

CITY OF YES

HOUSING PROPOSALS

PROPOSAL 1

The Proposed Action would increase housing opportunities in these areas by increasing affordable and supportive floor area ratios (FARs) in all medium- and high-density districts; expanding eligibility for the City's adaptive City of Yes for Housing Opportunity ... to a broader range of buildings...The Medium- and High-Density proposals consist of project components that primarily affect housing capacity and housing types in R6 through R10 districts and their Commercial District equivalents.

Universal Affordability Preference (UAP)

In recent decades, high-demand neighborhoods have lost affordable housing and become increasingly out of reach to working families.

The Universal Affordability Preference is a new tool that would allow buildings to add 20% more housing, but only if the additional units are affordable. As a result, it will deliver new affordable housing in high-cost neighborhoods across New York City to working families.

1.1: More Floor Area for Affordable and Supportive Housing..., the Proposed Action would increase FAR for all forms of affordable and supportive housing in all medium and high-density districts. This would be achieved through the following components:

1.1a: For districts with an existing preferential FAR, hold market-rate FAR constant while increasing FARs for all forms of affordable and supportive housing to the higher AIRS FAR—this is referred to as the “Universal Affordability Preference” (UAP) framework;

1.1b: For districts without an existing preferential FAR ..., provide a new preferential FAR for...affordable and supportive housing types that is 20 percent above the FAR for market-rate residential;

1.1c: ...

1.1d: Where necessary, adjust building envelopes to accommodate permitted FAR;

1.1e: Allow supportive housing to be classified as either Use Group (UG) 2 or UG 3; and

1.1f: Modify the ZR 74-903 Special Permit to an Authorization for supportive housing... Together, these aspects of the Proposed Action would facilitate more housing and affordable or supportive housing on development sites throughout medium- and high-density districts, helping to address the housing shortage and creating additional affordable housing in neighborhoods throughout New York City.

PROPOSAL 2

1.1g: Small and Shared Apartments

The Small and Shared Housing proposals seek to bring back and increase access to housing types that serve the young, the old, and the marginally housed. These are developments with small basic units for the increasing number of New Yorkers who wish to live alone but currently cannot because of lack of availability, or shared housing models with private bedrooms and common kitchens or other facilities.

The Proposed Action would:

1.2a: Eliminate DUF (Dwelling Unit Factor) within the Inner Transit-Oriented Development Area (including the Manhattan core);

1.2b: Reduce and simplify DUF outside the Inner Transit Oriented Development Area; 1.2c: Eliminate DUF within one- and two-family buildings; and

PROPOSAL 3

1.2d: Remove zoning obstacles to small and shared housing models for affordable, supportive, and privately financed projects (Permit new SRO-type housing).

1.2.e.: Eliminate Obstacles to Quality Housing Development

The Proposed Action would make changes to height and setback regulations to encourage greater predictability in non-contextual districts and reduce the unnecessary complexity produced by outdated height factor regulations.

The Proposed Action would:

1.3a: Remove obstacles to Quality Housing development on sites with existing buildings;

1.3b: Remove obstacles to Quality Housing development on irregular lots and lots where development is challenged by nearby infrastructure and other obstructions;

1.3c: Provide more flexible envelopes in Waterfront Areas to enable a broader range of development, including affordable housing;

1.3d: Eliminate the “sliver law” for developments that utilize Quality Housing regulations, regardless of district; and

1.3e: Create a discretionary action for sites in non-contextual districts where obstacles to Quality Housing development remain

PROPOSAL 4

1.3f: : Conversions

The Adaptive Reuse proposals seek to extend and improve the existing framework in ... the Zoning Resolution, which provides relaxed bulk regulations for conversions of nonresidential buildings built before 1977 or 1961 to residential use within defined geographies.

The proposed action would:

1.4a: Change the cutoff date for conversion from 1961 or 1977 to 1990;

1.4b: Expand the geographic applicability of the adaptive reuse regulations citywide;

1.4c: Enable conversion to a wider variety of housing types, including rooming units, supportive housing, and dormitories; and

1.4d: Eliminate outdated restrictions on conversions to residential uses in C6-1G, C6-2G, C6-2M and C6-4M commercial districts (none of which are in CD8M)

2: Low-Density Proposals

Beginning in the 1980s and accelerating in recent decades, layers of restrictions in low-density districts have seriously compromised the ability of these areas, which cover more than half of the city, to accommodate changes to existing buildings or support incremental housing development. CD8M

No low-density zoning districts in CD8M.

PROPOSAL 5

3: Parking Proposals

The Parking proposals seek to eliminate parking requirements citywide for new residential development. While it is expected that developers in most parts of the city would continue to provide some parking as part of new housing development, the Proposed Action would reduce existing conflicts between housing and parking on development sites across the city. Parking requirements for existing housing will remain, but the Proposed Action would create discretionary actions to eliminate or reduce those requirements where deemed

appropriate by a public review process

4: Other Zoning Changes

The components of the Proposed Action in this section represent zoning changes that are consistent with overall project goals—to enable more housing and more types of housing in every neighborhood across the city—but that do not fit naturally within any of the categories described above.

PROPOSAL 6

Transit Oriented Development

Adding housing near public transit is a commonsense approach to allow convenient lifestyles, limit the need for car ownership, lower congestion, reduce carbon emissions, and support the MTA. Many modest apartment buildings already exist in the outer boroughs – but more of these buildings could not be built today.

The regulations that ban 3-5 story apartment buildings force New Yorkers into long commutes, worsening traffic congestion and climate change. City of Yes would legalize modest apartment buildings where they fit best: on large lots near public transit, on wide streets or corner lots.

PROPOSAL 7

Campuses

Across the city, many campuses have underused space that they could turn into housing. That new construction can pay to fix up existing buildings, breathe new life into community institutions, and help address our housing crisis.

However, arbitrary rules mean that many campuses can not add new buildings. For example, a campus cannot add new height-limited buildings if existing buildings exceed that height limit.

By streamlining outdated rules, City of Yes would make it easier for campuses to add new buildings if they wish to. The new buildings could bring money for repairs, new facilities, and housing.