-a and inclusionary requirements for the first two Northside Piers towers. Another approximately 76 affordable units will be developed off-site in exchange for the 421-a and inclusionary benefits received by the third tower. This off-site project is currently in the pre-development stage and will contain 152 units, with half serving Northside Piers and half sold to other developers looking to fulfill their inclusionary requirements. Many programs and funding sources were combined to finance this project. **SLIDE** This combination has produced very affordable housing, with most of the units serving people at 50 and 60% of AMI. In response to concerns over displacement, 51% of the units are reserved for residents of Community Board 1. Eleven units will be set aside for adults with developmental disabilities. Tenants will be selected via a lottery process established by HPD. **SLIDE**

Turning now to the third waterfront development, little consistent information is available on The Edge. The Edge will be located on the waterfront on Kent Avenue, between North 5th and North 7th Streets. The project will include high- and mid-rise buildings and a mix of residential and retail spaces. **SLIDE** The Edge will consist of five buildings, 2, 4, 6, 30, and 40 stories which will include a total of 892 units in 4 buildings; we expect the fifth building will be for commercial use. **SLIDE**

Because The Edge is located on the waterfront in the 421-a exclusion zone, the developer must build affordable housing to receive the 421-a tax exemption. The developer can also receive an inclusionary housing bonus by meeting additional

affordable housing requirements. As the affordable units will account for 20 to 25% of the total units, the exact number is unknown. It currently appears that The Edge will use the inclusionary housing bonus because the project is currently proposing a total floor area of approximately 1.46 million square feet, which is greater than the allowable square footage without the bonus. In addition, it is likely The Edge will build affordable units on-site to receive a 25-year 421-a tax exemption. **SLIDE**

### *UPLAND*

There are currently only 3 waterfront developments that have been built, are being built, or are in the planning process. In contrast, our search for new residential development yielded many upland developments but only one is using the inclusionary housing bonus. Zoning differences in the waterfront versus upland help explain this imbalance. Developments in the rezoned area can receive a floor area bonus for building affordable units. Because many of the sites upland are smaller, developers are less inclined to seek a floor area bonus because the size of the site makes accommodating this extra footage difficult. Additionally, the 421-a exclusion area only covered the waterfront not upland allowing developers to capture the tax exemption as-of-right without producing affordable housing. The 421-a exclusion area may be expanded to cover upland by the end of the year, so the city is seeing a mad rush as developers move to get their foundations in, securing this incentive without providing affordable units.

Like the developments on the waterfront, new developments upland are selling luxury and a new Williamsburg. Here's some marketing language for one of the upland developments, "the modern": "Enter a lifestyle that puts you at the crossroads of luxury and contemporary urbanism. Focuses on design, grounded in comfort and inspired by the creativity of its environs. The modern williamsburg offers an opportunity to experience living unlike anywhere else in the Northside. Live modern..." Notice words like "experience living", "luxury" and "urbanism" that commodify housing and lifestyle. Unfortunately for new luxury residents, the marketing of some developments does not accurately reflect the characteristics of the development. For example, The Aqua advertises "come live poolside," but the pool at the development is not even functional. They also advertise that they are "uber luxurious." (<http://www.themodernwilliamsburg.com/>) **SLIDE**

### *THE CITY'S PROMISE*

To reassure the community that rezoning would benefit existing residents, the City committed that 3,548 units of affordable housing would be produced or preserved. In March 2007, the Department of Housing Preservation and Development presented the status of the rezoning to Community Board 1 and stated that more than 2,000

affordable units were planned or under construction on inclusionary and publicly owned sites meaning that the city was 57 percent towards meeting its expected affordable housing goal. The City expects that more than 1,000 units will be produced through the inclusionary housing program: 459 new units will be constructed on the waterfront and an additional 500 are expected on the waterfront but developers have not yet been named. Upland, 9 new units will be constructed and 237 existing affordable housing units will be preserved. Finally, more than 800 units will be built on publicly-owned sites (NYC HPD et al, 2007). **SLIDE**

We estimate that 309 waterfront inclusionary units are being produced or are planned. Palmer's Dock will produce 189 units: 113 are on-site; the remaining 76 are being constructed off-site on an upland public site. We estimate that 196 affordable units will result from The Edge. We based this number on the fact that 20-25% of The Edge's units will be affordable. Though the City has stated that 346 affordable units will result from The Edge, we think this number was based on a previous total unit count which has since decreased. Nine new construction affordable units have been produced upland. We also identified 152 new construction units on upland public sites. At least half of these units will be used to satisfy inclusionary housing requirements.

In the City's progress report, they state that 840 units are scheduled to be built on public sites. Of these units, 659 are still in discussion, developers have not been chosen, or HPD has issued Requests for Proposals. We estimate that of the 1,205 "active inclusionary" units reported by the City, 190, or 16%, are under construction. Of the 840 "active public" units, 0 are under construction. Given this information plus what we have learned about the development process, it is optimistic to state that the City is 57% of the way toward meeting its commitment. **SLIDE**

The Inclusionary Housing program is producing affordable housing in Greenpoint-Williamsburg. The private market is developing the affordable housing but they are doing so with significant government assistance. In addition to the density bonus, developers receive a variety of subsidies including land, tax exemptions, tax credits, and other forms of assistance. Developing affordable housing in this model is not a purely private market affair. It has required considerable subsidy which in turn has made the housing affordable to very low income households.

While we do not agree that the city is 57% of its way towards meeting its affordable housing goal, we did find that some affordable housing is currently being produced as a result of rezoning and more is on the way and perhaps even more importantly, at least some of this housing will be affordable to very low income households. We still however have a few concerns.

First, much of the affordable housing is being created using a few mechanisms that may not be easily replicated in other areas of the city. On the waterfront developers have more space to meet density requirements for affordable housing plus they receive additional tax exemption benefits and assorted development subsidies

which allow them to partially offset the cost of affordable housing. This may not be replicable in areas with smaller lot sizes, in less dense areas, where the 421-a is allowed as-of-right, or where additional subsidies are not provided.

Second, the City has dedicated a considerable amount of public land to produce affordable housing to meet its commitments in Williamsburg. Moving forward, less city-owned land will be available for these purposes, which will make it more challenging to build affordable housing. As the cost of land rises, it will be increasingly difficult for the city and developers to put together affordable housing projects

Third, this model of affordable housing development may be more difficult in the future because of a limited availability of development subsidies as well as potential caps and or subsidy reductions. HPD has been able to meet the majority of the demand for tax credits, but if more developers seek tax credits in the future, it will become harder to meet that demand especially if the number of tax credits is reduced.

Given all these issues, it is unclear whether the production of affordable housing via a voluntary inclusionary housing program is replicable in other parts of the City without additional deep subsidy. **SLIDE**

## COMMERCIAL CHANGE

Commercial change is a critical component of our study. Commercial establishments and street-level offices reflect the community's complexion and character as they are designed to serve the residents of a community. In the case of gentrification in Greenpoint-Williamsburg, although shops in the past have served the moderate income residents of the neighborhood, the targeted consumer of newer businesses is currently of a higher income bracket, resulting in an availability of higher priced goods and services. This shift in consumer product means an inaccessibility of goods and services to long-term residents and displacement of shops catering to that existing population. The shift in demand for these products by the gentrifiers also means higher rents for shopowners, resulting in a lack of affordability for existing shops. The shops and restaurants that we see today throughout Greenpoint-Williamsburg reflect the changing climate of business types: small, specialty non-necessity stores, such as women's accessories boutiques and gourmet food shops, dominate the landscape. Many of these shops occupy what used to be industrial or residential spaces. These new and generally more expensive dining establishments, cafes, and shops have come to define public space for the residents of these neighborhoods. This commercial change has also produced a new level of street activity and energy. **SLIDE**

We set out to study commercial change to understand gentrification in Greenpoint-Williamsburg. We conducted a study of change over time of two commercial corridors and a set of scattered sites. Our analysis considers affordability,

both of goods and property; change in uses; effects on the streetscape; and change in type of service or product offered. The commercial corridors selected were Bedford Avenue from North 10th Street to North 5th Street and Graham Avenue from Skillman Avenue to Devoe Street. We selected these two corridors because they have the most concentrated commercial activity in the neighborhood and because they represent very different populations. Despite a number of clearly established ethnically specific storefronts, Bedford Avenue offers a large number of high-end, non-necessity shops, such as women's accessories, designer eyeglasses, and a gourmet cheese shop. In contrast, many of the Graham Avenue shops appear well-established and cater to a less affluent contingent. Along with the corridors, we canvassed the neighborhood and identified 192 scattered businesses for further analysis. We selected these sites by identifying what we thought were newer commercial establishments catering to an upscale clientele. By traversing the entire Greenpoint-Williamsburg neighborhoods on foot, we documented the stores appearing to serve the newer residents. After canvassing, we consulted what is the equivalent of a historic Yellow Pages, the Coles Reports, to find historical data on each property. We then recorded the name and type of business for the years 1971, 1981, 1991, 1995, 1999, 2003, and 2007. In order to get a fuller picture of properties, we consulted the City of New York's Finance Department for the 2003 and 2007 market values for each property. In this way, we were able to determine property value changes. **SLIDE**

#### *COMMERCIAL FINDING #1: INCREASE IN COMMERCIAL USE*

In our site surveys, we noticed a burgeoning commercial sector. We saw new on-street storefronts under construction and old buildings newly rehabilitated for commercial uses. Commercial businesses, like restaurants, cafes, galleries and retail stores, increasingly dominate the landscape. This represents a significant shift from the area's past. Of our sample of 261 commercial addresses, at least 9 of them had an industrial use in 2003 before the rezoning and 30 of them were industrial in 1971. In addition, addresses that were once vacant storefronts or entirely residential are now occupied by new commercial businesses. Bedford Avenue is a prime example of the ongoing transition to commercial. The rezoning removed a special mixed use district for an area in central Williamsburg (around the L train stops), in favor of a C1-4 commercial overlay district along Bedford Avenue between N. 10th Street and N. 4th Street. This zoning change emphasizes "local retail" business specifically for the Bedford Corridor. The result has been immediate. Of the 82 addresses we identified along a stretch of Bedford Avenue, 42 (or 51%) of them had an identifiable commercial business in 2003. In our recent site visits, we identified 54 open commercial storefronts and 4 storefronts undergoing renovation. Thus, 70% of the addresses are now, or shortly will be, commercial businesses.

We concluded that this surge in commercial development will occur to meet the needs of a rapidly increasing residential population. New commercial overlay districts along Grand Street and Kent Avenue will also facilitate new development. **SLIDE**

### *COMMERCIAL FINDING #2: INCREASE IN UPSCALE COMMERCIAL*

In addition to an increase in commercial uses broadly, the area is experiencing an “upscaling” in its commercial businesses. As gentrification occurs, “culturally-exclusive amenities” are moving in at a rapid pace. These “amenities” include businesses such as boutique clothing stores, realtors, upscale restaurants, dance clubs, yoga studios, coffee shops and cafes, tattoo parlors, designer furniture stores, chain restaurants and services (like major bank branches) and organic groceries. We found that Williamsburg’s reputation as a neighborhood where industry, residences, and new commercial amenities exist side-by-side is in decline. Instead, the “culturally-exclusive” businesses are pushing everything else out. For example, we identified a new “restaurant row” along a stretch of North 6th Street in central Williamsburg. As recently as 2003, half of these restaurants had an industrial business listing – now they are nowhere to be found.

**SLIDE**

### *UPSCALING COMMERCIAL: ART SCENE*

Recently, galleries and a new art scene have become synonymous with Williamsburg. We identified a sample of 24 galleries that had first-floor storefronts. Only 4 of these galleries were listed in the business listings in the late 1990s. These galleries are serving as a bridge between Williamsburg’s industrial and commercial uses. Galleries like One Sixty Glass on Berry Street use large former industrial spaces for large-scale art design, in this case, a working glassworks. **SLIDE**

### *UPSCALING COMMERCIAL: BOUTIQUES*

Boutique clothing and furnishing stores are now found throughout Williamsburg. We identified 36 of these boutiques in our survey. Only 9 of them were listed in 2003’s business listings. At least one of these stores has moved “beyond boutique,” using Williamsburg as a platform to create a clothing franchise. Brooklyn Industries’ first store was on North 8th Street, a shop started by local artists who used recycled materials to make urbane, fashionable clothing. Now, Brooklyn Industries is a full-fledged retail chain with 8 shops in Manhattan and Brooklyn. **SLIDE**

### *UPSCALING COMMERCIAL: NIGHTLIFE*

Williamsburg is also now known for its up-and-coming, hip nightlife scene. We identified a sample of 53 bars, restaurants and clubs throughout the neighborhood that cater to an upscale clientele. Only 9 of these were in the 2003 business listings. However, of the 20 restaurants and bars we identified in the Bedford and Graham corridors, 11 of these were listed in 2003, 8 of them were even listed back to 1995 or earlier. These findings indicate a clear divergence in Williamsburg's nightlife. The establishments on Bedford and Graham are old neighborhood taverns, diners, pizzerias and other take-out shops. They are not pricey or "culturally-exclusive." They have served neighborhood residents for years, while the upscale restaurants and clubs are now just appearing. **SLIDE**

### *COMMERCIAL FINDING #3: DECREASE IN AFFORDABILITY*

Two main factors are driving commercial change in Greenpoint-Williamsburg: preferences of new residents, and rapidly rising real estate prices. While most businesses currently operating in the area will enjoy additional sales due to increasing population and an injection of wealth, the wealthier residents, in general, demand higher quality and/or more expensive goods, as well as goods and services not historically offered in the neighborhood. New businesses enter the neighborhood to capture the new market created by the new, wealthier residents, while many current businesses are either forced or choose to change their products and services to reflect these preferences.

The second major issue is rapidly rising real estate prices. In addition to moving from the north to the south, the gentrification of Greenpoint-Williamsburg has also moved geographically from west to east along the L train path. This phenomenon is partially illustrated by the difference in pace of market value appreciation between the two commercial corridors. Our data illustrates this phenomenon. Between 2003 and 2007, the total market value, as measured by the NYC Department of Finance, of the 82 properties located in our Bedford Avenue corridor increased by 224%, while the 74 properties included in the Graham Avenue corridor (which is located to the east of Bedford Ave), increased by 158%. Both of these rates are remarkable. However, the higher rate along Bedford Avenue is an indication of greater commercial gentrification activities.

Developers and property owners use the amount paid for a property as the base for calculating rents for commercial tenants. Greater market values for properties translate into greater rents for tenants. The major implications of rent increases are price increases for consumers and the displacement of businesses. **SLIDE**

#### *COMMERCIAL FINDING #4: INCREASED ACTIVITY*

Our fourth finding involves the increased activity from the commercial change. This activity results in greater sidewalk traffic and more of what Jane Jacobs calls “eyes on the street.” One resident, in his PhD dissertation explains, “By 2004 Bedford Avenue was so filled with restaurants, cafes, boutiques, record stores and bookstores, it was hard to distinguish from the East Village....Although residences rest above the line of storefronts, this is a heavily commercialized area. It is a place filled with faces on the street.” The phenomenon is positive for the neighborhood with respect to increasing patronage to existing businesses and improving the perception of safety in the area.

In conclusion, the new commercial activity creates some benefits, such as producing a more vibrant street life and providing goods and services not previously offered in the neighborhood. However, our study reveals that the increased commercial use, decrease in affordability, and increase in activity generally serves the new population and creates a significant disservice for the existing neighborhood residents.

On a related note, we will now discuss the concept of manufacturing and industrial displacement, as well as residential displacement, as it relates to the changing neighborhood dynamics in Greenpoint-Williamsburg. **SLIDE**

#### **INDUSTRIAL AND RESIDENTIAL DISPLACEMENT**

Our discussion of gentrification includes an examination of displacement. In Greenpoint-Williamsburg, displacement often affects industrial firms and low and moderate income residents. All aspects of change in Greenpoint-Williamsburg are influenced by the strong residential market. This was growing before the rezoning and was further swelled by it. Displacement is a cost of the gains reaped by investors and gentrifiers, and is deeply spatial. Industrial and residential displacement are closely related but we address them separately here. **SLIDE**

“Deindustrialization” is a historic event resulting from global competition. “Displacement,” which we observe more recently, is the result of land use decisions and gentrification. Deindustrialization involved the devastating loss of thousands of jobs over many years, particularly in manufacturing. Now, displacement is threatening the little remaining, but still important, industrial economy of Greenpoint-Williamsburg. New era small industrial uses such as light manufacture, transportation, warehousing, utilities and construction related, etc. have been thriving in Greenpoint-Williamsburg and other areas of New York City. But gentrification has been accelerated their displacement since the 1990s. In 1991 there were about 7,000 industrial jobs in Greenpoint-Williamsburg. In 2002 there were only 3,352 industrial jobs in Williamsburg and 889 in Greenpoint. (NYC Planning)



The graphics show Community District One broken up into 6 study areas. Loss of industrial jobs from 1991-2002 is most obvious in Greenpoint and Williamsburg; jobs are fairly stable in the other 4 areas. Above you see a map of the 1961 zoning for Greenpoint-Williamsburg that existed up until 2005. It had small changes made throughout the years to reflect the changing character. Note the prominence of manufacturing on the water's edge with residential areas inland. A large mixed district is in the center called the Northside zone. This area allowed a mix of industrial and residential by issuing permits for select industrial uses in mostly residential zones, or select residential uses in mostly industrial ones. This zoning offered some protections against the powerful push of the residential real estate market spilling out from Manhattan. It had the effect of creating a uniquely blended neighborhood and working class culture.

But residential growth found ways to overcome the dated land use paradigm. Filling a building with high-end residential extracts much more rent than partially filling it with small industrialists. Even before the rezoning in 2005, as residential rents grew, so too did the incentive for owners of buildings containing industries to be rid of those firms. A report by the Pratt Center explains "the primary reason that manufacturing uses have declined in mix-use districts is that an influx of non-manufacturing uses has caused property values to rise, prompting owners of manufacturing buildings to replace manufacturers with other uses that can generate higher rental revenues." (Pratt, 2001)

Conversion of former industrial buildings into residential lofts depleted industrial spaces. Manufacturing in particular is endangered by the physical transformation of its former buildings because it requires large spaces. Lofts are units of consumption rather than spaces of production. (Zukin, 1982) Today, condos and new construction compete for old manufacturing sites. **SLIDE**

Illegal conversions occurred often, but the extent of this problem is difficult to quantify. The illustration above is a start. It documents a number of residential uses in 2003 in buildings that were not originally residential. The new residential sites (the orange) are expanding the old residential territory (the yellow) into formerly industrial and commercial areas. It is probable that some of the yellow lots were sites of previous use change. It is unclear whether this map captures the full extent of conversions, or if it correctly illustrates clandestine phenomena such as residents obtaining commercial leases to live in manufacturing buildings. **SLIDE**

184 Kent is a landmark building that exemplifies gentrification and price speculation related to rezoning. The model industrial site containing many important features made specifically for industrial firms was pitted against the windfall of profits available to the building's owner if he redeveloped it to enter the residential market. The building had illegal residential lofts for an unknown period of time, and went for an official variance in 2000 to develop units with rents well beyond the reach of the

handful of industrial firms within. The owner argued for this variance because he could not even half-fill the building with industrial tenants; yet critics say there were plenty of interested industrial firms which he purposely denied. The variance was approved despite community opposition and outcries that prime industrial spaces would be lost forever. A source of political controversy and a sore spot with members of the community, another variance in 2004 that would add on more luxury units through physical changes to the building, was rejected. But with an eye towards waterfront development potential, landmark preservation status was also rejected, leaving the future uncertain. **SLIDE**

The 2005 rezoning dealt yet another blow to manufacturing in Greenpoint-Williamsburg because it enabled even more residential development, helped push prices further out of reach for small industrial firms, and literally cut down the amount of square feet throughout the neighborhoods that was specifically reserved for industry. City planning's Environmental Impact Statement estimated a loss of about 1 million square feet of space. (Dept. of Planning NYC, Greenpoint-Williamsburg Approved Rezoning Plan: EIS)

Given the available profits to be reaped by 'going-residential,' it is very likely that industrial buildings that are grandfathered in new residential zones, as well as the industrial buildings that are in the midst of a new MX mixed zone, will eventually displace their industrial tenants. Firms that own their building often sell and close up shop. Firms that rent soon face discouraging rent hikes. Again, it is estimated that 4,000 jobs in Greenpoint-Williamsburg are threatened. (Interview & Rezoned2006.com)

The zoning maps above show how zoning contributes to the residential market by setting a new legal context for land use. The smaller maps highlight the changes around the Bedford Corridor, which was the old Northside District permitting a mix of industrial and residential. Here, industrial firms, just like retailers and other services, face high real estate related costs. **SLIDE**

What is lost when industry, and manufacturing in particular, is displaced? Displaced manufacturing means a loss of jobs that were far superior choices for laborers with low to moderate education and/or English language skills. Compared to retail and restaurant jobs that are common throughout the city, only manufacturing has seen wages increase above the 21% inflation rate from 2000-2005 – they grew about 35% in that period. Data shows that the production-worker workforce is comprised of mostly immigrants and heavily includes people of color. Manufacturing jobs serve demographics that are often underrepresented in other economic sectors. Jobs like these constitute a key part of the immigrant experience in America, just as huge industrial plants did in past eras. **SLIDE**

To preserve and promote industry in Greenpoint-Williamsburg takes thoughtful policy and planning. Industrial advocacy organizations, realizing that zoning itself has failed to preserve and encourage industrial uses, have offered several ideas and programs

help industries. Greenpoint Manufacturing and Design Center (GMDC), New York Industrial Retention Network (NYIRN), Neighbors Allied for Good Growth (NAG) and other partners were involved in the rezoning negotiations. They support Industrial Employment Zones, one of many methods that could lessen the impact of the rezoning on existing industries. These are superior to Industrial Business Zones (IBZ) for a variety of reasons, but one main improvement is that IEZ would include a special permitting process for potentially “destabilizing” changes in use. Also important, the IEZs would apply to areas where industrial uses are already present. To benefit from the IBZ incentives and protections, a firm needs to relocate there. (Zoning for Jobs, 2006)

In 2007, industries, including once prevalent manufacturers, are up against strong market forces with few regulatory protections. Key jobs are at stake, as is an important niche in New York City’s diverse economy. The character of Greenpoint-Williamsburg is also at stake. But the City has yet to commit to preventing loss or creating an environment in which today’s industrial firms can really flourish. **SLIDE**

## RESIDENTIAL DISPLACEMENT

To understand how residents are affected by the changes we’ve discussed, we examined whether, how and why people are displaced. We interviewed residents and community based organization staff to get a better understanding of the processes that produce displacement. We identified the following: rising housing costs, demolition, structural damage to existing buildings caused by new construction, and harassment.

### **SLIDE**

Renters and homeowners are both displaced as a result of rising housing prices. Homeowners are often thought of as protected by homeownership but increasing property assessments are dramatically increasing taxes reducing homeownership’s protective affect. Furthermore, increased prices make it impossible for new residents to move to the neighborhood and for many renters to buy homes. Additionally, increased prices also effect existing residents who cannot afford to purchase a home or find an affordable apartment in the neighborhood. This is known as exclusionary displacement.

### **SLIDE**

New construction in some places has destabilized surrounding buildings forcing residents to move. Note the FDNY’s “DO NOT ENTER” sign on the building to the right of the building under construction. **SLIDE**

Landlords may refuse to make repairs such as to a hole in the wall or leaky faucet to force existing low income residents out of their apartments. Once the tenant moves, the landlord will make the repairs necessary to attract higher income residents. New owners may use this tactic to force existing residents to move out. Once tenants leave, owners will make substantial improvements to the building before re-renting vacant

units at increased rates. In some rare instances, new owners will condemn the existing building and construct an entirely new development featuring high rental or ownership units. **SLIDE**

If a landlord is unable to displace tenants by refusing to make repairs to individual apartments and the building at-large, the landlord may use the legal system to displace current tenants. Over the past ten years, as Williamsburg has experienced an increase in gentrification, local legal services offices have experienced an increase in the number of meritless lawsuits filed to displace current residents. The most common cases filed include those alleging illegal holdovers and nuisance. When accused of an illegal holdover, a tenant is said to have remained illegally in a unit from which they have no legal right to occupy due to an expired lease or lease violation. Those tenants accused of being a nuisance are most often said to have caused damage to the property or to have made excess noise or disruption. While most of these cases are dismissed for failure to state a legal claim, the fact remains that a majority of low income residents are displaced by meritless claims because they do not have an attorney present to defend their case. In addition, landlords often win these cases because tenants are afraid to appear in court, and as a result of their failure to appear, a default judgment is entered against the tenant followed by eviction proceedings if the tenant fails to contest the matter on appeal. **SLIDE**

Aside from court cases, landlords use New York City rent laws to displace existing tenants. Under the city's Rent Stabilization laws, a landlord may raise the rent to fair market value for those units that had a current rent of \$2,000 and were or became vacant after July 1993. Each time the apartment is vacated, the landlord can increase the current rent by 18-20 percent. Once the apartment reaches the \$2,000 monthly rent requirement, the unit is no longer covered under Rent Stabilization laws, and the landlord can then rent it at market rate. This creates an almost odd incentive to increase tenant turnover which enables landlords to increase the rent making it ultimately possible to deregulate the unit.

The displacement process and experience described above potentially affects any resident of Williamsburg. Long time residents and early gentrifiers risk losing their homes to these housing pressures every day. In addition, there are certain demographic groups that are vulnerable to displacement in additional ways. Interviewees reported that artists, Hasidim, the elderly, and recent immigrants are likely to be disproportionately affected by displacement. **SLIDE**

The elderly are particularly vulnerable to displacement since their incomes do not increase. For those who rent, many have long term relationships with their landlords and pay less than market rate in what is often called the informal housing market. But as the informal housing market is crumbling as landlords pass away or sell their buildings. New owners are likely to raise the rent. As there are few senior housing projects and they all have long waiting lists, seniors are often forced out of the

neighborhood. Some landlords harass elderly tenants to encourage them to move. A landlord might refuse to make repairs or attempt to impose a rent increase, arguing that the additional money is needed to make apartment and building repairs. In addition, landlords will also take elderly tenants to court on frivolous claims such as non-payment of rent or nuisance.

Artists are sometimes called the original gentrifiers. Many moved to Williamsburg for the inexpensive live work spaces and creative community. But their illegal conversion of abandoned warehouses leaves them vulnerable and in 2000, the city began to evict artists from their homes, claiming that the space was not safe for residential occupation. For those who were able to remain housing price increases are likely to displace them. Rent for large, loft space is often more expensive than artists can afford. Artists are then forced to choose between working enough hours at their 'day job' to pay the rent, or working enough hours to engage their creative engine and maintain their primary occupation. This predicament is important for New York City to address as housing costs continue to rise city wide. The displacement of artists may have a negative impact on the creative economy of the city, thus disallowing NYC to participate in the global economy in the same dominant way that it has in the past.

Traditionally, large families have always had some difficulty finding appropriately large units in Williamsburg, but the changing real estate market has made it more difficult. Real estate developers are able to make a greater profit by building smaller, one or two bedroom units. There is no incentive for developers to use more space to build larger units, when they can sell the smaller units for more money, thus vastly increasing their overall profit. **SLIDE**

Recent immigrants face particular displacement related challenges. Some may not be able to speak English and are unlikely to report landlord harassment or fight unfair evictions. Latino and Polish immigrants in Williamsburg have traditionally relied on their strong religious institutions to assist them in dealing with such problems, but the Roman Catholic churches in the neighborhood have been suffering financially, along with their congregations, and they are less able to help displaced members.

## **CONCLUSION**

Gentrification and the rezoning continue to affect Williamsburg-Greenpoint. Inclusionary zoning is creating very affordable housing units on the waterfront. Even though we often think of IZ as a private market program, the particular variant of IZ used in Williamsburg-Greenpoint heavily relies on public subsidies. This has enabled developers to provide housing available to people with very low incomes but we have to wonder whether it is sustainable and whether it can be replicated given the potential state caps on some program subsidy spending. We also wonder about how the rezoning

affected development and land costs. Upland, a frenzy of luxury development occurred before and after the rezoning. The inclusionary program does not appear to be enough of an incentive to encourage the development of affordable housing upland. Here, developers can take advantage of the 421-a tax exemption without providing affordable units. They also find the density bonus to be less valuable on the upland's small in-fill lots.

Gentrification and rezoning have facilitated new commercial activity in Greenpoint-Williamsburg. This creates some benefits in a more vibrant street life and the availability of new goods and services. However there is also a significant disservice to existing residents in the decrease in affordability of goods, and long-term businesses being displaced by businesses to serve the newer population. Finally, gentrification and rezoning have displaced industry and residents through a variety of processes, and industrial jobs are lost when manufacturers are driven out.

## **FUTURE RESEARCH**

Our project leads to many questions for future research. We highlight some here:

### *Alternative Models for Producing Affordable Housing*

Inclusionary zoning programs are usually private market programs, but New York City's program allows developers to use other subsidies like tax exemptions and tax credits in combination with IZ density bonuses. These "deep subsidies" have made the housing that is produced through IZ affordable to very low income households. We wonder though how much money it takes to produce a unit of affordable housing using this model and what alternatives there are for producing affordable housing. On the one hand this model is producing affordable housing on the waterfront adjacent to luxury housing and it is relatively affordable to households at a range of outcomes. But it seems fairly costly to produce. We suggest that future research consider models for producing affordable housing and the benefits and costs of each.

### *Replicating Rezoning/Upzoning/Inclusionary Zoning*

The Williamsburg-Greenpoint rezoning is often used as the model for the city's Inclusionary Zoning program and its rezoning efforts. We wonder whether the model can be replicated in other parts of the city. In Williamsburg the city anticipates using considerable city resources including land and subsidies to produce affordable housing upland. We wonder: 1) whether there is sufficient vacant and/or city-owned land to

produce affordable housing in other parts of the city? 2) if the city has sufficient resources to subsidize housing in all of the areas preparing to be rezoned? 3) How increased land prices and new development are measured as an effect of rezoning. Even if new affordable housing is produced it may not equal what is lost as a result of upzoning.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ACRIS. 2007. "Search Results by Parcel Identifier: Borough: Brooklyn/Kings, Block 2340, Lot: 6." <<http://a836-acris.nyc.gov/Scripts/DocSearch.dll/BBLResult?page=0>>. Accessed April 12, 2007.
- American Public Media. 2006. September 11<sup>th</sup>: Five Years Later. Marketplace, September 8, 2006.
- Anonymous Artist and Community Member. 2007. Interview by authors, April 3, 2007, Brooklyn, New York. In Person.
- Anonymous CDC Employee. 2007. Interview by authors, March 29, New York, New York. Telephone. In possession of Dr. Kathe Newman, Bloustein School of Planning and Policy, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey.
- Anonymous Developer. 2007. Telephone interview by authors, March 22, New Brunswick, New Jersey. Telephone. In possession of Dr. Kathe Newman, Bloustein School of Planning and Policy, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey.
- Anonymous Municipal Employee. 2007. Interview by authors, February 7, 2007, Brooklyn, New York. In Person.
- Atkinson, Rowland. 2000. "Measuring Gentrification and Displacement in Greater London." *Urban Studies* 37, no. 1: 149-65.
- Bahrampour, Tara. 2003. "City Seeking to Rezone Brooklyn Waterfront." *New York Times*, June 19. <<http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9C01EED91138F93AA25755C0A9659C8B63>> Accessed April 28, 2007.
- Bowles, Jonathan. 2000. Williamsburg Factory Goes Luxury Rental: \$3,500 Studios to Come. Center for an Urban Future. <[http://www.nycfuture.org/content/reports/report\\_view.cfm?repkey=49](http://www.nycfuture.org/content/reports/report_view.cfm?repkey=49)> Accessed April 12, 2007.
- Breibart, Joshua. 2001. Tenants Begin Battle For Brooklyn Loft Law. *Tenant Inquilino* 31, no. 4: 1, 4. <<http://www.tenant.net/Tengroup/Metcounc/Apr01/apr01.pdf>> Accessed April 28, 2007.
- Buettner, Russ, Heidi Evans, Robert Gearty, Brian Kates, Greg Smith, and Richard T. Pienciak. 2005. "Billions in Liberty Bonds Go Unspent," *Daily News*, 2005.
- Burd, Josh and Gail Robinson. 2006. Tax Breaks for Affordable Housing. *Gotham Gazette*, December 21.



- <<http://www.gothamgazette.com/article/searchlight/20061221/203/2067>>  
Accessed April 28, 2007.
- Cardwell, Diane. 2002. Council Wants Liberty Bonds To Build More Homes for Poor. New York Times, September 19, 2002.
- The City of New York Independent Budget Office. 2003. J-51 Property Tax Exemptions and Abatements. <<http://www.ibo.nyc.ny.us/iboreports/J51overview.pdf>>. Accessed April 28, 2007.
- Clancy, Michael. 2007. The Tides of Change Transform the Industrial East River. AM New York. March 30-April 1, 2007, p 10-11.
- Coalition for the Homeless. 2007. Falling Behind: A Midpoint Look at the Bloomberg Homeless Plan. <<http://www.coalitionforthehomeless.org/advocacy/StateoftheHomeless2007.html>> Accessed March 12, 2007.
- Coles Reports. 1971, 1981, 1991, 1995, 1999, 2003, and 2007. Borough of Brooklyn. Science, Industry and Business Library of the New York Public Library System.
- Community Board Number 1, Brooklyn. 2007. <<http://www.cb1brooklyn.org/>> Accessed January 28, 2007.
- Curran, Winifred. 2007. 'From the Frying Pan to the Oven': Gentrification and the Experience of Industrial Displacement in Williamsburg, Brooklyn. Urban Studies: forthcoming.
- Curran, Winifred and Hanson, Susan. 2005. Getting Globalized: Urban Policy and Industrial Displacement in Williamsburg, Brooklyn. Urban Geography 26.6: 461-482.
- The Developers Group. 2007. "The Aria." <<http://www.thedevelopersgroup.com/buildings/building.aspx?buildingid=1069>> Accessed March 31, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. "Ikon." <<http://www.thedevelopersgroup.com/buildings/building.aspx?buildingid=1036>> Accessed March 31, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. "LoftS1." <<http://www.thedevelopersgroup.com/buildings/building.aspx?buildingid=1087>> Accessed March 31, 2007.
- DiLorenzo, Sarah. 2006. Brooklyn Industries Hopes to Spread Outer Borough Chic. The Real Deal. <[http://www.therealdeal.net/issues/OCTOBER\\_2006/1159652536.php](http://www.therealdeal.net/issues/OCTOBER_2006/1159652536.php)> Accessed April 8, 2007.
- Douglaston Development. 2005. "The Edge." <<http://www.douglastondevelopment.com/projects/current/williamsburg.shtml>> Accessed March 6, 2007.
- Dunlap, David W. 2004. Liberty Bond's Yield: a New Downtown. New York Times, May 30, 2004.

- Dunn Development. 2007. "Palmer's Dock."  
<<http://www.dunndev.com/L3/palmers.html>> Accessed February 2, 2007.
- Empire State Development. No date. Introducing the New York Liberty Bond Program. <<http://www.empire.state.ny.us/wtc/LibertyBonds/WTC-LibertyBondBrochure.pdf>> April 28, 2007.
- Freedman-Schnapp, Michael. 2007. Interview by authors, March 23, New Brunswick, New Jersey. Telephone and E-mail.
- Freeman, Lance. 2005. Displacement or Succession?: Residential Mobility in Gentrifying Neighborhoods. *Urban Affairs Review* 40: 463-91.
- Freidman, A. et al. 2007. More Than a Link on the Food Chain: A Study of Citywide Economic Impact of Food Manufacturing in New York City. A Report by New York Industrial Retention Network and Fiscal Policy Institute.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. Manufacturing, Jobs, Wealth and the Middle Class. New York Industrial Retention Network.
- Furman Center for Real Estate and Urban Policy. 2005. State of New York City's Housing and Neighborhoods. New York: New York University.
- Greenpoint-Williamsburg Rezoning. 2005. Environmental Impact Statement. <<http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcp/html/greenpointwill/eis.shtml>> Accessed March 23, 2007.
- Halstead Property, LLC: Development Marketing. 2007. "440 Kent Avenue." <<http://www.halstead.com/detail.aspx?id=1085072>> Accessed April 12, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. "Northside Piers." <[http://www.halstead.com/developments\\_other.aspx?numb=60485](http://www.halstead.com/developments_other.aspx?numb=60485)> Accessed March 31, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. "Schaefer Landing: Williamsburg on The River." <<http://schaeferlanding.com/index2.html>> Accessed March 31, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. "Search Results." <<http://www.halstead.com/results.aspx?Page=1&p=1&address=40+KENT+AVENUE&s>> Accessed March 19, 2007.
- Hollander, Rob. 2006. Zoning for Dummies Part III: Impact. <<http://loho10002.blogspot.com/2006/11/zoning-for-dummies-part-iii-impact.html>> Accessed April 21, 2007.
- Housing First. 2005. A Home for All New Yorkers: A Housing First Policy Update.
- Huttler, Adam Forest. 2006. Keep The Arts In Williamsburg. *Fractured Atlas*. October 3. <<http://www.fracturedatlas.org/site/forum/thread/1402>> Accessed April 28, 2007.
- Kline, Suzie. 2007. Interview by authors, March 14, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

- Telephone. In possession of Dr. Kathe Newman, Bloustein School of Planning and Policy, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. Interview by authors, March 29, New Brunswick, New Jersey. Telephone. In possession of Dr. Kathe Newman, Bloustein School of Planning and Policy, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey.
- Lambert, Bruce. 2000. Evacuation Threat Looms in Crackdown on Illegal Loft Buildings in Brooklyn. The New York Times, December 20. <<http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9901E6DE1139F933A15751C1A9669C8B63>> Accessed April 28, 2007.
- LoftS1. 2007. <<http://www.lofts1condos.com/web.html>> Accessed March 31, 2007.
- Matamoros. 2007. Interview by authors, April 2007, Williamsburg, New York. Hand written notes. In possession of Dr. Kathe Newman, Bloustein School of Planning and Policy, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey.
- McClure, Kirk. 2000. The Low Income Housing Tax Credit as an Aid to Housing Finance: How Well Has it Worked? Housing Policy Debate. Volume 11, Issue 1, p. 91.
- The Mill Building. 2007. <<http://www.themillbuilding.com/>> Accessed April 20, 2007.
- the modern williamsburg. 2007. <[www.themodernwilliamsburg.com](http://www.themodernwilliamsburg.com)> Accessed March 31, 2007.
- The MUSE. 2007. <<http://www.musecondos.com/>> Accessed March 31, 2007.
- The Neighborhood Retail Alliance. 2007. <<http://momandpopnyc.blogspot.com/>> Accessed February 5, 2007.
- Neighbors Allied for Good Growth. 2006. Greenpoint-Williamsburg Ombudsman Area Survey: NAG final report to EWVIDCO.
- Nelson, Arthur C. 2006. Getting Ahead of the (Housing Curve): A Look at Emerging Housing Needs and Market Dynamics. Funders' Network for Smart Growth and Livable Communities.
- New York City. 2006. Mayor Bloomberg Breaks Ground at First Residential Development in Greenpoint- Williamsburg Rezoning Area. June 26. <[http://home2.nyc.gov/portal/site/nycgov/menuitem.c0935b9a57bb4ef3daf2f1c701c789a0/index.jsp?pageID=mayor\\_press\\_release&catID=1194&doc\\_name=http%3A%2F%2Fhome2.nyc.gov%2Fhtml%2Fom%2Fhtml%2F2006a%2Fpr220-06.html&cc=unused1978&rc=1194&ndi=1](http://home2.nyc.gov/portal/site/nycgov/menuitem.c0935b9a57bb4ef3daf2f1c701c789a0/index.jsp?pageID=mayor_press_release&catID=1194&doc_name=http%3A%2F%2Fhome2.nyc.gov%2Fhtml%2Fom%2Fhtml%2F2006a%2Fpr220-06.html&cc=unused1978&rc=1194&ndi=1)> Accessed February 2, 2007.
- New York City Department of City Planning. 2007. "Home Page." <<http://home2.nyc.gov>> Accessed February 8, 2007.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 2006. "Inclusionary Zoning Program."  
<[http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcp/html/zone/zh\\_inclu\\_housing.shtml](http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcp/html/zone/zh_inclu_housing.shtml)>.  
Accessed April 28, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2006. Zoning Data Tables.  
<[http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcp/pdf/zone/zh\\_tables.pdf](http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcp/pdf/zone/zh_tables.pdf)> Accessed February 21, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2005. Adopted Zoning.  
<[http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcp/pdf/greenpointwill/adopted\\_zoning\\_map\\_changes.pdf](http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcp/pdf/greenpointwill/adopted_zoning_map_changes.pdf)> Accessed February 21, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2005. Brooklyn Community District 1 Profile.  
<<http://home2.nyc.gov/html/dcp/pdf/lucds/bk1profile.pdf>> Accessed April 28, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2005. "Greenpoint-Williamsburg Rezoning."  
<<http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcp/html/greenpointwill/greenoverview.shtml>> Accessed April 12, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2003. Existing Zoning.  
<[http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcp/pdf/greenpointwill/existing\\_zoning.pdf](http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcp/pdf/greenpointwill/existing_zoning.pdf)>  
Accessed February 11, 2007.
- New York City Department of City Planning and Department of Housing Preservation and Development. November 2005. Greenpoint Williamsburg Inclusionary Housing Program.  
<[http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcp/pdf/greenpointwill/incl\\_housing\\_web.pdf](http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcp/pdf/greenpointwill/incl_housing_web.pdf)>  
Accessed February 11, 2007.
- New York City Department of Homeless Services. 2007. Daily Report.  
<<http://www.nyc.gov/html/dhs/downloads/pdf/dailyreport.pdf>>   
Accessed March 4, 2007.
- New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development. 2007. "Current Housing Lotteries."  
<<http://www.nyc.gov/html/hpd/html/apartment/lotteries.shtml>> Accessed April 1, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. "Developers: Large-Scale Development: Schaefer."  
<<http://home2.nyc.gov/html/hpd/html/developers/large-scale/schaefer.shtml>> Accessed April 12, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. NYC Housing Development Corporation Income Guidelines.  
<[http://www.nychdc.com/pdf/IncomeGuidelines/80\\_20\\_e.pdf](http://www.nychdc.com/pdf/IncomeGuidelines/80_20_e.pdf)> Accessed April 28, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. NYC Housing Development Corporation Income Guidelines Middle Income New Housing Opportunities Program. <<http://www.nychdc.com/pdf/IncomeGuidelines/NewHOP.pdf>> Accessed April 28, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. February 2, 2007. Request for Proposals: Greenpoint-Williamsburg.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 2006. <<http://www.nyc.gov/html/hpd/downloads/pdf/2006-HOME-Rents-Incomes.pdf>> Accessed April 28, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. October 2006. "Recommendations of the 421-a Taskforce." <<http://home2.nyc.gov/html/hpd/downloads/pdf/421ataskforcereporfinal4.pdf>> Accessed April 28, 2007.
- New York City Department of Housing Preservation & Development Staff. 2007. Interview by authors, March 8, New York, New York. Tape recording. In possession of Dr. Kathe Newman, Bloustein School of Planning and Policy, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey.
- New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development, Department of City Planning, the Department of Buildings, the Mayor's Office of Industrial and Manufacturing Business, and the Department of Parks and Recreation. March 2007. *Greenpoint-Williamsburg Progress Briefing*. Powerpoint Presentation.
- New York City Department of Finance. 2003/2004; 2007. Market Value and Assessed Value of Individual Properties. <[http://www.nyc.gov/html/dof/html/property/property\\_val\\_valuation.shtml](http://www.nyc.gov/html/dof/html/property/property_val_valuation.shtml)> Accessed April 16, 2007.
- New York City Housing and Neighborhood Information System. No date. < <http://www.nychanis.com/NYU/NYCHANIS>> Accessed April 1, 2007.
- New York City Housing Development Corporation Staff. 2007. Interview by authors, April 6, New Brunswick, New Jersey. Tape recording. In possession of Dr. Kathe Newman, Bloustein School of Planning and Policy, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey.
- New York City Planning Commission. 2006. City Planning Commission Report, January 25. <<http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcp/pdf/cpc/060170.pdf>> Accessed April 28, 2007.
- New York City Rent Guidelines Board. June 3, 2004. Changes to the Rent Stabilized Housing Stock in New York City in 2003. <[http://www.housingnyc.com/downloads/research/pdf\\_reports/changes04.pdf](http://www.housingnyc.com/downloads/research/pdf_reports/changes04.pdf)> Accessed April 28, 2007.
- New York State Division of Housing and Community Renewal. No date. Organization Profile: North Brooklyn Development Corp. <[http://www.dhcr.state.ny.us/ocd/apps/Profiles/profile\\_detail.asp?applid=58](http://www.dhcr.state.ny.us/ocd/apps/Profiles/profile_detail.asp?applid=58)> Accessed April 1, 2007.
- New York State Housing Finance Agency. 2005. LIHTC Allocations 1994-2005. <<http://www.nyhomes.org/docs/hfaffinancedprojectswithlihtcs.pdf>> Accessed February 4, 2007.
- Newman, Kathe, and Elvin K. Wily. 2006. The right to stay put, revisited: Gentrification and resistance to displacement in New York City. *Urban Studies* 43, no. 1: 23-57.

- No author. 2006. "ARIA music to ears of art lovers." Real Estate Weekly, August 16.  
<[http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\\_m3601/is\\_1\\_53/ai\\_n16714575](http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m3601/is_1_53/ai_n16714575)> Accessed March 31, 2007.
- North8 Condominiums. <<http://www.north8condos.com/>> Accessed March 31, 2007.
- North Brooklyn Alliance. 2005. <[www.northbrooklynalliance.org](http://www.northbrooklynalliance.org)> Accessed February 21, 2007.
- NYCEDC. 2007. Financing and Incentives: Liberty Bonds.  
<<http://www.nycedc.com/Web/FinancingIncentives/Financing/LibertyBonds/LibertyBonds.htm#Contact%20Information>>. Accessed April 28, 2007.
- NYC Campaign for Inclusionary Zoning. May 2005. <<http://www.prattcenter.net/pol-iz-nyc-program2005.php>> Accessed April 21, 2007.
- Office of the New York City Comptroller. May 23, 2006. Policy Brief: An Overview of Section 421-a Housing Subsidy Distribution.  
<[http://www.comptroller.nyc.gov/press/pdfs/05-23-06\\_policy\\_brief\\_421a.pdf](http://www.comptroller.nyc.gov/press/pdfs/05-23-06_policy_brief_421a.pdf)> Accessed April 28, 2007.
- One Sixty Glass. 2007. "About One Sixty Glass."  
<<http://www.onesixtyglass.com/about.htm>> Accessed April 14, 2007.
- Parkhill, Paul. 2007. Interview by authors, April 12, New Brunswick, New Jersey. E-mail.
- Patch, Jason. 2005. Fashioning Gentrification: The New Role of Women in Neighborhood Change. Dissertation. New York University Department of Sociology.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2004. The embedded landscape of gentrification. Visual Studies 19, no. 2: 169-86. <<http://taylorandfrancis.metapress.com/index/YVXQA0RJVUA8FJOJ.pdf>> Accessed April 28, 2007.
- Perris, Robert and Jocelyne Chait. 1998. Williamsburg Waterfront 197-a Plan. New York: Municipal Art Society Planning Center and the Pratt Center for Community and Environmental Development on behalf of Community Board 1.  
<<http://www.billburg.com/197a/index.html>> Accessed April 28, 2007.
- PolicyLink. 2006. "Inclusionary Zoning."  
<<http://www.policylink.org/EDTK/IZ/default.html>> Accessed April 28, 2007.
- PolicyLink and Pratt Institute Center for Community and Environmental Development. Fall 2004. Increasing Housing Opportunity in New York City: The Case for Inclusionary Zoning.
- Pratt Center for Community Development and Habitat for Humanity. Reforming New York City's 421-a Property Tax Exemption Program: Subsidize



- Affordable Homes, Not Luxury Development. <<http://www.prattcenter.net/pubs/PrattCenter-NY421-aReport.pdf>> Accessed April 28, 2007.
- Pratt Center for Community Development. 2001. Making it in New York: Manufacturing Land Use and Zoning Initiative: Background, pg. 16.
- Reconstruction Watch. "Liberty Bonds At-A-Glance."  
<[http://www.goodjobsny.org/rec\\_libertybond\\_breakdown.htm](http://www.goodjobsny.org/rec_libertybond_breakdown.htm)>
- Rezoned. 2006. Development Consequences and the Discontents in North Brooklyn. <<http://www.rezoned2006.com/>> Accessed March 23, 2007.
- Rozhon, Tracie. 2007. Housing Market Heats Up in City. New York Times, February 19.
- Ryan, Elizabeth. 2005. Palmer's Dock Coming to Waterfront. Queens Ledger, December 29.  
<<http://www.greenpointstar.com/StoryDisplay.asp?NewsStoryID=2775>> Accessed March 19, 2007.
- Salama, Jerry, Michael Schill, Jonathan Springer. 2005 Update. *Reducing the Cost of New Housing Construction in New York City*. Furman Center for Real Estate and Urban Policy. The New York University School of Law and Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service.
- Schuerman, Matthew. 2004. The Fire Down Below. The Village Voice, 17 March.  
<[http://www.villagevoice.com/news/0411\\_schuerman,51863,5.html](http://www.villagevoice.com/news/0411_schuerman,51863,5.html)> Accessed April 28, 2007.
- Son, Hugh. 2005. Rezoning Hits Housing Snag. New York Daily News, March 24.  
<<http://www.nydailynews.com/boroughs/story/292807p-250674c.html>>  
In Community Board 1 Meeting Minutes, December 6, 2005.
- Stallings, Ericka. Language Barriers Silence Immigrant Tenants. Gotham Gazette, April 2007. <<http://www.gothamgazette.com/article/immigrants/20070410/11/2144>> Accessed April 28, 2007.
- Stringer, Scott M. West Harlem Special District: A Zoning Proposal by Manhattan Borough President Scott M. Stringer. April 1, 2007 <<http://beta.mbps.org/press/pressreleases/file.2007-04-01.8368391293>> Accessed April 21, 2007.
- Such, Catherine. 2002. Low Income Housing Tax Credits, Community Investments. March, p. 3.
- Toll Brothers. 2007. "North8."  
<[http://www.tollbrothers.com/homesearch/servlet/HomeSearch?app=community\\_description&comm\\_num=8586](http://www.tollbrothers.com/homesearch/servlet/HomeSearch?app=community_description&comm_num=8586)> Accessed March 31, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. Northside Piers View Book.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. "Welcome to Northside Piers."  
<<http://www.northsidepiers.com/>> Accessed March 31, 2007.
- Vitullo-Martin, Julia. 2005. Test of Mayor's Housing Assumptions is

- About to Take Place in Brooklyn. The New York Sun, December 15. <<http://www.nysun.com/article/24490>> Accessed February 2, 2007.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000. Decennial Census.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1999. 2002. 2005. New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. <<http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/housing/nychvs/nychvs.html>> Accessed April 28, 2007.
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. 2004. Multifamily Section 8 Database. Accessed via Dataplace <<http://www.dataplace.org>> Accessed March 5, 2007.
- Wengroff, Jeffry. 2005. HE<sup>2</sup> Project Dev Retained for New Brooklyn Residential Bldgs. New York Real Estate Journal, December 6.
- Zoning for Jobs. 2004. Industrial Employment Districts: Making Space for New York's Working Economy. 11 Park Place #914 New York, NY 10007 (212) 404 6990.
- Zukin, Sharon. 1982. Loft Living. New Brunswick NJ: Rutgers University Press.