0: Introduction: The Public’s Private Apartment

Start. The role of housing in New York City has a renewed sense of potential as it finds itself at the center of new urban initiatives that rely on housing as a major force in redevelopment. From the Mayor’s Plan for New York to shifts at the federal level in Public Housing organization housing is central as a domestic entity and as a financially crucial urban tool.

These changes are evident at the national level, as housing policy in the United States is increasingly relying on the market place to spur innovation in design.

This syllabus presents a set of forces that are critical in new housing policy in New York and in the United States. Our studio site reflects these changes in both policy and formal realms.


1934: Clearance

The United States Housing Act of 1937—created by the Wagner Steagal Act of 1934—allocated 800,000,000 dollars in the form of federal loans to states to develop low income housing. In New York the prospect of 300,000,000 dollars in new federally provided funds loomed and the recently formed New York Housing Authority became an epicenter of urban development and design. Public housing became a major “new source—perhaps the great new source—of outside money” flowing into New York and whether one was interested in housing or not, the revenue stream was to become a major force of urban, political and social change. The shape these funds would take was to become a matter of architecture and planning; for the next 34 years housing would be a central focus of urban expenditure and urban policy. Indeed, the design of federally funded housing was to a large degree the design of the city itself. The implications of housing planning, financing and ultimately its architectural design have been at the root of issues that range from the construction of class and race divisions to mental health and social strife. Housing policies and architectural design have instigated changes in zoning and building massing, and have been at times the most poignant testing grounds for design ideas that began in the realm of the avant-garde and found themselves constructed in the very real situation of poverty, segregation and race relations. Housing prototypes by LeCorbusier’s (City of Tomorrow) published a decade earlier in 1924, became instrumental tools for “slum clearance;” in the early years of the New York Housing Authority tens of thousands of tenements were destroyed with the goal of “unslumming” the city. Then chairman of the Housing Authority, Edmond Borgia Butler, directly linked housing development with social and political change in claiming that “to justify further public housing, it is necessary to base public housing, on something more secure than improvement of the physical condition of the city, by substituting new bricks, mortar and steel for old.” “Public housing must not be used to regiment the tenants...poverty is not the sin of the poor; it is the sin of society,” claimed Butler.

Since its inception in 1934 the New York Housing Authority, like similar institutions in Washington DC, Chicago, San Francisco, etc, has advanced and then often retreated from its own policies: at the core of these development processes has been the poignant issue of how one characterises the forces that create poverty and how an empowered entity formalises its acts of intervention on behalf of an apparently less independent group of people.

1. Anthony Caro, “The Power Broker”
2. Michel Foucault, p 246.

Today: Yesterday / Baruch Houses: Avenue D, The Lower East Side/ Behind Glass: At the New York News Museum a Pulitzer Prize winning photograph shows children on the terrain-vague of a housing project plaza. Glass camera lenses, television screens and windows on poverty frame a view but fail to show the policy.

1926 and 1956: 20th Century Urban Tools for the management of strife and the production of the distributed city: The mass of city re-distributed according to volume, centrifugal force and speed. In the United States this distribution often followed class and racial lines.
0: Introduction: 
The Public’s Private Apartment

The Move to Ownership: Into the Market.

The voucher program’s goals mark a new watershed in the design of housing. Between 1996 and 2000 as many as 70,000 units of existing public housing were demolished in the United States to make way for new privately owned houses and housing units. In most cases these new developments are dispersed houses and low rise housing blocks. The 1998 Housing and Urban Development (HUD) budget included funding for 100,000 new vouchers indicating that sixty-six years of design and urban renewal experiments that have ranged from slum clearing and major urban design initiatives (that at times have been understood to have warehoused the poorer members of our city) have now given way to a moderated form of free-market development. The federal government now acts as an benevolent advocate that vouches for those that might not otherwise be able to enter the free-market of housing. The effects of this change have palpable impact on architectural design: with dispersal and the trend towards ownership and smaller buildings has come the return of traditional building types and often iconic images of house and “home.” At the smaller scale of development the role of design and the professional services of the architect are displaced: the average design fee for a single family house, for example, in the United States is approximately .0026%. Your work will seek new building types, new construction techniques and new programming that can add to the history of housing types already in place by analyzing the potentials of dispersal and ownership.

The National Picture

Public housing in the United States currently shelters approximately 3 million individuals in 1.3 million households. Nationally these families pay an average rent of $169 per month (1997) and have an average income of $7835 per year. The City of New York provides housing for almost 600,000 residents in more than 3000 buildings—1 in 12 New York residents live in some form of public housing. Unlike many cities, New York housing units tend to be included in the fabric of the city; these buildings are often atomized throughout the city fabric—they don’t stand alone as housing projects. There are of course very notable exceptions that have stood as the emblem of public housing.

Our studio will examine a section of the Lower East Side that has been greatly affected by the history of public housing development and that is currently facing significant market pressure towards gentrification and redevelopment. The syllabus outlines both state and market pressures on the area and on your site.

The state funds made available in 1996 for down-payment voucher programs augmented financial incentives already in place for public-private partnerships in housing development—historic-preservation and low-income tax credits, tax abatements, and donated city land. This combination of incentives has sometimes influenced design decisions: historic-preservation tax credits are often coupled with low-income housing tax credits in a way that lowers development costs while mandating historical housing types. In most cases, however, these incentives have no clear architectural or urban expression, and the development processes usually result in typical speculative housing, with low-level building and design practices.

What is NYCHA? Is it a concentrated entity or a dispersed organization?

NYCHA’s own description from their website:

The New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA) provides decent and affordable housing in a safe and secure living environment for low- and moderate-income residents throughout the five boroughs. To fulfill this mission, NYCHA must preserve its aging housing stock through timely maintenance and modernization of its developments. NYCHA also administers a citywide Section 8 Leased Housing Program in rental apartments. Simultaneously, we work to enhance the quality of life at NYCHA by offering our residents opportunities to participate in a multitude of community, educational and recreational programs, as well as...
1. The Public Apartment: NYCHA, Mitchell-Lama, NYHPD, UDC, Union Housing

The Rockaway Peninsula is home to approximately 38,000 households; more than 13,000 of these households are in publicly funded and assisted buildings.

A recent RFP calls for the development of market-rate two-family housing on a one hundred-acre ocean front site.

The property, currently owned by the NYHPD, is defined at its perimeter by three types of state and federally assisted housing. In the midst of these policy and typological histories new market rate housing will be built in the near future if the RFP produces a successful development strategy.

Ocean Village is on the east perimeter of the site at Beach 59th Street; it was built by the Urban Development Corporation between 1968 and 1974 and offers subsidized housing to lower income families.

At the western perimeter of the site the Arverne and Hammel Houses were developed by the Housing Authority of New York; the average income for families in NYCHA apartments is $13,406 (as of January 1, 1999). Also on the western edge of the site are nine mid rise apartment slabs that were built as part of the Mitchell-Lama housing program; these cooperative apartments are owned by NYCHA.

NYCHA was created in 1934. By the end of 1935 NYCHA dedicated First Houses, our first development, located on the Lower East Side of Manhattan.

The Way It Is Today

NYCHA is the largest public housing authority in North America. NYCHA’s Conventional Public Housing Program has 181,000 apartments in 345 developments throughout the City in 2,702 residential buildings containing 3,318 elevators. NYCHA has over 15,101 employees serving about 174,195 families and approximately 418,810 authorized residents.

- NYCHA’s Public Housing represents 8.3% of the City’s rental apartments and are home to 5.2% of the City’s population
- NYCHA residents and Section 8 voucher holders combined occupy 12.2% of the City’s rental apartments and make up 8.0% of the City’s population.

Conventional Public Housing in New York City

- The Bronx has 98 developments with 45,546 apartments
- Brooklyn has 101 developments with 59,005 apartments
- Manhattan has 103 developments with 54,255 apartments
- Queens has 26 developments with 17,372 apartments
- Staten Island has 11 developments with 4,860 apartments
- Six (6) developments consist of FHA Acquired homes located in more than one borough
- 42 developments are for seniors only; 15 seniors-only buildings exist within mixed-population developments
- NYCHA has more than 10,000 apartments designated for seniors only
- There also are 6,838 retrofitted apartments for families of persons who are mobility impaired as of April 22, 2003.
1. The Public Apartment: NYCHA, Mitchell-Lama, NYHPD, UDC, Union Housing

The Union House:

In the 1920s, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America “was the most powerful union in the garment industry,” with a membership that reached 175,000 workers. The union built a project housing 700 families in the Bronx. A project on the Lower East Side was a cooperative that provided housing for 233 families. The mortgages for the apartment units were provided by the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company and backed by the union. In addition, media and financial institutions responsive to worker needs supported the project: “mortgages also came from the Jewish Daily Forward and the Amalgamated Ban, which belonged to the union” (Plunz, 1990: 157).

The Amalgamated Housing provides an excellent model for how housing developments can provide a political, economic and social base for working class people. In this model, housing becomes a bridge for social needs outside an immediate residence, promotes employment and improves self-sufficiency. The Amalgamated housing complex “had cooperative stores which offered groceries and filled other daily needs at reduced cost.” The store was a large enterprise, housed in a separate building. The project “provided day care and education programs for young children, giving an economic advantage to parents, who could each work.” The Amalgamated also “developed extensive consumer services, including self-generated electricity which was sold to families at a cost below Consolidated Edison.” The cooperative also distributed milk and ice at cost and provided a laundry service (Plunz, 1990: 157).
2. Income Mixing and the QWHRA

*Partly in reaction to the growing concentration of very poor households in public housing across the US, Congress passed the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998 (QHWRA). This legislation requires public housing authorities (PHAs) to adopt plans to address the problem of growing poverty concentrations and grants considerable flexibility in setting admissions policies to implement those plans. The US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has declined to offer a standard for what it considers an undue concentration of poverty within public housing. However, commentary to the Final Rule for producing Public Housing Agency Plans suggests that a property where the average family income is below 85% of PHA mean income indicates an unacceptable level of poverty concentration, while 115% or above PHA mean income indicates relatively "high income" developments. Basically, QHWRA requires that PHAs "deconcentrate" poverty by attempting to bring higher income families into high-poverty developments and very poor families into higher-income developments. By providing working role models that support enforcement of management rules, as well as access to job networks and information, the economic outcomes and security of tenants in or from high-poverty developments may be enhanced.*


The QWHRA: the Congressional Act

H. R. 4194

One Hundred Fifth Congress
of the United States of America

AT THE SECOND SESSION
Begun and held at the City of Washington on Tuesday,
the twenty-seventh day of January, one thousand nine hundred and ninety-eight
An Act.

Making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes. Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

For tenant-based assistance under the United States Housing Act of 1937 to help eligible families make the transition from welfare to work, $283,000,000 from the total amount provided under this heading, to be administered by public housing agencies (including Indian tribes and their tribally designated housing entities, as defined by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development), and to remain available until expended: For tenant-based assistance under the United States Housing Act of 1937 to help eligible families make the transition from welfare to work, $283,000,000 from the total amount provided under this heading, to be administered by public housing agencies and to remain available until expended. . . SEC. 513. INCOME TARGETING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 16 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437n) is amended by striking the section designation and all that follows through the end of subsection
2. Income Mixing and the QWHRA

Diagrams reveal relationships between income, race and housing type on the peninsula. Arverne and Edgemere housing is generally 50 or more units per building. Income in this area is approximately 22% of Queens’s median income. At the western end of the peninsula wealthy areas such as Neponsit and Belle Harbor are predominantly Caucasian; dwelling types are almost exclusively single-family houses and the income per household is approximately 220% of Queens median income. The incidence of HIV infection soars in the area of the public housing. The Arverne and Edmere sectors of the peninsula are one of three of the highest concentrations of poverty in New York City. Diagram by Anthony Burke, GSAP and Jane Kim/Glen Fulk, GSAP.
2. Income Mixing and the QWHRA

National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials

http://www.nahro.org/legislative/federal/021999qhwra.html

Income Mix and Deconcentration Provisions

1. What are some of the incentives that may be offered to families to encourage income-mixing? The Act does not specify any particular incentives. However, an agency might consider using its locally-determined preferences, rent structure options, self-sufficiency programs, or other tools and flexibility provided in the Act, to encourage income-mixing.

2. Is it mandatory for every agency to have an income mix and deconcentration policy? Yes, it is. Agencies must describe it in their agency plan.

3. What problems are anticipated when mixing higher-income families into lower-income areas, without quotas? How does the Act impact issues about desegregation and deconcentration in public housing? Please refer to section 513, income targeting. The effective date of these provisions is October 21, 1998.

Public housing agencies are required to serve families at or below 80% of the area median income, and forty percent (40%) of new families must have incomes at or below 30% of the area median. Therefore, the difference in income levels is not expected to create insurmountable difficulties in blending these families in a certain development or community. Creating racial or income quotas is not permitted. The applicant alone must make the choice whether to accept the incentive to occupy a unit in a development where most incomes are either above or below that of the family. Agencies may not coerce applicants or take adverse actions against them.

(d) and inserting the following:

"SEC. 16. (a) INCOME ELIGIBILITY FOR PUBLIC HOUSING.—"

"(1) INCOME MIX WITHIN PROJECTS.—A public housing agency may establish and utilize income-mix criteria for the selection of residents for dwelling units in public housing projects, subject to the requirements of this section.

"(2) PHA INCOME MIX.—"

"(A) TARGETING.—Except as provided in paragraph (4), of the public housing dwelling units of a public housing agency made available for occupancy in any fiscal year H. R. 4194—84 by eligible families, not less than 40 percent shall be occupied by families whose incomes at the time of commencement of occupancy do not exceed 30 percent of the area median income, as determined by the Secretary with adjustments for smaller and larger families.

"(3) PROHIBITION OF CONCENTRATION OF LOW-INCOME FAMILIES. ""(A) PROHIBITION.—A public housing agency may not, in complying with the requirements under paragraph (2), concentrate very low-income families (or other families with relatively low incomes) in public housing dwelling units in certain public housing projects or certain buildings within projects. The Secretary shall review the income and occupancy characteristics of the public housing projects and the buildings of such projects of such agencies to ensure compliance with the provisions of this paragraph and paragraph (2).

"(B) DECONCENTRATION.—""

"(i) IN GENERAL.—A public housing agency shall submit with its annual public housing agency plan under section 5A an admissions policy designed to provide for deconcentration of poverty and income-mixing by bringing higher income tenants into lower income projects and lower income tenants into higher income projects. This clause may not be construed to impose or require any specific income or racial quotas for any project or projects.

"(ii) INCENTIVES.—In implementing the policy under clause (i), a public housing agency may offer incentives for eligible families having higher incomes to occupy dwelling unit in projects predominantly occupied by eligible families having lower incomes, and provide for occupancy of eligible families having lower incomes in projects predominantly occupied by eligible families having higher incomes.

"(iii) FAMILY CHOICE.—Incentives referred to in clause (ii) may be made available by a public housing agency only in a manner that allows for the eligible family to have the sole discretion in determining whether to accept the incentive and an agency may not take any adverse action toward any eligible family for choosing not to accept an incentive and occupancy of a project described in clause (ii)(ii), Provided, That the skipping of a family on a waiting list to reach another family to implement the policy under clause..."
3. The Lower East Side: Avenue D

The Seam: 14th Street and Avenue D and the East River

The Lower East Side is bounded to the north by 14th Street, to the East by the East River, to the South by Fulton and Franklin Streets and to the West by Pearl Street and Broadway. It includes several neighborhoods including the East Village, Chinatown, Little Italy, Tompkins Square, Astor Place. The line marks Avenue D and East 14th Street.

The Studio concerns incorporate this complete territory: our building site is bounded by E 4th/ E5th Sts + Avenues C and D.
4. The Seam:  
Studio Territory:  
Ave D

The Seam:

14th Street and Avenue D:  Our studio will address the redevelopment of a block bounded by East 5th and East 4th Street and Avenue D and Avenue C.  
The block is adjacent to a low-rise “contextual” NYCHA development titled:

the “Lower East Side II Consolidation.”

LOWERS EAST SIDE II CONSOLIDATION  
640 East 5th Street  
New York, NY 10009  
(212) 529-8340 Fax (212) 477-3029

46 Units an Acre/ 146 people an acre

Street Boundaries  
Avenue C  
Avenue B  
Subway Lines  
F to Second Avenue (follow M21 bus directions below)  
J, M to Delancey Street  
L to First Avenue (follow M9, M14C and M14D bus directions below)  
Bus Lines  
M21 (northbound) to Avenue C and 5th Street – walk west on Avenue C  
M9 to 4th Street and Avenue B  
M14C, M14D (eastbound) to Avenue D and 6th Street – walk up the block to Avenue D and 5th Street

SITE STATISTICS AND DESCRIPTION:  
Lower East Side II Houses consists of four, 3-story buildings with 186 apartments housing some 564 residents at the 3.85-acre site. Completed August 31, 1988, it is bordered by East 4th, East 5th and East 6th Streets, Avenues B, C and D in Manhattan.
4. The Seam: 
Studio Territory: 
Ave D

Block dimensions 
195' x 675' 
131,625 sq ft 

R7-2 zoning
4. The Seam:
Studio Territory:
Ave D

The Seam: 14th Street and Avenue D and the East River
5. The Immediate Site

East 5th Street:

1. Looking East: Market at corner of East 5th and Avenue D

2. Mid-block view: Looking East: Market at corner of East 5th and Avenue D

3. Looking South: View to facade of school.

4. Looking West: View to Community Garden.
6. Housing and the Rezoning New York City's Waterfronts

The Mayor's Plan for Housing:

"While the number of people who live below Chambers Street has grown significantly -- from 12,000 to 20,000 in the past ten years -- other than Battery Park City, for residents there isn't a there there. No real supermarkets... not enough open space... and not enough schools. And for that reason, families make up a much smaller percentage of the Downtown community than in other communities throughout the city.

With targeted investments, we can catalyze the creation of two exciting new neighborhoods south of Chambers Street -- one near Fulton Street, east of Broadway -- and the other, South of Liberty street, west of Broadway.

A New Emphasis on Housing and the Waterfront as a Factor in the Redevelopment in New York City

Areas facing major Redevelopment and new Housing Initiatives:

Queens: 1. Long Island City: Waterfront and "Art Loop" including MoMA QNS.

Brooklyn: 2. Greenpoint: Waterfront
3. Williamsburg: Waterfront. See First Year Studio

Manhattan: 4. The Mayor Plan for Housing
5. The Lower Manhattan Redevelopment Corporation


Key Housing Constituents: The LES

Stuyvesant Town: MET LIFE
The New York City Housing Authority
c. The New York Department of Housing Preservation and Development
Mitchell Lama Housing
Bloomberg’s Housing Plan

*“Housing Plan For New York City’s 21st Century Neighborhoods” by Mayor Michael R. Bloomberg: Delivered to New York Housing Conference/National Housing Conference 29th Annual Luncheon Sheraton New York Hotel*

The solution is doing the kind of strategic investment and groundwork that turns dreams into realities by using limited public funding to encourage private investment. Over the next five years, we will implement new strategies that will, combined with existing programs, create more than $3 billion in public spending on housing. That money will finance some 27,000 new units and preserve 38,000 more, for a total of 65,000 units. This public spending will increase production of new units by 25% compared to the last five years. And it will, in turn, stimulate the private sector to make major new investments in our city.

Here’s how the money breaks down. The City’s Housing Development Corporation (HDC) will leverage a new pool of $500 million to finance construction of 17,000 units. In addition to that, some $555 million will be redirected by the City’s Department of Housing Preservation and Development (HPD) from housing maintenance to new investment in some 8,000 units. And the remaining $2 billion is the continuing maintenance of effort by HPD in the City’s housing capital and expense budgets—ensuring creation and preservation of some 40,000 units.

The second principal element is a combination of legislative and administrative change. Here, the City will coordinate a variety of initiatives, including brownfield clean-ups, rezoning, land disposition policy and regulatory reform. This will cut building and land acquisition costs, and lay the groundwork to attract more private construction.

Let me describe these initiatives in a bit more detail, starting with our financial strategy: Between now and fiscal year 2008, HDC will make twice as much money available for affordable housing as it has over the last five years. That public investment will be created by aggressively and creatively pushing the financial envelope on HDC’s equity. To create these funds, we’re going to put HDC’s cash assets to work, and borrow against the mortgages that HDC holds. The half-billion dollar pool this generates is expected to leverage four times as much money—or $2 billion—as private financing will accompany the public’s initial investment. This will be in addition to funds raised through HDC’s traditional tax-exempt bond financing, which will come to some $750 million over the next five years. This pool will finance the construction and rehab of more than 17,000 units of low- and moderate-income housing in targeted communities. And for the first time, HDC will also commit a portion of these funds to middle-income housing. HDC’s so-called “New-Hop” program will be expanded to include housing for middle class New Yorkers with incomes between about $38,000 and $63,000 a year. These include teachers, police officers, firefighters, health care workers—the kind of people who make communities stronger. To complement that pool of HDC funds, HPD also is performing a little financial magic of its own.

Over the next five years, HPD will redirect more than $555 million in planned city and federal funding to targeted neighborhood renewal. Much of this money was originally intended for the rehabilitation and disposition of the City’s in rem housing stock. But as you know, most of that housing has now passed to new private owners. That’s wonderful news. Private ownership is our ultimate goal. And for an added bonus, it will give us the opportunity to redirect those funds to targeted housing investments over the next five years. Part of this re-directed funding includes equity we’ll raise against the low income housing tax credit program— to achieve these goals. HPD will, for example, provide low-interest loans to acquire and clean up brownfields for housing development. The bottom line is that all of these new and existing funds will preserve and create 65,000 units citywide between now and 2008. This commitment demonstrates that, even in these difficult budget times, the city is not walking away from the job of funding affordable housing. Today, we’re distributing a plan called “new marketplace: creating housing for the next generation.” It details how our commitment to housing will also extend to:  

* Providing low-cost loans to renovate and lease apartments that have long been vacant and off the market...  
* Doing what our conscience demands to help homeless families with special needs and youngsters aging out of foster care...  
* And helping new homeowners make their first down payments, while also encouraging private employers to do the same.

The public dollars in these programs represent an important part—but only a part—of the city’s housing strategy. Just as important is the second part of our plan—that is, to jump-start private investment in targeted communities by removing barriers to development and reducing costs of construction. And we’ll use a range of policy tools toward that end. I mentioned HPD’s capital program for acquiring and cleaning brownfields. Under the leadership of the Department of Environmental Protection, the city is conducting a comprehensive assessment of potential brownfields throughout the city with an eye toward beneficial reuse.

Complementing that effort in many neighborhoods, will be targeted rezoning of abandoned waterfronts and underutilized manufacturing areas for mixed residential and commercial use.

I have asked our city planning commission to move forward aggressively with rezoning plans in communities throughout the City, including: East Harlem, Jamaica, Long Island City, Port Morris, Morrisania, Park Slope, Greenpoint, and Williamsburg. We’ll work with the city council to enact these zoning changes.
7. Programming:

A new Model Housing Block for the Lower East Side

New York Quality Housing Program:

Standard Unit Sizes:

- Single Room Occupancy: 500 sq ft +/-
- One Bedroom Apartment: 850 sq ft +/-
- Two Bedroom Apartment: 1100 sq ft +/-
- Three Bedroom Apartment: 1350 sq ft +/-
- Four Bedroom Apartment: 1600 sq ft +/-

1. Compatibility with existing neighborhood and scale and character.
2. Provide adequate sized and naturally lit ventilated housing.
3. Provide on-site recreation space to meet needs of occupants.
4. Design to promote security and safety of the residents.
5. Apartments should be designed to provide sunlight for a significant portion of the day.
6. A Daycare Center should be provided.

Americans with Disabilities Act: every apartment should be accessible; at least two elevators are required. Designs that do not meet these criteria are unacceptable.

Site Coverage: The Site Zoning is R-7, and the maximum site coverage is 80% for a corner lot and 60% for an interior lot. The Quality Housing program requires at least 1% of total floor area be devoted to indoor and 3% to outdoor recreation. 50% of outdoor space must be landscaped and at least 1 tree per 2000 sq. ft. Building height will be determined in studio.

Program a new density and allocation of housing on the block bounded by East 5th, East 4th and Avenues C and D. Fulfill the following programming requirements to address the existing site conditions.

A. Housing: Density to be determined by studios
   (after research phase a studio wide FAR range will be set.)

Potential Development Models on the LES.

1. Market Rate Housing: Carlyle Group: Market Rate Development: Market Rate Housing: Global Strategy:
   Since its establishment in 1987, The Carlyle Group has grown from a group of four investors with $5 million in capital to one of the world’s largest private equity firms. As of March 2002, the firm had over $13.5 billion in capital committed to 20 private equity funds. We have developed the largest, most diversified investor base of any private equity firm, with more than 535 investors from 55 countries. Source: Carlyle Group Website:

   Case Study: A 19,186-sf block of retail space on two floors at the newly constructed NoLita Place residential tower is ready for occupancy and brokers are looking for high-end amenity-related tenants, including upscale restaurants, a high-end showroom or a gourmet market. The 12-story, 65-unit luxury property was completed earlier this month.

2. Non Profit Housing: Common Ground: Assisted Housing: Formerly Homeless
   "We start by creating communities where housing is safe, attractive and affordable. We then add support services, like access to medical and mental health care, job training and job placement. We believe that to rebuild an individual’s life from homelessness requires more than a home, more than good health, more than a job and more than a supportive community – the entire package is necessary. We offer long term results at a fraction of the cost of alternative responses to homelessness. Our permanent housing programs cost $10,000 and $12,000 per person each year--compared with prison cells at $22,000, shelters at $60,000 and mental health institutions at $113,000 per year." Source: Common Ground Website

   Case Study: The Andrews Hotel: Bowery and Spring: Supportive housing is permanent housing with social services for the formerly homeless, people with mental and/or medical disabilities, the elderly, and individuals with low-income. Supportive housing combines affordable accommodations with services like mental health and drug addiction counseling, job training and placement, community activities, and help with life skills like cooking and money management.

B. School Playing Fields: Provide a new interface with the existing school. The school itself should be kept in tact.

C. Community Garden or Park: Maintain or Replace the community garden.

D. Retail Market: Replace or modify the existing market.
8. Density: Developing a New Block in Manhattan

Contemporary and Historic Urban Density

FAR

Units/Acre

Residents/Acre

A. Density/FAR/Zoning: NYCHA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DVLPMTMNT</th>
<th>BORO CD</th>
<th>ZD_1</th>
<th>FAR_RES</th>
<th>FAR_RES_EXIST</th>
<th>FAR_RES_AVAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RIIS</td>
<td>MANHATTAN 03</td>
<td>R7-2</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALD</td>
<td>MANHATTAN 03</td>
<td>R7-2</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DVLPMTMNT NAME</th>
<th>RES COVERAGE SQ FT</th>
<th>NON RES COVERAGE SQ FT</th>
<th>EXISTING FLOOR AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RIIS</td>
<td>139,816.00</td>
<td>7,546.00</td>
<td>483,510.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALD</td>
<td>126,236.00</td>
<td>6,881.00</td>
<td>1,519,888.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPMENT NAME</th>
<th>NON RES STORIES</th>
<th>EXIST FAR</th>
<th>NON RES FLOOR AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WALD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>6,881.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Density/Historic LES: (Source: Richard Plunz, text)

*NYC was 6th among world cities in population

*NYC was 1st among world cities in density @ an avg. of 143.2 persons / acre

*A portion of the LES had a density of 800 persons / acre

*Paris was 2nd among world cities in density @ an avg. of 125.2 persons / acre

*Allowable lot coverage after 1901 ‘New Law’ Tenement House Act = 70%

No building could be higher than 1 1/3 x the width of the street it faced

Potential Density: Karla Rothstein Estimates

Block is 195’ x 675’ (approx. 54 — 25” x 100’ building sites)
131,625 sq ft x .7 = 92,137 SF max footprint x 6 stories = 552,825 SF built = FAR of 4.2

Site: 3.02 Acres

*Density maximums (the number of dwelling units per acre) are based on an average of 2 1/2 zoning rooms per dwelling

http://www.tenant.net/Other_Laws/zoning/r6.html
9. NYCHA: The Context

BARUCH HOUSES/BARUCH ADDITION
100 Columbia Street
New York, NY 10002
(212) 677-9400 Fax (212) 598-0752

3. 79 Units an Acre/195 people an acre

Street Boundaries
FDR Drive/Columbia Street
East Houston/Delancey Street
Subway Lines
F to Delancey Street – walk east on Delancey Street to Columbia Street – walk north
J, M, Z to Essex – walk east on Delancey Street to Columbia Street – walk north
Bus Lines
M14 Avenue C/D to East Houston and
Columbia Streets – walk south
M22 to Jackson and Madison Streets – walk north

NAMED AFTER: BERNARD M. BARUCH (1870-1965) - The “Park Bench Statesman,” made his fortune on Wall Street, but his greatest challenge and his greatest satisfaction were his service to his country as an economic advisor during both World War I and II, and as a confidante to six presidents. He often met officials on a park bench in Washington’s Lafayette Park because of the privacy and relaxed atmosphere. After WW II Baruch coined the phrase “Cold War,” describing our relations with the Soviet Union. Baruch Houses is in Manhattan.

SITE STATISTICS AND DESCRIPTION:
Bernard M. Baruch Houses, the largest NYCHA development in Manhattan, has 17 buildings, some 7, 13, and 14-stories high. Completed June 30, 1959 it is on 27.46-acres in Lower Manhattan. The complex has 2,193 apartments housing an estimated 5,367 residents. F. D. R. Drive, East Houston, Delancey and Columbia Streets border the development.
9. NYCHA: The Context

Wald, Lillian Houses
54 Avenue D
New York, NY 10009
(212) 673-9306 Fax (212) 673-2140

1857 Units 16.46 Acres 4,536 people
113 Units an Acre / 275 people an acre

Street Boundaries
Avenue D/FDR Drive
East 6th Street/Houston Street
Subway Lines
F to Delancey Street or 2nd Avenue and East Houston – walk east
don Delancey Street towards Columbia Street
J, M to Essex Street (follow above instructions)
L to 1st Avenue and 14th Street (follow bus instructions below)
Bus Lines
M14C, M14D going towards Avenue D and East 6th Street

NAMED AFTER: LILLIAN WALD (1867 – 1940) – She originated the
public health nursing service in the country and the Henry Street Nurses
Settlement on the Lower East Side. A dynamic force for social reform
she created widely accepted models of public health and social service
programs. Her nursing education in New York led her to conclude that
tenement residents lacked proper health care, so she organized the
Henry Street nurses group and later expanded settlement programs to
include social services, especially for children. Wald played a key role in
organizing the American Red Cross. She was a leader in the fight
to abolish child labor and helped foster the creation of the Children’s
Bureau in 1912. Wald Houses is in Manhattan.

SITE STATISTICS AND DESCRIPTION:
Lillian Wald Houses on Manhattan’s Lower East Side has 16 buildings
10, 11, 13 and 14-stories tall with 1,857 apartments housing an esti-
mated 4,536 residents. Completed October 14, 1949, the 16.46-acre
complex is between F.D.R. Drive, Avenue D, East 6th and East Houston
Streets.

Riis, Jacob Houses
454 East 10th Street
Manhattan, NY 10009
(212) 228-2400 Fax (212) 426-8435

105 Units an Acre/247 people an acre

Street Boundaries
FDR Drive/Avenue D
East 6th Street/East 13th Street
Subway Lines
F to Delancey Street or 2nd Avenue and East Houston – walk east
down Delancey Street towards Columbia Street
J, M to Essex Street (follow above instructions)
L to 1st Avenue and 14th Street (follow bus instructions below)
Bus Lines
M14C, M14D going towards Avenue D and East 6th Street

NAMED AFTER: JACOB AUGUST RIIS (1849-1914) – Danish-born American
journalist and reformer whose reports on living conditions in city slums led to
improvements in housing and education. His stories in newspapers and books
about slum dwellings and abuses in lower class urban life were collected in “How the Other
Half Lives (1890).” Riis dwelled on the city’s slum tenements and how the people
there lived. His vivid descriptions, often depicted in slides, caused audiences at
his lectures to moan, shudder and even faint. He founded a pioneer settlement
house in New York City named after him. Riis Houses is in Manhattan.

SITE STATISTICS AND DESCRIPTION:
Jacob Riis Houses on Manhattan’s Lower East Side has 13 buildings, 6, 13, and
14-stories high. The 11.73-acre complex has 1,187 apartments housing some
2,903 residents. Completed January 17, 1949, it is between East 8th and East
13th Streets, Avenue D and F.D.R. Drive.

Jacob Riis II on Manhattan’s Lower East Side has six buildings, 6, 13, and 14-
stories tall. There are 577 apartments housing some 1,402 people. The 5.94-
acre complex was completed January 31, 1949 and is between East 6th and
East 8th Streets, Avenue D and the F.D.R. Drive.
10. Re-Distribute

A tax credit is a form of subsidy that is granted to a developer/builder who commits to providing affordable housing—the credit’s value is then sold to a corporation who in effect provides the equity that funds construction. The tax credit maintains the semblance of a free-market by providing public financing incentives—tax funds—that bridge the gap between market rate housing and lower income families. The disparity between market rate and a subsidised market might otherwise cause re-distributions of population by income, race, class, gender or other factors. These financing initiatives often state their goals as those of re-building dis-invested territory in a way that market forces are presumed to be unable to.

Flow

On the cusp of the 19th century Thomas Jefferson, Madison, Locke and de Tocqville all countered attempts at a legislated redistribution of monolithic forms of wealth, even, as they recognised the free-market rights to private property sustained a dangerous potential to damage equality in the pooling of wealth. In a society that protected the rights to property and potentially exploitive monetary gain it ponders, Federalist law, nonetheless protected the individual right to gains made in a free-market even if those gains often seemed intolerable in light of losses suffered by the apparently less industrious. This studio is situated directly at the nexus of federal policy that had recently redirected how the government would address the issue of poverty and housing in the United States. The changes in federal policy amounted to nothing less than a compete shift in how the government would seek to address the problem of housing the poor—a problem that since 1935 it had aggressively addressed in the centralised control and management of scores of rental apartment units and histories of slum clearing. In 1998, the federal government was focused on returning housing to the market and in removing the government from the role of landlord or developer. The federal government was adopting a conservative view to housing development and was declining its former role as landlord and developer for housing for the poor.

The studio will investigate architecture’s relation to the different financing mechanisms with housing as a means to intervening, directing and managing the construction of new territories. Design will address the planning stages of development and proceed to a final presentation that is comprehensive in the analysis of program, construction and tectonics and ultimately to use and need. The public/private partnership will be the means to designing housings as the interchange of construction, finance and private life. The problem of housing becomes the problem of the city—and the re-distribution of public and private funds becomes a factor in architectural design. Our goal will be to create what Michel Foucault has called an “economy of visibility”...”one in which the “exercise of power” has some degree of transparency, legibility or interactivity. Can the building reveal it’s histories to those that participate in it’s making, and habitation?

“Traditionally, power was what was seen, what was shown, and what was manifested and, paradoxically, found the principle of its force in the movement by which it deployed that force. Those on whom [power] was exercised could remain in the shade, they received the light only from that portion of power that was conceded to them, or from the reflection of it that for a moment they carried. Disciplinary power, on the other hand is exercised through invisibility; at the same time it imposes on those whom it subjects a principle of compulsory visibility. In discipline, it is the subjects who have to be seen. Their visibility assures the hold of the power that is exercised over them. It is the fact of being constantly seen, of being able always to be seen, that maintains the disciplined individual in his subjection. And the examination is the technique by which power, instead of emitting the signs of its potency, instead of imposing its mark on its subjects, holds them in a mechanism of objectification. In this space of domination, disciplinary power manifests its potency, essentially by arranging objects. The examination is, as it were, the ceremony of this objectification.”

The dispersal of public housing into smaller atomized units has been a response to the public dissatisfaction with larger scale centralised housing projects. The slum clearing projects and garden city towers of earlier housing initiatives have come to symbolise if not embody the monolithic power that not only was enacted upon a group of people but that essentially revealed their poverty in the very collectivity it architec-
12. Strife

Tools for Urban Redevelopment

Political Action? Momentum

War Time Housing

The development of housing describes war if we ascribe to Thomas Hobbes allocation of the term to those states in which a greater "one" does not provide for the peaceful coexistence of many. In our case, and in Hobbes, the greater one is not a theological deity, not nature, but the "city" as a matrix of legal, economic and ultimately class related powers. Power is what a subject brings to a collective -- it is the value of their strength. War in Hobbes Leviathan is not only the state of arms but those states that precede and follow actual battle -- war is the strife on either side of confrontation. War is the antipathy of the commonwealth, a period of political alliance that exhibits the "greatest human powers" in the "compounding of the powers of most men, united by consent." In Hobbes language war describes a disequilibrium in the requirements of the political, economic and human domains -- it presumes that these domains can coincide.
13. Symposia

The studio curriculum is divided into three phases, each of which is initiated with an in-studio symposium. A reader provides supporting essays in the history, theory and practice of the design of housing. Attendance is mandatory.

**Studio Phase A: Policy + ReDistribution**
Symposium Participants: Michael Bell, Karla Rothstein, Thomas Mellins

Synopsis: Federalist era law has historically been the conservative benchmark that challenged overt redistribution of monies or property to compensate for a free-market: “To take from one, because it is thought his own industry and that of his fathers, has acquired too much, in order to spare to others, who, or whose fathers have not exercised equal industry or skill, is to violate arbitrarily the first principle of association.” This section of the studio will examine the policies of redistribution such as the sale of tax credits, bond financing of lower-income housing and the subsidisation of home ownership.

**Studio Phase B: Other Types + Tectonics**
Symposium Participants: Sulan Kolatan, Yoshiko Sato, Charles Eldred

Synopsis: The division of labor gives the worker a “peculiar“ task, wrote Adam Smith in the Wealth of Nations in 1776. Those who work face an odd separation from the whole of the produced project- when their labor is combined with that of others it ideally produces a unified project, but today what access does a worker have to the whole. Smith’s example is that of the pinmaking in 1776 in which he exhibited the mathematics of divided labor and it’s exponential return. Smith revealed that ten workers together could assemble 48,000 pins in a day while a lone worker could “scarcely produce 20 pins.” By what means does a building’s construction reveal itself and to whom?

**Studio Phase C: New Materials and Production Techniques**
Symposium Participants: Scott Marble, Robert Marino, Mario Gooden

Synopsis: Household products and the media interchange they portend has been an object of formal design and theory and inquiry since the mid-19th century: “The brand was to serve as a guarantee of the constant quality of the product, but in order for it to do that work, the very forms of the product had to remain constant too…the famous bottle for Odol, for example, one of Germany’s first major successful trademark products, has changed only four or five times in the century since it’s introduction.” (Frederic Schwartz, The Werkbund, “The Type,” p 135). What options for design and fabrication are available in new materials and media today?
Symposium A: Power and Geographic Description of Demographics

Speakers: Michael Bell, "The Public’s Private Apartment?"
Karla Rothstein, "The House Moses Built: Bulldozing Reform"

Redistribution and the Conservative House

"To take from one, because it is thought his own industry and that of his fathers, has acquired too much, in order to spare to others, who, or whose fathers have not exercised equal industry or skill, is to violate arbitrarily the first principle of association."1

Conservative or Liberal? Federalist era law at the turn of the 19th of the century was succinct and direct in its resistance to the redistribution of capital and surplus in means other than those of a free-market. The redistribution of wealth from one party to another based on a negation of the market’s fairness or ability to sustain opportunity for all was directly rejected in Federalist era congressional legislation and debate. The right to property and it’s profits was historically guaranteed by law. In reality no such clarity is actually put into practice: federal subsidies for housing routinely adjust affordability and the tendencies of the market: the largest single housing subsidy in the United States is actually the mortgage interest deduction provided to home owners—mostly the middle class and predominantly Caucasian. This symposium will examine the term re-distribution in relation to housing development in New York City but also in terms of a broad array of urban issues from shopping and retail to automobiles and transportation.

This symposium will present dimensional and numeric attributes of major urban infrastructural systems in comparison with those of federal housing programs. The comparison is intended to offer insight into housing’s ability to act as a localizing framework for the organisation of life as it competes with economic mechanisms whose prowess in shaping urban space and life at times seems omnipotent. The goal is to examine the possibility of grafting architectural potential at the intersection and melding of urban systems of finance, structure and productive mechanisms.

* data comparison sample/Borrowing time: On any given weekday the aggregate population of the city of Houston, drives an average of 53,000,000 miles. Translated at the average speed of commuter traffic this amounts to an aggregate drive time of 35 years per day. To drive those 35 years a day, Houston purchased more than 460 million dollars worth of automobiles in 1996-the United States accounted for 525.9 billion dollars in car sales that same year. If valued against one of the most prominent cultural monuments built in the last decade, auto sales in the United States in 1996 could have funded 525 Getty Centers in a single year. These numbers are technology’s numeric benchmarks (in this case very slow technologies) culled from procedures whose mechanics have outpaced architecture’s attempts to dimensionally shape space-public space, work space, living space, productive space, etc.)

---

Reader Number 1
Power and Geographic Description of Demographics


Noam Chomsky, “The Prosperous Few and the Restless Many.”


Michel Foucault, “Foucault Reader,” edited by Paul Rabinow.


Elizabeth Wilson, The Sphinx in the City: Urban Life, the Control of Disorder, and Women. Berkeley: University of California Press


Michael Bell and Sze Tsung Leong, Slow Space, p 14, “347 Years, Slow Space.”

Symposium B: The LES: Types and New Territories

A. Type: Recurring Types and Temporal Change

The first symposium examined Federal, City and Local housing plans that add equity to a housing purchase by adding financial value at the front end of a purchase. These plans achieve this by providing either individual or collective equity for a development: a housing project is abetted by large-scale equity infusion in the form of tax credits or an individual purchase is abetted by small scale rent or purchase subsidy. It gives the buyer a boost and a head start in the process of ownership - it is a shield against accrued interest. Equity, however, is affected dramatically in the way a building is produced by a developer long before it’s purchased. The standard mass-produced housing unit, as a product of fundamental building trades such as dry-walling, framing or painting, accrues value-surplus for its developer based on the efficient division of labor processes and the replication of basic building techniques: these techniques have direct architectural consequence and they directly affect the accrual of income, surplus and profit in the development of housing. Buildings are produced by processes that are designed to expedite the construction process and to alleviate the accrued interest and carrying costs of construction financing: Tectonic decisions have immediate impact on the production of architecture as well as the production of income and profit. How can one reveal the collaboration of these trades and processes or intuit the latent energy in a work of architecture. This symposium will examine the formal and material histories of housing type in New York.

B. Tectonics: Material Choices: Revealing Heat

Photo-elasticity was "the method of experimental stress analysis" during the 1930’s. As a form of finite element analysis the photo-elastic process reveals an observable relationship between optical patterns generated within a transparent material and the distribution of stresses that migrate through the material under loading. The behaviour of the material under stress is witnessed in the patterns generated as a polarized light passes through the assembled model. The polarization produces a light whose waves vibrate within a single plane; as a control device the polarization allows the discretization of an otherwise infinite number of wave axes. In certain materials the refraction of this polarized light coincides with the material’s primary stress points. Changes in the "velocity of the transmission of light" as it passes through these materials reveals the pattern of stress distribution as it occurs in the model.
Symposium B:
The LES: Types and New Territories
Symposium C:
Modernizing the Modern:
New Materials and Production Techniques

Moderator: Robert Marino, Mario Gooden
Speakers: Robert Marino, GSAP, “Jean Prouve”
Scott Marble, GSAP, “Fabrications”
Mario Gooden, GSAP.

What materials are modern?

“Behrens’ contribution to AEG product design was to be in the realm of style rather than technique.”

Sometime around 1929 the percentage of the United States Gross National Product that could be attributed to steel production reached its peak. The quantity of steel produced continued to rise, however, and its per capita usage in the United States continued to climb until the 1970’s, but the degree to which steel production constituted the benchmark industry for the United States economy had been challenged for most of this century. Steel has nonetheless remained as an icon of architectural integrity.

In the late 1970’s the production of plastics surpassed that of steel in the United States. The manifestations of this shift have recently shown themselves in a new array of plastic consumer goods and increasingly in architectural form itself. This section considers the relationship between the phenomenal and aesthetic qualities of materials and how this can effect or produce a cultural condition. How do new materials and new applications or evolutions of existing materials offer new conditions? (glass that transforms from clear to opaque with electrical charges; fire rated glass with invisible liquid inner layer which produces up to a 2 hr. rating; titanium as a lightweight strong and pliable membrane that is equally applicable to roofs and walls.)

Material production / Spatial production: The issues of form and new materials—forms and the technologies embedded in their production—have been at the center of debates around design, branding and the production of household goods as commodities as early as Peter Behren’s trademark designs for AEG. The relationship of new materials to domestic culture, to speed, efficiency and the rationalization of housing and the products that occupy the domestic landscape have their roots in technologies that architecture has at times tried to reveal and at times evaded. What potentials lie in fusing these initiatives; what potential lies in chemical engineering that stabilized new materials and new forms that has recently? This symposium will discuss the role of new materials in architectural design and in the products that form the domestic landscape.

“The brand was to serve as a guarantee of the constant quality of the product, but in order for it to do that work, the very forms of the product had to remain constant too… the famous bottle for Odol, for example, one of Germany’s first major successful trademark products, has changed only four or five times in the century since its introduction…” Frederic Schwartz, The Werkbund, “The Type,” p 135.

This symposium will attempt to outline issues and themes which establish relationships between two types of production - material production (understood as the physical environment and the means of methods of creating this environment) and spatial production (a set of social relationships which evolve out of a given spatial structure and simultaneously a production of its own spatial structure independent of what is given). Our interest will be in the mediation between material and social production and an evolution of the canonic ideal of form following function; we will examine the potential of form following the transmissive qualities of performance.
Manhattan’s Lower East Side: Housing and the City of New York
GSAP: Housing Studio Fall 2003
Graduate School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation
400 Avery Hall: 1172 Amsterdam Avenue: New York, NY 10027

Michael Bell, Charles Eldred, Mario Gooden, Sulan Kolatan, Craig Konyk, Robert Marino, Karla Rothstein, Yoshiko Sato
Ben Krone, Teaching Assistant


Charles Eames, John Entenza and Herbert Matter, "What is a House?," Arts and Architecture, July 1944, pp.22-39


Recommended Reading List: Seminars: A/B/C


Jane Jacobs, The Death and Life of Great American Cities.

Mary Mcleod, "Everyday and Other Spaces."


Schedule

Week 1: Re-Distribution and the Creation of New Territories
M
W  3  studio lottery/Rm 114
F  5

Week 2: Re-Distribution and the Creation of New Territories
M  8
W  10  Site Visit and Documentation
F  12

Week 3: Re-Distribution and the Creation of New Territories
M  15
W  17  Seminar: Presentation of Research
F  19

Week 4: Re-Distribution and the Creation of New Territories
M  22
W  24  2-4PM, Symposium A (required attendance)
F  26

Week 5: History: Tectonics + Type
M  29
W  1
F  3

Week 6: History: Tectonics + Type
M  6  Symposium B, 2-4PM (required attendance)
W  8
F  10

Week 7: History: Tectonics + Type
M  13
W  15
F  17  Second Year Mid Terms

Week 8: History: Tectonics + Type
M  20  Second Year Mid Terms
W  22  First Year Mid Terms
F  24  First Year Mid Terms
SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 9: Modernization’s Modernization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 10: Modernization’s Modernization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 11: Modernization’s Modernization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 12: Modernization’s Modernization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 13: Modernization’s Modernization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th. 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Final Requirements

1" = 60'-0" site model

1" = 1'-0" Site Plan showing context

1/16" = 1'-0" Final model showing context.

1/8" = 1'-0" plans, sections, elevations for all buildings.

Partial Section Model at 1/4" = 1'-0"

1/4" detail plan of units

Perspective of interior and exterior views.

Each studio will provide a site model that is jointly prepared.
14. Housing is a Right? Still?

“The New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA) provides decent and affordable housing for low income City residents. The Authority currently manages and maintains 346 public housing developments with 181,000 units housing nearly 535,000 residents including an estimated 105,000 persons living doubled up. In addition, through the federally funded Section 8 Existing Housing Program, NYCHA uses certificates and vouchers to assist an additional 77,000 families in private apartments. The Authority manages new construction and rehabilitation of public housing buildings and units. While continuing to maintain a safe and secure living environment in its public housing developments, the Authority also focuses on providing social services for the needs of its residents.”

Analysis of Income Distribution: “Following HUD’s Final Rule, we have computed the average income for families in federal units at $13,406 (as of January 1, 1999). This calculation excludes all city and state developments, as well as all units that have been designated elderly-only under NYCHA’s Designated Housing Plan.” “The average family size of a family in NYCHA’s federal family units is 2.53 persons.” “HUD has established the FY 1999 income range for a Very Low Income family of three in New York City as between $14,400 and $24,050.”

United Nations Human Rights Website: Fact Sheet No.21, The Human Right to Adequate Housing: Global Shelter Strategy.

“The right to adequate housing is universally recognised by the community of nations . . . All nations without exception, have some form of obligation in the shelter sector, as exemplified by their creation of housing ministries or housing agencies, by their allocation of funds to the housing sector, and by their policies, programmes and projects . . . All citizens of all States, poor as they may be, have a right to expect their Governments to be concerned about their shelter needs, and to accept a fundamental obligation to protect and improve houses and neighbourhoods, rather than damage or destroy them. Adequate housing is defined within the Global Strategy as meaning: adequate privacy, adequate space, adequate security, adequate lighting and ventilation, adequate basic infrastructure and adequate location with regard to work and basic facilities—all at a reasonable cost.”

New York Times: National Religious Leaders’ Call for Action on Housing: Religion Leaders Call Housing a Sacred Right By Gustav Niebuhr, Friday, September 10, 1999: “An unusually broad group of religious leaders--Roman Catholics, Protestants, Jews, Buddhists and Muslims-- has signed a letter to President Clinton, declaring that access to housing is a “sacred right” and asking the Government to take specific measures to help the poor obtain permanent shelter.”

Studio Requirements

These areas of design and research will be coordinated with each studio.

Research, Design, and Collaborative Skills

Critical Methods

Comprehensive Design

Program Preparation

Human Behaviour and Diversity

Use of Precedents

Accessibility

Site Conditions

Structural, Environmental, Life Safety Systems

Building Code Compliance
These models intend to stimulate a complex and mixed environment that provides for low-income housing without resorting to master planning or large scale ...

Representatives from these development armatures will address the studio this semester.

15. Non Profit Development Models
New York, New York

Public / Private Partnerships
City of New York, former Katherine Gray, Chair Community Board 4
Department of Housing Finance and Development, Planner. Columbia University GSAP graduate.
NY HFD goal: The city/state/federal government provides equity on behalf of poorer class in the form of tax credits, bond initiatives, housing vouchers or direct rental subsidy to tenants.
Community Board 4 goals: prevent displacement, assure the complex mix of CB 4. Prevent expansion of Central Business District through the innovation of new housing/working building types that can assuage demands for housing and commercial space in Manhattan.

Non Profit Development
Common Ground
http://www.commonground.org
Assisted Living for individuals: Income levels $15 to $30,000/annum
Rossane Hagerty or Vickie Clark, 212-471-0800 or 0815 (Clark)
Non-Profit entity provides equity on behalf of poorer class. Equity comes from the sale of tax credits as well as for-profit ventures operating as non-profit job training.
Current project: The Prince George / 400 units for individuals / Manhattan

From Common Ground Web Site: "We start by creating communities where housing is safe, attractive and affordable. We then add support services, like access to medical and mental health care, job training and job placement. We believe that to rebuild an individual’s life from homelessness requires more than a home, more than good health, more than a job and more than a supportive community – the entire package is necessary. We offer long term results at a fraction of the cost of alternative responses to homelessness. Our permanent housing programs cost $10,000 and $12,000 per person each year—compared with prison cells at $22,000, shelters at $60,000 and mental health institutions at $113,000 per year."

Job training funds Non-Profit Redevelopment
"Greyston Foundation"
Contact: Charles Lief, 914-376-3900
Worker Training/Housing: workers provide income that creates housing equity.
Projects: Greyston recently opened the Burnham Building in Irvington, N.Y. as a new library and 22 subsidised apartments.

From the Greyston Foundation’s Mission statement: Greyston has an 18 years commitment to creating community wealth and serving the underserved in southern Westchester County. From it’s beginning as a small neighborhood bakery in 1982, Greyston has grown into a comprehensive, integrated set of non-profit operations providing jobs, training, housing, child-care, social services, and health services. . .The Greyston constituency now numbers over 1000 men, women, and children.” "Greyston Bakery, a profitable $3.5 million food production business, trains and provides permanent employment for 55 formerly “hard to employ individuals.” Greyston pioneered “social enterprise”—using business to solve problems in the inner city—long before it emerged as a holy grail for reducing non-profit’s dependency on external funding.

Venture Capital and the sale of Tax Credits
"Intrust” www.intrust.com
Re-development provides return on Investment: Intrust manages a venture capital fund that provides investors with a return on investment in low-income housing.
Two investment capital funds that invest in a seven-county region of New York state. The funds are each worth approximately 10 million dollars. The funds were raised from the sale of tax credits for low income housing and historic preservation.
Intrust invests in projects in the Hudson River Valley and Houston, Texas. Contact: Steve Tindall or Jim Mingey, President, Intrust, Wilmington Delaware.
16. Market housing Development Model
Houston, Texas

What is ownership and how through the voucher program will it provide representation, empowerment and inclusion? The following data addresses issues of housing within the economic processes of commercial development. The goal in assessing this information is to ascertain the constituent value of a single family house within the larger scenario of Houston’s economy. Houston is almost exclusively a city of single family houses even though it is the fourth largest city in the United States. The following data is offered as a survey that reveals what home ownership is within the larger mechanism of urban finance. In terms of the voucher program this data is only the beginning of a renewed comprehension of how ownership apparently abets representation, empowerment and inclusion. It is clear that architectural design has much to offer, and that the voucher program as it stands has no way of gaining access to its potential.

Comparative Value of Voucher Program: What is the scope of the voucher program in relation to other Houston expenditures? The voucher program will provide housing assistance to 25,000 families. The total value of the program depends upon the ratio of new to existing houses purchased within its guidelines. The program could offer as much as $225 million in assistance or as little as $75 million.1 If compared with expenditures by the Texas Department of Transportation in Houston some startling insights surface. For example: the Texas DOT currently administers almost $1.4 billion in Houston area highway construction contracts. During the last year alone road construction in Houston costs reached $457 million and maintenance of existing roadways amounted to an expenditure of $57 million. In this context the voucher program is relatively small if not insignificant. Should it be more? Could it be more? The construction of one recent segment of freeway in Houston costs approximately $22 million a mile; at this rate, three and one half miles of freeway could fund the entire voucher program at its low estimate and in fact the total cost of the 8 mile freeway in question was more than $182 million,2 or enough to fund the entire program at its high end. Houston has somewhere in the range of 8,700 miles of “freeway” lane miles; the actual distance and value is almost impossible to figure.

Ownership/Equity/Representation and design: Is it possible to design a house in which equity could be accrued at an accelerated rate? The average single family house in Houston is sold approximately every nine years. At that point, assuming an initial mortgage of $50,000, the average home “owners” would have amassed $5,622 in equity. To amass this equity they would have made mortgage payments that total $33,984 or approximately $354 per month.3 As these calculations demonstrate, ownership within the voucher program will not provide more than personal satisfaction and self esteem. This data does not account for federal income tax deductions that accompany a mortgage nor does it include added monthly costs such as insurance, property tax, school taxes or utility costs. Ownership in this average scenario clearly does not provide the economic empowerment and representation it is assumed to, nor is it necessarily a better economic situation than renting. Is there a way that architectural design could abet a faster accrual of equity? For example: full equity in a $25,000 automobile could be accrued in five years at a monthly expense of $502.34 In Houston it may be conceivable to build a $25,000 3-bedroom house. If this house offered even modest innovation in energy efficiency it could be possible to allocate savings in monthly utilities expenditures to the greater mortgage payments that would come with a short term loan. Equity could be amassed at a tremendously accelerated rate. It may be possible to design a house in which full equity were accrued in five years, even within the costs guidelines of the voucher program. Innovation in energy use alone could make a dramatic difference in how affordable these houses are; innovation in labor processes involved in construction could also alter the affordability and quality of the houses.

1. This estimated value of the voucher program is based only on value of vouchers and does not include costs of administration of program. It is based on the program’s plan to provide assistance to as many as 25,000 home buyers.
2. Texas Department of Transportation information gathered at T.D.O.T. internet web site. The freeway costs estimate describes an 8 to 10 lane portion of Texas I-8. The final costs is estimated at $182,824,356 dollars. Another segment of freeway, State Highway 99, was built the same year was estimated at $3,850,000,000 dollars per mile, or a total costs of 63,220,000 dollars for a 16.42 mile segment of 4-6 lanes. The "total personal income" for Harris County in the year 1995 was 77,774,000,000 dollars.
3. Equity and mortgage payments based on a 50,000 dollars loan at 7.9% for 30 years. Equity and payment based on a 25,000 dollars loan at 7.9% for 5 years. The average weekly wage in Harris County in 1992 was $554.03; advertised mortgages on SableRidge homes were approximately $550.00 per month.

The above data was culled from private interviews with the developer. The name
How Does the Market Develop Houses? The voucher program assumes that the market will and can produce houses more efficiently than federal or city housing agencies. Developer houses in Houston are routinely offered for sale at prices as low as $55,000 and these houses are within the reach of many families who would rely on the voucher program. Innovation, however, in either simple functionality, design, or quality of materials is non-existent. The voucher program hopes to rely on the free-market to provide a decent level of housing. Will it? Does the building industry have the will to innovate? Clearly architects have had little success in infiltrating the machinations of housing. The term “housing starts” that often indicates the health of the economy almost invariably indicates the demise of architecture as we have valued it. Consider this case study.

Sable Ridge is a Houston subdivision of 347 houses built in the early 1980’s at a total cost of $16 million. It is situated outside the Houston Beltway or Loop in an area currently growing in population at a rate of more than 10% per annum. Compaq Computers, whose headquarters are in this area, alone accounts for much of this growth. The square foot costs of construction for housing built at Sable Ridge was $33/ft. Architectural fees for this project of more than 500,000 sq/ft were $4,550 or .028% of total construction. The entire subdivision of Chase Ridge could have been constructed on an average downtown Houston city block at a height of 5 stories (there are countless empty downtown Houston blocks) Architectural fees for such a low rise project would have amounted to more than $1.4 million — the developers of Sable Ridge made a profit of about $2 million.

Building materials that compose a single house at Chase Ridge have a relative value of approximately $10,000 per house if bought on a per house basis at a retail hardware store. The rest of the costs is accounted for by labor, advertising and profit. The market provides no incentive to build in the city center or to use architectural services. Clearly the market does not provide the components or the innovation that could make the voucher program a success in terms of providing meaningful civic representation.

The guidelines set by the Houston Voucher program are drastic but not without potential or even aesthetic challenge. A family of four must earn less than $36,800 to qualify for assistance. Proposed designs for new and renovated houses built within the limits of the market as it applies to this income group could mark a real and significant contribution not only to this strata of our population but to our conception of the contemporary city as a whole.
in New York City
A new federal emphasis on policies that foster the role of private finance in housing development, coupled with a city and state focus on the waterfront as a factor in the redevelopment in New York City create a dynamic and rapidly changing role for architects and planners.

A snapshot of areas facing major redevelopment and new housing initiatives in New York City.

Queens:
1. Long Island City Waterfront and “Art Loop” including MoMA QNS.

Brooklyn:
2. Greenpoint: Waterfront
3. Williamsburg: Waterfront
4. Brooklyn Atlantic Yards/Atlantic Terminal

Manhattan:
5. The Mayor’s Plan for Housing
6. The Lower Manhattan Redevelopment Corporation
7. WTC and “Ground Zero”
9. Columbia Expansion (not shown)

Staten Island
10. Fresh Kills Landfill (not shown)

Bronx
11. South Bronx becomes Downtown Bronx (not shown)

Part 1: Private Housing and Public Planning

*The first principle of association guarantees the “free exercise of his industry and the fruits acquired by it.”
Thomas Jefferson 1

The role of housing in New York City has a renewed sense of potential as it finds itself at the center of new urban initiatives that rely on housing as a major force in redevelopment. From the Mayor’s Plan for New York to shifts at the federal level in Public Housing organization housing is central as a domestic entity and as a financially crucial urban development tool. These changes are evident at the national level, as housing policy in the United States is increasingly relying on the market place to spur innovation in design.
This syllabus presents a set of forces that are critical in new housing policy in New York and in the United States. Our studio site and programming reflect these changes in both policy and in formal realms.

When the first public housing projects were proposed in the United States there was immediate and strong reaction from housing developers and banking associations that accused the programs of being "unfair government competition." In 1938, three years after the formation of the New York Housing Authority, the newly formed Housing Authority of Houston faced strong resistance that declared the agency to be Socialist competition with the free market. Today, 66 years later, at the outset of a new federal housing initiative that offers assistance to families to purchase rather than rent a dwelling the debate has come full circle. Current housing policies in the United States have, to an unprecedented degree, forgone the construction of collective and financially subsidised rental housing and focused government housing initiatives in the open market of private developers and the single-family house or low rise townhouse/condominium. Federal home buyer voucher programs are aimed at helping families purchase a dwelling from a consortium of speculative builders and non-profit developers rather than rent a federal or city owned subsidised apartment.

These programs provide lower income individuals or families with a down payment voucher that in effect disperses federal housing initiatives into a moderated version of a free market. The voucher is often a short-term lien that is forgiven in full after five years of ownership provided the home owner proves to be reliable as a mortgage risk. Individual ownership is believed to create a strong foundation for the re-development of neighbourhoods. Ownership is intended to re-territorialize a dis-invested area—it offers the residents a stake in their community.

Re-Distributing Wealth: The Public’s Private Apartment

Affordable housing in New York City is almost inevitably developed as a public/private partnership in which the private market demands on housing construction are ameliorated or compensated for by public investment and subsidy in the form of tax credits and bond financing. A tax credit is a form of subsidy that is granted to a developer/builder who commits to providing affordable housing—the credit’s value is then sold to a corporation who in effect provides the equity that funds construction. The tax credit maintains the semblance of a free-market by providing public financing incentives—tax funds—that bridge the gap between market rate housing and lower income families. The disparity between market rate and a subsidised market might otherwise cause re-distributions of population by income, race, class, gender or other factors. These financing initiatives often state their goals as those of re-building dis-invested territory in a way that market forces are presumed to be unable to.

Flow

On the cusp of the 19th century Thomas Jefferson, Madison, Locke and de Tocqville all countered attempts at a legislated redistribution of monolithic forms of wealth, even, as they recognised the free-market rights to private property sustained a dangerous potential to damage equality in the pooling of wealth. In a society that protected the rights to property and potentially exploitive monetary gain it po-tends, Federalist law, nonetheless protected the individual right to gains made in a free-market even if those gains often seemed intolerable in light of losses suffered by the apparently less industrious. This studio is situated directly at the nexus of federal policy that had recently redirected how the government would address the issue of poverty and housing in the United States. The changes in federal policy amounted to nothing less than a compete shift in how the government would seek to address the problem of housing the poor—a problem that since 1935 it had aggressively addressed in the centralised control and management of scores of rental apartment units and histories of slum clearing. In 1998, the federal government was focused on returning housing to the market and in removing the government from the role of landlord or developer. The federal government was adopting a conservative view to housing development and was declining its former role as landlord and developer for housing for the poor.

The studio will investigate architecture’s relation to the different financing mechanisms with housing as a means to intervening, directing and managing the construction of new territories. Design will address the planning stages of development and procede to a final presentation that is comprehensive in the analysis...
of program, construction and tectonics and ultimately to use and need. The public/private partnership will be the means to designing housings as the interchange of construction, finance and private life. The problem of housing becomes the problem of the city—and the re-distribution of public and private funds becomes a factor in architectural design. Our goal will be to create what Michel Foucault has called an “economy of visibility”...“one in which the “exercise of power” has some degree of transparency, legibility or interactivity. Can the building reveal it’s histories to those that participate in its making, and habitation?

“Traditionally, power was what was seen, what was shown, and what was manifested and, paradoxically, found the principle of its force in the movement by which it deployed that force. Those on whom [power] was exercised could remain in the shade, they received the light only from that portion of power that was conceded to them, or from the reflection of it that for a moment they carried. Disciplinary power, on the other hand is exercised through invisibility; at the same time it imposes on those whom it subjects a principle of compulsory visibility. In discipline, it is the subjects who have to be seen. Their visibility assures the hold of the power that is exercised over them. It is the fact of being constantly seen, of being able always to be seen, that maintains the disciplined individual in his subjection. And the examination is the technique by which power, instead of emitting the signs of its potency, instead of imposing its mark on its subjects, holds them in a mechanism of objectification. In this space of domination, disciplinary power manifests its potency, essentially by arranging objects. The examination is, as it were, the ceremony of this objectification.”

The dispersal of public housing into smaller atomized units has been a response to the public dissatisfaction with larger scale centralised housing projects. The slum clearing projects and garden city towers of earlier housing initiatives have come to symbolise if not embody the monolithic power that not only was enacted upon a group of people but that essentially revealed their poverty in the very collectivity it architecturally represented. For Foucault “liberty is a practice;” it does not and cannot take a form. Still Foucault warns “that the exercise of freedom is” not “indifferent to spatial distribution...it can only function when there is a certain convergence; in the case of divergence or distortion, it immediately becomes the opposite of what was intended.” Dispersal is intended to disarm the monolithic will of a centralised authority—our studio will seek to test the limits of this policy in architectural design.

Subjects: Mathematics

This studio presents two conflated mathematics projects: the first is of vision and pictorial space related to form; to properties of depth, volume, mass, transparency and figure, and to a standing and perhaps latent humanist subject. The subject of this mathematics is a person who occupies space —using as their primary tools their eyes, and a stable, even still ideal of space. As an architect this subject has been schooled in post-war architectural criticism—relying on a thesis of form as distinct from and stable within its surroundings. This architect relies on historical precedents set within Modernism and within the stable types of unit plans, room sizes, property lines and construction components.

The second mathematics is an operational process of formalization rather than form—a technical project of mass production (renewed with computer interfaces and new interactions between designer and producers), standardization, labor mechanisms, and organizations of money over a quantity of time. This mathematics is extra-urban and extra-architectural, and its dimensions form an economic geography that affects social and political landscapes well beyond the architecture produced.

Mathematics, in these two cases is both a geometric problem of relatively minor architectural dimensions and vectors—planar spaces, reduced systems of linearity and forms of assembly or aggregation, but also a property of infrastructural, technological and financial processes—time based mechanisms that often outmode, and out maneuver architect’s attempts to orchestrate or provide for a subject’s local prospects—to provide repose within the greater mechanisms of the city.

Your work in the Housing Studio is sited in the late modern city—not a city of Modern design, but a city of modern processes and techniques. Your subject—your client—is an inhabitant who is often distanced and excluded from the creation of the territories they ultimately inhabit. Housing, in particular, is a poignant program for the architect in this regard: housing implies rest, coherence, safety and respite— if not a secure vantage on the
larger scenario of the city, and its relation to scale, geometry, production and social/political purpose is
endemic to its history. Yet, metropolitan New York is often characterized as emblematic of a by now ubiq-
uitous United States urbanism whose formal and architectural attributes—and its architectural qualities—
have become increasingly fragmented as its trade, labor, financial, media and production systems have
become mathematically unified and self-perpetuating. As a small-scale participant in the great milieu of
managerial systems at work in the city, architecture is simultaneously expected to provide a means to
comprehend if not stabilize illusive and temporal macro and micro processes that precipitate the construc-
tion of the city.

The housing studio asks that you examine Architecture’s political and social agency—its ability to partici-
pate in the construction of an urban subject. You will be asked to explore the edges between the disci-
pline—its intrinsic or “professional” attributes, and agencies, and its migration towards, and inclusion of a
wider array of social or political factors. The late modern city — in this case New York City, sustained by its
relentless re-invention, and seeming self regulation — requires an architecture that provides a perceptual
and technical means—you will be working at many scales and within many forms of production and
agency. Architectural work, in part sustained by, and produced within latent procedural histories of legisla-
tive policy, capital investment techniques/strategies, formal histories, re-inhabits these realms and provides
new forms of private life within the most public of processes, and the most illusive and ephemeral dimen-
sions of contemporary urban space.

At Columbia dynamic modeling and mapping of events has been a primary design and research tool. In recent
months if not years, these tools have become evident in the mainstream press and indeed in popular forms of
organization. Demonstrations, Conventions and everyday news are often shown in time based, durational, maps and
diagrams.

The Housing Studio has attempted to build on these techniques—and to expand their usefulness in projecting
the future implications of planning decisions, of policy goals and of many techniques that do not have obvious or appar-
ent visible form. Your work as a designer addresses the orchestration and reaction to fast and slow realms—quick
events and slower durational calculations. The following notes—refer to work by Bernard Tschumi on program-
ing, events and relationships between architecture, program and event.

Part 2. Dynamic Programming: From Theory to Mainstream Media

During the First Phase of the studio each section will develop the studio program by analyzing each of the
following four Programming Vectors. Our site is currently being re-zoned as a special zoning district—with
this in mind our studio will develop the potential uses of the site by re-establishing the history and potential
re-invention of key housing demands. Each of these vectors indicates an important historical and current
driving force in housing production; they address constituencies, political goals and urban tools such as
zoning and infrastructure—our six studios will share information at the end of this phase and determine the
full programming with the advice of an outside consultant from the non-profit housing sector and a com-
merical market rate housing development team.

Ink, charcoal, graphite, cut-and-pasted photographic reproduc-
tions, Letraset type, and color pencil on tracing paper, 24” x 32”
2” (61 x 980.4 cm). The Museum of Modern Art, New York.

Your work should address four modes of programming for a full city block site on Manhattan’s ““Far West
Side”.” The block—defined by West 44th and 45th Street, and Tenth and Eleventh Avenues—is within the
southern region of the new planning area titled “The “Far West Side”.” Your work, as designers, architects, planners and urbanists, will require you to program as well as design this city block. The studio faculty and
invited guests will present a series of initiatives and forces that in negotiation will affect the future of the
area. Your work will require inventive design—and also strategic work on anticipating and projecting the
future of the area’s programming. We will collectively determine the full block programming after a research
phase, but at this point in time you should anticipate maintaining all the current services on the site and
meeting the demands of the new redevelopment for housing.
With your partner and faculty critic you are asked to address the four following “programming vectors.” They are referred to as vectors because they are not presented as fixed entities or quantitative fields or needs—instead they are understood as forces described by direction and magnitude. Indeed, they are understood more as a mode of becoming than as something known—formally or dimensionally defined—or as with known political resonance. In fact, each could be understood to address program as something that is in direct counter-position as well covalency to the liquid and flexible dimensions of money—of economic procedure.

It is Tschumi’s elevation of program to a level equal to other historically accepted architectural conventions that is noted by K. Michael Hays as a milestone that marks Tschumi’s arrival on the architectural scene itself. Of Tschumi’s Manhattan Transcripts, Hays wrote:

“*Their explicit purpose is to transcribe things normally removed from conventional architectural representation, namely complex relationships between spaces and their use; between the set and the script; between type and program, between objects and events.*

Sources: New York City Police Department New York City Department of Transportation Metropolitan Transportation Authority New Jersey Transit Authority

with your partner and faculty critic you are asked to address the four following “programming vectors.” They are referred to as vectors because they are not presented as fixed entities or quantitative fields or needs—instead they are understood as forces described by direction and magnitude. Indeed, they are understood more as a mode of becoming than as something known—formally or dimensionally defined—or as with known political resonance. In fact, each could be understood to address program as something that is in direct counter-position as well covalency to the liquid and flexible dimensions of money—of economic procedure.

It is Tschumi’s elevation of program to a level equal to other historically accepted architectural conventions that is noted by K. Michael Hays as a milestone that marks Tschumi’s arrival on the architectural scene itself. Of Tschumi’s Manhattan Transcripts, Hays wrote: “*Their explicit purpose is to transcribe things normally removed from conventional architectural representation, namely complex relationships between spaces and their use; between the set and the script; between type and program, between objects and events.*

Sources: New York City Police Department New York City Department of Transportation Metropolitan Transportation Authority New Jersey Transit Authority

middle right and bottom right: NY Times, RNC Diagramming; Voter Analysis and projection and Geography.
Dynamic Programming: Vectors 1, 2, 3, 4.

Programming Vector 1

Infrastructure+ Services + Housing

Program Agents: Port Authority Bus Stations, Pennsylvania Station, Lincoln Tunnel, UPS Distribution Center

The role and image of the city are changing and perhaps despite our general sense that New York is still the same, dependable, dense, and vibrant cosmopolitan city, it is actually undergoing or about to undergo a series of major structural changes: with or without the Olympics, and on the scale much greater than the World Trade Center redevelopment. Although they may be hard-pressed to admit that their plans for the future of New York are as much of a gamble on its future as all modernist plans before, the city officials in mayor Bloomberg's office are getting ready to rezone and redevelop large parts of Manhattan and the Boroughs with as much enthusiasm as Moses had while knitting his New York parkway network. The NYC waterfront, two thirds of which were zoned for manufacturing as late as the 1960s, will be rezoned for mixed use. This will provide new territory for housing, light industry and commercial space, and will consequently eliminate a specific type of New York landscape—as familiar as it is unnoticeable sometimes—the underused and slower backdrop to the rest of the city life. This will officially bring the age of manufacturing in New York City to a closure. With mixed use zoning of most of New York's waterfront, functionalism will reach another scale, in which a city as large and as diverse (still) as New York will simply leave its industrial past behind, as industry moves with the latest currents in global economy.

If indeed Hell's Kitchen gets developed, as the Bloomberg administration, its Economic Development Corporation and the department of City Planning suggest, it will accommodate 28 million square feet of commercial office space; 12.6 million square feet of residential space; 960,000 square feet of hotel space and 680,000 square feet of retail space. This plan, which is incidentally not too different in terms of numbers from the 1968 Plan for New York City, will require that a part of the city instrumental for regional transportation to and from New York, that has accommodated a variety of light industries (defined by their adjacency to the theater district and the accessibility to the West Side Highway and the river) and a service sector necessary for both regional transportation and light industry, will change irreversibly. Does this mean we will soon have a city without a service sector? Or does this mean that the city has to be redesigned in such a way that service sectors and large urban infrastructures get absorbed, overlapped and tightly surrounded by housing and office space?

Your site analysis and programming will address these questions and your design work will propose new urban forms of housing and services. The history of the Lincoln and Holland Tunnels—indeed of all the bridges and tunnels that serve New York City—is one that was instrumental in the formation of the regional suburb and the decentralization of the city. Can Manhattan's "Far West Side" serve its mandated dual purposes of housing and office space—of infrastructure and dwellings?
The New York State Mitchell-Lama Housing Program was created in 1955 for the purpose of providing housing for middle-income families. The housing developed under this program is more commonly known as Mitchell-Lama housing, derived from the last names of former Manhattan State Senator MacNeil Mitchell and former Brooklyn Assemblyman Alfred Lama, who sponsored the legislation. It is officially embodied in the Private Housing Finance Law and is designed to accommodate the housing needs of moderate income families. “A total of 269 Mitchell-Lama developments with over 105,000 apartments were built under the program. In addition, 22 middle-income developments with over 10,000 apartments were built under the Limited-Dividend program, a precursor of the Mitchell-Lama program. A number of the Mitchell-Lama developments have withdrawn from the program under a process called buyout and are no longer under DHCR supervision.”

“There are 132 City-sponsored, moderate- and middle-income rental and limited-equity cooperative developments in New York City which contain approximately 54,000 units, known as Mitchell-Lamas. HPD supervises waiting lists, management issues, and has other oversight responsibilities for 50 Mitchell-Lama developments; an additional 82 developments have shared supervision by HPD and the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development. There are approximately 94 Mitchell-Lama buildings in the City, which contain approximately 65,000 units, that are supervised by the State Division of Housing and Community Renewal (DHCR).” “Mitchell-Lama apartments are sold or rented through waiting lists kept by each development. Many Mitchell-Lama waiting lists are closed because there are already enough applicants listed to fill vacancies expected in the foreseeable future. Periodically, these developments open their waiting lists and new applications are accepted based on a lottery system. Mitchell-Lama developments must advertise when they open their waiting lists. Check your local newspapers to find out when applications are being accepted.”

Sources for Mitchell Lama background: http://www.dhcr.state.ny.us/ohm/progs/mitchlam/ohmprgmi.htm http://www.dhcr.state.ny.us/ohm/progs/mitchlam/ohmprgmi.htm
Affordable Housing?: “The Far West Side”

Market Rate Housing: B: According to the Mid Year 2004 Corcoran Report, the average sale prices for condominium in Midtown West (W34-W57, Fifth-Hudson River) are up 38% over 2003 - with 3+ bedrooms leading the market average condo prices per SF are up 24% over 2003, primarily due to new construction throughout the area. Average sale prices for co-ops in Midtown West are up 28% over 2003 co-op prices per SF are up 13% over 2003, sale price for 2 BR co-ops are up 61%.

2004 Average Sale prices in Midtown West (W34-W57, Fifth-Hudson River):
**studio- $274K**
**1 BR- $416K**
**2 BR- $784K**
**3+ BR- $1.207M**

Programming Vector 3

Outsourcing the Poor?

Program Agents: Common Ground Community and the NYHPD

New York City often finances housing in a public/private partnership that allows developers to receive low costs financing in exchange for providing a proportion of lower-income housing. These financial mechanisms—or products—are often referred to as 80/20 financing. The developer must provide 20% of the housing units at a pricing that is affordable to lower-income demographics. On the Far West Side these provisions are given—new housing developments must provide 20% of the new housing at lower-income rents or sale prices. In recent years, however, it has become common for the lower-income housing to be produced off-site; in effect to be outsourced and provided in lower land cost areas and in lower income areas. There are examples where this was provided by building the lower income housing in a borough other than Manhattan. The results allow the developer to borrow development funds at subsidized rates, and build the lower income producing housing in less valuable areas. New York City has struggled for decades with trying to maintain a semblance of economic diversity in its population—yet today it could be said that Manhattan and the “Far West Side” in particular are final frontiers of formerly affordable housing. How will your project respond to issues of displacement of or re-location of lower income people and the poor?

During the end of the 19th century and throughout the 20th, the rise and ceaseless transformation of the industrial city has continually adjusted its means, desire and abilities to offer work and housing to the poor. The very identity of the city has been based in absorbing the migration of those seeking work in a newly urban life. Yet the city has rarely shown either the ability to fully employ the poor at wages that fully match urban housing costs, nor has it always proved to offer the equitable distribution of services across the spectrum of race, sex or other variables of personal identity.

In a contemporary scenario Noam Chomsky makes a distinction between the geographical United States and American corporations. The country he has written is “developing characteristics of the third world”—but he speculated that its corporate share of worldwide production was probably increasing. According to Chomsky, capital generated within an evolving global economy is no longer distributed in centripetal and centrifugal urban patterns, or in relation to knowable geographic origins. In places like New York, the economic, private, and public shapes of the city have not only lost their territorial relation to an origin, but have left their inhabitants without a collective imagination of power’s origin; according to Chomsky the forecast prefigures a two-tiered society—islands of wealth for investors and milieus of despair for the “restless many.” This programming vector asks you to research and address the demographics of your project and its ability to address the place of lower income and poverty conditions.

“The moving, questing people were migrant now. Those families which had lived on a little piece of land, who had lived and died on forty acres, had eaten and starved on the produce of forty acres, had now the whole West to rove in. And they scamperecd about, looking for work; and the highways were streams of people, and the ditch banks were lines of people.” Behind them more were coming. The great highways streamed with moving people. There in the Middle- and Southwest had lived a simple agrarian folk who had not changed with industry, who had not formed with machines, or know the power and danger of machines in private hands. They had not grown up in the paradoxes of industry. Their senses were still sharp to the ridiculousness of industrial life.” The Grapes of Wrath by John Steinbeck, p385, 386

Common Ground Programming and Housing Types:

Keeping People in the neighborhoods where they can find support.

Programming and Architectural Case Studies: Common Ground Community in conjunction with The New York Department of Housing, Preservation and Development, and the New York City Department of Mental Health Services:
"Common Ground is one of many organizations that attempt to ameliorate the high cost of living in New York City by providing housing for lower income and impoverished people: "We start by creating communities where housing is safe, attractive and affordable. We then add support services, like access to medical and mental health care, job training and job placement. We believe that to rebuild an individual’s life from homelessness requires more than a home, more than good health, more than a job and more than a supportive community – the entire package is necessary. We offer long term results at a fraction of the cost of alternative responses to homelessness. Our permanent housing programs cost $10,000 and $12,000 per person each year--compared with prison cells at $22,000, shelters at $60,000 and mental health institutions at $113,000 per year." Common Ground is planning permanent housing and services for families who are homeless or are at risk of becoming so. The housing will be designed to reduce isolation and foster social interaction between stable families and those needing support. Source: Common Ground Website

A: Common Ground: East New York: Homelessness Prevention: Common Ground in conjunction with the NYHPD has established a program in East New York to bring vacant apartments on-line for use by families at risk for homelessness. This program is a pilot program to re-use and re allocate the NYHPD identified 60 thousand vacant apartments in NYC. These vacant apartments constitute a number equal to amount of housing the Bloomberg Administration plans to create. In this case one could argue that those apartments already exist but cannot be accessed. Common Ground believes it is necessary to find a means to access under-utilized apartments—and to find a way to keep lower income families from being displaced. Common Ground’s goal is to create permanent housing for families that is affordable, attractive and integrated into the community. The tenant mix will include relatively stable low-income families with strong community ties, families “at-risk” of becoming homeless and families exiting the shelter system. Services will be provided both on-site and in partnership with local community organizations, and focus on building relationships between families and reducing the social disconnection that often occurs with extended periods of homelessness.

“The 2002 HVS reports that the number of vacant rental units in New York City was 61,265 and the city-wide rental vacancy rate was 2.94 percent during the period between February and June 2002. The rental vacancy rate is significantly lower than the 5 percent threshold mandated by state law to justify the continuation of rent control and rent stabilization. The survey also reports that the City’s total inventory of residential units was 3.2 million” Source: From: http://nyc.gov/html/hpd/html/for-researchers/housing-vacancy-surveys.html

**From the Bloomberg Plan: Providing low-cost loans to renovate and lease apartments that have long been vacant and off the market... / Doing what our conscience demands to help homeless families with special needs and youngsters aging out of foster care.../ And helping new homeowners make their first down payments, while also encouraging private employers to do the same.

B: Common Ground: The Foyer Program: The Foyer program is a housing-based career development program targeting young adults (ages 18-24) who are "aging out" of foster or residential care, are homeless or at risk of homelessness. Designed to prevent homelessness by offering a comprehensive transitional experience to independent adulthood, participants will work over a two-year period toward goals of permanent housing and stable employment. The 40-unit program is housed at The Christopher Nels Larson Residence. See: The Foyer Program <http://www.commonground.org/new_housing/homelessness_prevention/foyer.asp>

C: Common Ground: Re-Entry Housing: Common Ground is developing a re-entry housing initiative to prevent homelessness and criminal recidivism for homeless men and women exiting the corrections system. The initiative consists of three distinct programs: a transitional re-entry housing and employment program; a permanent supportive housing program linked with participation in work; and a residential program for youth leaving the juvenile justice system: “A program initiated in 1988, the Involuntarily Displaced Families Program, has provided permanent housing in State-aided middle income developments for homeless families. Under a DCHR Emergency Order, Mitchell-Lama and Limited Dividend rental developments in New York City and Westchester County were required to fill at least one of every five vacancies with involuntarily displaced families referred through the NYS Department of Social Services. Approximately 1,000 families have been permanently housed in State-supervised housing developments at any one time under this program. IDFP was suspended in 1997 due to a lack of Federal housing vouchers to subsidize eligible families.”
Programming Vector 4

Up Zoning

As a special zoning district the “Far West Side” is being re-zoned to accommodate a far greater density of office space and housing than it currently provides. Our studio is entering these redevelopment plans at a time when the zoning is still in question and is malleable—the programming vectors represent past forces as well as current goals, yet your work must re-invent each vector’s potential and how they interact to produce a full program for the city block. New York City is being “up-zoned” in sectors of all five boroughs—below we discuss several of these scenarios.
The latest addenda to the zoning resolution come in the form of “special zoning districts”, areas within the five boroughs that have a special designation with regard to zoning. These districts have come to the attention of the planning commission as areas in need of special considerations. The Clinton special zoning district is one such district. The special zoning district rules attempt to address all the political, architectural, environmental, and cultural pressures that come to bear on a particular neighborhood.

The tools to accomplish this begin with Zoning and City based legislation that addresses the organization of programming, building bulk and height and the retention of services. The area is projected to be able to absorb 28 million square feet of office space and 12,000 new apartments. This Programming Vector requires an analysis of the city zoning; past, present and future to determine the major parameters of your proposal.

“The zoning resolution of the City of New York is a legal document in its latter stages of development and use. As an old document that has been added to and amended as needed for almost 90 years, it could be understood as a condensed version of the history of built structures in this city.”

“Through zoning, a city regulates building size, population density and the way land is used. Zoning recognizes the changing demographic and economic conditions of the city and is a key tool for carrying out planning policy. New York City enacted the nation’s first comprehensive zoning resolution in 1916 and the City continues to be a leader in zoning policy in the United States.”

Source: An Introduction to Zoning Terminology

New York City is divided into three basic zoning districts: residential (R), commercial (C) and manufacturing (M). The three basic categories are further subdivided by the intensity of use, whether for retail or manufacturing categories, parking, building bulk or residential density. Zoning regulations do not usually apply to public parks.

Development within these residential, commercial and manufacturing districts is governed by use, bulk and parking requirements. Each zoning district regulates permitted uses;

1. the size (bulk) of the building permitted in relation to the size of the lot;
2. the required open space for residential uses on the lot or the maximum amount of building coverage allowed on the lot;
3. the number of dwelling units permitted on the lot;
4. the distance between the building and the street;
5. the distance between the building and the lot line;
6. the amount of parking required; and
7. other requirements applicable to specific residential, commercial or manufacturing activities, including the size and placement of signs.

The studio building site, prior to 2001, was designated as “M1-5”, (a basic manufacturing use), with a “C1-2 overlay”, which governs commercial development on Tenth Avenue. In addition it is subject to the “Clinton Special Zoning District”.

M1

M1 areas range from the Garment District in Manhattan, with its multistory lofts, to areas in the other boroughs with low-bulk plants. The M1 district is often an industrial front yard or a buffer to adjacent residential or commercial districts. Strict performance standards are common to all M1 districts. Light industries typically found in M1 areas include knitting mills, printing plants and wholesale service facilities. In theory, nearly all industrial uses can locate in M1 areas if they meet the rigorous performance standards required in the Zoning Resolution. Retail and office uses are also permitted. Use Group 4 community facilities are allowed in M1 zones by special permit but not in other manufacturing districts. Parking and loading requirements vary with district and use, but high density districts (M1-4 to M1-6) are exempt from parking requirements. Residential development is generally not allowed in manufacturing districts.

However, M1 districts with a significant number of residential buildings may be mapped M1-D. The D suffix
indicates that limited new residential uses are permitted, by City Planning Commission authorization, on
sites that meet specific criteria. The maximum FAR for permitted residential uses is 1.65. Accessory park-
ing for residences is not required, except in M1-ID districts.

Under certain criteria, artists may have joint living-work quarters in lofts in M1-5A and M1-5B districts
(mapped in the SoHo/NoHo area of Lower Manhattan). In M1-5M and M1-6M districts, the conversion of
non-residential floors of a building to dwelling units is permitted, provided a specified amount of floor area
is preserved for certain categories of manufacturing, industrial and commercial fuses. Conversion to
dwellings is also allowed, with various restrictions, in the Special Lower Manhattan Mixed Use District.

C1

C1 districts accommodate the retail and personal service shops needed in residential neighborhoods.
These districts are often mapped as an overlay along major avenues in otherwise residentially zoned neigh-
borhoods. They are widely mapped throughout the city. Typical uses include grocery stores, small dry
cleaning establishments, restaurants and barber shops. All cater to the daily needs of the immediate neigh-
borhood. Regulations limit commercial use to one or two floors.

Continuous, clustered retail development is desired in these districts. Local service and repair establish-
ments are not permitted to break the retail commercial continuity.

C1-1 to C1-5 districts are mapped as overlays—generally along major avenues—in residential districts,
while C1-6 to C1-9 districts are not mapped as overlays. When C1-1 to C1-5 districts are mapped in R
or R6B districts, the maximum commercial FAR is 1.0; when mapped in other R6 and R7 to R10
districts (including contextual districts with the suffix A, B or X), the maximum commercial FAR is 2.0.
Residential bulk in these commercial districts is governed by the regulations of the surrounding residential
district. The maximum commercial FAR in C1-6 to C1-9 districts (including the contextual districts) is 2.0,
while residential bulk ranges from that permitted in R7 districts for C1-6 districts to that permitted in R10
districts for C1-9 districts.

The regulations applicable to a new building located within a contextual commercial district are similar to
those of the corresponding contextual residence district with respect to allowable lot coverage, required
street wall height, the location of the front building wall and the permissible residential bulk and density.

Parking is not required in C1 areas mapped in densely populated areas (C1-5 through C1-9) because shops
in these neighborhoods attract and generate little automobile traffic. In less densely developed areas,
where most people drive, parking is required.

Samples of Sites that Are Re-Zoned Recently in NYC

Manhattan: The Bowery and Lower East Side
Market Rate Housing: A: Carlyle Group: Market Rate Development: Market Rate Housing: Global Strategy:
Since its establishment in 1987, The Carlyle Group has grown from a group of four investors with $5 mil-
lion in capital to one of the world’s largest private equity firms. As of March 2002, the firm had over $13.5
billion in capital committed to 20 private equity funds. We have developed the largest, most diversified
investor base of any private equity firm, with more than 535 investors from 55 countries. Source: Carlyle
Group Website:

A 19,186-sf block of retail space on two floors at the newly constructed NoLIta Place residential tower is
ready for occupancy and brokers are looking for high-end amenity-related tenants, including upscale
restaurants, a high-end showroom or a gourmet market. The 12-story, 65-unit luxury property was com-
pleted earlier this month

Queens, Long Island City, NYC 2012
Olympic Village Design Winner Announced Architectural Firm Morphosis’ Design Focuses on Athletes’
Needs and Experience.
May 26, 2004 / New York Governor George E. Pataki, New York City Mayor Michael R. Bloomberg, Queens Borough President Helen Marshall and NYC2012 today announced the architectural firm Morphosis (Santa Monica, CA) as the winner of NYC2012’s Olympic Village Design Study.

Morphosis was selected from among five finalists that included Henning Larsens Tegnestue A/S (Copenhagen, Denmark), MVRDV (Rotterdam, The Netherlands), Smith-Miller + Hawkinson Architects (New York, NY) and 2004 Pritzker Prize winner Zaha Hadid Architects (London, United Kingdom).

Brooklyn PRESS RELEASE: Brooklyn, NY, December 10, 2003 – Internationally acclaimed architect Frank Gehry and Bruce C. Ratner, President and CEO of Forest City Ratner Companies, today unveiled a master plan for the arena that will house the Nets basketball team that Mr. Ratner is seeking to bring to downtown Brooklyn. The Brooklyn Arena will be the centerpiece of a mixed-use development called Brooklyn Atlantic Yards. Mayor Michael Bloomberg, Brooklyn Borough President Marty Markowitz and Brooklyn-born basketball All-Star Bernard King hailed the exciting plan at a news conference in the Ceremonial Room of Brooklyn’s Borough Hall.

The 800,000 square-foot Brooklyn Arena will be the focal point of Brooklyn Atlantic Yards, an urban complex of housing, commercial and retail space, as well as six acres of landscaped public open space – including a park on the Arena’s roof, ringed by an open-air running track that doubles as a skating rink in winter with panoramic vistas facing Manhattan year-round.

The site for Brooklyn Atlantic Yards is adjacent to the third-largest transportation hub in New York City – Atlantic Terminal, where nine different subway lines and the Long Island Railroad converge. These modes of transportation will make visiting the Brooklyn Arena easy for fans, whether they’re coming from other boroughs or from the surrounding suburbs – drastically reducing the vehicular traffic that would be expected at a site that lacked mass transit.

The site has long been defined by transportation; its current primary use is as a storage yard for Long Island Railroad trains. Three blocks of exposed tracks lie between Atlantic Avenue and Pacific Street. The Brooklyn Atlantic Yards master plan proposes to relocate the storage tracks to the eastern part of the site, freeing the western part for the Arena. Decking over the new, relocated yards, will allow the architect to build the complex’s public open space and residential buildings on the eastern portion of the site.

“The existing railroad yard is really a barrier that isolates the neighborhoods north and south of Atlantic Avenue,” says Mr. Gehry. “We’ve designed a mixed-use development with offices, apartments, shops and the Arena, which breaks down the barrier and ties the neighborhood together in a way that’s appropriate with higher-density uses along Atlantic Avenue and lower-density uses near the more residential area on Dean Street.”

Programming: Brooklyn Atlantic Yards:

800,000 square feet for the sports arena – with 19,000 seats for basketball games and 20,000 as configured for other events, such as concerts;
six acres of publicly accessible open space;
—4.4 million square feet of residential, in approximately 4,500 units
—2.1 million square feet of commercial office space;
—300,000 square feet of retail space;
—3,000 parking spaces.
"Far West Side"
Study Area Marked by Square.

East Meets West

The “Far West Side” is a new name for an old neighborhood. Our studio will examine the redevelopment of the area bounded in this diagram by the square. We will explore its relationship to the swath of the city that spans from the Hudson River to the East River, from Hell’s Kitchen to the Mid Town Business District; from services and infrastructure to offices and housing.

Our plans will address an area of the city that will retain its services sector—major infrastructure and transportation—and simultaneously absorb 12 million sq feet of housing and 28 million square feet of offices in current redevelopment planning. The “Far West Side” and Mid Town Business District will merge as a new East-West sector of Manhattan.
The Studio Site is defined by:

**West 44th and 45th Streets**

and

**Tenth and Eleventh Avenues.**

The boundaries that surround this full city block include:

Recent 40-50 story tall speculative housing towers; a full city block of the UPS distribution center (FEDEX is nearby as well); The Chinese Consulate (A former hotel); small scale tenement housing blocks; services such as a full block long Hess gas station on 10th Avenue, the excavated railroad right of way leading to Pennsylvania Station (which has certain cases of
housing being built over it); and open land and parking lots, major commercial housing projects nearby as well as Mitchell-Lama developments. Times Square, The Port Authority, the Main Post Office and Pennsylvania Station are immediately Southeast of the site. Our site is one block from the Hudson River with close proximity to the Circle Line, bike paths, and the "Entrepid" battleship. below: View from Site: Looking East from 11th Avenue.
Form and Boundaries: Existing Zoning
Part 4: Public Housing: Urban Form Advances; Strife; Retreats; Revisions

1934: Clearance

The United States Housing Act of 1937—created by the Wagner Steagal Act of 1934—allocated 800,000,000 dollars in the form of federal loans to states to develop low income housing. In New York the prospect of 300,000,000 dollars in new federally provided funds loomed and the recently formed New York Housing Authority became an epi-center of urban development and design. Public housing became a major “new source—perhaps the great new source—of outside money” flowing into New York and whether one was interested in housing or not, the revenue stream was to become a major force of urban, political and social change. The shape these funds would take was to become a matter of architecture and planning; for the next 34 years housing would be a central focus of urban expenditure and urban policy. Indeed, the design of federally funded housing was to a large degree the design of the city itself. The implications of housing planning, financing and ultimately its architectural design have been at the root of issues that range from the construction of class and race divisions to mental health and social strife. Housing policies and architectural design have instigated changes in zoning and building massing, and have been at times the most poignant testing grounds for design ideas that began in the realm of the avant-garde and found themselves constructed in the very real situation of poverty, segregation and race relations. Housing prototypes by LeCorbusier’s (City of Tomorrow) published a decade earlier in 1924, became instrumental tools for “slum clearance;” in the early years of the New York Housing Authority tens of thousands of tenements were destroyed with the goal of “unslumming” the city. Then chairman of the Housing Authority, Edmond Borgia Butler, directly linked housing development with social and political change in claiming that “to justify further public housing, it is necessary to base public housing, on something more secure than improvement of the physical condition of the city, by substituting new bricks, mortar and steel for old.” “Public housing must not be used to regiment the tenants...poverty is not the sin of the poor; it is the sin of society,” claimed Butler.

Since its inception in 1934 the New York Housing Authority, like similar institutions in Washington DC, Chicago, San Francisco, etc, has advanced and then often retreated from its own policies: at the core of these development processes has been the poignant issue of how one characterises the forces that create poverty and how an empowered entity formalises its acts of intervention on behalf of an apparently less independent group of people.

1. Anthony Caro, “The Power Broker”
2. Michel Foucault, p 246.

Today: Yesterday / Baruch Houses: Avenue D, The Lower East Side/ Behind Glass: At the New York News Museum a Pulitzer Prize winning photograph shows children on the terrain-vague of a housing project plaza. Glass camera lenses, television screens and windows on poverty frame a view but fail to show the policy.

1926 and 1956: 20th Century Urban Tools for the management of strife and the production of the distributed city: The mass of city re-distributed according to volume, centrifugal force and speed. In the United States this distribution often followed class and racial lines.
The Move to Ownership: Into the Market.

The voucher program’s goals mark a new watershed in the design of housing. Between 1996 and 2000, as many as 70,000 units of existing public housing were demolished in the United States to make way for new privately owned houses and housing units. In most cases these new developments are dispersed houses and low rise housing blocks. The 1998 Housing and Urban Development (HUD) budget included funding for 100,000 new vouchers indicating that sixty-six years of design and urban renewal experiments that have ranged from slum clearing and major urban design initiatives (that at times have been understood to have warehoused the poorer members of our city) have now given way to a moderated form of free-market development. The federal government now acts as a benevolent advocate that vouches for those that might not otherwise be able to enter the free-market of housing. The effects of this change have palpable impact on architectural design: with dispersal and the trend towards ownership and smaller buildings has come the return of traditional building types and often iconic images of house and “home.” At the smaller scale of development the role of design and the professional services of the architect are displaced: the average design fee for a single family house, for example, in the United States is approximately .0026%. Your work will seek new building types, new construction techniques and new programming that can add to the history of housing types already in place by analyzing the potentials of dispersal and ownership.

The state funds made available in 1996 for down-payment voucher programs augmented financial incentives already in place for public-private partnerships in housing development—historic-preservation and low-income tax credits, tax abatements, and donated city land. This combination of incentives has sometimes influenced design decisions: historic-preservation tax credits are often coupled with low-income housing tax credits in a way that lowers development costs while mandating historical housing types. In most cases, however, these incentives have no clear architectural or urban expression, and the development processes usually result in typical speculative housing, with low-level building and design practices.

Rockaways Case Study: Arverne and Edgemere
What is NYCHA? Is it a concentrated entity or a dispersed organization? NYCHA’s own description from their website:

The New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA) provides decent and affordable housing in a safe and secure living environment for low- and moderate-income residents throughout the five boroughs. To fulfill this mission, NYCHA must preserve its aging housing stock through timely maintenance and modernization of its developments. NYCHA also administers a citywide Section 8 Leased Housing Program in rental apartments. Simultaneously, we work to enhance the quality of life at NYCHA by offering our residents opportunities to participate in a multitude of community, educational and recreational programs, as well as job readiness and training initiatives.

NYCHA was created in 1934. By the end of 1935 NYCHA dedicated First Houses, our first development, located on the Lower East Side of Manhattan.

The Way It Is Today

NYCHA is the largest public housing authority in North America. NYCHA’s Conventional Public Housing Program has 181,000 apartments in 345 developments throughout the City in 2,702 residential buildings containing 3,318 elevators. NYCHA has over 15,101 employees serving about 174,195 families and approximately 418,810 authorized residents.

NYCHA’s Public Housing represents 8.3% of the City’s rental apartments and are home to 5.2% of the City’s population.

NYCHA residents and Section 8 voucher holders combined occupy 12.2% of the City’s rental apartments and make up 8.0% of the City’s population.
New York City’s Public Housing: Many Histories, Many Forms.

The property, currently owned by the NYHPD, is defined at its perimeter by three types of state and federally assisted housing. In the midst of these policy and typological histories new market rate housing will be built in the near future if the RFP produces a successful development strategy.

Ocean Village is on the east perimeter of the site at Beach 59th Street; it was built by the Urban Development Corporation between 1968 and 1974 and offers subsidized housing to lower income families.

At the western perimeter of the site the Arverne and Hammel Houses were developed by the Housing Authority of New York; the average income for families in NYCHA apartments is $13,406 (as of January 1, 1999). Also on the western edge of the site are nine mid rise apartment slabs that were built as part of the Mitchell-Lama housing program; these cooperative apartments are owned by their residents. The NYHPD RFP would dilute that concentration in adding as many as 2000 units of new market rate housing to the area. While these new housing units are not subsidized at the point of sale they will be subsidized indirectly as a public/private partnership; the HPD will effectively donate the property to the developer who is awarded the contract. Major funding for infrastructure is anticipated to come from the state of New York thus further reducing development costs.

Conventional Public Housing in New York City

- The Bronx has 98 developments with 45,546 apartments
- Brooklyn has 101 developments with 59,005 apartments
- Manhattan has 103 developments with 54,255 apartments
- Queens has 26 developments with 17,372 apartments
- Staten Island has 11 developments with 4,860 apartments
- Six (6) developments consist of FHA Acquired homes located in more than one borough
- 42 developments are for seniors only; 15 seniors-only buildings exist within mixed-population developments
- NYCHA has more than 10,000 apartments designated for seniors only
- There also are 6,838 retrofitted apartments for families of persons who are mobility impaired as of April 22, 2003.
NYCHA on the Lower East Side: Case Study

WALD, LILLIAN HOUSES
54 Avenue D
New York, NY 10009
(212) 673-9306 Fax (212) 673-2140

1857 Units 16.46 Acres 4,536 people
113 Units an Acre / 275 people an acre

Street Boundaries
Avenue D/FDR Drive
East 6th Street/Houston Street
Subway Lines
F to Delancey Street or 2nd Avenue and East Houston – walk east down Delancey Street towards Columbia Street
J, M to Essex Street (follow above instructions)
L to 1st Avenue and 14th Street (follow bus instructions below)
Bus Lines
M14C, M14D going towards Avenue D and East 6th Street

NAMED AFTER: LILLIAN WALD (1867 – 1940) – She originated the public health nursing service in the country and
the Henry Street Nurses Settlement on the Lower East Side. A dynamic force for social reform she created widely
accepted models of public health and social service programs. Her nursing education in New York led her to con-
clude that tenement residents lacked proper health care, so she organized the Henry Street nurses group and later
expanded settlement programs to include social services, especially for children. Wald played a key role in organizing
the American Red Cross. She was a leader in the fight to abolish child labor and helped foster the creation of the
Children's Bureau in 1912. Wald Houses is in Manhattan.

SITE STATISTICS AND DESCRIPTION:
Lillian Wald Houses on Manhattan's Lower East Side has 16 buildings 10, 11, 13 and 14-stories tall with 1,857 apart-
ments housing an estimated 4,536 residents. Completed October 14, 1949, the 16.46-acre complex is between
F.D.R. Drive, Avenue D, East 6th and East Houston Streets.
RIIS, JACOB HOUSES
454 East 10th Street
Manhattan, NY 10009
(212) 228-2400 Fax (212) 426-8435

105 Units an Acre/247 people an acre

Street Boundaries
FDR Drive/Avenue D
East 6th Street/East 13th Street
Subway Lines
F to 6th Avenue and 14th Street – transfer to M14
L to 1st Avenue – transfer to M14
Bus Lines
M14C/M14D at 14th Street to 10th Street and Avenue D

NAMED AFTER: JACOB AUGUST RIIS (1849-1914) – Danish-born American journalist and reformer whose reports on living conditions in city slums led to improvements in housing and education. His stories in newspapers about slum dwellings and abuses in lower class urban life were collected in “How the Other Half Lives (1890).” Riis dwelled on the city’s slum tenements and how the people there lived. His vivid descriptions, often depicted on slides, caused audiences at his lectures to moan, shudder and even faint. He founded a pioneer settlement house in New York City named after him. Riis Houses is in Manhattan.

SITE STATISTICS AND DESCRIPTION:
Jacob Riis Houses on Manhattan’s Lower East Side has 13 buildings, 6, 13, and 14-stories high. The 11.73-acre complex has 1,187 apartments housing some 2,903 residents. Completed January 17, 1949, it is between East 8th and East 13th Streets, Avenue D and F.D.R. Drive.
Jacob Riis II on Manhattan’s Lower East Side has six buildings, 6, 13, and 14-stories tall. There are 577 apartments housing some 1,402 people. The 5.94-acre complex was completed January 31, 1949 and is between East 6th and East 8th Streets, Avenue D and the F.D.R. Drive.

LOWERS EAST SIDE II
CONSOLIDATION
640 East 5th Street
New York, NY 10009
(212) 529-8340 Fax (212) 477-3029

46 Units an Acre/146 people an acre

Street Boundaries
Avenue C
Avenue B
Subway Lines
F to Second Avenue (follow M21 bus directions below)
J, M to Delancey Street
L to First Avenue (follow M9, M14C and M14D bus directions below)
Bus Lines
M21 (northbound) to Avenue C and 5th Street – walk west on Avenue C

SITE STATISTICS AND DESCRIPTION:
Lower East Side II Houses consists of four, 3-story buildings with 186 apartments housing some 564 residents at the 3.85-acre site. Completed August 31, 1988, it is bordered by East 4th, East 5th and East 6th Streets, Avenues B, C and D in Manhattan.
The QWHRA is designed to allow the deconcentration of poverty in public housing blocks—the diagram to the right shows the three highest concentrations of poverty in NYC—the sites at Far Rockaway are almost exclusively public housing. Zip Code 11692 contains 15,000 units of public housing.

Up To Date: QWHRA: Public Housing’s New Territory:

**New Legislation: New Housing?**

In 1996, the Clinton administration’s plan to reduce the concentration of public housing in city centers was accelerated by the allocation of federal funding for housing vouchers. Intended to encourage property ownership among a wide spectrum of lower-income Americans, vouchers provide a one-time subsidy to the developer at the time of sale—in effect, supplying a down payment for the buyer. In 1998, the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act augmented this effort. These initiatives were both pragmatic and ideological, dealing with issues of poverty, the deconstruction of the racial and ethnic territories created by previous federal housing programs, and historic urban paradigms of density and centripetal concentration.

Poverty Deconcentration Plan: “Partly in reaction to the growing concentration of very poor households in public housing across the US, Congress passed the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998 (QHWRA). This legislation requires public housing authorities (PHAs) to adopt plans to address the problem of growing poverty concentrations and grants considerable flexibility in setting admissions policies to implement those plans. The US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has declined to offer a standard for what it considers an undue concentration of poverty within public housing. However, commentary to the Final Rule for producing Public Housing Agency Plans suggests that a property where the average family income is below 85% of PHA mean income indicates an unacceptable level of poverty concentration, while 115% or above PHA mean income indicates relatively “high income” developments. Basically, QHWRA requires that PHAs “deconcentrate” poverty by attempting to bring higher income families into high-poverty developments and very poor families into higher-income developments. By providing working role models that support enforcement of management rules, as well as access to job networks and information, the economic outcomes and security of tenants in or from high-poverty developments may be enhanced.”

National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials

http://www.nahro.org/legislative/federal/021999qhwra.html

Income Mix and Deconcentration Provisions

1. What are some of the incentives that may be offered to families to encourage income-mixing? The Act does not specify any particular incentives. However, an agency might consider using its locally-determined preferences, rent structure options, self-sufficiency programs, or other tools and flexibility provided in the Act, to encourage income-mixing.

2. Is it mandatory for every agency to have an income mix and deconcentration policy? Yes, it is. Agencies must describe it in their agency plan.

3. What problems are anticipated when mixing higher-income families into lower-income areas, without quotas? How does the Act impact issues about desegregation and deconcentration in public housing? Please refer to section 513, income targeting. The effective date of these provisions is October 21, 1998.

Public housing agencies are required to serve families at or below 80% of the area median income, and forty percent (40%) of new families must have incomes at or below 30% of the area median. Therefore, the difference in income levels is not expected to create insurmountable difficulties in blending these families in a certain development or community. Creating racial or income quotas is not permitted. The applicant alone must make the choice whether to accept the incentive to occupy a unit in a development where most incomes are either above or below that of the family. Agencies may not coerce applicants or take adverse actions against them.

The QWHRA: the Congressional Act

H. R. 4194
One Hundred Fifth Congress of the United States of America

AT THE SECOND SESSION
Begun and held at the City of Washington on Tuesday, the twenty-seventh day of January, one thousand nine hundred and ninety-eight.

Making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes. Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

For tenant-based assistance under the United States Housing Act of 1937 to help eligible families make the transition from welfare to work, $283,000,000 from the total amount provided under this heading, to be administered by public housing agencies (including Indian tribes and their tribally designated housing entities, as defined by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development), and to remain until expended: For tenant-based assistance under the United States Housing Act of 1937 to help eligible families make the transition from welfare to work, $283,000,000 from the total amount provided under this heading, to be administered by public housing agencies and to remain available until expended. . . SEC. 513. INCOME TARGETING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 16 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437n) is amended by striking the section designation and all that follows through the end of subsection (d) and inserting the following: “SEC. 16. (a) INCOME ELIGIBILITY FOR PUBLIC HOUSING.—

“(1) INCOME MIX WITHIN PROJECTS.—A public housing agency may establish and utilize income-mix criteria for the selection of residents for dwelling units in public housing projects, subject to the requirements of this section.

“(2) PHA INCOME MIX.—

“(A) TARGETING.—Except as provided in paragraph (4), of the public housing dwelling units of a public housing agency made available for occupancy in any fiscal year H. R. 4194—84 by eligible families, not less than 40 percent shall be occupied by families whose incomes at the time of commencement of occupancy do not exceed 30 percent of the area median income, as determined by the Secretary with adjustments for smaller and larger families.

“(3) PROHIBITION OF CONCENTRATION OF LOW-INCOME FAMILIES. “(A) PROHIBITION.—A public housing agency may not, in complying with the requirements under paragraph (2), concentrate very low-income families (or other families with relatively low incomes) in public housing dwelling units in certain public housing projects or certain buildings within projects. The Secretary shall review the income and occupancy characteristics of the public housing projects and the buildings of such projects of such agencies to ensure compliance with the provisions of this paragraph and paragraph (2).

“(B) DECONCENTRATION.—“(i) IN GENERAL.—A public housing agency shall submit with its annual public housing agency plan under section 5A an admissions policy designed to provide for deconcentration of
poverty and income-mixing by bringing higher income tenants into lower income projects and lower income tenants into higher income projects. This clause may not be construed to impose or require any specific income or racial quotas for any project or projects.

"(ii) INCENTIVES.—In implementing the policy under clause (i), a public housing agency may offer incentives for eligible families having higher incomes to occupy dwelling unit in projects predominantly occupied by eligible families having lower incomes, and provide for occupancy of eligible families having lower incomes in projects predominantly occupied by eligible families having higher incomes.

'(iii) FAMILY CHOICE.—Incentives referred to in clause (ii) may be made available by a public housing agency only in a manner that allows for the eligible family to have the sole discretion in determining whether to accept the incentive and an agency may not take any adverse action toward any eligible family for choosing not to accept an incentive and occupancy of a project described in clause (ii)(ii), Provided, That the skipping of a family on a waiting list was done to reach another family to implement the policy under clause.

Diagrams reveal relationships between densities to public housing, income, race and housing type on the Far Rockaway Peninsula. Arverne and Edgemere housing is generally 50 or more units per building. Income in this area is approximately 22% of Queens’s median income. At the western end of the peninsula wealthy areas such as Neponsit and Belle Harbor are predominantly Caucasian; dwelling types are almost exclusively single-family houses and the income per household is approximately 220% of Queens median income. Upper diagram by Anthony Burke.
Part 5: Symposia: City-War(s) Protest, Production—Strife

“Behrens contribution to AEG product design was to be in the realm of style rather than technique.”  

Two symposiums will consider the relationship of aesthetic, technical and political qualities of materials and production and their deployment within and as urban design and architecture. How do new materials and new applications or evolutions of existing materials offer new domestic or urban conditions?

Questions: Material . Labor:

Sometime around 1929 the percentage of the United States Gross National Product that could be attributed to steel production reached its peak. The quantity of steel produced continued to increase, however, and its per capita usage in the United States continued to climb until the 1970’s, but the degree to which steel production constituted the benchmark industry for the United States economy had been challenged for most of this century. Steel has nonetheless remained as an icon or linguistic and structural signifier of architectural integrity. In the late 1970’s the production of plastics surpassed that of steel in the United States. The manifestations of this shift have recently shown themselves in a new array of architectural and consumer goods—increasingly in architectural form itself the term plastic has come to mean a new form of maleability—and with this shift the concept of strife, violence and struggle that accompany labor or production have changed. At what level do you address a new theme of tectonics? and what means of strife or violence are to be anticipated within these new techniques?

Questions: Off Site Strife . On Site Control:

A new arena being configured between production and design, but also a new territory that is manifest across borders and spaces that have long lay fallow as cast-offs of prior class struggles and prior economic regimes. Why does Frank Gehry continually tell us that he is collaborating with a steel fabricator in the Mid West? What makes it important that our fabricators are usually remote? Evan Dougis produced his installation of Jean Prouvé’s mass production prototypes by way of a North Carolina CNC milling plant. The literal distance between Dougis and the mill seemed to be in counter-point to the break metal and sweat of Prouvé presumably urban factory. Architects today are quickly reconfiguring how they interact with high-end and low-end industrial production sources, wherever they are, and in doing so we are re-entering the capital realms that were the engines of twentieth century urbanism. It is hard not to find it dizzying to engage in new production techniques—especially when a low end computer and a dsl line can make you a local participant in fabrication done far off site—but as new borders are drawn between old economic entities new territories will emerge. At the moment, the network of theories that has sustained our first dive into new production is written within philosophies of practices rather than forms (Foucault, LeFevre, Situationists), and within time-based theories of immemnence and becoming (Bergson, Deleuze). Felix Guattari, in his essay “Regimes, Pathways, Subjects,” suggested that a spate of technologies that sustained new production in the post war era had lead to what he called the same “monstrous realms of alienation.” He was, of course, at some level correct, but he also stated that one of the reasons this was so was that the new waves of technology he was referring to did not increase an individual’s ability to enter into producing the world—it did allow a wider more democratic means to choose from what had been produced.

Questions: Techniques Revealed . Techniques Concealed:

“It is tempting to fall back on the Foucauldian formula that identifies the civilized calm of liberal democracy as a violence refoulée, refined beyond perceptibility yet all the more total for that. It is a seductive and convincing hypothesis, but perhaps worth avoiding for that very reason. You will note that in Mutations, our approach was to emphasize precisely the violence and just how unhidden it now is, the blatant lack of refinement, the horrific in-your-face-ness of the American City as the direct indexical marking of a power that is smug, adventurous and unchallenged. There is certainly a lot going on beneath the surface as Foucault reminds us, but one should guard against becoming so refined that one forgets to look at the surface too. In the end however, the true explanatory power resides in connecting the two continuums. In Mutations, although we showed hundreds of images of a society seemingly deliberately tearing itself apart with contradictions, the real engines of transformation, as the texts argued, were to be found in the mutations of knowledge and in the means of social administration itself. Automation, for example, did not bring democracy to America, rather the opposite.” Sanford Kwinter—interview in “32” no. 4.

The issues of form and new materials—forms and the technologies embedded in their production—have been at the center of debates around design, branding and the production of household goods as commodities as early as Peter Behren’s trademark designs for AEG. The relationship of new materials to domestic culture, to speed, efficiency and the rationalization of housing and the products that occupy the domestic landscape have their roots in technologies that architecture has at times tried to reveal and at times evaded. What potential lies in fusing these initiatives; what potential lies in chemical engineering that stabilized new materials and new forms that has recently? These symposiums will discuss the role of new materials in architectural design and in the products that form the domestic landscape.
Redistribution and the Conservative House

Federalist era law has historically been the conservative benchmark that challenged overt re-distribution of monies or property to compensate for a free-market: "To take from one, because it is thought his own industry and that of his fathers, has acquired too much, in order to spare to others, who, or whose fathers have not exercised equal industry or skill, is to violate arbitrarily the first principle of association." This section of the studio will examine the policies of redistribution such as the sale of tax credits, bond financing of lower-income housing and the subsidisation of home ownership. Beginning with the New Deal and tracing a path to Voucher Programs, this seminar will address the role of the state in producing housing in the United States. In 1996 and 1998, two landmark pieces of legislation passed the United States Congress that dramatically altered the course of U.S. Federal housing policy and also its foundational relation to both the architecture and planning of European forms of early modern housing, but also the degree to which the U.S. Federal government relies on non-market based financial means to address low cost and poverty housing production. This seminar will address how the role of the state is conceived at the outset of federal housing policy in the U.S. In 1937, and how both in form and in ideology United States federal housing has been derived from European models of housing based in socialism.

*To take from one, because it is thought his own industry and that of his fathers, has acquired too much, in order to spare to others, who, or whose fathers have not exercised equal industry or skill, is to violate arbitrarily the first principle of association.*

Federalist era law at the turn of the 19th of the century was succinct and direct in its resistance to the redistribution of capital and surplus in means other than those of a free-market. The redistribution of wealth from one party to another based on a negation of the market’s fairness or ability to sustain opportunity for all was directly rejected in Federalist era congressional legislation and debate. The right to property and its profits was historically guaranteed by law. In reality no such clarity is actually put into practice: federal subsidies for housing routinely adjust affordability and the tendencies of the market: the largest single housing subsidy in the United States is actually the mortgage interest deduction provided to home owners—mostly the middle class and predominantly Caucasian. This symposium will examine the term re-distribution in relation to housing development in New York City but also in terms of a broad array of urban issues from shopping and retail to automobiles and transportation.

This symposium will present dimensional and numeric attributes of major urban infrastructural systems in comparison with those of federal housing programs. The comparison is intended to offer insight into housing’s ability to act as a localizing framework for the organisation of life as it competes with economic mechanisms whose prowess in shaping urban space and life at times seems omnipotent. The goal is to examine the possibility of grafting architectural potential at the intersection and melding of urban systems of finance, structure and productive mechanisms.

Data comparison sample/Borrowing time: On any given weekday the aggregate population of the city of Houston, drives an average of 53,000,000 miles. Translated at the average speed of commuter traffic this amounts to an aggregate drive time of 35 years per day. To drive those 35 years a day, Houston purchased more than 460 million dollars worth of automobiles in 1996—the United States accounted for 525.9 billion dollars in car sales that same year. If valued against one of the most prominent cultural monuments built in the last decade, auto sales in the United States in 1996 could have funded 525 Getty Centers in a single year. These numbers are technology’s numeric benchmarks (in this case very slow technologies) culled from procedures whose mechanics have outpaced architecture’s attempts to dimensionally shape space-public space, work space, living space, productive space, etc.)
The first symposium examined Federal, City and Local housing plans that add equity to a housing purchase by adding financial value at the front end of a purchase. These plans achieve this by providing either individual or collective equity for a development: a housing project is abetted by large-scale equity infusion in the form of tax credits or an individual purchase is abetted by small scale rent or purchase subsidy. It gives the buyer a boost and a head start in the process of ownership - it is a shield against accrued interest. Equity, however, is affected dramatically in the way a building is produced by a developer long before it's purchased. The standard mass-produced housing unit, as a product of fundamental building trades such as dry-walling, framing or painting, accrues value-surplus for its developer based on the efficient division of labor processes and the replication of basic building techniques: these techniques have direct architectural consequence and they directly affect the accrual of income, surplus and profit in the development of housing. Buildings are produced by processes that are designed to expedite the construction process and to alleviate the accrued interest and carrying costs of construction financing: Tectonic decisions have immediate impact on the production of architecture as well as the production of income and profit. How can one reveal the collaboration of these trades and processes or intuit the latent energy in a work of architecture. This symposium will examine the formal and material histories of housing type in New York.

**THE RISE OF THE STANDARD** was based in early forms of Taylorist work practices, and in the metaphysics of an idealized commodity—a segregate entity that can be isolated from the field it was created within and occupies. Architects today are entering directly into production, or at least are communicating directly with producers; the concept of the standard is being revised. The door has only just opened to considering what new production really means and what it will be applied to. If it is applied to material, it will indeed be tied to economic value, and it will face future benchmark crises. At the moment this is the race, and this is direct application. Is it possible to take on a more ephemeral and recalcitrant task of addressing the nature of the global urban spaces being constructed today within not just the literal networks of software and industrial communications, but within the spatial milieus of a newly organized labor and production that Felix Guattari and many others have enunciated? The first world’s relations to third world labor; relations between major financial centers and local production forms; or simply the space of the city itself. This will change—in this symposium we will suggest that in the first major wave of transformation we can and should expect both new extremely conductive spaces to emerge—live spaces—and also new zones of unanticipated loss and atrophy. As we enter into production—and leave the linguistic aspects of previous architectural theories behind—we are entering once again into the realms of industry and capital. We are doing so in a way that is both intensely local and segregate—but also, by nature, deterritorialized.

How can new technologies of materials, construction and production methods allow for cost-efficiency, flexible design, speed of construction, and low-energy consumption? How can these innovations be implemented both at the large scale of the building industry as well as the ad hoc scale of the individual project? How can a balance between traditional techniques and technological innovation be achieved that permits the experiment of the new as well as the refinement of the old?
Three presentations led by GSAPP faculty will help set the stage for our work:

Lance Freeman, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Planning
Case Study: “Far West Side” Studio, Spring 2004

Professor Lance Freeman will present his studio’s work on September 13. The documentation of his studio is available at:


“The history of Clinton/Hell’s Kitchen is a narrative in which an immigrant slum was transformed into a mixed-use neighborhood that services the larger region through both infrastructure and economic activity. Several major transportation facilities, such as Penn Station, the Lincoln Tunnel, and the West Side Highway, are located in close proximity to the study area and fundamentally impact the character of the neighborhood in terms of traffic and the local economy. The industrial economy that was once connected to the Hudson River has given way to new sectors that provide important support services to the city-wide and regional economies. Many of these businesses take advantage of relatively low rents, highway accessibility, and close proximity to customers and suppliers, especially the auto sales and service sector and entertainment related businesses.

Laurie Hawkinson
Professor of Architecture
Smith-Miller Hawkinson Architects

Professor Laurie Hawkinson will present the work of her firm Smith-Miller Hawkinson for the design of the Olympics Village on a site at Queens West in New York City. Smith-Miller Hawkinson were one of five firms invited to design housing on the Queens waterfront as part of NYC 2012’s Olympics bid. The housing was designed to serve the Olympics and then become market rate housing. The presentation will present the housing and its relation to the over-all NYC 2012 planning—our site on the “Far West Side” is a component of the same planning initiatives.

Steven Holl
Steven Holl Architects
Professor of Architecture

Professor Steven Holl will present his firm’s work on housing in four sites in Japan and China. The Fukuoka and Makuhari developments in Japan and projects at Nanning and Beijing in China.
Schedule

Week 1
Sept 8  Lottery Room  Room 114 @ 4PM
10  Studio Meeting with Instructors

Week 2
13  2PM—Professor Lance Freeman, Planning Presentation: the “Far West Side” Studio
15
17

Week 3
20  2PM—Symposium 1: Bell/Rothstein/Miljacki
22
24

Week 4
27  Programmatic Vector Review—KR/MB—AM/SM—RM/DT
29
Oct 1  2PM—Professor Laurie Hawkinson, NYC 2012 Housing Presentation

Week 5
4
6
8  2PM—Symposium 2: Marble/Marino/Turnbull

Week 6
11
13
15

Week 7
18
20
22  Housing Studio Priority Mid Term Days

Week 8
25  Housing Studio Priority Mid Term Days
27
29

Week 9
Nov 1  Election Holiday
3  2PM—Professor Steven Holl—Four Housing Projects
5

Week 10
8
10
12
**SCHEDULE**

Week 11  
15  
17  
19

Week 12  
22  
24  
26   Thanksgiving Holiday

Week 14  
29  
Dec 1  
3

Week 15  
6   First Year Priority  
7  
8   Final Housing Priority  
9  
10

Final Requirements

1” = 60'-0” site model

1” = 1'-0” Site Plan showing context

1/16” = 1'-0” Final model showing context.  

1/8” = 1'-0” plans, sections, elevations for all buildings.  

Partial Section Model  
at 1/4” =1'-0”

1/4” detail plan of units

Perspective of interior and exterior views.

Each studio will provide a site model that is jointly prepared.
Between 1996 and 2001, as U.S. housing policy increasingly moved toward less reliance on direct subsidy of low income and poverty housing, more than fifty-one thousand public housing units were razed or converted. Most of this transformation—directed to a nationwide network of U.S. Housing Authority sites—was done through a program based within the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The program is titled Hope VI. Hope VI supplies funding to demolish “distressed” public housing units, and is intended also to create a greater demographic mix in public housing blocks. While income is a standard denominator used to reveal the social demographic, any number of other variables such as race or family make up were also used. Hope IV has been understood as both a boost to public housing—it does fund renovation—but also as a force that at its core diminishes the number of public housing units available. The program is now more than ten years old, and its ramifications while clearly visible are also far from understood: it is only beginning.

Hope VI program have, had a very clear architectural, and urban design impact and expression: this places the program’s initiatives firmly within our profession’s expertise, yet in its social and political dimensions it test the limits of what architecture can address? Or does it? This is a central question of facing our studio. In most cases, former tenants of public housing apartments – almost universally designed within formal traditions of CIAM inspired modernism — were relocated to newly constructed low- rise housing blocks, condominiums, and townhouses (containing apartments). Within architectural paradigms the debate about this has often centered on the overt changes in building design. Its roots in this arena are deep, and can be traced to an evolution that included housing design in Europe—the Berlin Internationale Bauausstellung (IBA) of 1984-87, for example—and U. S. post modernism and what has become known today as New Urbanism. While the formal antecedents for Hope VI redevelopment can be argued to be clear, it is the structural changes in the policies that are less scrutinized and perhaps as compelling to architectural design and to conceptions of space.

Hope VI is at it’s a core program of remediation—funds are literally for architectural renovation and repair; and for a far more ambiguous—some critics would say unjust — project of social renovation. Critics contend it is the commitment to low income, and poverty housing that is being renovated, i.e., diminished. The dynamics of the market, and its potential for innovation, are increasingly the force that is expected to pro-
vide sustenance to lower income people. The questions that comes with programs such as Hope VI is to what degree do they represent a move away from state initiated practices that run contrary to markets.

Architecture and planning have been deeply embedded in these questions for a century—from literal incantations to remove housing production from speculative practices but still engage technology by Walter Gropius, to recent innovations in how architecture engages production and standardization (the Non-Standard is one example)—the questions about markets and inequity persist in architecture and today Public Housing is being forced to confront them in new ways.

1. Cleared — Prevented

“Federal law required families on urban renewal sites to be relocated in a considerate, human manner. Every block of the area... Brimmed over with indications that the families on the Manhattanville site were simply fleeing their homes into the nearest available shelter, no matter how inadequate.” 1

The 2005 Housing Studio at Columbia will work on two sites simultaneously—both sites fall within the Brooklyn neighborhood of Brownsville. The two sites are situated within walking distance of each other—but they fall within very different areas of the neighborhood. Each area faces unique circumstances that will affect its future in terms of planning and housing development. The housing studio will ask each team to analyze the area, both within New York City, and within ultimately greater conditions of public housing, and urbanism in the United States. One of the two sites is a site owned by the New York City Housing Authority; the second site is adjacent to property owned by NYCHA, but it is privately held, and will be privately developed. Your work will require you to look closely at the history of the Housing Authority in the United States—and its particular role in New York City. NYCHA is a federal agency; like the Newark Housing Authority or the Los Angeles Housing Authority, it operates at the city level, but is a federal organization networked to other housing authorities nationwide. Our work begins with a decade old program that has greatly affected the architecture and planning—the urbanism—of federal housing authorities. The program is titled Hope VI, and it is perhaps the most instrumental policy change that has attempted to link the actual architecture/planning of public housing with the social, racial and economic conditions of its residents since public housing’s inception in 1937.

The ultimate goal of our semester is to design housing that can address the needs of the two locations, and the people who live there in ways that provide an alternative to issues of displacement that are not only part of public housing’s history, but are also a component of the Hope VI renewal programs. This syllabus gives background on the Hope VI programs—however, the studio will require each team to do research on the program. To do this we ask that you consider the history of the housing authority, and the potential futures that are now being projected onto the neighborhood of Brownsville—a neighborhood that has been tremendously shaped by public housing during the past fifty years. One studio site is literally in the process of being cleared of former public housing—transformed radically from its past. This is a site of current and contentious displacement, although the circumstances are far different than those of 1963 mentioned in the quote that opens this syllabus. The second site is facing what some project to be major change—not by way of literal architectural or human displacement —clearing— but by the impending set of market forces and private development that are newly active in Brownsville, and that will change the area in the next decade.
2. Site/s

Site — 1. Prospect Plaza Houses
Source of Action: Department of Housing and Urban Development:
Studio to Design: 430 Saratoga Avenue: demolished: 102 Units
Location: Prospect Place, Saratoga Avenue, Howard Avenue, Park Place.
Re-Entering: This site of Prospect Plaza is currently partially demolished to make way for renovation and for new housing.

HUD Involvement at Brownsville:
[quoted]

Prospect Plaza Houses, located in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville communities of Brooklyn, was built in 1974 and originally consisted of four-masonry 12 and 15 story buildings containing 368 public housing units. Several years back the New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA), noting the deteriorating condition of the property and seeking to take advantage of HUD’s new vision for public housing embodied in the HOPE VI program, applied to HUD for funding to rethink and rebuild the complex. NYCHA was then rewarded for their creative vision through receipt of $21.4 million HOPE VI grant from HUD in 1999 for the revitalization of Prospect Plaza and the surrounding neighborhood. To date, one tower containing 102 units has already been demolished for development of new community center, commercial space and additional rental units. The June 27th event marked the next step toward revitalizing the remainder of the property. The completed work that will result will contain approximately 670 units: 323 public housing rental units, 273 non-public housing rental units (in townhouse configurations) and 37 two-family homeowner units. The total project, one which envisions a more mixed-use/mixed ownership concept, will in the end cost over $255 million.

[Source: NYCHA] The New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA) provides affordable housing to nearly 420,000 authorized low- and moderate-income residents living in 345 housing developments with nearly 2,700 residential buildings that include approximately 181,000 apartments in the five boroughs. The Bronx has 98 developments, Brooklyn has 101 developments, Manhattan has 103 developments, Queens has 20 developments and Staten Island has 11 developments. 42 of all such developments are for seniors only, and there are 6 FHA “acquired homes” under NYCHA’s jurisdiction as well.

Site — 2. Livonia Avenue
Action Source: Private Development / Federal Housing and Urban Development:
Studio to Design: Variable Units and Density.
Location: Livonia Avenue, south side of Livonia Avenue between Junius and Rockaway Avenue
Entering: Private Development

3. Studio Programming: Two Sites:
Alternative Futures to Hope VI Redevelopment

Each studio design team is asked to research the history of the Prospect Plaza and its current conversion with Hope VI funding. You are asked to design the complex in a way that can simultaneously meet the demands of Hope VI programming—that is adding new non-public housing and mixed use to the site as originally planned—and to retain the original density and number of public housing units. This can be accomplished with the simultaneous use of a site on Livonia Avenue.

The programming for the studio will encompass a single entire block of Prospect Plaza. This block contains the two remaining towers and the absent demolished tower. The existing tower on the opposite block remains, and is not part of our studio site though it will have an impact of course.

Studios can choose to either keep the existing two towers on our block or re-design without them—but the studio program asks that the full original provisions of the NYCHA Public Housing that were on the
block be provided for—266 units—and that the new non public housing be provided as well—either on site or by using a Livonia Street Site. Livonia Street is not understood in the syllabus as either primary, secondary or equal to the Prospect Plaza site—this is a design project to be formulated with each team.

Each studio should take on an analysis of the existing programming, and the changes that are underway. At the end of this analysis phase the faculty will meet to determine a direction culled from the work of the entire studio. The total new housing can be provided on the block of Prospect Plaza, and also provided at the Livonia Street site—studios must provide a method of allocating units. Our goal is to meet the standards of Hope VI in terms of new non-Public Housing can be added without losing existing Public Housing units.

The total number of units to be provided for is 395—allocated in a mix between that would produce 266 NYCHA units, 37 two family units, (74 units total) and 55 open market rental units. With individual studio analysis this can be revised — Hope VI is a program that provides new market rate housing by reducing the public housing units—as such each studio will need to analyze the program and the impact at Prospect Plaza.

When you look at the number please note that we are providing for NYCHA housing in three—not four—of the original towers. Our total number of NYCHA units is then 266 units rather than the 368 in the four towers. Extra programming such as retail, or institutional spaces should be addressed in diagrammatic form to show how it relates to the housing.


City: New York
Official PHA Name: New York City Housing Authority
Name of Site: Prospect Plaza Houses
HOPE VI Coordinator: Sharon Ebert

FY 1998 Revitalization Grant: $21.4 million
FY 1998 Demolition Grant: $731,688

In March of 1999, NYCHA was awarded a HOPE VI grant for the revitalization of Prospect Plaza Houses located in the Oceanhill / Brownsville section of Brooklyn, NY. HUD approved NYCHA’s Revitalization Plan in November 1999. NYCHA has five years from the date of the award to expend all HOPE VI funds, or, until spring 2004.

The entire budget for the Revitalization Plan is over $90 million and includes HOPE VI funds, Capital Funds, private equity, private loans, financial contributions from local/city elected officials, and in-kind contributions from various community and social service partners.

This initiative is integrated with ongoing community development and neighborhood revitalization activities in the surrounding area, and enlists the participation of resident leaders, community-based organizations, elected officials and private entities. To maintain a presence in the community and provide Residents with direct access to services and program information, NYCHA’s Department of Housing Finance and Development has identified temporary space within the Brownsville Multi-Service Center, 444 Thomas Boyland Street, for use as a Revitalization Activities Field Office. The Center is owned by the NYC Human Resources Administration (HRA) and operated by The Miracle Makers, Inc., a community-based not-for-profit.

The office is centrally located to accommodate Prospect Plaza residents who have temporarily relocated elsewhere in Brooklyn and Queens, and close to public transportation (bus and subway). The building is organized to promote service referrals—local and citywide providers are housed in the same place—reduc-
ing travel and delays. Agencies operating in the Center include the Urban League, Central Brooklyn Neighborhood Employment, Community Board 16 and Miracle Makers (childcare and service referrals).

Built in 1974, Prospect Plaza Houses is now characterized by severe physical and social distress. The low-income community, in which the development is situated, would benefit from new development and the area’s low-income residents are in need of (educational, life-/job-skills) training and services tailored to their particular needs. NYHCA seeks to transform Prospect Plaza into a viable, mixed-income and mixed-use development.

Under the Revitalization Plan, NYCHA and three Developments teams will rehabilitate 200 existing dwelling units and construct 252 units to replace 368 existing public housing units. One Tower (102 dwelling units) is slated for demolition. Specifically, the Plan includes:

- Construction of 37, two-family, three story brick townhouses on City-owned parcels, of which one unit is owner-occupied and one unit is rental.

- Construction of three- and four-story brick townhouse-like buildings for a total of 138 rental units on a City-owned parcel. Eighty-three (83) dwelling units will receive public housing operating subsidy and be for public housing residents, the remaining 55 will be rented to the general public: all dwelling units will have tax credit rents.

- Demolition of a 15-story masonry building (Tower #1) due to underground water problems and substantial rehabilitation of the three remaining towers resulting in a minimum of 322 new dwelling units of which 240 will be for public housing residents and the remaining units will be for the general public. All dwelling units will have tax credit rents. The 240 public housing dwelling units will receive public housing operating subsidies.

Of the 452 dwelling units, 355 units will be reserved for Prospect Plaza residents; the remaining 84 units will be for the general public. In addition, a 40,000 square foot (SF) multi-functional community center that will house a 10,000 SF child day care center, a 10,000 SF job incubator center and a 20,000 SF recreation center will be built on the site of the demolished tower. Small neighborhood retail is also planned along Saratoga Avenue. $3.8 million is set aside to provide community and supportive services to the residents.

**YCHA: Prospect Plaza Housing Revitalization**

The opening phase of a $148 million HOPE VI revitalization plan for the New York City Housing Authority’s Prospect Plaza Houses in the Ocean-Hill/Brownsville section of Brooklyn [has begun] for 37 new two-family townhouses.

[The groundbreaking] on Dean Street between Saratoga and Howard Avenues marks the site where 34 new two-family homes will be constructed. (Three two-family town homes will also be constructed on vacant land on Sterling Place.) The first row of the modular town homes, which are being built at the Brooklyn Navy Yard, were on display.
Brownsville

Community District 16 : Brownsville/Ocean Hill
(Based on Census 2000 data—prepared by Common Ground Community, NY.

Demographics:
Borders Bedford-Stuyvesant, Crown Heights, and East New York
Vacant lots account for 10% of total land mass
Total population 85,343
There are 20,032 families in Brownsville
Nearly half of these are families of single mothers and their children

Housing:
84% of all Brownsville units are renter occupied
30% of all Brownsville units are public housing
42% of all families live in Public Housing
858 Brownsville families have become homeless over the last 4 years.

Income:
Median Family Income: $21,560, 50% of households have income below $20,000
39% of the population receives income supports of some kind

Education/Employment
40% of residents do not have a high school diploma
51% of residents above the age of 16 are not in the labor force

Reserve Reading at Butler Library: Brownsville
Pritchett, Wendell E. Brownsville, Brooklyn: Blacks, Jews, and the Changing Face of the Ghetto
Wilson, William J. The truly Disadvantaged: the Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy
Freedman, Samuel G., Upon this Rock: the Miracles of a Black Church
Chatanow, Gerald. Another time, Another Place: a Neighborhood Remembered

Film
Brownsville, Black and White in the Media Center / Butler Library.

5. About HOPE VI

Overview / The HOPE VI program serves a vital role in the Department of Housing and Urban Development’s efforts to transform Public Housing.

The specific elements of public housing transformation that have proven key to HOPE VI include:

* Changing the physical shape of public housing
* Establishing positive incentives for resident self-sufficiency and comprehensive services that empower residents
* Lessening concentrations of poverty by placing public housing in nonpoverty neighborhoods and promoting mixed-income communities
* Forging partnerships with other agencies, local governments, nonprofit organizations, and private businesses to leverage support and resources

Any Public Housing Authority that has severely distressed public housing units in its inventory is eligible to apply. Indian Housing Authorities and Public Housing Authorities that only administer the Housing Choice Vouchers (Section 8) Program are NOT eligible to apply. Individuals are also NOT eligible to apply.
HOPE VI Revitalization grants fund:
* Capital costs of major rehabilitation, new construction and other physical improvements
* Demolition of severely distressed public housing
* Acquisition of sites for off-site construction
* Community and supportive service programs for residents, including those relocated as a result of revitalization efforts

HOPE VI Demolition grants fund the demolition of severely distressed public housing, relocation, and supportive services for relocated residents.

History and Background
National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing

The HOPE VI Program, originally known as the Urban Revitalization Demonstration (URD), was developed as a result of recommendations by the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing, which was charged with proposing a National Action Plan to eradicate severely distressed public housing. The Commission recommended revitalization in three general areas:
* physical improvements,
* management improvements, and
* social and community services to address resident needs.

As a result, HOPE VI was created by the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993 (Pub.L. 102-389), approved on October 6, 1992.
6. Public Housing: Urban Form
Advances; Strife; Retreats; Revisions—Clearing

1937: Clearance: Remediation—PREVENTION

The United States Housing Act of 1937—created by the Wagner Steagal Act of 1934—allocated 800,000,000 dollars 1 in the form of federal loans to states to develop low income housing. In New York the prospect of 300,000,000 dollars in new federally provided funds loomed and the recently formed New York Housing Authority became an epi-center of urban development and design. Public housing became a major “new source—perhaps the great new source—of outside money” flowing into New York and whether one was interested in housing or not, the revenue stream was to become a major force of urban, political and social change. The shape these funds would take was to become a matter of architecture and planning; for the next 34 years housing would be a central focus of urban expenditure and urban policy. Indeed, the design of federally funded housing was to a large degree the design of the city itself. The implications of housing planning, financing and ultimately its architectural design have been at the root of issues that range from the construction of class and race divisions to mental health and social strife. Housing policies and architectural design have instigated changes in zoning and building massing, and have been at times the most poignant testing grounds for design ideas that began in the realm of the avant-garde and found themselves constructed in the very real situation of poverty, segregation and race relations. Housing prototypes by LeCorbusier’s (City of Tomorrow) published a decade earlier in 1924, became instrumental tools for “slum clearance;” in the early years of the New York Housing Authority tens of thousands of tenements were destroyed with the goal of “unslumming” the city. Then chairman of the Housing Authority, Edmond Borgia Butler, directly linked housing development with social and political change in claiming that “to justify further public housing, it is necessary to base public housing, on something more secure than improvement of the physical condition of the city, by substituting new bricks, mortar and steel for old.” “Public housing must not be used to regiment the tenants...poverty is the not the sin of the poor; it is the sin of society,” claimed Butler.

Since its inception in 1937 the New York Housing Authority, like similar institutions in Washington DC, Chicago, San Francisco, etc, has advanced and then often retreated from its own policies: at the core of these development processes has been the poignant issue of how one characterises the forces that create poverty and how an empowered entity formalises its acts of intervention on behalf of an apparently less independent group of people.

1. Anthony Caro, “The Power Broker”
2. Michel Foucault, p 246.

Today: Yesterday / Baruch Houses: Avenue D, The Lower East Side/ Behind Glass: At the New York News Museum a Pulitzer Prize winning photograph shows children on the terrain-vague of a housing project plaza. Glass camera lenses, television screens and windows on poverty frame a view but fail to show the policy

1926 and 1956: 20th Century Urban Tools for the management of strife and the production of the distributed city: The mass of city re-distributed according to volume, centrifugal force and speed. In the United States this distribution often followed class and racial lines
Ownership

The Move to Ownership: Into the Market.

The voucher program’s goals mark a new watershed in the design of housing. Between 1996 and 2000 as many as 57,000 units of existing public housing were demolished in the United States (under Hope VI plans) to make way for new privately owned houses and housing units. In most cases these new developments are dispersed houses and low rise housing blocks. The 1998 Housing and Urban Development (HUD) budget included funding for 100,000 new vouchers indicating that sixty-six years of design and urban renewal experiments that have ranged from slum clearing and major urban design initiatives (that at times have been understood to have warehoused the poorer members of our city) have now given way to a moderated form of free-market development. The federal government now acts as a benevolent advocate that vouches for those that might not otherwise be able to enter the free-market of housing. The effects of this change have palpable impact on architectural design: with dispersal and the trend towards ownership and smaller buildings has come the return of traditional building types and often iconic images of house and “home.” At the smaller scale of development the role of design and the professional services of the architect are displaced: the average design fee for a single family house, for example, in the United States is approximately .0026%. Your work will seek new building types, new construction techniques and new programming that can add to the history of housing types already in place by analyzing the potentials of dispersal and ownership.

The state funds made available in 1996 for down-payment voucher programs augmented financial incentives already in place for public-private partnerships in housing development—historic-preservation and low-income tax credits, tax abatements, and donated city land. This combination of incentives has sometimes influenced design decisions: historic-preservation tax credits are often coupled with low-income housing tax credits in a way that lowers development costs while mandating historical housing types. In most cases, however, these incentives have no clear architectural or urban expression, and the development processes usually result in typical speculative housing, with low-level building and design practices.
Manhattan and Brooklyn: A new continuous re-development agenda reaches into the center of Brooklyn.

A new federal emphasis on policies that foster the role of private finance in housing development, coupled with a city and state focus on the waterfront as a factor in the redevelopment in New York City create a dynamic and rapidly changing role for architects and planners. A snapshot of areas facing major redevelopment and new housing initiatives in Manhattan is being mirrored in the Bronx, Queens and especially in Brooklyn.

Queens: 1. Long Island City Waterfront and “Art Loop” including MoMA QNS.


Staten Island: 10. Fresh Kills Landfill (not shown)

Bronx: 11. South Bronx becomes Downtown Bronx (not shown)

7. Private Housing and Public Planning: Into Brooklyn

*The first principle of association guarantees the “free exercise of his industry and the fruits acquired by it.”
Thomas Jefferson 1

The role of housing in New York City has a renewed sense of potential as it finds itself at the center of new urban initiatives that rely on housing as a major force in redevelopment. From the Mayor’s Plan for New York to shifts at the federal level in Public Housing organization housing is central as a domestic entity and as a financially crucial urban development tool. These changes are evident at the national level, as housing policy in the United States is increasingly relying on the market place to spur innovation in design.
When the first public housing projects were proposed in the United States there was immediate and strong reaction from housing developers and banking associations that accused the programs of being "unfair government competition." In 1938, three years after the formation of the New York Housing Authority, the newly formed Housing Authority of Houston faced strong resistance that declared the agency to be Socialist competition with the free market. Today, 68 years later, at the outset of a new federal housing initiative that offers assistance to families to purchase rather than rent a dwelling the debate has come full circle. Current housing policies in the United States have, to an unprecedented degree, forgone the construction of collective and financially subsidised rental housing and focused government housing initiatives in the open market of private developers and the single-family house or low rise townhouse/condominium. Federal home buyer voucher programs are aimed at helping families purchase a dwelling from a consortium of speculative builders and non-profit developers rather than rent a federal or city owned subsidised apartment.

These programs provide lower income individuals or families with a down payment voucher that in effect disperses federal housing initiatives into a moderated version of a free market. The voucher is often a short-term lien that is forgiven in full after five years of ownership provided the home owner proves to be reliable as a mortgage risk. Individual ownership is believed to create a strong foundation for the re-development of neighbourhoods. Ownership is intended to re-territorialize a dis-invested area—it offers the residents a stake in their community.

8. Re-Distributing Wealth: The Public’s Private Apartment

Affordable housing in New York City is almost inevitably developed as a public/private partnership in which the private market demands on housing construction are ameliorated or compensated for by public investment and subsidy in the form of tax credits and bond financing. A tax credit is a form of subsidy that is granted to a developer/builder who commits to providing affordable housing—the credit’s value is then sold to a corporation who in effect provides the equity that funds construction. The tax credit maintains the semblance of a free-market by providing public financing incentives—tax funds—that bridge the gap between market rate housing and lower income families. The disparity between market rate and a subsidised market might otherwise cause re-distributions of population by income, race, class, gender or other factors. These financing initiatives often state their goals as those of re-building dis-invested territory in a way that market forces are presumed to be unable to.

Flow

On the cusp of the 19th century Thomas Jefferson, Madison, Locke and de Tocqville all countered attempts at a legislated redistribution of monolithic forms of wealth, even, as they recognised the free-market rights to private property sustained a dangerous potential to damage equality in the pooling of wealth. In a society that protected the rights to property and potentially exploitive monetary gain it portends, Federalist law, nonetheless protected the individual right to gains made in a free-market even if those gains often seemed intolerable in light of losses suffered by the apparently less industrious. This studio is situated directly at the nexus of federal policy that had recently redirected how the government would address the issue of poverty and housing in the United States. The changes in federal policy amounted to nothing less than a compete shift in how the government would seek to address the problem of housing the poor—a problem that since 1935 it had aggressively addressed in the centralised control and management of scores of rental apartment units and histories of slum clearing. In 1998, the federal government was focused on returning housing to the market and in removing the government from the role of landlord or developer. The federal government was adopting a conservative view to housing development and was declining its former role as landlord and developer for housing for the poor.

The studio will investigate architecture’s relation to the different financing mechanisms with housing as a means to intervening, directing and managing the construction of new territories. Design will address the planning stages of development and proceed to a final presentation that is comprehensive in the analysis of program, construction and tectonics and ultimately to use and need. The public/private partnership will be the means to designing housings as the interchange of construction, finance and private life. The problem of housing becomes the problem of the city—and the re-distribution of public and private funds.
becomes a factor in architectural design. Our goal will be to create what Michel Foucault has called an 
“economy of visibility”...“one in which the “exercise of power” has some degree of transparency, legibility or 
interactivity. Can the building reveal its histories to those that participate in its making, and habitation?

“Traditionally, power was what was seen, what was shown, and what was manifested and, paradoxically, 
found the principle of its force in the movement by which it deployed that force. Those on whom [power] 
was exercised could remain in the shade, they received the light only from that portion of power that was 
conceded to them, or from the reflection of it that for a moment they carried. Disciplinary power, on the 
other hand is exercised through invisibility; at the same time it imposes on those whom it subjects a princi-
ple of compulsory visibility. In discipline, it is the subjects who have to be seen. Their visibility assures the 
hold of the power that is exercised over them. It is the fact of being constantly seen, of being able always 
to be seen, that maintains the disciplined individual in his subjection. And the examination is the technique 
by which power, instead of emitting the signs of its potency, instead of imposing its mark on its subjects, 
holds them in a mechanism of objectification. In this space of domination, disciplinary power manifests its 
potency, essentially by arranging objects. The examination is, as it were, the ceremony of this objectifica-
tion.”

The dispersal of public housing into smaller atomized units has been a response to the public dissatisfaction 
with larger scale centralised housing projects. The slum clearing projects and garden city towers of 
earlier housing initiatives have come to symbolise if not embody the monolithic power that not only was 
enacted upon a group of people but that essentially revealed their poverty in the very collectivity it architect-
urally represented. For Foucault “liberty is a practice;” it does not and cannot take a form. Still Foucault 
warns “that the exercise of freedom is” not “indifferent to spatial distribution...it can only function when 
there is a certain convergence; in the case of divergence or distortion, it immediately becomes the oppo-
site of what was intended. 2 Dispersal is intended to disarm the monolithic will of a centralized authority—
our studio will seek to test the limits of this policy in architectural design.

above: detail of Excel spreadsheet mapping evolution of 
the Wagner Steagal Act. Recent amendments in the 
act are designed to instigate movement and action—form 
gives over to movement. 

Legislation intended to imple-
ment: “mobility, facilitate work, 
flexibility, increase self suffi-
ciency, reduce geographic 
concentration of poverty, 
increase ownership, increase 
housing choices.”
Your work, as designers, architects, planners and urbanists, will require you to program as well as design a new city block. The studio faculty and invited guests will present a series of initiatives and forces that in negotiation will affect the future of the area. Your work will require inventive design—and also strategic work on anticipating and projecting the future of the area's programming. We will collectively determine the full block programming after a research phase, but at this point in time you should anticipate maintaining all the current services on the site and meeting the demands of the new redevelopment for housing.

During the First Phase of the studio each section will develop the studio program by analyzing each of the following three Programming Vectors. Each of these vectors indicates an important historical and current driving force in housing production; they address constituencies, political goals and urban tools such as zoning and infrastructure—our seven studios will share information at the end of this phase and determine the full programming with the advice of an outside consultant from the non-profit housing sector and a commercial market rate housing development team.

At Columbia dynamic modelling and mapping of events has been a primary design and research tool. In recent months if not years, these tools have become evident in the mainstream press and indeed in popular forms of organization. Demonstrations, Conventions and everyday news are often shown in time based, durational, maps and diagrams.

The Housing Studio has attempted to build on these techniques—and to expand their usefulness in projecting the future implications of planning decisions, of policy goals and of many techniques that do not have obvious or apparent visible form. Your work as a designer addresses the orchestration and reaction to fast and slow realms—quick events and slower durational calculations. The following notes—refer to work by Bernard Tschumi on programming, events and relationships between architecture, program and event.

Your work, as designers, architects, planners and urbanists, will require you to program as well as design a new city block. The studio faculty and invited guests will present a series of initiatives and forces that in negotiation will affect the future of the area. Your work will require inventive design—and also strategic work on anticipating and projecting the future of the area's programming. We will collectively determine the full block programming after a research phase, but at this point in time you should anticipate maintaining all the current services on the site and meeting the demands of the new redevelopment for housing.

With your partner and faculty critic you are asked to address the three following “programming vectors.” They are referred to as vectors because they are not presented as fixed entities or quantitative fields or needs—instead they are understood as forces described by direction and magnitude. Indeed, they are understood more as a mode of becoming than as something known – formally or dimensionally defined – or as with known political resonance. In fact, each could be understood to address program as something that is in direct counter-position as well covalency to the liquid and flexible dimensions of money—of economic procedure.
Our first phase of work will involve devising new programs for Brownsville and loading new variables into the dynamic models.

It is Tschumi’s elevation of program to a level equal to other historically accepted architectural conventions that is noted by K. Michael Hays as a milestone that marks Tschumi’s arrival on the architectural scene itself. Of Tschumi’s Manhattan Transcripts, Hays wrote:

“Their explicit purpose is to transcribe things normally removed from conventional architectural representation, namely complex relationships between spaces and their use; between the set and the script; between type and program, between objects and events.”
Vector 1
Sustaining a Heterogeneous Middle Class?

Program Agents: The Mitchell-Lama Housing Programs; The New York Department of Housing, Preservation and Development

Michael Hays’ Introduction to Architecture Theory: Since 1968 concluded with the acknowledgement that a younger audience may have such an “altogether altered” relationship to consumption that they may be hesitant to engage in practices that resist the dominant productive economies of the city. Hays suggested that an overt resistance to the commodity processes that underlie an entire generation of theorists and practitioners whose work rests upon the negative dialectics of Theodor Adorno was under tremendous pressure, in part due to the pervasiveness and growth of capital economies in the 1990’s. The production of architecture based in the work of Adorno and intellectual descendents such as Manfredo Tafuri or Massimo Cacciari, Hays wrote, may no longer hold appeal to younger architects.

This programming vector asks you to reconsider the role of the state in the production of housing and the role of anti-market systems that ameliorate the economic pressures/factors in housing design, development and sale. In New York City publicly subsidized housing is very common—1 in 12 New Yorkers live in a publicly assisted form of housing. Adjacent to our site is a NYCHA housing—but also predominant in the city fabric is a wide range of Mitchell-Lama developments; as Prospect Plaza begins to be assimilated into a wider field of market rate housing what is the future of the “quasi-socialist” housing block in New York City?

The syllabus outlines both state and market pressures on the area and on your site.

Mitchell-Lama: "The New York State Mitchell-Lama Housing Program was created in 1955 for the purpose of building affordable housing for middle-income residents. The housing developed under this program is more commonly known as Mitchell-Lama housing, derived from the last names of former Manhattan State Senator MacNeil Mitchell and former Brooklyn Assemblyman Alfred Lama, who sponsored the legislation. It is officially embodied in the Private Housing Finance Law and is designed to accommodate the housing needs of moderate income families." "A total of 269 Mitchell-Lama developments with over 105,000 apartments were built under the program. In addition, 22 middle-income developments with over 10,000 apartments were built under the Limited-Dividend program, a precursor of the Mitchell-Lama program. A number of the Mitchell-Lama developments have withdrawn from the program under a process called buyout and are no longer under DHCR supervision."

"There are 132 City-sponsored, moderate- and middle-income rental and limited-equity cooperative developments in New York City which contain approximately 54,000 units, known as Mitchell-Lamas. HPD supervises waiting lists, management issues, and has other oversight responsibilities for 50 Mitchell-Lama developments; an additional 82 developments have shared supervision by HPD and the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development. There are approximately 94 Mitchell-Lama buildings in the City, which contain approximately 65,000 units, that are supervised by the State Division of Housing and Community Renewal (DHCR)." "Mitchell-Lama apartments are sold or rented through waiting lists kept by each development. Many Mitchell-Lama waiting lists are closed because there are already enough applicants listed to fill vacancies expected in the foreseeable future. Periodically, these developments open their waiting lists and new applications are accepted based on a lottery system. Mitchell-Lama developments must advertise when they open their waiting lists. Check your local newspapers to find out when applications are being accepted."

Sources for Mitchell Lama background: http://www.dhcr.state.ny.us/ohm/progs/mitchlam/ohmprgmi.htm
http://www.dhcr.state.ny.us/ohm/progs/mitchlam/ohmprgmi.htm
A changing landscape for public housing—Public housing in the United States currently shelters approximately 3 million individuals in 1.3 million households. Nationally these families pay an average rent of $169 per month (1997) and have an average income of $7835 per year. The City of New York provides housing for almost 600,000 residents in more than 3000 buildings. Unlike many cities, New York housing units tend to be included in the fabric of the city; these buildings are often atomized throughout the city fabric—they don’t stand alone as housing projects. There are of course very notable exceptions that have stood as the emblem of public housing. This landscape is changing—new federal plans are re-allocating funds for public housing.

Northeast Loses in Reshuffling of Housing Aid
By DAVID W. CHEN—NY Times: Published: August 30, 2004

The Bush administration is replacing the nation’s three-decade-old financing system for public housing with a new formula that will redistribute billions of dollars, chiefly from New York and other big, urban areas in the Northeast and Midwest to small, rural places in the South.

Vector 2
Outsourcing the Poor?

Program Agents: Common Ground Community and the NYHPD

New York City often finances housing in a public/private partnership that allows developers to receive lower costs financing in exchange for providing a proportion of lower-income housing. These financial mechanisms—or products—are often referred to as 80/20 financing. The developer must provide 20% of the housing units at a pricing that is affordable to lower-income demographics. On the Far West Side these provisions are given—new housing developments must provide 20% of the new housing at lower-income rents or sale prices. In recent years, however, it has become common for the lower-income housing to be produced off-site; in effect to be outsourced and provided in lower land cost areas and in lower income areas. There are examples where this was provided by building the lower income housing in a borough other than Manhattan. The results allow the developer to borrow development funds at subsidized rates, and build the lower income producing housing in less valuable areas. New York City has struggled for decades with trying to maintain a semblance of economic diversity in its population—yet today it could be said that NYC is approaching the final frontier of formerly affordable housing. How will your project respond to issues of displacement of or re-location of lower income people and the poor?

During the end of the 19th century and throughout the 20th, the rise and ceaseless transformation of the industrial city has continually adjusted its means, desire and abilities to offer work and housing to the poor. The very identity of the city has been based in absorbing the migration of those seeking work in a newly urban life. Yet the city has rarely shown either the ability to fully employ the poor at wages that fully match urban housing costs, nor has it always proved to offer the equitable distribution of services across the spectrum of race, sex or other variables of personal identity.

In a contemporary scenario Noam Chomsky makes a distinction between the geographical United States and American corporations. The country he has written is “developing characteristics of the third world”—but he speculated that its corporate share of worldwide production was probably increasing. According to Chomsky, capital generated within an evolving global economy is no longer distributed in centripetal and centrifugal urban patterns, or in relation to knowable geographic origins. In places like New York, the economic, private, and public shapes of the city have not only lost their territorial relation to an origin, but have left their inhabitants without a collective imagination of power’s origin; according to Chomsky the forecast prefigures a two-tiered society—Islands of wealth for investors and milieus of despair for the restless many.” This programming vector asks you to research and address the demographics of your project and its ability to address the place of lower income and poverty conditions.

Programming and Housing Types:

Programming and Architectural Case Studies: Common Ground Community in conjunction with The New York Department of Housing, Preservation and Development, and the New York City Department of Mental Health Services:

Keeping People in the neighborhoods where they can find support.

*Common Ground is one of many organizations that attempt to ameliorate the high cost of living in New York City by providing housing for lower income and impoverished people: “We start by creating communities where housing is safe, attractive and affordable. We then add support services, like access to medical and mental health care, job training and job placement. We believe that to rebuild an individual’s life from homelessness requires more than a home, more than good health, more than a job and more than a supportive community – the entire package is necessary. We offer long term results at a fraction of the cost of alternative responses to homelessness. Our permanent housing programs cost $10,000 and $12,000 per person each year—compared with prison cells at $22,000, shelters at $60,000 and mental health institutions at $113,000 per year.” Common Ground is planning permanent housing and services for families who
are homeless or are at risk of becoming so. The housing will be designed to reduce isolation and foster social interaction between stable families and those needing support. Source: Common Ground Website

A: Common Ground: Brownsville and East New York: Homelessness Prevention: Common Ground in conjunction with the NYHPD has established a program in East New York to bring vacant apartments on-line for use by families at risk for homelessness. This program is a pilot program to re-use and re-allocate the NYHPD identified 60 + thousand vacant apartments in NYC. These vacant apartments constitute a number equal to amount of housing the Bloomberg Administration plans to create. In this case one could argue that those apartments already exist but cannot be accessed. Common Ground believes it is necessary to find a means to access under-utilized apartments—and to find a way to keep lower income families from being displaced. Common Ground’s goal is to create permanent housing for families that is affordable, attractive and integrated into the community. The tenant mix will include relatively stable low-income families with strong community ties, families "at-risk" of becoming homeless and families exiting the shelter system. Services will be provided both on-site and in partnership with local community organizations, and focus on building relationships between families and reducing the social disconnection that often occurs with extended periods of homelessness.

"The 2002 HVS reports that the number of vacant rental units in New York City was 61,265 and the city-wide rental vacancy rate was 2.94 percent during the period between February and June 2002. The rental vacancy rate is significantly lower than the 5 percent threshold mandated by state law to justify the continuation of rent control and rent stabilization. The survey also reports that the City's total inventory of residential units was 3.2 million" Source: From: http://nyc.gov/html/hpd/html/for-researchers/housing-vacancy-surveys.html

**From the Bloomberg Plan: Providing low-cost loans to renovate and lease apartments that have long been vacant and off the market... / Doing what our conscience demands to help homeless families with special needs and youngsters aging out of foster care.../ And helping new homeowners make their first down payments, while also encouraging private employers to do the same.

B: Common Ground: The Foyer Program: The Foyer program is a housing-based career development program targeting young adults (ages 18-24) who are "aging out" of foster or residential care, are homeless or at risk of homelessness. Designed to prevent homelessness by offering a comprehensive transitional experience to independent adulthood, participants will work over a two-year period toward goals of permanent housing and stable employment. The 40-unit program is housed at The Christopher Nels Larson Residence. See: The Foyer Program <http://www.commonground.org/new_housing/homelessness_prevention/foyer.asp>

C: Common Ground: Re-Entry Housing: Common Ground is developing a re-entry housing initiative to prevent homelessness and criminal recidivism for homeless men and women exiting the corrections system. The initiative consists of three distinct programs: a transitional re-entry housing and employment program; a permanent supportive housing program linked with participation in work; and a residential program for youth leaving the juvenile justice system: “A program initiated in 1988, the Involuntarily Displaced Families Program, has provided permanent housing in State-aided middle income developments for homeless families. Under a DHCR Emergency Order, Mitchell-Lama and Limited Dividend rental developments in New York City and Westchester County were required to fill at least one of every five vacancies with involuntarily displaced families referred through the NYS Department of Social Services. Approximately 1,000 families have been permanently housed in State-supervised housing developments at any one time under this program. IDFP was suspended in 1997 due to a lack of Federal housing vouchers to subsidize eligible families.”
Vector 3
Up Zoning

Significant portions of all five boroughs in NYC are being re-zoned to accommodate a far greater density of office space and housing than they currently provide. Our studio, focused on Brownsville, enters these redevelopment plans at a time when the new zoning is still in question and is malleable—the programming vectors represent past forces as well as current goals, yet your work must re-invent each vectors potential and how they interact to produce full program for the city block. New York City is being “up-zoned” in sectors of all five boroughs—below we discuss several of these scenarios. Your site falls under very distinct zoning regulations—and the NYCHA site was historically, though no longer, exempt from city zoning.

“Through zoning, a city regulates building size, population density and the way land is used. Zoning recognizes the changing demographic and economic conditions of the city and is a key tool for carrying out planning policy. New York City enacted the nation’s first comprehensive zoning resolution in 1916 and the City continues to be a leader in zoning policy in the United States.”

Source: An Introduction to Zoning Terminology

New York City is divided into three basic zoning districts: residential (R), commercial (C) and manufacturing (M). The three basic categories are further subdivided by the intensity of use, whether for retail or manufacturing categories, parking, building bulk or residential density. Zoning regulations do not usually apply to public parks.

Development within these residential, commercial and manufacturing districts is governed by use, bulk and parking requirements. Each zoning district regulates permitted uses;

1. the size (bulk) of the building permitted in relation to the size of the lot;
2. the required open space for residential uses on the lot or the maximum amount of building coverage allowed on the lot;
3. the number of dwelling units permitted on the lot;
4. the distance between the building and the street;
5. the distance between the building and the lot line;
6. the amount of parking required; and
7. other requirements applicable to specific residential, commercial or manufacturing activities, including the size and placement of signs.

The studio building site, prior to 2001, was designated as “M1-5”, (a basic manufacturing use), with a “C1-2 overlay”, which governs commercial development on Tenth Avenue. In addition it is subject to the “Clinton Special Zoning District”.

M1

M1 areas range from the Garment District in Manhattan, with its multistory lofts, to areas in the other boroughs with low-bulk plants. The M1 district is often an industrial front yard or a buffer to adjacent residential or commercial districts. Strict performance standards are common to all M1 districts. Light industries typically found in M1 areas include knitting mills, printing plants and wholesale service facilities. In theory, nearly all industrial uses can locate in M1 areas if they meet the rigorous performance standards required in the Zoning Resolution. Retail and office uses are also permitted. Use Group 4 community facilities are allowed in M1 zones by special permit but not in other manufacturing districts. Parking and loading requirements vary with district and use, but high density districts (M1-4 to M1-6) are exempt from parking requirements. Residential development is generally not allowed in manufacturing districts.

However, M1 districts with a significant number of residential buildings may be mapped M1-D. The D suffix indicates that limited new residential uses are permitted, by City Planning Commission authorization, on sites that meet specific criteria. The maximum FAR for permitted residential uses is 1.65. Accessory parking for residences is not required, except in M1-ID districts.
Under certain criteria, artists may have joint living-work quarters in lofts in M1-5A and M1-5B districts (mapped in the SoHo/NoHo area of Lower Manhattan). In M1-5M and M1-6M districts, the conversion of non-residential floors of a building to dwelling units is permitted, provided a specified amount of floor area is preserved for certain categories of manufacturing, industrial and commercial fuses. Conversion to dwellings is also allowed, with various restrictions, in the Special Lower Manhattan Mixed Use District.

C1

C1 districts accommodate the retail and personal service shops needed in residential neighborhoods. These districts are often mapped as an overlay along major avenues in otherwise residentially zoned neighborhoods. They are widely mapped throughout the city. Typical uses include grocery stores, small dry cleaning establishments, restaurants and barber shops. All cater to the daily needs of the immediate neighborhood. Regulations limit commercial use to one or two floors.

Continuous, clustered retail development is desired in these districts. Local service and repair establishments are not permitted to break the retail commercial continuity.

C1-1 to C1-5 districts are mapped as overlays—generally along major avenues—in residential districts, while C1-6 to C1-9 districts are not mapped as overlays. When C1-1 to C1-5 districts are mapped in RI to R5 and R6B districts, the maximum commercial FAR is 1.0; when mapped in other R6 and R7 to R10 districts (including contextual districts with the suffix A, B or X), the maximum commercial FAR is 2.0. Residential bulk in these commercial districts is governed by the regulations of the surrounding residential district. The maximum commercial FAR in C1-6 to C1-9 districts (including the contextual districts) is 2.0, while residential bulk ranges from that permitted in R7 districts for C1-6 districts to that permitted in RIO districts for C1-9 districts.

The regulations applicable to a new building located within a contextual commercial district are similar to those of the corresponding contextual residence district with respect to allowable lot coverage, required street wall height, the location of the front building wall and the permissible residential bulk and density.

Parking is not required in C1 areas mapped in densely populated areas (C1-5 through C1-9) because shops in these neighborhoods attract and generate little automobile traffic. In less densely developed areas, where most people drive, parking is required.

10. Samples of Sites that Are Re-Zoned for New Market Housing

**Manhattan: The Bowery and Lower East Side**

Market Rate Housing: A: Carlyle Group: Market Rate Development: Market Rate Housing: Global Strategy: Since its establishment in 1987, The Carlyle Group has grown from a group of four investors with $5 million in capital to one of the world's largest private equity firms. As of March 2002, the firm had over $13.5 billion in capital committed to 20 private equity funds. We have developed the largest, most diversified investor base of any private equity firm, with more than 535 investors from 55 countries. Source: Carlyle Group Website:

A 19,186-sf block of retail space on two floors at the newly constructed NoLita Place residential tower is ready for occupancy and brokers are looking for high-end amenity-related tenants, including upscale restaurants, a high-end showroom or a gourmet market. The 12-story, 65-unit luxury property was completed earlier this month.
Queens, Long Island City, NYC 2012—Not Awarded

May 26, 2004 / New York Governor George E. Pataki, New York City Mayor Michael R. Bloomberg, Queens Borough President Helen Marshall and NYC2012 today announced the architectural firm Morphosis (Santa Monica, CA) as the winner of NYC2012’s Olympic Village Design Study. Morphosis was selected from among five finalists that included Henning Larsens Tegnestue A/S (Copenhagen, Denmark), MVRDV (Rotterdam, The Netherlands), Smith-Miller + Hawkinson Architects (New York, NY) and 2004 Pritzker Prize winner Zaha Hadid Architects (London, United Kingdom).

Brooklyn

PRESS RELEASE: Brooklyn, NY, December 10, 2003 – Internationally acclaimed architect Frank Gehry and Bruce C. Ratner, President and CEO of Forest City Ratner Companies, today unveiled a master plan for the arena that will house the Nets basketball team that Mr. Ratner is seeking to bring to downtown Brooklyn. The Brooklyn Arena will be the centerpiece of a mixed-use development called Brooklyn Atlantic Yards. Mayor Michael Bloomberg, Brooklyn Borough President Marty Markowitz and Brooklyn-born basketball All-Star Bernard King hailed the exciting plan at a news conference in the Ceremonial Room of Brooklyn’s Borough Hall.

The 800,000 square-foot Brooklyn Arena will be the focal point of Brooklyn Atlantic Yards, an urban complex of housing, commercial and retail space, as well as six acres of landscaped public open space – including a park on the Arena’s roof, ringed by an open-air running track that doubles as a skating rink in winter with panoramic vistas facing Manhattan year-round.

The site for Brooklyn Atlantic Yards is adjacent to the third-largest transportation hub in New York City – Atlantic Terminal, where nine different subway lines and the Long Island Railroad converge. These modes of transportation will make visiting the Brooklyn Arena easy for fans, whether they’re coming from other boroughs or from the surrounding suburbs – drastically reducing the vehicular traffic that would be expected at a site that lacked mass transit.

The site has long been defined by transportation; its current primary use is as a storage yard for Long Island Railroad trains. Three blocks of exposed tracks lie between Atlantic Avenue and Pacific Street. The Brooklyn Atlantic Yards master plan proposes to relocate the storage tracks to the eastern part of the site, freeing the western part for the Arena. Decking over the new, relocated yards, will allow the architect to build the complex’s public open space and residential buildings on the eastern portion of the site.

"The existing railroad yard is really a barrier that isolates the neighborhoods north and south of Atlantic Avenue," says Mr. Gehry. "We’ve designed a mixed-use development with offices, apartments, shops and the Arena, which breaks down the barrier and ties the neighborhood together in a way that’s appropriate – with higher-density uses along Atlantic Avenue and lower-density uses near the more residential area on Dean Street." Programming: Brooklyn Atlantic Yards:

800,000 square feet for the sports arena – with 19,000 seats for basketball games and 20,000 as configured for other events, such as concerts;
—six acres of publicly accessible open space;
—4.4 million square feet of residential, in approximately 4,500 units
—2.1 million square feet of commercial office space;
—300,000 square feet of retail space;
—3,000 parking spaces.
11. Studio Site: Brownsville
12. CLEARING: Rockaways Case Study: Arverne and Edgemere


Ocean Village (previous page) funded in 1968 by UDC
13. What is NYCHA? Is it a concentrated entity or a dispersed organization? NYCHA’s own description from their website:

The New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA) provides decent and affordable housing in a safe and secure living environment for low- and moderate-income residents throughout the five boroughs. To fulfill this mission, NYCHA must preserve its aging housing stock through timely maintenance and modernization of its developments. NYCHA also administers a citywide Section 8 Leased Housing Program in rental apartments. Simultaneously, we work to enhance the quality of life at NYCHA by offering our residents opportunities to participate in a multitude of community, educational and recreational programs, as well as job readiness and training initiatives.

NYCHA was created in 1934. By the end of 1935 NYCHA dedicated First Houses, our first development, located on the Lower East Side of Manhattan.

The Way It Is Today

NYCHA is the largest public housing authority in North America. NYCHA’s Conventional Public Housing Program has 181,000 apartments in 345 developments throughout the City in 2,702 residential buildings containing 3,318 elevators. NYCHA has over 15,101 employees serving about 174,195 families and approximately 418,810 authorized residents.

- NYCHA’s Public Housing represents 8.3% of the City’s rental apartments and are home to 5.2% of the City’s population
- NYCHA residents and Section 8 voucher holders combined occupy 12.2% of the City’s rental apartments and make up 8.0% of the City’s population.

The Waiting List for Public Housing

- On March 31, 2003 there were 265,702 applicants on the waiting lists for subsidized housing in the City
- 146,097 families are on the waiting list for Conventional Public Housing
- 149,238 families are on the list for the Section 8 program
- 29,633 applicants are on both lists

© Arverne and Edgemere: The Rockaway Peninsula is home to approximately 38,000 households; more than 13,000 of these households are in publicly funded and assisted buildings.
New York City’s Public Housing: Many Histories, Many Forms.

The property, currently owned by the NYHPD, is defined at its perimeter by three types of state and federally assisted housing. In the midst of these policy and typological histories new market rate housing will be built in the near future if the RFP produces a successful development strategy.

Ocean Village is on the east perimeter of the site at Beach 59th Street; it was built by the Urban Development Corporation between 1968 and 1974 and offers subsidized housing to lower income families.

At the western perimeter of the site the Arverne and Hammel Houses were developed by the Housing Authority of New York; the average income for families in NYCHA apartments is $13,406 (as of January 1, 1999). Also on the western edge of the site are nine mid rise apartment slabs that were built as part of the Mitchell-Lama housing program; these cooperative apartments are owned by their residents. The NYHPD RFP would dilute that concentration in adding as many as 2000 units of new market rate housing to the area. While these new housing units are not subsidized at the point of sale they will be subsidized indirectly as a public/private partnership; the HPD will effectively donate the property to the developer who is awarded the contract. Major funding for infrastructure is anticipated to come from the state of New York thus further reducing development costs.

Conventional Public Housing in New York City

- The Bronx has 98 developments with 45,546 apartments
- Brooklyn has 101 developments with 59,005 apartments
- Manhattan has 103 developments with 54,255 apartments
- Queens has 26 developments with 17,372 apartments
- Staten Island has 11 developments with 4,860 apartments
- Six (6) developments consist of FHA Acquired homes located in more than one borough
- 42 developments are for seniors only; 15 seniors-only buildings exist within mixed-population developments
- NYCHA has more than 10,000 apartments designated for seniors only
- There also are 6,838 retrofitted apartments for families of persons who are mobility impaired as of April 22, 2003.
14. NYCHA on the Lower East Side: Case Study

WALD, LILLIAN HOUSES
54 Avenue D
New York, NY 10009
(212) 673-9306 Fax (212) 673-2140

1857 Units 16.46 Acres 4,536 people
113 Units an Acre / 275 people an acre

Street Boundaries
Avenue D/FDR Drive
East 6th Street/Houston Street

Subway Lines
F to Delancey Street or 2nd Avenue and East Houston – walk east down Delancey Street towards Columbia Street
J, M to Essex Street (follow above instructions)
L to 1st Avenue and 14th Street (follow bus instructions below)

Bus Lines
M14C, M14D going towards Avenue D and East 6th Street

NAMED AFTER: LILLIAN WALD (1867 – 1940) – She originated the public health nursing service in the country and the Henry Street Nurses Settlement on the Lower East Side. A dynamic force for social reform she created widely accepted models of public health and social service programs. Her nursing education in New York led her to conclude that tenement residents lacked proper health care, so she organized the Henry Street nurses group and later expanded settlement programs to include social services, especially for children. Wald played a key role in organizing the American Red Cross. She was a leader in the fight to abolish child labor and helped foster the creation of the Children’s Bureau in 1912. Wald Houses is in Manhattan.

SITE STATISTICS AND DESCRIPTION:
Lillian Wald Houses on Manhattan’s Lower East Side has 16 buildings 10, 11, 13 and 14-stories tall with 1,857 apartments housing an estimated 4,536 residents. Completed October 14, 1949, the 16.46-acre complex is between F.D.R. Drive, Avenue D, East 6th and East Houston Streets.
RIIS, JACOB HOUSES
454 East 10th Street
Manhattan, NY 10009
(212) 228-2400 Fax (212) 426-8435

105 Units an Acre/247 people an acre

------------------------------------------------------------------------
Street Boundaries
FDR Drive/Avenue D
East 6th Street/East 13th Street
Subway Lines
F to 6th Avenue and 14th Street – transfer to M14
L to 1st Avenue – transfer to M14
Bus Lines
M14C/M14D at 14th Street to 10th Street and Avenue D

------------------------------------------------------------------------
NAMED AFTER: JACOB AUGUST RIIS (1849-1914) – Danish-born American journalist and reformer whose reports on
living conditions in city slums led to improvements in housing and education. His stories in newspapers about slum
dwellings and abuses in lower class urban life were collected in “How the Other Half Lives (1890).” Riis dwelled on
the city’s slum tenements and how the people there lived. His vivid descriptions, often depicted on slides, caused audi-
ences at his lectures to moan, shudder and even faint. He founded a pioneer settlement house in New York City named
after him. Riis Houses is in Manhattan.

------------------------------------------------------------------------
SITE STATISTICS AND DESCRIPTION:
Jacob Riis Houses on Manhattan’s Lower East Side has 13 buildings, 6, 13, and 14-stories high. The 11.73-acre com-
plex has 1,187 apartments housing some 2,903 residents. Completed January 17, 1949, it is between East 8th and
East 13th Streets, Avenue D and F.D.R. Drive.
Jacob Riis II on Manhattan’s Lower East Side has six buildings, 6, 13, and 14-stories tall. There are 577 apartments
housing some 1,402 people. The 5.94-acre complex was completed January 31, 1949 and is between East 6th and
East 8th Streets, Avenue D and the F.D.R. Drive.

LOWERS EAST SIDE II
CONSOLIDATION
640 East 5th Street
New York, NY 10009
(212) 529-8340 Fax (212) 477-3029

46 Units an Acre/ 146 people an acre

------------------------------------------------------------------------
Street Boundaries
Avenue C
Avenue B
Subway Lines
F to Second Avenue (follow M21 bus directions below)
J, M to Delancey Street
L to First Avenue (follow M9, M14C and M14D bus directions below)
Bus Lines
M21 (northbound) to Avenue C and 5th Street – walk west on Avenue C

SITE STATISTICS AND DESCRIPTION:
Lower East Side II Houses consists of four, 3-story buildings with 186 apartments housing some 564 residents at the
3.85-acre site. Completed August 31, 1988, it is bordered by East 4th, East 5th and East 6th Streets, Avenues B, C
and D in Manhattan.
The QWHRA is designed to allow the deconcentration of poverty in public housing blocks—the diagram to the right shows the three highest concentrations of poverty in NYC—the sites at Far Rockaway are almost exclusively public housing. Zip Code 11692 contains 15,000 units of public housing.


In 1996, the Clinton administration’s plan to reduce the concentration of public housing in city centers was accelerated by the allocation of federal funding for housing vouchers. Intended to encourage property ownership among a wide spectrum of lower-income Americans, vouchers provide a one-time subsidy to the developer at the time of sale—in effect, supplying a down payment for the buyer. In 1998, the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act augmented this effort. These initiatives were both pragmatic and ideological, dealing with issues of poverty, the deconstruction of the racial and ethnic territories created by previous federal housing programs, and historic urban paradigms of density and centripetal concentration.

Poverty Deconcentration Plan: “Partly in reaction to the growing concentration of very poor households in public housing across the US, Congress passed the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998 (QHWRA). This legislation requires public housing authorities (PHAs) to adopt plans to address the problem of growing poverty concentrations and grants considerable flexibility in setting admissions policies to implement those plans. The US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has declined to offer a standard for what it considers an undue concentration of poverty within public housing. However, commentary to the Final Rule for producing Public Housing Agency Plans suggests that a property where the average family income is below 85% of PHA mean income indicates an unacceptable level of poverty concentration, while 115% or above PHA mean income indicates relatively "high income" developments. Basically, QHWRA requires that PHAs "deconcentrate" poverty by attempting to bring higher income families into high-poverty developments and very poor families into higher-income developments. By providing working role models that support enforcement of management rules, as well as access to job networks and information, the economic outcomes and security of tenants in or from high-poverty developments may be enhanced.”

16. The QWHRA: the Congressional Act

H. R. 4194
One Hundred Fifth Congress of the United States of America

AT THE SECOND SESSION
Begun and held at the City of Washington on Tuesday, the twenty-seventh day of January, one thousand nine hundred and ninety-eight

An Act.

Making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes. Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

For tenant-based assistance under the United States Housing Act of 1937 to help eligible families make the transition from welfare to work, $283,000,000 from the total amount provided under this heading, to be administered by public housing agencies (including Indian tribes and their tribally designated housing entities, as defined by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development), and to remain available until expended: For tenant-based assistance under the United States Housing Act of 1937 to help eligible families make the transition from welfare to work, $283,000,000 from the total amount provided under this heading, to be administered by public housing agencies and to remain available until expended. . . SEC. 513. INCOME TARGETING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 16 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437n) is amended by striking the section designation and all that follows through the end of subsection (d) and inserting the following: “SEC. 16. (a) INCOME ELIGIBILITY FOR PUBLIC HOUSING.—

“(1) INCOME MIX WITHIN PROJECTS.—A public housing agency may establish and utilize income-mix criteria for the selection of residents for dwelling units in public housing projects, subject to the requirements of this section.

“(2) PHA INCOME MIX.—

“(A) TARGETING.—Except as provided in paragraph (4), of the public housing dwelling units of a public housing agency made available for occupancy in any fiscal year H. R. 4194—84 by eligible families, not less than 40 percent shall be occupied by families whose incomes at the time of commencement of occupancy do not exceed 30 percent of the area median income, as determined by the Secretary with adjustments for smaller and larger families.

“(3) PROHIBITION OF CONCENTRATION OF LOW-INCOME FAMILIES. “(A) PROHIBITION.—A public housing agency may not, in complying with the requirements under paragraph (2), concentrate very low-income families (or other families with relatively low incomes) in public housing dwelling units in certain public housing projects or certain buildings within projects. The Secretary shall review the income and occupancy characteristics of the public housing projects and the buildings of such projects of such agencies to ensure compliance with the provisions of this paragraph and paragraph (2).

“(B) DECONCENTRATION.—“(i) IN GENERAL.—A public housing agency shall submit with its annual public housing agency plan under section 5A an admissions policy designed to provide for deconcentration of

National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials

http://www.nahro.org/legislative/federal/021999qwhra.html

Income Mix and Deconcentration Provisions

1. What are some of the incentives that may be offered to families to encourage income-mixing? The Act does not specify any particular incentives. However, an agency might consider using its locally-determined preferences, rent structure options, self-sufficiency programs, or other tools and flexibility provided in the Act, to encourage income-mixing.

2. Is it mandatory for every agency to have an income mix and deconcentration policy? Yes, it is. Agencies must describe it in their agency plan.

3. What problems are anticipated when mixing higher-income families into lower-income areas, without quotas? How does the Act impact issues about desegregation and deconcentration in public housing? Please refer to section 513, income targeting. The effective date of these provisions is October 21, 1998.

Public housing agencies are required to serve families at or below 80% of the area median income, and forty percent (40%) of new families must have incomes at or below 30% of the area median. Therefore, the difference in income levels is not expected to create insurmountable difficulties in blending these families in a certain development or community. Creating racial or income quotas is not permitted. The applicant alone must make the choice whether to accept the incentive to occupy a unit in a development where most incomes are either above or below that of the family. Agencies may not coerce applicants or take adverse actions against them.
poverty and income-mixing by bringing higher income tenants into lower income projects and lower income tenants into higher income projects. This clause may not be construed to impose or require any specific income or racial quotas for any project or projects.

“(ii) INCENTIVES.—In implementing the policy under clause (i), a public housing agency may offer incentives for eligible families having higher incomes to occupy dwelling unit in projects predominantly occupied by eligible families having lower incomes, and provide for occupancy of eligible families having lower incomes in projects predominantly occupied by eligible families having higher incomes.

‘(iii) FAMILY CHOICE.—Incentives referred to in clause (ii) may be made available by a public housing agency only in a manner that allows for the eligible family to have the sole discretion in determining whether to accept the incentive and an agency may not take any adverse action toward any eligible family for choosing not to accept an incentive and occupancy of a project described in clause (ii)(i), Provided, That the skipping of a family on a waiting list was done to reach another family to implement the policy under clause.

Diagrams reveal relationships between densities for public housing, income, race and housing type on the Far Rockaway Peninsula. Arverne and Edgemere housing is generally 50 or more units per building. Income in this area is approximately 22% of Queens’s median income. At the western end of the peninsula wealthy areas such as Neponsit and Belle Harbor are predominantly Caucasian; dwelling types are almost exclusively single-family houses and the income per household is approximately 220% of Queens median income. Upper diagram by Anthony Burke.
Organizing the Masses: Housing, the State and the City

Part 1: Autonomous and Committed Art


Part 2: Techniques, Power and Territory.


Part 3: Urban Housing in the United States
Elizabeth Wilson, The Sphinx in the City: Urban Life, the Control of Disorder, and Women, (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Gwendolyn Wright, Building the Dream: A Social History of Housing in America (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1983); chap. 7 "Americanization and Ethnicity in UrbanS".


Part 4: The Masses: Reforming Space / Observing Culture


Part 5: City of Refugees: The Individual in Duress Finds New Means

Roger Caillois, "October," The First Decade, "Mimicry and Legenary Psychasthenia," p 60

Part 1: Typology: Form and Industry
Alan Colquhoun, "Typology and Design Method," Perspecta 12, 1969, pp.71-74


Part 2: Typology: Labor + Technology: Pre-War Europe and Post-War America


Part 3: Architecture: Suppressing Technology


Part 4: Architecture Means and Inscribed Subjects


Studio Schedule

September 7, Wednesday
Housing Studio Lottery
4PM
Room 114

September 16, Friday
Brownsville Research Presentations by:
Laura Kurgan, GSAPP / Million Dollar Blocks/ Brownsville Research
Fatou Dieye, GSAPP/ Research / Brownsville
Wood Auditorium
2PM

September 23, Friday
Brownsville Programming and Site Use Studies
Studio Reviews

October 10, Monday
All School / Housing Studio Symposium:
Housing and City at Columbia: 70 years After the New Deal.
10:30AM — 4:40PM
Wood Auditorium

The GSAPP will present a daylong conference of in-house faculty to discuss Housing and the City at Columbia. The event would be for all GSAPP Students—not just housing studio students—and open to the entire school and all programs. We will specifically look at the conceptual and political underpinnings of the term, and how the current political/economic climate in the world changes our work. Essential to the day would be that we look at the historic meanings of the term housing (in particular how it was manifest in Europe and the United States. More essential to the day, however, is a goal to look closely at the role of new legislation that increasingly diminishes the role of the state in housing provisions, and the larger picture of how poverty/wealth issues are changing globally. The speakers are asked to explore design ramifications: At the core of the conference is a question about how Columbia’s Housing Studio has evolved over time—and what are the important issue to bring to housing now. We have a title that is a stand in—but it does point to the core questions of “Housing and City at Columbia: 70 years After the New Deal.”

Participants: Sumila Gulyani, Jason Caburn, Reinhold Martin, Kenneth Frampton, Ana Miljacki, Gwendolyn Wright, Lance Freeman, Richard Plunz, Karla Rothstein, the legacy of Robert Moses in NYC housing, Rosanne Haggerty, Founder/President Common Ground Community, NYC, Michael Bell

October 19, Wednesday
All School Lecture/ in conjunction with the Housing Studio
Teddy Cruz: Canadian Centre for Architecture, James Stirling Award.
Teddy Cruz will present his work on housing for at the San Diego/Tijuana border.
6:30PM
Wood Auditorium

October 21, Friday
Housing Studio Mid Terms
Sections 1, 2, 3

October 24, Monday
Housing Studio Mid Terms
Sections 4, 5, 6, 7
November 2, Wednesday
Housing Studio Symposium
Room 114
Participants: Alisa Andrasek, Ana Miljacki, Scott Marble, Olivier Touraine

December 8, Wednesday
Housing Studio Finals
All Sections

Final Requirements

1" = 60'-0" site model

1" = 1'-0" Site Plan showing context

1/16" = 1'-0" Final model showing context.

1/8" = 1'-0" plans, sections, elevations for all buildings.

Partial Section Model
at 1/4" = 1'-0"

1/4" detail plan of units

Perspective of interior and exterior views.

Each studio will provide a site model that is jointly prepared.
Common Ground’s Plan:

I. HomeLink Program
Located in PS/IS 323, HomeLink connects families to free services designed to prevent eviction and homelessness, including benefits screening, health insurance, tax assistance, counseling, job and housing search assistance, legal assistance, credit counseling, and cash assistance.

Families at risk of homelessness receive intensive case management coordination with the goal of preserving permanent housing, or when necessary, identifying new safe and stable housing in the community. We work closely with neighborhood partners that include East Brooklyn Congregations, Brooklyn Legal Services, and the Coalition for Eviction Prevention.

A tenant education course will provide clients with housing difficulties certificates of completion marking them as desirable tenants to local landlords.

II. Increase the supply of existing housing by 200 units
The Real Estate Services Unit will work closely with Community Preservation Corporation (CPC) and Housing Preservation and Development (HPD) to provide technical assistance to landlords to bring 200 additional units to the market through our anti-abandonment initiative. In exchange, these units will be made available for families who would otherwise become homeless.

In situations where tenants are facing homelessness because they cannot live safely in their apartments, the Real Estate Services Unit will assist the tenants in advocating that landlords comply with appropriate building codes.

III. Development of 300 New Units of Housing
- Development of 300 new housing units in Brownsville over 5 years
  - Approximately 80 units will be LAMP (low income affordable marketplace) housing made up of 1, 2, and 3-bedroom family units
  - 70-80 units will be created as Section 202 Housing for the Elderly which will include common space and support services

For Brownsville families, we will provide:

- A “Single Stop” center, funded by the Robin Hood Foundation, that will consolidate access to government benefits and legal assistance for neighborhood families. This center, which opened in February 2005, will serve as a triage center to identify families at risk of homelessness.

- A presence at Brooklyn Housing Court that will flag cases involving Brownsville families facing eviction to enable mediation with landlords or time to secure financial assistance.

- A community-wide outreach and education effort, led by EBC, that will engage tenant associations, churches, schools, and other community institutions in educating their members about the availability of homelessness prevention services, and to enlist community members in offering help, housing, and support to their neighbors facing homelessness.

- Emergency financial assistance that will preserve tenancies when such help will resolve, not simply postpone, a housing crisis.

- Family mediation services that will support families who are providing housing to other dependent family members.

- Case coordination and service to ensure families are not locked in bureaucratic “silos” and obtain all of the
benefits to which they are entitled.

Collaborations with local hospitals and schools to identify and offer services to those families with known predictors of instability. Very young mothers of very young children living in the household of another family member and families who have previously experienced homelessness are among those known to be at “high risk.”

Links to other community services, particularly employment, healthcare, and childcare, that will stabilize families in crisis.

Assistance with accessing affordable housing in the community through new family supportive housing units developed by Common Ground, existing units improved and made accessible by Common Ground, and a brokerage service that includes a neighborhood directory of vacancies.

For Brownsville landlords, we will provide:

Mediation services as an alternative dispute mechanism to eviction.

Assistance in accessing City loan programs to improve their properties, in return for making vacant units available at affordable rents to families referred by the Prevention program.

Technical assistance with building design and management improvements, in return for making vacant units available at affordable rents to families referred by the Prevention program.

In those cases where vacant units are “off line” due to poor conditions, technical assistance in restoring those units, in return for their being pledged to families referred by the Prevention program. Technical assistance in accessing and managing rental subsidy programs.

Relief from advertising, tenant screening, and legal costs by serving as an intermediary for placing and supporting tenants, by preparing families with a comprehensive tenant education curriculum.
The Columbia Housing Studio and New York City

At Columbia, the Housing Studio has shown both a remarkable consistency, and an ability to revise its direction since its inception in 1975. Parallel to the studio a wide range of scholarship on housing issues—in the Schools of Architecture, Planning, Urban Design and in Preservation and Real Estate—have also continually updated and refined their directions.

Historically situated between pragmatic and local concerns, wide ranging and competing concepts of the city, and housing legislation initiated under the New Deal, the Housing Studio has, during the past seven years, increasingly addressed a new set of political and economic issues that have characterized a less ambitious role for government in low-income or poverty housing, and a more conservative reading of the market’s role in design and development—both in New York and worldwide.

This new inception of the Housing Studio will try to extend to the studio’s attempts to respond to new world conditions in housing, and in particular to re-examine the role of advocacy that has often been a core engine in the studio’s work.

Our studio will address two distinct sites in Queens, New York City—one site will test the limits of architectural design in relation to demanding urban conditions, but also more particularly in relation to the quickly shifting dynamics of Queens’ population and what forms of advocacy have historically been present and can be expected in the near future. The studio will re-examine questions of poverty and risk as it relates to housing in New York City, and in particular how these issues are unique in Queens as opposed to Brooklyn or Manhattan where the studio has usually focused its invention.

Faculty from the GSAPP will lend their expertise to the course and help shape the studio’s increasingly global perspective, as we simultaneously reinforce its New York City base. We will discuss the now 30 year-old Housing Studio histories, and the changing conceptual and political underpinnings of housing themes that have been at the core of the studio.

What are the important issues to bring to housing now; how is the study of housing a unique and a separate component of the core curriculum, and where are its overlaps and opportunities within the GSAPP?

Last fall in the housing studio we sponsored a conference that explored the housing studio’s history—from its inception as a formally organized required studio by Professors Richard Plunz and Kenneth Frampton (circa 1975), to its more recent organization in which many of us have now taught for some time. That conference—focused on renewing the studio’s relation to NYC—and in particular to the role NYC plays in the school’s critical imagination; yet the underlying and perhaps more important goal of the conference was to look at the city’s image as it was manifest in the national press at the studio’s inception and to compare this to how we make use of the image and reality of the city today. In short — while the conference was not by any means conclusive in its scope—it was structured to try to look at the way NYC was portrayed in the 60’s and 70’s as a “city in crisis”—to compare this to what forms of “crisis” exist today if one were to look at housing and urban life in New York. To a large degree the “crisis” vividly professed as endemic to urban life in NY in the 1970’s usually linked issues of poverty, to housing, to crime to urban life itself. All of this was of course deeply rooted in issues of race and relations between racial groups.

All of these issues might be better understood and commented upon by other professions, but our profession has of course often been at the center of these issues because we indeed are very much participants in the issues—designing housing, urban planning and forecasting social relations with our work and its inherent systems of organization. Yet, it is of course also true that our work often, if not usually, begins after the major policy decisions have been made by civic entities, government and legislative bodies. These questions are renewed today—during the past decade the role of the designer, the architect, the planner all have changed dramatically—both literally in terms of the forms of what we produce, but also in the content of what we are called to react to. We did seek to re-examine what it means to work on urban housing and to explore how the terms city and poverty, city and housing have changed.

What we began to do last fall with help from Sumila Gulyani (Planning Prof) and David Turnbull as well as Ana Miljacki, was to open a conversation whereby NYC contemporary issues of housing and poverty were re-established as parallel or covalent with global questions of poverty and housing. To this end Teddy Cruz also was invited to Columbia to speak on the GSAPP lecture series. Of course this was a massive issue to take on but it was presented in somewhat direct terms and with somewhat literal means: the housing studio at Columbia has often addressed low income and public housing and as such has situated its work in the context of federal housing legislation. That said, we have relied on United States and NY City and state modes of housing policy and housing politics. The symposium last fall was subtitled—or at least discussed as a “housing at Columbia 75 years after the New Deal.” As U.S. federal aid has shifted dramatically since 1995—we asked speakers to think about how US housing for low income and poverty situations relates to situations in emerging nations and emerging economies.

Sumila Gulyani joined Columbia after her doctorate at MIT and after several years at the World Bank where she directed poverty housing development in Africa; David Turnbull, Ana Miljacki and Reinhold Martin presented work on non-US circumstances. All of this was presented in the third panel of the conference after Richard Plunz and Kenneth Frampton as well as myself, Gwendolyn Wright and Rosanne Haggerty all discussed housing more directly in terms of NYC and the United States. The studio itself last year worked in Brooklyn on a NYCHA site—directly working on a US policy shift under Hope VI funding streams. Last fall we were very much a NYC studio—and U.S. housing studio—but we did begin a concerted effort to create a more global connection for our work. In short we began last fall to try to calibrate our attention to a global picture while examining the regional and national nature of the studio’s historical themes. We address this here to say that even though we are once again going to be working in a Core Studio addressing a regional site in NYC we are still planning to examine our work in a global context and to extend work from last fall. What is emerging is an initiative to seek a finer grain look at how NYC has within it a much more subtle and complex strain of demographic/social and political life than we have previously examined carefully.

With this in mind, the idea of working in Queens came to the forefront—that we should consider a look at the full range of Queens County as a studio “site” — and then begin to establish Queens as a parallel zone to other world sites and in some ways as something that is surely a NYC condition but that also, due to its demographics and its population, more accurately reflects world conditions. We have not looked at (central) Queens before in the studio: a quick look at the borough gives a strong impression of the diversity of housing types and race….income, etc — its demographics and patterns of recent immigration—but also the enclaves of constituencies in Queens developed in the past 25 years. Does Queens have within it a spectrum of the United States in terms of housing types, (suburban to urban?) world demographics (?). The county spans from the Atlantic Ocean to Long Island Sound—from manufacturing to suburban houses and includes enclaves of more recent immigration trends in the United States.

Our previous studios have focused on sites in NYC that were more directly tied to federal and city public or publicly assisted housing sites (the New York City Housing Authority, the New York City Department of Housing, Preservation and Development, Mitchell Lama, Urban Development Corporation). In turn these sites, such as last years work in Brownsville, brought to the forefront relations that characterized the civil rights era and architectural and urban design issues related to CIAM, Modernism, and the urban renewal policies of the 1940's to 70's. To move our work to Queens this year in part moves us out of the more architecturally formal or politically well known situations of Brownsville—this does not replace looking at the political histories and the future of New York City housing as it related to public housing and its formal histories— but ideally it would move last year’s steps towards understanding a contemporary subject/occupant citizen for “housing” here in NYC as more relate-able to other world citizens. The demographics of Queens should help instigate this.
30 Years Ago: Our Amnesia: An Image of New York City in the 1970's

At its inception 30 years ago, what has since become known as the Housing Studio at Columbia’s Graduate School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation, was not understood as a unique or stand alone studio, or as an overtly coordinated or separate component of the school’s curriculum. Today the Housing Studio is a unique segment of the school’s program as well as a threshold studio that provides the culmination of the core design studios within the Master of Architecture program.

The current Housing Studio has arguably relied also on a form of amnesia, a vague but pervasive sense that the early housing studios were perhaps more overtly activist at their inception then they actually were. But was this the case—and indeed, if it was, how have the terms changed today?

Prominent in this collective memory is an essential reading of New York City urban history—perimeter blocks, the very material of New York City, the urban grid, the networks of public housing blocks, the transportation systems, and the zones of wealth, poverty and race—but also a specter of the city in the 1970’s as a city in crisis. The Housing Studio has always rooted its work in New York—grafting it into the city’s hardware and unlike other school’s housing programs, New York City has served as the school’s continual barometer. New York, provides a reading of the local and knowable, but also immense and diverse urban circumstances; but the Housing Studio also is set against a broader national image—indeed a mirage of some sort—and projection of a social/political spectacle that New York City has borne for the nation in every form of media. A 1968 Time magazine cover story on Mayor John Lindsey characterized the city—in not atypical terms for the late 60’s and mid 70’s—in the cover story “New York: The Breakdown of a City.” Three years into Lindsey's term, the article claimed that the city's welfare roles had swollen by 40% —that 1 in 8 New Yorkers were receiving relief, and that New York had become a national magnet for welfare recipients. Of course, housing, and public housing in particular, in the 1960's and 1970's was at its core a major component of New York’s political landscape, but the Housing Studio has actually rarely linked itself solely to poverty or public housing.

A significant aspect of the current work of the Housing Studio has been to re-vise both the literal cartography, and material of New York City—we will address newly emerging sites in the city, and design teams will make significant new proposals for design, but will they also revise the media driven myth that New York City produces of itself and that it receives from outside itself? The studio will seek to become newly global in its concerns—but it also will bear the project of very local and essential need. These attributes create a very dense weave of concerns that each design team will hopefully bring to some level of new evidence and potential.

A key question is how do we register or formulate the links between design and politics today, how do we see the work of a Housing Studio in the context of work in programs in Planning, Advanced Architecture Design, and Urban Design—in History and Theory. More so, how are other programs seeing the role of New York City in their realms? The barometers and use of statistics that were used to describe and act upon both urban form and urban social conditions in the 1960's have changed—at times dramatically. Social programs such as welfare ranks have shrunk under new policies in the ten years since 1996 alone—and successive waves of gentrification spliced with global wealth have reformatted the demographics of NYC social life. But more critically perhaps—the intellectual means available to engage questions of poverty or constituencies at risk have evolved and are less overtly instrumental and less inclined (ideally) to objectify those they seek to assist.

The studio will ask you to make theoretical and applied attempts to negotiate these questions. By applied we mean outlining actual case histories and analysis of government policy and structure: for example—in the 1960’s the formation of the Office of Economic Opportunity, which funded poverty assistance programs (under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson) that are still in existence today such as Head Start, was subsequently headed by both Donald Rumsfeld and Frank Carlucci. Both were subsequent Secretaries of Defense. Carlucci was also CEO of IBM and the head of the global hedge and equity fund the Carlyle Group. Do these biographies matter? — There are of course many of them—or do they indicate a structural question of how government and markets interrelate and how architectural and urban development is indeed tied quite directly to political change and ideology? These shifts force new theoretical and practical/
material positions about how one characterizes the actions and role of government in the midst of inequity and social need.

To this end the studio will discuss the role of statistics and data, and new means to make use of and indeed organize data. Our work will be organized in part with lectures by guest and faculty whose work specializes in the use of data in policy and urban design. Laura Kurgan will present research completed by the Spatial Information Design Lab and discuss techniques of using demographic data in conjunction with mapping to affect social and political change.

40 Years Ago
The War on the War on Poverty:

The creation of the Office for Economic Opportunity.

From Wikipedia: "The Office of Economic Opportunity was the agency responsible for administering most of the War on Poverty programs created as part of United States President Lyndon B. Johnson's Great Society legislative agenda."

"Programs such as VISTA, Job Corps, Community Action and Head Start were all administered by the OEO. It was established in 1964, but quickly became a target of both left-wing and right-wing critics of the War on Poverty. The OEO was dismantled by President Richard Nixon in 1973, though many of the agency's programs were transferred to other government agencies."

"The O.E.O., from the Republican point of view, was a hardship post. Nixon hated the agency, which had become the point of interaction between the federal government and the sixties—the agency most likely to attract demonstrations and occupations. Rumsfeld was supposed to calm things down—in particular, to put an end to political protesting, on the government's nickel, by recipients of O.E.O. grants. Working at the O.E.O., however, was not bad for one's career in
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At its outset as a New Deal program, low income and poverty housing provisions were understood as a national problem addressed by national legislation, and a network of housing authorities that were each city based and named. The construction of public housing was essentially enacted as a network of city based programs, but New York City alone received the bulk of the initial federal monies for poverty housing and continues to today. By 1975, public housing was deeply registered in the national imagination, often conflating issues of poverty, welfare and racial strife and inequity with city life—arguably understood as an iconic urban situation it was cordoned off in the center (or edge) of American cities, literally distant from a mainstream viewer reading Time or watching the nightly news. As such it could be addressed with a sense of distance, or objectivity—reading the journalism from the late sixties and early seventies today it is startling to see major though oddly normative news stories forecasting the social and economic meltdowns of America’s then largest city. Public Housing, however, has always been a national project funded at the federal level. Below is the PHA Field Office network as described in 1941. New York and Chicago are the major sites of Public Housing today—but so too are sites in Bridgeport, CT or Houston. Public Housing in this network was a national organization—funded by a federal program but enacted as a city based and indeed city/Mayor’s Office staffed board. Federal interest is and was deeply entwined with city interest. Our studio will begin to examine these conditions today—in particular how this national issue has become increasingly global.

Finally, Rumsfeld is offered a job in the Nixon administration (albeit an unlikely one) at the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), an anti-poverty agency started by Lyndon Johnson. As director of the OEO, Rumsfeld is expected to lobby for its congressional funding — funding he had vetoed as a member of Congress. Nixon and his top advisers want Rumsfeld to slowly phase out the OEO, but, “to everyone’s surprise, particularly the surprise of other Republican friends of Rumsfeld,” says Mann, “he digs in and really pushes hard for the program.”

He cuts non-performing projects and works with the states to develop more economically feasible ones. “He saved it, but he saved it by revolutionizing it, by changing it,” remembers his deputy director, Frank Carlucci. While at the OEO, Rumsfeld hires a “quiet and unassuming” Capitol Hill intern named Dick Cheney to be his executive assistant...PBS.org

History: Regional office system of PHA derives from that adopted in 1939 by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. Housing Authority Region</th>
<th>Headquarters</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>CT, ME, MA, NH, RI, VT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>NJ, NY, PA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>DE, DC, KY, MD, PR, VA, WV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>AL, FL, GA, NC, SC, TN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>CO, IL, IN, IA, KS, MI, MN, MO, MT, NE, ND, OH, SD, WI, WY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth, TX</td>
<td>AR, LA, MS, NM, OK, TX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>AZ, CA, HI, ID, NV, OR, UT, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From: "The Quiet Man Dick Cheney’s discreet rise to unprecedented power." by Nicholas Lemann
New Yorker
2001-05-07

History: Regional office system of PHA derives from that adopted in 1939 by:
Public Housing Transformation: 70 Years After the New Deal

Columbia has not been the only school to offer a housing studio—and planning departments if not architecture programs were deeply embedded in work in his arena—but Columbia was perhaps alone in the degree to which its location in New York City at Morningside Heights, and its focus on housing coalesced. In making New York City its laboratory, the school in essence seemed to be working in a manner that was both local, and knowable, yet also national, and via the media spectacle of how poverty, race and urban life were being played out, it was also of necessity a player at the cleft between pragmatic circumstance of essential human need—life at the literal doorstep of and within an urban building—and simultaneously within the media driven projections that funneled and certainly mythologized an untouchable—and possibly therefore unchangeable—view of urban life. To a tremendously dispersed audience—to the then new megalopolis that housed a new public well outside the city—such a situation surely created a cleft that fueled a divide that the studio in its current form still must cross.

"Critical" Advocacy: Columbia, the IAUS

The housing studio as directed by Richard Plunz, and Kenneth Frampton, both of whom shaped and founded what became the original studio in 975, often seemed to be an attempt to de-politicize a sector of architectural and urban design that by 1975 had become thoroughly misconstrued in the previous decades. As a political tool of slum clearing, and urban renewal—as destructive displacement tools re-organizing whole communities and neighborhoods—housing by the mid 1970’s was discussed in terms that seemed to try to establish their own internal value. The early Housing Studios and those of the middle 1980’s often addressed housing in decidedly less political terms, but still squarely aimed at a nexus of social issues and late modern themes of production. What Richard Plunz has referred to as “good housing” seems in part reminiscent of the term “good design” as it was employed in the Museum of Modern Art exhibitions under the same name. Kenneth Frampton has referred to it as “middle class housing,” again in a way that related housing production to social issues—though without the same urgency of urban/political crisis evoked in the activism around poverty or welfare issues in regard to public housing.

Studio work in these years was at times based in issues of type—both in a pragmatic sense indicating issues such as low-rise/high density housing, or a theoretical project of type. The Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies publication of Aldo Rossi’s Architecture and the City, and A Scientific Autobiography, and also writing by Rafael Moneo in Oppositions on Rossi’s work on type, and autonomy, would have given more agency to architecture by de-limiting its reference to political or economic content. Frampton’s work in low-rise high-density housing, the Marcus Garvey Housing, was designed in collaboration with Arthur Baker and Theodore Lieberman of the Urban Development Corporation, and completed in 1976 in Brownsville, Brooklyn. The work was also exhibited in the 1973 Museum of Modern Art, New York exhibition, “Another Chance for Housing: Low Rise Alternatives.” Paul Bayard, director of the Historic Preservation program at the school today, was an attorney for the UDC during the late 1960’ and early 1970’s.

The influence of this work is still strong in the Housing Studio, as is a commitment to essential design issues that remain key in the studio— the layout of apartment units at 1/4” to 1’, designing building massing for daylight provisions, etc. However, studio work today more often tries to incorporate —
even inculcate — everyday spaces of housing with processes that are more likely to extend rather than enclose space: pragmatic concerns to connect dwelling spaces to daylight, are likely to be enacted with simultaneous attempts to reveal the mathematics of building form, or to extend the interiority of the unit in ways that embed its logic into the motors of local infrastructure. **Incantations of themes prominent in the 1970’s are re-examined today** — “Housing is a right” (recall Bella Abzug’s pin stuck in her hat, or speeches addressing equal opportunity for mortgage access)—for example, is renewed in the context of dexterous analytical / studio work that links concepts of the 70’s call for housing rights to a new constellation of world cities or competing interests.

The work on interiors in the Housing Studio has proven to often be the most compelling, yet also the most tortured—in contemporary housing, designers always asks who produces the envelope, and how stable it should be. Our current work, we believe, has usefulness well beyond the New York City arena, and the school’s spatial skills seem primed for new applications.

**Housing is a Right?**

The studio presents housing development as a set of competing rights—not always in the banner form of protest, or overt political action, but by linking themes of property — to ownership—that are newly potent (and potentially destructive) in federal low-income housing goals to historic goals of inequity. The Housing Studio has been deeply influenced by concepts of land tenure, and titling un-titled property—by moving towards legal forms of agency prior to design; in this regard we have been influenced by economist Hernando de Soto, but also more up close figures within our own field such as Teddy Cruz.

Hernando de Soto has been a leading figure in attempting to show property title and value to land and housing assets on behalf of poor occupants—de Soto's work ascribes market value to not titled property and does so on behalf of those who have tenency. Cruz also works in this manner—solving problems of poverty with the tools of market capitalism.

The housing studio increasingly sees a potential parity between housing development in the United States and non-US sites. In fact, in light of the absence of a history of advocacy and government support for housing provisions in developing countries it is possible to look to developing countries, how they are now creating means of addressing populations at risk, as useful sources of positive invention for work in US cities where support and advocacy for at risk populations is decreasing.

**Planning for a Post Hope VI Housing Authority.**

Between 1996 and 2001, as U.S. housing policy increasingly moved toward less reliance on direct subsidy of low income and poverty housing, more than fifty-one thousand public housing units were razed or converted. Most of this transformation—directed to a nationwide network of U.S. Housing Authority sites—was done through a program based within the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The program is titled Hope VI. Hope VI supplies funding to demolish “distressed” public housing units, and is intended also to create a greater demographic mix in public housing blocks. While income is a standard denominator used to reveal the social demographic, any number of other variables such as race or family make up was also used. Hope VI has been understood as both a boost to public housing—it does fund renovation—but also as a force that at its core diminishes the number of public

**Studio Site: Fall 2005: Prospect Plaza Houses vacated and partially demolished prior to redevelopment. New low rise housing in foreground. 2005**
housing units available. The program is now more than ten years old, and its ramifications while clearly visible are also far from understood: it is only beginning.

Hope VI programs have had a very clear architectural and urban design impact and expression: this places the program's initiatives firmly within our profession's expertise, yet in its social and political dimensions it tests the limits of what architecture can address. Or does it? This is a central question facing our studio.

In most cases, former tenants of public housing apartments – almost universally designed within formal traditions of CIAM inspired modernism — were relocated to newly constructed low-rise housing blocks, condominiums, and townhouses (containing apartments). Within architectural paradigms the debate about this has often centered on the overt changes in building design. Its roots in this arena are deep, and can be traced to an evolution that included housing design in Europe—the Berlin Internationale Bauausstellung (IBA) of 1984-87, for example—and U. S. post modernism and what has become known today as New Urbanism. While the formal antecedents for Hope VI redevelopment can be argued to be clear, it is the structural changes in the policies that are less scrutinized and perhaps as compelling to architectural design and to conceptions of space.

Hope VI is at it's a core program of remediation—funds are literally for architectural renovation and repair; and for a far more ambiguous—some critics would say unjust — project of social renovation. Critics contend it is the commitment to low income, and poverty housing that is being renovated, i.e., diminished. The dynamics of the market, and its potential for innovation, are increasingly the force that is expected to provide sustenance to lower income people. The question that comes with programs such as Hope VI is to what degree they represent a move away from state initiated practices that run contrary to markets.

Architecture and planning have been deeply embedded in these questions for a century—from literal incantations to remove housing production from speculative practices (but still engage technology) by Walter Gropius, to recent innovations in how architecture engages production and standardization (the Non-Standard is one example)—the questions about markets, architectural design and production linked to questions of inequity persist in architecture today.

Public Housing in the United States but also worldwide is being forced to confront these questions in new ways: below are transformations in funding and policy for Housing support in Germany, The United States, Russia and China.

The Market and the Subsized Dwelling: Dramatic Change: Case Studies

1. Germany: Sell Public Assets to Private International Equity Funds at Highest Price Possible: Public Housing in Private Hands By Mark Landler, Published: May 5, 2006 / Mr. Rossberg reached a deal in March to sell Dresden's entire stock of 48,000 city-owned apartments to an American private equity firm, the Fortress Investment Group, for $1.2 billion. In a single stroke, Dresden wiped out its burdensome public debt. "We had to move fast," he said, "because if you had 10 German cities selling their property, it would be a buyer's market." That may soon be the case. German cities are lining up for a mammoth wave of foreign investment in their property. Lured by a German real estate market that is the most stagnant in any major European country, and a vast supply of well-kept public housing, American and other foreign companies have already snapped up dozens of projects in Berlin, Bremen, Essen and other German cities.


Fortress manages approximately $11 billion in private equity capital on behalf of leading institutional investors and high net worth individuals. The private equity funds primarily make control-oriented investments in cash flowing businesses and asset portfolios in the United States and Western Europe.

Fortress has grown to become a leading private equity firm by acquiring attractive businesses and building them in partnership with management. The private equity funds focus on acquiring cash flowing asset-based businesses that offer (i) downside protection in the form of tangible collateral and diversified cash flows combined with (ii) significant upside
potential from improvements to the operations, capitalization, and growth and strategic development of the underlying businesses. Sectors in which the Fortress private equity funds have been active investors include financial services, residential and commercial real estate, senior living, transportation, energy and power, and media/telecommunications.

Michael Jackson Refinances to Stave Off Bankruptcy (Update2) By Alex Armitage and Dana Cimilluca
April 13 (Bloomberg) -- Michael Jackson, struggling to stave off bankruptcy, agreed to a debt refinancing that may lead him to forfeit a share of a music catalog that includes more than 200 Beatles songs. Jackson refinanced loans with hedge fund Fortress Investment Group LLC, the singer said in an e-mailed statement today. The statement didn’t disclose terms of the refinancing.

2. United States: Transform City funded and supported Asset into Market Assets: 110-Building Site in N.Y. Is Put Up for Sale / By Charles V. Bagli and Janny Scott. Published: August 30, 2006
Metropolitan Life is putting Stuyvesant Town and Peter Cooper Village — a stretch of 110 apartment buildings along the East River — on the auction block. The sale of Stuyvesant Town and Peter Cooper Village, shown in 1947, would transform a complex built for World War II veterans. With a target price of nearly $5 billion, the sale would be the biggest deal for a single American property in modern times. It would undoubtedly transform what has been an affordable, leafy redoubt for generations of Manhattan’s middle class: teachers and nurses, firefighters and police officers, office clerks and construction workers. The deal is likely to lead to profound changes for many of the 25,000 residents of the two complexes, where two-thirds of the apartments have regulated rents at roughly half the market rate. Any new owner paying the equivalent of $450,000 per apartment is going to be eager to create a money-making luxury enclave, real estate executives say.

The sale would only add to the seismic cultural shifts already under way in New York City and especially in Manhattan, where soaring housing costs have made the borough increasingly inhospitable to working-class and middle-class residents. It would be another challenge to Mayor Michael R. Bloomberg’s effort to stabilize and expand the number of affordable apartments in the city.

3. Russia: Create Market Assets and Create Market Financing for Private Market Housing President Vladimir Putin. From the Speech at the Meeting with the Cabinet Members, the Heads of the Federal Assembly, and State Council Members, September 5, 2005
The goal of the Affordable Housing project is to lower interest rates on mortgage loans over a period of two years and almost triple the total mortgage loans made, bringing them to a total of 260 billion roubles. By 2007, our task is to encourage significant growth in housing construction. Compared with 2004, the amount of construction
should have increased by at least a third. For this reason, budgets of all levels must allocate funds for the
development of housing infrastructure. I emphasise that budgets of all levels should do this. Recently, a lot
has been said about mortgages. However, in practice not enough has been done. I ask that we complete
the legal basis on which to issue mortgage securities. I charge the government of the Russian Federation to
develop a mechanism for subsidising mortgage credits, and to considerably increase the authorised capital
of the Agency for mortgages and housing credits, after giving it state guarantees.

One of the most pressing problems we face today is providing people with affordable housing. This remains
a real problem for the majority of people in Russia. The government, regional and local authorities should
work towards having at least a third of the population (and not a tenth, as is currently the case) able to buy
housing that meets modern standards by 2010. They will buy housing through their own savings and with
the help of mortgage schemes.

4. China: United States Department of Housing and Urban Development Provides Assistance to
China in creating Secondary Housing Mortgage Securities Market. Dateline: 05/20/00
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development HUD and Chinese Ministry of
Construction Lay Foundation for Groundbreaking Secondary Mortgage Market Creation in China
SHANGHAI, China, May 20 /PRNewswire/ -- U.S. Housing and Urban Development Secretary Andrew
Cuomo today (Sunday) took the first step in implementing a housing finance pilot project that will help China
establish a secondary mortgage market and ultimately securitize residential mortgages. The program, under
development by HUD and Chinese Ministry of Construction officials, is expected to result in a pilot securi-
tization program that will be implemented by Chinese financial institutions. The development plan calls for
a series of substantive working groups comprised of U.S. public and private sector officials, U.S. private
sector financial institutions and Chinese government and financial officials. Discussion from these working
groups will result in an action plan for the securitization program

Below: Investment Bank analysis of Chinese Mortgage Markets:

**Residential Housing investments In China**

The success of the reforms in 1998 has translated into a booming domestic property sector and acceleration in housing investments in China. The share of residential housing investment as a percentage of GDP has risen to 5.6% in 2003, up from less
than 3% before 1998 and less than 1% before the 1990s. This is in comparison to other developed or emerging economies that had undertaken a higher share of residential housing investments for decades.

**Residential investment as percentage of GDP:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>China</th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>Singapore</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960s</td>
<td>Na</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>Na</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: CEIC, Goldman Sachs Research estimates*
2006—Brooklyn to Queens—2 Distinct Sites and 2 Neighborhoods

The 2005 Housing Studio at Columbia worked on two sites simultaneously—both sites fell within the Brooklyn neighborhood of Brownsville and they dealt directly with redevelopment of the NYCHA site at Prospect Plaza. Information on these sites and the social and political issues are included in this syllabus to facilitate work this fall. The two sites were situated within walking distance of each other—but they fall within very different areas of Brownsville.

The Housing Studio will again work on two sites simultaneously—however, the work will be situated in Queens, New York. While the work is similar in many ways the two sites are far more distinct than last year and indeed harder to compare despite some obvious differences in constituencies and development potentials. We will again work with NYCHA—however, the NYCHA presence in Queens is very distinct from the role the agency has played in Brooklyn, Manhattan and the Bronx. NYCHA’s prominence in those boroughs is distinctive—in Queens, new immigration patterns have made issues that were once central to NYCHA such as race or ethnicity and income newly present and newly complex in Queens.

Queens is the most ethnically diverse county in the United States—and while immigration patterns in the past five years have actually seen greater immigration in the United States in the suburbs than the major cities, Queens remains not only the most diverse county, it is also a bellweather for social change both in NY and in the United States. Our work in Brooklyn did not instigate the same level of inquiry and attention to immigration.

Your work in studio will in part be a project to analyze the relations between two sites in Queens—and to create the programming that links the sites. This will be attempted in large part in relation to local circumstances at each site; but also as an attempt to examine the structure of urbanism in Queens by examining that which indeed does not easily coordinate—and may not coordinate—or provide reductive synthesis.

Post Hope VI:

A major goal of our semester, during the fall 2005—but more so in 2006—is to design housing that can address the needs of the NYC redevelopment sites, and the people who they serve—in ways that provide an alternative to issues of displacement that are not only part of public housing’s history, but are also a literal component of the Hope VI renewal programs. In Queens, these questions have very different manifestations—displacement is driven by market change to what are already market sites—and change driven by varying degrees of immigration, but also the maturation of areas that have long been changed by immigration.

This syllabus gives background on the Hope VI programs — however, the studio will require each team to
do research on the program. To do this we ask that you consider the history of the two sites—and the project a Public Housing Authority, amidst recent demands for a broad array of both low income, as well as poverty housing—but also the upper tier of income groups and the speculative pressures they exert on property. What are the potential futures that are now being projected onto the two neighborhoods in Queens we are studying.

Your work will encompass a broad spectrum of income levels, race and ethnicities, and in particular a tendency in Queens to enclavism. In this context faculty will help guide work to address responding to constituent need—but more critically how constituencies are identified and what techniques or means were historically employed and what techniques are available today. These two sites will address a range of people whose needs are at times highly evident—but also at times difficult to distinguish. Who is at risk, who is poor, who is highly mobile and economically advanced—and how do these people interact. Does it affect design? Planning? Organization? Concepts of space and interiority? Building construction and means?

An in-studio conference will address these questions with outside guests lending expertise, however, it is expected that each studio will develop unique means of assessing the issues.

Queens Site 1: Jamaica

Site 1: One urban block adjacent to the AirTrain and LIRR Station at downtown Jamaica. Traditional urban planning currently has street front commercial space backed by residential houses and duplexes.

Client: GJDC: Greater Jamaica Development Corporation

Scope: Student Teams will design one city block of new housing with densities set by re-zoned-FAR. The existing block currently has a small amount of single family houses/ and duplexes as well as commercial property. The re-zoning allows a much greater FAR for both programs and it would be possible to remove all existing buildings or to retain them selectively. This site will mix housing and commerical uses—though you are expected only to fully develop the housing uses. Unit allocations must address the emerging needs of Jamaica and be related to the wider needs of Queens.

Zoning: C4-5x—FAR: 5.0 / Expected Apartment Units: approx. 200 units.

Queens Site 2: Flushing

Site 2 is a New York City Housing Authority development titled Bland Houses. It is at a distance from but opposite and in view of Shea Stadium. Bland Houses represents a typical NYCHA condition of buildings separated from the street front.

Bland Houses: 40-25 College Point Boulevard, Queens, NY 11354
Total Number of Apartments: 399
Total Population: 978
Completion Year: 1952

Client: New York City Housing Authority

Program: Provide design to add mixed income housing to the existing NYCHA site.

Scope: NYCHA has begun to define the first steps of a new program that would ideally add mixed income rental housing to existing NYCHA sites. These existing NYCHA sites are potential targets for new development due the open space and the recent budget cuts that NYCHA has faced for the first time its history. Funds for federal housing authorities have improved for southern and semi-suburban sites (in particular for Texas and Florida); NYC has lost funds in the past two years. NYCHA requests design proposals that would add housing to NYCHA sites and in particular could be seen to produce the heterogeneity of population that was in part a Hope VI goal without removing any NYCHA housing. Instead the new units would be added to NYCHA sites and it is possible that a new building type could be added or a transformation of the existing NYCHA structures. Bland House is a site that can sustain new development. NYCHA has never been seen it as an attractive solution to remove NYCHA units and replace them with market rate units under Hope VI—NYCHA has strong demands on unit vacancy and does not have the social distress that has been said to give reason to remove units in other FHA's such as Chicago or Bridgeport, CT. Expected Apartment Units: approx. 100 units.
While the objective is to provide affordable housing to residents and workers in the area, a mixed income project that can attract higher income families will make the project financially viable.

Instead, a complete market study that looks at the demographics in a specified area is required to get a true picture of the demand for new housing development at this location.

From GJDC draft plan for Downtown Jamaica

Queens Site 1: Jamaica
Queens Site 2: Flushing
## Deficits at the Housing Authority

Revenue has not kept pace with expenses at the New York City Housing Authority, leading to significant projected budget deficits. The agency says it will no longer be able to cover deficits from its reserve fund.

### N.Y.C.H.A. Budget Gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gaps in Millions of Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'01</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'03</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'05</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'07</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Change in Nondiscretionary Spending, 2001 to 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Change in Millions of Dollars</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>$136.2</td>
<td>+45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensions</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>+8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>+42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Bargaining</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>+28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers’ Compensation</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>+39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>+11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>+14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: New York City Housing Authority
Note: All figures reported by fiscal year.*

---

## New York Asks Help From Poor in Housing Crisis

**By JANNY SCOTT**

Published: March 9, 2006

The New York City Housing Authority, landlord to more than 400,000 poor New Yorkers, is facing a budget shortfall of $168 million and has proposed narrowing the gap by charging residents new fees and increasing old ones for everything from owning a dishwasher to getting a toilet unclogged.

### Multimedia

- [Graphic: Deficits at the Housing Authority](#)

The authority says its operating deficit stems from enormous increases in energy and pension costs while its federal financing for public housing has been cut. Since 2001, the agency says, it has spent $357 million from its reserves to close repeated budget gaps; this year, for the first time, it no longer has enough reserves to cover the shortfall.

So it has proposed charging tenants $5.75 a month to run a washing machine, $5 a month to operate a dishwasher, $10 a month for a separate freezer. Parking fees will rise to $75 from $5 a year on April 1.
The number of immigrants has increased five times as fast in the suburbs as in New York City since 2000, reversing historical migration patterns as new immigrants increasingly bypass the city in search of jobs and affordable housing across the region, new census data show.

According to figures released this month by the Census Bureau, the number of immigrants living in the region’s suburbs grew by about 225,000 from 2000 to 2005, compared with an increase of about 44,000 in the city during the same period. During the 1990’s, the number of immigrants grew by 788,000 in the city, compared with 632,000 in the suburbs, the data show.

“The inner city has shifted away from being the big center for job creation, and now jobs are being created in the suburbs,” said Douglas S. Massey, a Princeton University demographer. “Immigrants have followed.”

The borough of Queens is a patchwork quilt of dozens of unique neighborhoods, each with its own distinct identity. Residents of Queens have been known to identify more with their neighborhood than with the borough as a whole. Howard Beach and Middle Village are home to large Italian-American populations, Rockaway Beach has a large Irish-American population, Astoria, in the northwest, is traditionally home to one of the largest Greek populations outside of Greece, and is home to a growing population of young professionals from Manhattan. Maspeth is home to many European immigrants, including a large Polish population.

Long Island City is a major manufacturing and commercial center, as well as being the location of the massive Queensbridge housing project, former home to a number of hip-hop luminaries including perhaps its most famous son, Nas. Jackson Heights, Elmhurst, and Corona make up an enormous conglomeration of Hispanic and Asian American communities; Flushing, in the north-central part of the borough, is a major commercial hub for Chinese American and Korean American businesses; Richmond Hill, in the south, has the largest population of Sikhs outside of India; Forest Hills and Kew Gardens, in central Queens, have traditionally large Jewish populations as well as large Hispanic populations while Jamaica is a major business and transportation hub for the borough, and also home to large African American and Caribbean populations. There are also middle-class African-American, Filipino American, Latino and Caribbean neighborhoods such as Saint Albans, Cambria Heights, Queens Village, Rosedale and Laurelton along east and southeast Queens. Together, these neighborhoods comprise the most diverse county in the United States, and easily provide the richest cultural experience found anywhere in the world. Some Queens neighborhoods, such as Ozone Park, Bayside, Maspeth, Kew Gardens and Woodside are home to a very diverse mix of many different nationalities.
September 13, Wednesday
StudioConference: "Policy and Power / Instrumental or?"
Moderator: Michael Bell and Laura Kurgan

How are government and market systems responding to and identifying those living at risk and in poverty today? What shifts have occurred in how we identify those in poverty or at risk since the advent of major national advocacy policies and national and transnational systems of governmental aid. What new means of use and relevance does statistical data, demographics and instrumental systems such as geographic mapping of data offer today?

1. Are there similarities between American/US poor constituencies and third world constituencies in terms of what they can expect as national resources and actions taken on their behalf?

2. What potential are there for new forms of justice and equity means that are a result of the globalization of the US economy—has globalization created new means to care for the US poor?

3. Does the recent rise in immigration to non center cities—and indeed to cities as well—have parallels in the potential to create racial strife that can be understood as related to strife in the Civil Rights Era?

4. Who are the urban poor today? What kinds of categories exist to describe the poor? in the United States? In the developed world? In the developing worlds?

5. Who fails to be easily identified and what changes are there that could help see and respond to those that are at risk?

Panel Discussion and Conference / Guests:

Viren Brahmbhatt is an architect and urban designer. For the past several years, he has focused on Viren Brahmbhatt is an architect and urban designer. For the past several years, he has focused on affordable housing and infrastructure in New York City. He has worked with the New York City Housing Authority’s Design Department on design and implementation of the Community Centers Program, GIS, Urban Design projects, and a Master Plan for HOPE VI Project in Brooklyn. He has also collaborated on several research projects with the School of Architecture & Urban Design and the Earth Institute at Columbia University. Mr. Brahmbhatt holds a Masters degree in Architecture and Urban Design from Pratt Institute and an undergraduate degree form the School of Architecture (CEPT), Ahmedabad, India where he also held a faculty position (1988-1992). His published work includes such independent projects as “The Vacant City: Urban Design Project for The Mont Des Arts, Brussels (Belgium) and “Investigations into Architectural Design: Conceptions and Processes” published in 1988 (CEPT, India). Viren is currently working on three architectural projects for community facilities in New York City and master plans for residential developments at Markham Gardens in Staten Island, Linden Houses and Prospect Plaza in Brooklyn as well as various other sites in New York City. His ongoing work in India includes various small and large-scale architectural projects, housing and a mixed-use riverfront development project in Calcutta.

Eric Cadora directs the newly formed Justice Mapping Center, where he oversees the use of geographical analyses to help corrections departments and policymakers understand and address the spatial dimensions of incarceration, parole/probation supervision, and reentry. The Justice Mapping Center works in close collaboration with the JFA Institute, which provides a range of analytical services to corrections and government. He also partners with Columbia University’s Spatial Information Design Lab to develop new spatial analyses that better visualize criminal justice policy and practice. Mr. Cadora served as the Program Officer for grant making at the Open Society Institute’s (OSI) After Prison Initiative from 2001 through 2004. He joined OSI after 14 years at the Center for Alternative Sentencing and Employment Services (CASES), New York’s largest running intermediate sanction program, where he oversaw its Information Systems, Research, and Policy units. Mr. Cadora is co-author of Community Justice, a primer on the history of problem-solving, neighborhood-level, criminal justice reform in community policing, community courts, neighborhood probation, and corrections. Together with Charles Swartz, he has published mapping studies for The Urban Institute, the Council of State Governments, New Jersey Institute of Social Justice, and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Sumila Gulyani is Assistant Professor of Urban Planning at Columbia's Graduate School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation. She is also Director of the Infrastructure and Poverty Action Lab (I-PAL). Prior to joining Columbia University in 2005, Dr. Gulyani spent ten years at the World Bank working on infrastructure and urban development programs and policies in Sub-Saharan Africa; East, South-East and South Asia; and Central America. As a researcher and practitioner in the field of international economic development, Dr. Gulyani focuses on economic and institutional issues in: (i) infrastructure and service delivery (especially, water supply, transportation and electricity); (ii) urban poverty and slum upgrading; and (iii) urban governance and municipal finance. She is currently leading a World Bank study of 4000 slum households in Nairobi and Dakar to examine the nature of poverty, jobs and service delivery in low-income, informal settlements in these cities. Dr. Gulyani received her Ph.D. in Economic Development and Urban Planning from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1998. She also holds graduate degrees in architecture and city planning (S.M.Arch.S. and M.C.P.) from MIT.
The New York Quality Housing Program allows a greater FAR in exchange for a developer providing higher quality housing:

Standard Unit Sizes:
- Single Room Occupancy: 500 sq ft +/-
- One Bedroom Apartment: 850 sq ft +/-
- Two Bedroom Apartment: 1100 sq ft +/-
- Three Bedroom Apartment: 1350 sq ft +/-
- Four Bedroom Apartment: 1600 sq ft +/-

1. Compatibility with existing neighbourhood and scale and character.
2. Provide adequate sized and naturally lit ventilated housing.
3. Provide on-site recreation space to meet needs of occupants.
4. Design to promote security and safety of the residents.
5. Apartments should be designed to provide sunlight for a significant portion of the day.
6. A Daycare Center should be provided.

American's with Disabilities Act: every apartment should be accessible; at least two elevators are required. Designs that do not meet this criteria are unacceptable.

Studio Work is required to address federal legislation that addresses the American's with Disabilities Act. Amended in 1988, the Fair Housing Act shows the literal aspect of accessibility issues; these aspects of housing law are concurrent too and a parcel of other long running aspects of housing provision that are discussed and formulated as rights.

Fair Housing Act

The Fair Housing Act, as amended in 1988, prohibits housing discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, disability, familial status, and national origin. Its coverage includes private housing, housing that receives Federal financial assistance, and State and local government housing. It is unlawful to discriminate in any aspect of selling or renting housing or to deny a dwelling to a buyer or renter because of the disability of that individual, an individual associated with the buyer or renter, or an individual who intends to live in the residence. Other covered activities include, for example, financing, zoning practices, new construction design, and advertising.

The Fair Housing Act requires owners of housing facilities to make reasonable exceptions in their policies and operations to afford people with disabilities equal housing opportunities. For example, a landlord with a "no pets" policy may be required to grant an exception to this rule and allow an individual who is blind to keep a guide dog in the residence. The Fair Housing Act also requires landlords to allow tenants with disabilities to make reasonable access-related modifications to their private living space, as well as to common use spaces. (The landlord is not required to pay for the changes.) The Act further requires that new multifamily housing with four or more units be designed and built to allow access for persons with disabilities. This includes accessible common use areas, doors that are wide enough for wheelchairs, kitchens and bathrooms that allow a person using a wheelchair to maneuver, and other adaptable features within the units.

Complaints of Fair Housing Act violations may be filed with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. For more information or to file a complaint, contact:

Office of Program Compliance and Disability Rights
Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
451 7th Street, S.W., Room 5242
Washington, D.C. 20410

www.hud.gov/offices/fheo

Architectural Barriers Act

The Architectural Barriers Act (ABA) requires that buildings and facilities that are designed, constructed, or altered with Federal funds, or leased by a Federal agency, comply with Federal standards for physical accessibility. ABA requirements are limited to architectural standards in new and altered buildings and in newly leased facilities. They do not address the activities conducted in those buildings and facilities. Facilities of the U.S. Postal Service are covered by the ABA. For more information or to file a complaint, contact:
Brooklyn and Hope VI: Appendix Material on Hope VI.

Information provided as background on Brooklyn and Hope VI development. Please plan to formulate planning and development goals for your work on NYCHA sites with these performance goals in mind—and to discuss new directions “After Hope VI.”

1. Hope VI Case Study

Site — 1. Prospect Plaza Houses
Source of Action: Department of Housing and Urban Development:
Studio to Design: 430 Saratoga Avenue: demolished: 102 Units
Location: Prospect Place, Saratoga Avenue, Howard Avenue, Park Place.
Re-Entering: This site of Prospect Plaza is currently partially demolished to make way for renovation and for new housing.

HUD Involvement at Brownsville:

[quoted]

Prospect Plaza Houses, located in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville communities of Brooklyn, was built in 1974 and originally consisted of four-masonry 12 and 15 story buildings containing 368 public housing units. Several years back the New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA), noting the deteriorating condition of the property and seeking to take advantage of HUD’s new vision for public housing embodied in the HOPE VI program, applied to HUD for funding to rethink and rebuild the complex. NYCHA was then rewarded for their creative vision through receipt of $21.4 million HOPE VI grant from HUD in 1999 for the revitalization of Prospect Plaza and the surrounding neighborhood. To date, one tower containing 102 units has already been demolished for development of new community center, commercial space and additional rental units. The June 27th event marked the next step toward revitalizing the remainder of the property. The completed work that will result will contain approximately 670 units: 323 public housing rental units, 273 non-public housing rental units (in townhouse configurations) and 37 two-family homeowner units. The total project, one which envisions a more mixed-use/mixed ownership concept, will in the end cost over $255 million.

[Source: NYCHA] The New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA) provides affordable housing to nearly 420,000 authorized low- and moderate-income residents living in 345 housing developments with nearly 2,700 residential buildings that include approximately 8,000 apartments in the five boroughs. The Bronx has 98 developments, Brooklyn has 101 developments, Manhattan has 103 developments, Queens has 20 developments and Staten Island has 11 developments. 42 of all such developments are for seniors only, and there are 6 FHA “acquired homes” under NYCHA’s jurisdiction as well.

2. Livonia Avenue

Action Source: Private Development / Federal Housing and Urban Development:
Studio to Design: Variable Units and Density.
Location: Livonia Avenue, south side of Livonia Avenue between Junius and Rockaway Avenue
Entering: Private Development

3. Studio Programming: Two Sites:
Alternative Futures to Hope VI Redevelopment

Each studio design team is asked to research the history of the Prospect Plaza and its current conversion with Hope VI funding. You are asked to design the complex in a way that can simultaneously meet the demands of Hope VI programming—that is adding new non-public housing and mixed use to the site as originally planned—and to retain the original density and number of public housing units. This can be accomplished with the simultaneous use of a site on Livonia Avenue.

The programming for the studio will encompass a single entire block of Prospect Plaza. This block contains
the two remaining towers and the absent demolished tower. The existing tower on the opposite block remains, and is not part of our studio site though it will have an impact of course.

Studios can choose to either keep the existing two towers on our block or re-design without them—but the studio program asks that the full original provisions of the NYCHA Public Housing that were on the block be provided for—266 units—and that the new non public housing be provided as well—either on site or by using a Livonia Street Site. Livonia Street is not understood in the syllabus as either primary, secondary or equal to the Prospect Plaza site—this is a design project to be formulated with each team.

Each studio should take on an analysis of the existing programming, and the changes that are underway. At the end of this analysis phase the faculty will meet to determine a direction culled from the work of the entire studio. The total new housing can be provided on the block of Prospect Plaza, and also provided at the Livonia Street site—studios must provide a method of allocating units. Our goal is to meet the standards of Hope VI in terms of new non-Public Housing can be added without losing existing Public Housing units.

The total number of units to be provided for is 395—allocated in a mix between that would produce 266 NYCHA units, 37 two family units, (74 units total) and 55 open market rental units. With individual studio analysis this can be revised — Hope VI is a program that provides new market rate housing by reducing the public housing units—as such each studio will need to analyze the program and the impact at Prospect Plaza.

When you look at the number please note that we are providing for NYCHA housing in three—not four—of the original towers. Our total number of NYCHA units is then 266 units rather than the 368 in the four towers. Extra programming such as retail, or institutional spaces should be addressed in diagrammatic form to show how it relates to the housing.

4. Site Profile: Hope VI and Prospect Plaza:
The official planning underway since 1998.

City: New York
Official PHA Name: New York City Housing Authority
Name of Site: Prospect Plaza Houses
HOPE VI Coordinator: Sharon Ebert

FY 1998 Revitalization Grant: $21.4 million
FY 1998 Demolition Grant: $731,688

In March of 1999, NYCHA was awarded a HOPE VI grant for the revitalization of Prospect Plaza Houses located in the Oceanhill / Brownsville section of Brooklyn, NY. HUD approved NYCHA's Revitalization Plan in November 1999. NYCHA has five years from the date of the award to expend all HOPE VI funds, or, until spring 2004.

The entire budget for the Revitalization Plan is over $90 million and includes HOPE VI funds, Capital Funds, private equity, private loans, financial contributions from local/city elected officials, and in-kind contributions from various community and social service partners.

This initiative is integrated with ongoing community development and neighborhood revitalization activities in the surrounding area, and enlists the participation of resident leaders, community-based organizations, elected officials and private entities. To maintain a presence in the community and provide Residents with direct access to services and program information, NYCHA's Department of Housing Finance and Development has identified temporary space within the Brownsville Multi-Service Center, 444 Thomas Boyland Street, for use as a Revitalization Activities Field Office. The Center is owned by the NYC Human Resources Administration (HRA) and operated by The Miracle Makers, Inc., a community-based not-for-profit.
The office is centrally located to accommodate Prospect Plaza residents who have temporarily relo-
cated elsewhere in Brooklyn and Queens, and close to public transportation (bus and subway). The
building is organized to promote service referrals—local and citywide providers are housed in the same
place—reducing travel and delays. Agencies operating in the Center include the Urban League, Central
Brooklyn Neighborhood Employment, Community Board 16 and Miracle Makers (childcare and service
referrals).

Built in 1974, Prospect Plaza Houses is now characterized by severe physical and social distress. The
low-income community, in which the development is situated, would benefit from new development and
the area's low-income residents are in need of (educational, life-/job-skills) training and services tailored
to their particular needs. NYHCA seeks to transform Prospect Plaza into a viable, mixed-income and
mixed-use development.

Under the Revitalization Plan, NYCHA and three Developments teams will rehabilitate 200 existing
dwelling units and construct 252 units to replace 368 existing public housing units. One Tower (102
dwelling units) is slated for demolition.
Specifically, the Plan includes:

· Construction of 37, two-family, three story brick townhouses on City-owned parcels, of which one unit
is owner-occupied and one unit is rental.

· Construction of three- and four-story brick townhouse-like buildings for a total of 138 rental units on a
City-owned parcel. Eighty-three (83) dwelling units will receive public housing operating subsidy and be
for public housing residents, the remaining 55 will be rented to the general public: all dwelling units will
have tax credit rents.

· Demolition of a 15-story masonry building (Tower #1) due to underground water problems and sub-
stantial rehabilitation of the three remaining towers resulting in a minimum of 322 new dwelling units of
which 240 will be for public housing residents and the remaining units will be for the general public. All
dwelling units will have tax credit rents. The 240 public housing dwelling units will receive public hous-
ing operating subsidies.

Of the 452 dwelling units, 355 units will be reserved for Prospect Plaza residents; the remaining 84
units will be for the general public. In addition, a 40,000 square foot (SF) multi-functional community
center that will house a 10,000 SF child day care center, a 10,000 SF job incubator center and a 20,000
SF recreation center will be built on the site of the demolished tower. Small neighborhood retail is also
planned along Saratoga Avenue. $3.8 million is set aside to provide community and supportive services
to the residents.

YCHA: Prospect Plaza Housing Revitalization
The opening phase of a $148 million HOPE VI revitalization plan for the New York City Housing
Authority’s Prospect Plaza Houses in the Ocean-Hill/Brownsville section of Brooklyn [has begun] for 37
new two-family townhouses.

[The groundbreaking] on Dean Street between Saratoga and Howard Avenues marks the site where 34
new two-family homes will be constructed. (Three two-family town homes will also be constructed on
vacant land on Sterling Place.) The first row of the modular town homes, which are being built at the
Brooklyn Navy Yard, were on display.
Community District 16: Brownsville/Ocean Hill
(Based on Census 2000 data—prepared by Common Ground Community, NY.

Demographics:
Borders Bedford-Stuyvesant, Crown Heights, and East New York
Vacant lots account for 10% of total land mass
Total population 85,343
There are 20,032 families in Brownsville
Nearly half of these are families of single mothers and their children

Housing:
84% of all Brownsville units are renter occupied
30% of all Brownsville units are public housing
42% of all families live in Public Housing
858 Brownsville families have become homeless over the last 4 years.

Income:
Median Family Income: $21,560, 50% of households have income below $20,000
39% of the population receives income supports of some kind

Education/Employment
40% of residents do not have a high school diploma
51% of residents above the age of 16 are not in the labor force

Reserve Reading at Butler Library: Brownsville
Pritchett, Wendell E. Brownsville, Brooklyn: Blacks, Jews, and the Changing Face of the Ghetto
Wilson, William J. The truly Disadvantaged: the Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy
Freedman, Samuel G., Upon this Rock: the Miracles of a Black Church
Chatanow, Gerald. Another time, Another Place: a Neighborhood Remembered

Film
Brownsville, Black and White in the Media Center / Butler Library.

5. About HOPE VI
Overview / The HOPE VI program serves a vital role in the Department of Housing and Urban Development's efforts to transform Public Housing.

The specific elements of public housing transformation that have proven key to HOPE VI include:
* Changing the physical shape of public housing
* Establishing positive incentives for resident self-sufficiency and comprehensive services that empower residents
* Lessening concentrations of poverty by placing public housing in nonpoverty neighborhoods and promoting mixed-income communities
* Forging partnerships with other agencies, local governments, nonprofit organizations, and private businesses to leverage support and resources

Any Public Housing Authority that has severely distressed public housing units in its inventory is eligible to apply. Indian Housing Authorities and Public Housing Authorities that only administer the Housing Choice Vouchers (Section 8) Program are NOT eligible to apply. Individuals are also NOT eligible to apply.
HOPE VI Revitalization grants fund:
* Capital costs of major rehabilitation, new construction and other physical improvements
* Demolition of severely distressed public housing
* Acquisition of sites for off-site construction
* Community and supportive service programs for residents, including those relocated as a result of revitalization efforts

HOPE VI Demolition grants fund the demolition of severely distressed public housing, relocation, and supportive services for relocated residents.

History and Background
National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing

The HOPE VI Program, originally known as the Urban Revitalization Demonstration (URD), was developed as a result of recommendations by the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing, which was charged with proposing a National Action Plan to eradicate severely distressed public housing. The Commission recommended revitalization in three general areas:
* physical improvements,
* management improvements, and
* social and community services to address resident needs.

As a result, HOPE VI was created by the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993 (Pub.L. 102-389), approved on October 6, 1992.
6. Public Housing: Urban Form
Advances; Strife; Retreats; Revisions—Clearing

1937: Clearance: Remediation—PREVENTION

The United States Housing Act of 1937—created by the Wagner Steagall Act of 1934—allocated 800,000,000 dollars in the form of federal loans to states to develop low income housing. In New York the prospect of 300,000,000 dollars in new federally provided funds loomed and the recently formed New York Housing Authority became an epicenter of urban development and design. Public housing became a major "new source—perhaps the great new source—of outside money" flowing into New York and whether one was interested in housing or not, the revenue stream was to become a major force of urban, political and social change. The shape these funds would take was to become a matter of architecture and planning; for the next 34 years housing would be a central focus of urban expenditure and urban policy. Indeed, the design of federally funded housing was to a large degree the design of the city itself. The implications of housing planning, financing and ultimately its architectural design have been at the root of issues that range from the construction of class and race divisions to mental health and social strife. Housing policies and architectural design have instigated changes in zoning and building massing, and have been at times the most poignant testing grounds for design ideas that began in the realm of the avant-garde and found themselves constructed in the very real situation of poverty, segregation and race relations.

Housing prototypes by LeCorbusier's (City of Tomorrow) published a decade earlier in 1924, became instrumental tools for "slum clearance;" in the early years of the New York Housing Authority tens of thousands of tenements were destroyed with the goal of "unslumming" the city. Then chairman of the Housing Authority, Edmond Borgia Butler, directly linked housing development with social and political change in claiming that "to justify further public housing, it is necessary to base public housing, on something more secure than improvement of the physical condition of the city, by substituting new bricks, mortar and steel for old." "Public housing must not be used to regiment the tenants...poverty is the not the sin of the poor; it is the sin of society," claimed Butler.

Since its inception in 1937 the New York Housing Authority, like similar institutions in Washington DC, Chicago, San Francisco, etc, has advanced and then often retreated from its own policies: at the core of these development processes has been the poignant issue of how one characterises the forces that create poverty and how an empowered entity formalises its acts of intervention on behalf of an apparently less independent group of people.

1. Anthony Caro, "The Power Broker"

2. Michel Foucault, p 246.
Ownership

The Move to Ownership: Into the Market.

The voucher program’s goals mark a new watershed in the design of housing. Between 1996 and 2000 as many as 57,000 units of existing public housing were demolished in the United States (under Hope VI plans) to make way for new privately owned houses and housing units. In most cases these new developments are dispersed houses and low rise housing blocks. The 1998 Housing and Urban Development (HUD) budget included funding for 100,000 new vouchers indicating that sixty-six years of design and urban renewal experiments that have ranged from slum clearing and major urban design initiatives (that at times have been understood to have warehoused the poorer members of our city) have now given way to a moderated form of free-market development. The federal government now acts as a benevolent advocate that vouches for those that might not otherwise be able to enter the free-market of housing. The effects of this change have palpable impact on architectural design: with dispersal and the trend towards ownership and smaller buildings has come the return of traditional building types and often iconic images of house and “home.” At the smaller scale of development the role of design and the professional services of the architect are displaced: the average design fee for a single family house, for example, in the United States is approximately 0.0026%. Your work will seek new building types, new construction techniques and new programming that can add to the history of housing types already in place by analysing the potentials of dispersal and ownership.

The state funds made available in 1996 for down-payment voucher programs augmented financial incentives already in place for public-private partnerships in housing development—historic-preservation and low-income tax credits, tax abatements, and donated city land. This combination of incentives has sometimes influenced design decisions: historic-preservation tax credits are often coupled with low-income housing tax credits in a way that lowers development costs while mandating historical housing types. In most cases, however, these incentives have no clear architectural or urban expression, and the development processes usually result in typical speculative housing, with low-level building and design practices.
Manhattan and Brooklyn: A new continuous redevelopment agenda reaches into the center of Brooklyn.

A new federal emphasis on policies that foster the role of private finance in housing development, coupled with a city and state focus on the waterfront as a factor in the redevelopment in New York City create a dynamic and rapidly changing role for architects and planners. A snapshot of areas facing major redevelopment and new housing initiatives in Manhattan is being mirrored in the Bronx, Queens and especially in Brooklyn.

Queens:
1. Long Island City Waterfront and “Art Loop” including MoMA QNS.

Brooklyn:
2. Greenpoint: Waterfront
3. Williamsburg: Waterfront
4. Brooklyn Atlantic Yards/Atlantic Terminal

Manhattan:
5. The Mayor’s Plan for Housing
6. The Lower Manhattan Redevelopment Corporation
7. WTC and “Ground Zero”
9. Columbia Expansion (not shown)

Staten Island
10. Fresh Kills Landfill (not shown)

Bronx
11. South Bronx becomes Downtown Bronx (not shown)

7. Private Housing and Public Planning: What about Queens?

"The first principle of association guarantees the "free exercise of his industry and the fruits acquired by it."
Thomas Jefferson

The role of housing in New York City has a renewed sense of potential as it finds itself at the center of new urban initiatives that rely on housing as a major force in redevelopment. From the Mayor’s Plan for New York to shifts at the federal level in Public Housing organization housing is central as a domestic entity and as a financially crucial urban development tool. These changes are evident at the national level, as housing policy in the United States is increasingly relying on the market place to spur innovation in design.
When the first public housing projects were proposed in the United States there was immediate and strong reaction from housing developers and banking associations that accused the programs of being "unfair government competition." In 1938, three years after the formation of the New York Housing Authority, the newly formed Housing Authority of Houston faced strong resistance that declared the agency to be Socialist competition with the free market. Today, 68 years later, at the outset of a new federal housing initiative that offers assistance to families to purchase rather than rent a dwelling the debate has come full circle. Current housing policies in the United States have, to an unprecedented degree, forgone the construction of collective and financially subsidised rental housing and focused government housing initiatives in the open market of private developers and the single-family house or low rise townhouse/condominium. Federal home buyer voucher programs are aimed at helping families purchase a dwelling from a consortium of speculative builders and non-profit developers rather than rent a federal or city owned subsidised apartment.

These programs provide lower income individuals or families with a down payment voucher that in effect disperses federal housing initiatives into a moderated version of a free market. The voucher is often a short-term lien that is forgiven in full after five years of ownership provided the home owner proves to be reliable as a mortgage risk. Individual ownership is believed to create a strong foundation for the re-development of neighbourhoods. Ownership is intended to re-territorialize a dis-invested area—it offers the residents a stake in their community.

8. Re-Distributing Wealth: The Public’s Private Apartment

Affordable housing in New York City is almost inevitably developed as a public/private partnership in which the private market demands on housing construction are ameliorated or compensated for by public investment and subsidy in the form of tax credits and bond financing. A tax credit is a form of subsidy that is granted to a developer/builder who commits to providing affordable housing—the credit’s value is then sold to a corporation who in effect provides the equity that funds construction. The tax credit maintains the semblance of a free-market by providing public financing incentives—tax funds—that bridge the gap between market rate housing and lower income families. The disparity between market rate and a subsidised market might otherwise cause re-distributions of population by income, race, class, gender or other factors. These financing initiatives often state their goals as those of re-building dis-invested territory in a way that market forces are presumed to be unable to.

Flow

On the cusp of the 19th century Thomas Jefferson, Madison, Locke and de Tocqville all countered attempts at a legislated redistribution of monolithic forms of wealth, even, as they recognised the free-market rights to private property sustained a dangerous potential to damage equality in the pooling of wealth. In a society that protected the rights to property and potentially exploitive monetary gain it portends, Federalist law, nonetheless protected the individual right to gains made in a free-market even if those gains often seemed intolerable in light of losses suffered by the apparently less industrious. This studio is situated directly at the nexus of federal policy that had recently redirected how the government would address the issue of poverty and housing in the United States. The changes in federal policy amounted to nothing less than a compete shift in how the government would seek to address the problem of housing the poor—a problem that since 1935 it had aggressively addressed in the centralised control and management of scores of rental apartment units and histories of slum clearing. In 1998, the federal government was focused on returning housing to the market and in removing the government from the role of landlord or developer. The federal government was adopting a conservative view to housing development and was declining its former role as landlord and developer for housing for the poor.

The studio will investigate architecture’s relation to the different financing mechanisms with housing as a means to intervening, directing and managing the construction of new territories. Design will address the planning stages of development and proceed to a final presentation that is comprehensive in the analysis of program, construction and tectonics and ultimately to use and need. The public/private partnership will be the means to designing housing as the interchange of construction, finance and private
life. The problem of housing becomes the problem of the city—and the re-distribution of public and private funds becomes a factor in architectural design. Our goal will be to create what Michel Foucault has called an "economy of visibility"..."one in which the "exercise of power" has some degree of transparency, legibility or interactivity. Can the building reveal its histories to those that participate in its making, and habitation?

"Traditionally, power was what was seen, what was shown, and what was manifested and, paradoxically, found the principle of its force in the movement by which it deployed that force. Those on whom [power] was exercised could remain in the shade, they received the light only from that portion of power that was conceded to them, or from the reflection of it that for a moment they carried. Disciplinary power, on the other hand is exercised through invisibility; at the same time it imposes on those whom it subjects a principle of compulsory visibility. In discipline, it is the subjects who have to be seen. Their visibility assures the hold of the power that is exercised over them. It is the fact of being constantly seen, of being able always to be seen, that maintains the disciplined individual in his subjection. And the examination is the technique by which power, instead of emitting the signs of its potency, instead of imposing its mark on its subjects, holds them in a mechanism of objectification. In this space of domination, disciplinary power manifests its potency, essentially by arranging objects. The examination is, as it were, the ceremony of this objectification."

The dispersal of public housing into smaller atomized units has been a response to the public dissatisfaction with larger scale centralised housing projects. The slum clearing projects and garden city towers of earlier housing initiatives have come to symbolise if not embody the monolithic power that not only was enacted upon a group of people but that essentially revealed their poverty in the very collectivity it architecturally represented. For Foucault "liberty is a practice," it does not and cannot take a form. Still Foucault warns "that the exercise of freedom is" not "indifferent to spatial distribution...it can only function when there is a certain convergence; in the case of divergence or distortion, it immediately becomes the opposite of what was intended. ² Dispersal is intended to disarm the monolithic will of a centralized authority—our studio will seek to test the limits of this policy in architectural design.
Your work, as designers, architects, planners and urbanists, will require you to program as well as design a new city block. The studio faculty and invited guests will present a series of initiatives and forces that in negotiation will affect the future of the area. Your work will require inventive design—and also strategic work on anticipating and projecting the future of the area's programming. We will collectively determine the full block programming after a research phase, but at this point in time you should anticipate maintaining all the current services on the site and meeting the demands of the new redevelopment for housing.

With your partner and faculty critic you are asked to address the three following “programming vectors.” They are referred to as vectors because they are not presented as fixed entities or quantitative fields or needs—instead they are understood as forces described by direction and magnitude. Indeed, they are understood more as a mode of becoming than as something known—formally or dimensionally defined—or as with known political resonance. In fact, each could be understood to address program as something that is in direct counter-position as well covalency to the liquid and flexible dimensions of money—of economic procedure.

### 9. Dynamic IMAGINATION?

Non-Architectural Shapes—Making Constituencies in NYC

At Columbia dynamic modelling and mapping of events has been a primary design and research tool. In recent months if not years, these tools have become evident in the mainstream press and indeed in popular forms of organization. Demonstrations, Conventions and everyday news are often shown in time based, durational, maps and diagrams.

The Housing Studio has attempted to build on these techniques—and to expand their usefulness in projecting the future implications of planning decisions, of policy goals and of many techniques that do not have obvious or apparent visible form. Your work as a designer addresses the orchestration and reaction to fast and slow realms—quick events and slower durational calculations. The following notes—refer to work by Bernard Tschumi on programming, events and relationships between architecture, program and event.
It is Tschumi's elevation of program to a level equal to other historically accepted architectural conventions that is noted by K. Michael Hays as a milestone that marks Tschumi's arrival on the architectural scene itself. Of Tschumi's Manhattan Transcripts, Hays wrote:

"Their explicit purpose is to transcribe things normally removed from conventional architectural representation, namely complex relationships between spaces and their use; between the set and the script; between type and program, between objects and events."
Vector 1
Housing Experiments in Engineering a Heterogeneous Income Group?

Program Agents: The Mitchell-Lama Housing Programs; The New York Department of Housing, Preservation and Development

Michael Hays’ Introduction to Architecture Theory: Since 1968 concluded with the acknowledgement that a younger audience may have such an “altogether altered” relationship to consumption that they may be hesitant to engage in practices that resist the dominant productive economies of the city. Hays suggested that an overt resistance to the commodity processes that underlie an entire generation of theorists and practitioners whose work rests upon the negative dialectics of Theodor Adorno was under tremendous pressure, in part due to the pervasiveness and growth of capital economies in the 1990’s. The production of architecture based in the work of Adorno and intellectual descendent such as Manfredo Tafuri or Massimo Cacciari, Hays wrote, may no longer hold appeal to younger architects.

This programming vector asks you to reconsider the role of the state in the production of housing and the role of anti-market systems that ameliorate the economic pressures/factors in housing design, development and sale. In New York City publicly subsidized housing is very common—1 in 12 New Yorkers live in a publicly assisted form of housing. Adjacent to our site is a NYCHA housing—but also predominant in the city fabric is a wide range of Mitchell-Lama developments; as Bland Houses and Central Jamaica begin to be assimilated into a wider field of market rate housing what is the future of the "quasi-socialist" housing block in New York City?

The syllabus outlines both state and market pressures on the area and on your site.

Mitchell-Lama: "The New York State Mitchell-Lama Housing Program was created in 1955 for the purpose of building affordable housing for middle-income residents. The housing developed under this program is more commonly known as Mitchell-Lama housing, derived from the last names of former Manhattan State Senator MacNeil Mitchell and former Brooklyn Assemblyman Alfred Lama, who sponsored the legislation. It is officially embodied in the Private Housing Finance Law and is designed to accommodate the housing needs of moderate income families." "A total of 269 Mitchell-Lama developments with over 105,000 apartments were built under the program. In addition, 22 middle-income developments with over 10,000 apartments were built under the Limited-Dividend program, a precursor of the Mitchell-Lama program. A number of the Mitchell-Lama developments have withdrawn from the program under a process called buyout and are no longer under DHCR supervision."

"There are 132 City-sponsored, moderate- and middle-income rental and limited-equity cooperative developments in New York City which contain approximately 54,000 units, known as Mitchell-Lamas. HPD supervises waiting lists, management issues, and has other oversight responsibilities for 50 Mitchell-Lama developments; an additional 82 developments have shared supervision by HPD and the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development. There are approximately 94 Mitchell-Lama buildings in the City, which contain approximately 65,000 units, that are supervised by the State Division of Housing and Community Renewal (DHCR)." "Mitchell-Lama apartments are sold or rented through waiting lists kept by each development. Many Mitchell-Lama waiting lists are closed because there are already enough applicants listed to fill vacancies expected in the foreseeable future. Periodically, these developments open their waiting lists and new applications are accepted based on a lottery system. Mitchell-Lama developments must advertise when they open their waiting lists. Check your local newspapers to find out when applications are being accepted."

Sources for Mitchell Lama background: http://www.dhcr.state.ny.us/ohm/progs/mitchlam/ohmprgmi.htm http://www.dhcr.state.ny.us/ohm/progs/mitchlam/ohmprgmi.htm
A changing landscape for public housing—Public housing in the United States currently shelters approximately 3 million individuals in 1.3 million households. Nationally these families pay an average rent of $169 per month (1997) and have an average income of $7835 per year. The City of New York provides housing for almost 600,000 residents in more than 3000 buildings. Unlike many cities, New York housing units tend to be included in the fabric of the city; these buildings are often atomized throughout the city fabric—they don’t stand alone as housing projects. There are of course very notable exceptions that have stood as the emblem of public housing. This landscape is changing—new federal plans are re-allocating funds for public housing.

Northeast Loses in Reshuffling of Housing Aid

By DAVID W. CHEN—NY Times: Published: August 30, 2004

The Bush administration is replacing the nation’s three-decade-old financing system for public housing with a new formula that will redistribute billions of dollars, chiefly from New York and other big, urban areas in the Northeast and Midwest to small, rural places in the South.

Vector 2


Program Agents: Common Ground Community and the NYHPD

New York City often finances housing in a public/private partnership that allows developers to receive low costs financing in exchange for providing a proportion of lower-income housing. These financial mechanisms—or products—are often referred to as 80/20 financing. The developer must provide 20% of the housing units at a pricing that is affordable to lower-income demographics. On the Far West Side these provisions are given—new housing developments must provide 20% of the new housing at lower-income rents or sale prices. In recent years, however, it has become common for the lower-income housing to be produced off-site; in effect to be outsourced and provided in lower land cost areas and in lower income areas. There are examples where this was provided by building the lower income housing in a borough other than Manhattan. The results allow the developer to borrow development funds at subsidized rates, and build the lower income producing housing in less valuable areas. New York City has struggled for decades with trying to maintain a semblance of economic diversity in its population—but today it could be said that NYC is approaching the final frontier of formerly affordable housing. How will your project respond to issues of displacement of or re-location of lower income people and the poor?

During the end of the 19th century and throughout the 20th, the rise and ceaseless transformation of the industrial city has continually adjusted its means, desire and abilities to offer work and housing to the poor. The very identity of the city has been based in absorbing the migration of those seeking work in a newly urban life. Yet the city has rarely shown either the ability to fully employ the poor at wages that fully match urban housing costs, nor has it always proved to offer the equitable distribution of services across the spectrum of race, sex or other variables of personal identity. In a contemporary scenario Noam Chomsky makes a distinction between the geographical United States and American corporations. The country he has written is "developing characteristics of the third world"—but he speculated that its corporate share of worldwide production was probably increasing. According to Chomsky, capital generated within an evolving global economy is no longer distributed in centripetal and centrifugal urban patterns, or in relation to knowable geographic origins. In places like New York, the economic, private, and public shapes of the city have not only lost their territorial relation to an origin, but have left their inhabitants without a collective imagination of power’s origin; according to Chomsky the forecast prefigures a two-tiered society—islands of wealth for investors and milieus of despair for the "restless many." This programming vector asks you to research and address the demographics of your project and its ability to address the place of lower income and poverty conditions.

Programming and Architectural Case Studies: Common Ground Community in conjunction with The New York Department of Housing, Preservation and Development, and the New York City Department of Mental Health Services:

Keeping People in the neighborhoods where they can find support.

"Common Ground is one of many organizations that attempt to ameliorate the high cost of living in New York City by providing housing for lower income and impoverished people: "We start by creating communities where housing is safe, attractive and affordable. We then add support services, like access to medical and mental health care, job training and job placement. We believe that to rebuild an individual’s life from homelessness requires more than a home, more than good health, more than a job and more than a supportive community – the entire package is necessary. We offer long term results at a fraction of the cost of alternative responses to homelessness. Our permanent housing programs cost
$10,000 and $12,000 per person each year—compared with prison cells at $22,000, shelters at $60,000 and mental health institutions at $113,000 per year.” Common Ground is planning permanent housing and services for families who are homeless or are at risk of becoming so. The housing will be designed to reduce isolation and foster social interaction between stable families and those needing support.

Source: Common Ground Website

A: Common Ground: Brownsville and East New York: Homelessness Prevention: Common Ground in conjunction with the NYHPD has established a program in East New York to bring vacant apartments on-line for use by families at risk for homelessness. This program is a pilot program to re-use and re-allocate the NYHPD identified 60 + thousand vacant apartments in NYC. These vacant apartments constitute a number equal to amount of housing the Bloomberg Administration plans to create. In this case one could argue that those apartments already exist but cannot be accessed. Common Ground believes it is necessary to find a means to access under-utilized apartments—and to find a way to keep lower income families from being displaced. Common Ground's goal is to create permanent housing for families that is affordable, attractive and integrated into the community. The tenant mix will include relatively stable low-income families with strong community ties, families "at-risk" of becoming homeless and families exiting the shelter system. Services will be provided both on-site and in partnership with local community organizations, and focus on building relationships between families and reducing the social disconnection that often occurs with extended periods of homelessness.

"The 2002 HVS reports that the number of vacant rental units in New York City was 61,265 and the citywide rental vacancy rate was 2.94 percent during the period between February and June 2002. The rental vacancy rate is significantly lower than the 5 percent threshold mandated by state law to justify the continuation of rent control and rent stabilization. The survey also reports that the City's total inventory of residential units was 3.2 million" Source: From: http://nyc.gov/html/hpd/html/for-researchers/housing-vacancy-surveys.html

**From the Bloomberg Plan: Providing low-cost loans to renovate and lease apartments that have long been vacant and off the market... / Doing what our conscience demands to help homeless families with special needs and youngsters aging out of foster care.../ And helping new homeowners make their first down payments, while also encouraging private employers to do the same.

B: Common Ground: The Foyer Program: The Foyer program is a housing-based career development program targeting young adults (ages 18-24) who are "aging out" of foster or residential care, are homeless or at risk of homelessness. Designed to prevent homelessness by offering a comprehensive transitional experience to independent adulthood, participants will work over a two-year period toward goals of permanent housing and stable employment. The 40-unit program is housed at The Christopher Nels Larson Residence. See: The Foyer Program <http://www.commonground.org/new_housing/homelessness_prevention/foyer.asp>

C: Common Ground: Re-Entry Housing: Common Ground is developing a re-entry housing initiative to prevent homelessness and criminal recidivism for homeless men and women exiting the corrections system. The initiative consists of three distinct programs: a transitional re-entry housing and employment program; a permanent supportive housing program linked with participation in work; and a residential program for youth leaving the juvenile justice system: “A program initiated in 1988, the Involuntarily Displaced Families Program, has provided permanent housing in State-aided middle income developments for homeless families. Under a DHCR Emergency Order, Mitchell-Lama and Limited Dividend rental developments in New York City and Westchester County were required to fill at least one of every five vacancies with involuntarily displaced families referred through the NYS Department of Social Services. Approximately 1,000 families have been permanently housed in State-supervised housing developments at any one time under this program. IDFP was suspended in 1997 due to a lack of Federal housing vouchers to subsidize eligible families.”
Vector 3
Up Zoning in Downtown Jamaica, NY

Significant portions of all five boroughs in NYC are being re-zoned to accommodate a far greater density of office space and housing than they currently provide. Our studio, focused on Flushing and Jamaica, enters these redevelopment plans at a time when the new zoning is still in question and is malleable—the programming vectors represent past forces as well as current goals, yet your work must re-invent each vectors potential and how they interact to produce full program for the city block. New York City is being "up-zoned" in sectors of all five boroughs—below we discuss several of these scenarios. Your site falls under very distinct zoning regulations—and the NYCHA site was historically, though no longer, exempt from city zoning.

"Through zoning, a city regulates building size, population density and the way land is used. Zoning recognizes the changing demographic and economic conditions of the city and is a key tool for carrying out planning policy. New York City enacted the nation’s first comprehensive zoning resolution in 1916 and the City continues to be a leader in zoning policy in the United States."

Source: An Introduction to Zoning Terminology

New York City is divided into three basic zoning districts: residential (R), commercial (C) and manufacturing (M). The three basic categories are further subdivided by the intensity of use, whether for retail or manufacturing categories, parking, building bulk or residential density. Zoning regulations do not usually apply to public parks.

Development within these residential, commercial and manufacturing districts is governed by use, bulk and parking requirements. Each zoning district regulates permitted uses;

1. the size (bulk) of the building permitted in relation to the size of the lot;
2. the required open space for residential uses on the lot or the maximum amount of building cover age allowed on the lot;
3. the number of dwelling units permitted on the lot;
4. the distance between the building and the street;
5. the distance between the building and the lot line;
6. the amount of parking required; and
7. other requirements applicable to specific residential, commercial or manufacturing activities, including the size and placement of signs.

M1

M1 areas range from the Garment District in Manhattan, with its multistory lofts, to areas in the other boroughs with low-bulk plants. The M1 district is often an industrial front yard or a buffer to adjacent residential or commercial districts. Strict performance standards are common to all M1 districts. Light industries typically found in M1 areas include knitting mills, printing plants and wholesale service facilities. In theory, nearly all industrial uses can locate in M1 areas if they meet the rigorous performance standards required in the Zoning Resolution. Retail and office uses are also permitted. Use Group 4 community facilities are allowed in M1 zones by special permit but not in other manufacturing districts. Parking and loading requirements vary with district and use, but high density districts (M1-4 to M1-6) are exempt from parking requirements. Residential development is generally not allowed in manufacturing districts.

However, M1 districts with a significant number of residential buildings may be mapped M1-D. The D suffix indicates that limited new residential uses are permitted, by City Planning Commission authorization, on sites that meet specific criteria. The maximum FAR for permitted residential uses is 1.65. Accessory parking for residences is not required, except in M1-ID districts.

Under certain criteria, artists may have joint living-work quarters in lofts in M1-5A and M1-5B districts (mapped in the SoHo/NoHo area of Lower Manhattan). In M1-5M and M1-6M districts, the conversion
of non-residential floors of a building to dwelling units is permitted, provided a specified amount of floor area is preserved for certain categories of manufacturing, industrial and commercial fuses. Conversion to dwellings is also allowed, with various restrictions, in the Special Lower Manhattan Mixed Use District.

C1

Cl districts accommodate the retail and personal service shops needed in residential neighborhoods. These districts are often mapped as an overlay along major avenues in otherwise residentially zoned neighborhoods. They are widely mapped throughout the city. Typical uses include grocery stores, small dry cleaning establishments, restaurants and barber shops. All cater to the daily needs of the immediate neighborhood. Regulations limit commercial use to one or two floors.

Continuous, clustered retail development is desired in these districts. Local service and repair establishments are not permitted to break the retail commercial continuity.

C1-1 to C 1-5 districts are mapped as overlays — generally along major avenues — in residential districts, while Cl-6 to Cl-9 districts are not mapped as overlays. When Cl-1 to C 1-5 districts are mapped in RI to RS and R6B districts, the maximum commercial FAR is 1.0; when mapped in other R6 and R7 to R10 districts (including contextual districts with the suffix A, B or X), the maximum commercial FAR is 2.0. Residential bulk in these commercial districts is governed by the regulations of the surrounding residential district. The maximum commercial FAR in Cl-6 to Cl-9 districts (including the contextual districts) is 2.0, while residential bulk ranges from that permitted in R7 districts for Cl-6 districts to that permitted in RIO districts for Cl-9 districts.

The regulations applicable to a new building located within a contextual commercial district are similar to those of the corresponding contextual residence district with respect to allowable lot coverage, required street wall height, the location of the front building wall and the permissible residential bulk and density.

Parking is not required in Cl areas mapped in densely populated areas (Cl-5 through Cl-9) because shops in these neighborhoods attract and generate little automobile traffic. In less densely developed areas, where most people drive, parking is required.

10. Samples of Sites that Are Re-Zoned for New Market Housing

Manhattan: The Bowery and Lower East Side
Market Rate Housing: A: Carlyle Group: Market Rate Development: Market Rate Housing: Global Strategy: Since its establishment in 1987, The Carlyle Group has grown from a group of four investors with $5 million in capital to one of the world’s largest private equity firms. As of March 2002, the firm had over $13.5 billion in capital committed to 20 private equity funds. We have developed the largest, most diversified investor base of any private equity firm, with more than 535 investors from 55 countries. Source: Carlyle Group Website:

A 9,86-sf block of retail space on two floors at the newly constructed NoLIta Place residential tower is ready for occupancy and brokers are looking for high-end amenity-related tenants, including upscale restaurants, a high-end showroom or a gourmet market. The 12-story, 65-unit luxury property was completed earlier this month.
Queens, Long Island City, NYC 2012—Not Awarded

May 26, 2004 / New York Governor George E. Pataki, New York City Mayor Michael R. Bloomberg, Queens Borough President Helen Marshall and NYC2012 today announced the architectural firm Morphosis (Santa Monica, CA) as the winner of NYC2012's Olympic Village Design Study. Morphosis was selected from among five finalists that included Henning Larsens Tegnestue A/S (Copenhagen, Denmark), MVRDV (Rotterdam, The Netherlands), Smith-Miller + Hawkinson Architects (New York, NY) and 2004 Pritzker Prize winner Zaha Hadid Architects (London, United Kingdom).

Brooklyn

PRESS RELEASE: Brooklyn, NY, December 0, 2003 – Internationally acclaimed architect Frank Gehry and Bruce C. Ratner, President and CEO of Forest City Ratner Companies, today unveiled a master plan for the arena that will house the Nets basketball team that Mr. Ratner is seeking to bring to downtown Brooklyn. The Brooklyn Arena will be the centerpiece of a mixed-use development called Brooklyn Atlantic Yards. Mayor Michael Bloomberg, Brooklyn Borough President Marty Markowitz and Brooklyn-born basketball All-Star Bernard King hailed the exciting plan at a news conference in the Ceremonial Room of Brooklyn's Borough Hall.

The 800,000 square-foot Brooklyn Arena will be the focal point of Brooklyn Atlantic Yards, an urban complex of housing, commercial and retail space, as well as six acres of landscaped public open space – including a park on the Arena’s roof, ringed by an open-air running track that doubles as a skating rink in winter with panoramic vistas facing Manhattan year-round.

The site for Brooklyn Atlantic Yards is adjacent to the third-largest transportation hub in New York City – Atlantic Terminal, where nine different subway lines and the Long Island Railroad converge. These modes of transportation will make visiting the Brooklyn Arena easy for fans, whether they’re coming from other boroughs or from the surrounding suburbs – drastically reducing the vehicular traffic that would be expected at a site that lacked mass transit.

The site has long been defined by transportation; its current primary use is as a storage yard for Long Island Railroad trains. Three blocks of exposed tracks lie between Atlantic Avenue and Pacific Street. The Brooklyn Atlantic Yards master plan proposes to relocate the storage tracks to the eastern part of the site, freeing the western part for the Arena. Decking over the new, relocated yards, will allow the architect to build the complex’s public open space and residential buildings on the eastern portion of the site.

"The existing railroad yard is really a barrier that isolates the neighborhoods north and south of Atlantic Avenue," says Mr. Gehry. "We’ve designed a mixed-use development with offices, apartments, shops and the Arena, which breaks down the barrier and ties the neighborhood together in a way that’s appropriate – with higher-density uses along Atlantic Avenue and lower-density uses near the more residential area on Dean Street." Programming: Brooklyn Atlantic Yards:

800,000 square feet for the sports arena – with 19,000 seats for basketball games and 20,000 as configured for other events, such as concerts;
six acres of publicly accessible open space;
- 4.4 million square feet of residential, in approximately 4,500 units
- 2.1 million square feet of commercial office space;
- 300,000 square feet of retail space;
- 3,000 parking spaces.
12. Displacement = CLEARING:
Rockaways Case Study: Arverne and Edgemere


Ocean Village (previous page) funded in 1968 by UDC
38

3. What is NYCHA? Is it a concentrated entity or a dispersed organization?

NYCHA’s own description from their website:

The New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA) provides decent and affordable housing in a safe and secure living environment for low- and moderate-income residents throughout the five boroughs. To fulfill this mission, NYCHA must preserve its aging housing stock through timely maintenance and modernization of its developments. NYCHA also administers a citywide Section 8 Leased Housing Program in rental apartments. Simultaneously, we work to enhance the quality of life at NYCHA by offering our residents opportunities to participate in a multitude of community, educational and recreational programs, as well as job readiness and training initiatives.

NYCHA was created in 1934. By the end of 1935 NYCHA dedicated First Houses, our first development, located on the Lower East Side of Manhattan.

The Way It Is Today

NYCHA is the largest public housing authority in North America. NYCHA's Conventional Public Housing Program has 181,000 apartments in 345 developments throughout the City in 2,702 residential buildings containing 3,318 elevators. NYCHA has over 15,101 employees serving about 174,195 families and approximately 418,810 authorized residents.

NYCHA's Public Housing represents 8.3% of the City's rental apartments and are home to 5.2% of the City's population.

NYCHA residents and Section 8 voucher holders combined occupy 12.2% of the City's rental apartments and make up 8.0% of the City's population.

The Waiting List for Public Housing

- On March 31, 2003 there were 265,702 applicants on the waiting lists for subsidized housing in the City
  - 146,097 families are on the waiting list for Conventional Public Housing
  - 149,238 families are on the list for the Section 8 program
  - 29,633 applicants are on both lists

The Rockaway Peninsula is home to approximately 38,000 households; more than 13,000 of these households are in publicly funded and assisted buildings.
New York City’s Public Housing: Many Histories, Many Forms.

The property, currently owned by the NYHPD, is defined at its perimeter by three types of state and federally assisted housing. In the midst of these policy and typological histories new market rate housing will be built in the near future if the RFP produces a successful development strategy.

Ocean Village is on the east perimeter of the site at Beach 59th Street; it was built by the Urban Development Corporation between 1968 and 1974 and offers subsidized housing to lower income families.

At the western perimeter of the site the Arverne and Hammel Houses were developed by the Housing Authority of New York; the average income for families in NYCHA apartments is $13,406 (as of January 1, 1989). Also on the western edge of the site are nine mid-rise apartment slabs that were built as part of the Mitchell-Lama housing program; these cooperative apartments are owned by their residents. The NYHPD RFP would dilute that concentration in adding as many as 2000 units of new market rate housing to the area. While these new housing units are not subsidized at the point of sale they will be subsidized indirectly as a public/private partnership; the HPD will effectively donate the property to the developer who is awarded the contract. Major funding for infrastructure is anticipated to come from the state of New York thus further reducing development costs.

Conventional Public Housing in New York City

- The Bronx has 98 developments with 45,546 apartments
- Brooklyn has 101 developments with 59,005 apartments
- Manhattan has 103 developments with 54,255 apartments
- Queens has 26 developments with 17,372 apartments
- Staten Island has 11 developments with 4,860 apartments
- Six (6) developments consist of FHA Acquired homes located in more than one borough
- 42 developments are for seniors only; 15 seniors-only buildings exist within mixed-population developments
- NYCHA has more than 10,000 apartments designated for seniors only
- There also are 6,838 retrofitted apartments for families of persons who are mobility impaired as of April 22, 2003.
14. NYCHA on the Lower East Side: Case Study

WALD, LILLIAN HOUSES
54 Avenue D
New York, NY 10009
(212) 673-9306 Fax (212) 673-2140

1857 Units 16.46 Acres 4,536 people
113 Units an Acre / 275 people an acre

Street Boundaries
Avenue D/FDR Drive
East 6th Street/Houston Street
Subway Lines
F to Delancey Street or 2nd Avenue and East Houston – walk east down Delancey Street towards Columbia Street
J, M to Essex Street (follow above instructions)
L to 1st Avenue and 14th Street (follow bus instructions below)
Bus Lines
M14C, M14D going towards Avenue D and East 6th Street

NAMED AFTER: LILLIAN WALD (1867 – 1940) – She originated the public health nursing service in the country and the Henry Street Nurses Settlement on the Lower East Side. A dynamic force for social reform she created widely accepted models of public health and social service programs. Her nursing education in New York led her to conclude that tenement residents lacked proper health care, so she organized the Henry Street nurses group and later expanded settlement programs to include social services, especially for children. Wald played a key role in organizing the American Red Cross. She was a leader in the fight to abolish child labor and helped foster the creation of the Children’s Bureau in 1912. Wald Houses is in Manhattan.

SITE STATISTICS AND DESCRIPTION:
Lillian Wald Houses on Manhattan’s Lower East Side has 16 buildings 10, 11, 13 and 14-stories tall with 1,857 apartments housing an estimated 4,536 residents. Completed October 14, 1949, the 16.46-acre complex is between F.D.R. Drive, Avenue D, East 6th and East Houston Streets.
M14C/M14D at 14th Street to 10th Street and Avenue D

NAMED AFTER: JACOB AUGUST RIIS (1849-1914) – Danish-born American journalist and reformer whose reports on living conditions in city slums led to improvements in housing and education. His stories in newspapers about slum dwellings and abuses in lower class urban life were collected in "How the Other Half Lives (1890)." Riis dwelled on the city's slum tenements and how the people there lived. His vivid descriptions, often depicted on slides, caused audiences at his lectures to moan, shudder and even faint. He founded a pioneer settlement house in New York City named after him. Riis Houses is in Manhattan.

SITE STATISTICS AND DESCRIPTION:
Jacob Riis Houses on Manhattan's Lower East Side has 3 buildings, 6, 13, and 14-stories high. The 11.73-acre complex has 1,187 apartments housing some 2,903 residents. Completed January 17, 1949, it is between East 8th and East 13th Streets, Avenue D and F.D.R. Drive.
Jacob Riis II on Manhattan’s Lower East Side has six buildings, 6, 13, and 14-stories tall. There are 577 apartments housing some 1,402 people. The 5.94-acre complex was completed January 31, 1949 and is between East 6th and East 8th Streets, Avenue D and the F.D.R. Drive.

LOWERS EAST SIDE II
CONSOLIDATION
640 East 5th Street
New York, NY 10009
(212) 529-8340 Fax (212) 477-3029

46 Units an Acre/ 146 people an acre

Street Boundaries
Avenue C
Avenue B
Subway Lines
F to Second Avenue (follow M21 bus directions below)
J, M to Delancey Street
L to First Avenue (follow M9, M14C and M14D bus directions below)
Bus Lines
M21 (northbound) to Avenue C and 5th Street – walk west on Avenue C

SITE STATISTICS AND DESCRIPTION:
Lower East Side II Houses consists of four, 3-story buildings with 186 apartments housing some 564 residents at the 3.85-acre site. Completed August 31, 1988, it is bordered by East 4th, East 5th and East 6th Streets, Avenues B, C and D in Manhattan.

In 1996, the Clinton administration’s plan to reduce the concentration of public housing in city centers was accelerated by the allocation of federal funding for housing vouchers. Intended to encourage property ownership among a wide spectrum of lower-income Americans, vouchers provide a one-time subsidy to the developer at the time of sale—in effect, supplying a down payment for the buyer. In 1998, the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act augmented this effort. These initiatives were both pragmatic and ideological, dealing with issues of poverty, the deconstruction of the racial and ethnic territories created by previous federal housing programs, and historic urban paradigms of density and centripetal concentration.

Poverty Deconcentration Plan: “Partly in reaction to the growing concentration of very poor households in public housing across the US, Congress passed the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998 (QHWRA). This legislation requires public housing authorities (PHAs) to adopt plans to address the problem of growing poverty concentrations and grants considerable flexibility in setting admissions policies to implement those plans. The US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has declined to offer a standard for what it considers an undue concentration of poverty within public housing. However, commentary to the Final Rule for producing Public Housing Agency Plans suggests that a property where the average family income is below 85% of PHA mean income indicates an unacceptable level of poverty concentration, while 115% or above PHA mean income indicates relatively “high income” developments. Basically, QHWRA requires that PHAs “deconcentrate” poverty by attempting to bring higher income families into high-poverty developments and very poor families into higher-income developments. By providing working role models that support enforcement of management rules, as well as access to job networks and information, the economic outcomes and security of tenants in or from high-poverty developments may be enhanced.”

16. The QWHRA: the Congressional Act

H. R. 4194
One Hundred Fifth Congress of the United States of America

AT THE SECOND SESSION
Begun and held at the City of Washington on Tuesday, the twenty-seventh day of January, one thousand nine hundred and ninety-eight An Act.

Making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes. Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

For tenant-based assistance under the United States Housing Act of 1937 to help eligible families make the transition from welfare to work, $283,000,000 from the total amount provided under this heading, to be administered by public housing agencies (including Indian tribes and their tribally designated housing entities, as defined by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development), and to remain available until expended. . .

SEC. 53. INCOME TARGETING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 437n) is amended by striking the section designation and all that follows through the end of subsection (d) and inserting the following: “SEC. 6. (a) INCOME ELIGIBILITY FOR PUBLIC HOUSING.—

“(1) INCOME MIX WITHIN PROJECTS.—A public housing agency may establish and utilize income-mix criteria for the selection of residents for dwelling units in public housing projects, subject to the requirements of this section.

“(2) PHA INCOME MIX.—

“(A) TARGETING.—Except as provided in paragraph (4), of the public housing dwelling units of a public housing agency made available for occupancy in any fiscal year H. R. 4194—84 by eligible families, not less than 40 percent shall be occupied by families whose incomes at the time of commencement of occupancy do not exceed 30 percent of the area median income, as determined by the Secretary with adjustments for smaller and larger families.

“(3) PROHIBITION OF CONCENTRATION OF LOW-INCOME FAMILIES. “(A) PROHIBITION.—A public housing agency may not, in complying with the requirements under paragraph (2), concentrate very low-income families (or other families with relatively low incomes) in public housing dwelling units in certain public housing projects or certain buildings within projects. The Secretary shall review the income and occupancy characteristics of the public housing projects and the buildings of such projects of such agencies to ensure compliance with the provisions of this paragraph and paragraph (2).
“(B) DECONCENTRATION.—“(i) IN GENERAL.—A public housing agency shall submit with its annual public housing agency plan under section 5A an admissions policy designed to provide for deconcentration of poverty and income-mixing by bringing higher income tenants into lower income projects and lower income tenants into higher income projects. This clause may not be construed to impose or require any specific income or racial quotas for any project or projects.

“(ii) INCENTIVES.—In implementing the policy under clause (i), a public housing agency may offer incentives for eligible families having higher incomes to occupy dwelling unit in projects predominantly occupied by eligible families having lower incomes, and provide for occupancy of eligible families having lower incomes in projects predominantly occupied by eligible families having higher incomes.

'(iii) FAMILY CHOICE.—Incentives referred to in clause (ii) may be made available by a public housing agency only in a manner that allows for the eligible family to have the sole discretion in determining whether to accept the incentive and an agency may not take any adverse action toward any eligible family for choosing not to accept an incentive and occupancy of a project described in clause (i)(II), Provided, That the skipping of a family on a waiting list was done to reach another family to implement the policy.
Part 1: Autonomous and Committed Art


Part 2: Techniques, Power and Territory.


Part 3: Urban Housing in the United States
Elizabeth Wilson, The Sphinx in the City: Urban Life, the Control of Disorder, and Women, (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Gwendolyn Wright, Building the Dream: A Social History of Housing in America (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1983); chap. 7 "Americanization and Ethnicity in Urban™


Part 4: The Masses: Reforming Space / Observing Culture


Part 5: City of Refugees: The Individual in Duress Finds New Means

Roger Caillois, "October," The First Decade, "Mimicry and Legenary Psychasthenia," p 60

Part 1: Typology: Form and Industry
Alan Colquhoun, "Typology and Design Method," Perspecta 12, 1969, pp.71-74

Part 2: Typology: Labor + Technology: Pre-War Europe and Post-War America

Part 3: Architecture: Suppressing Technology

Part 4: Architecture Means and Inscribed Subjects

Housing Studio Organization

The Housing Studio is primarily and foremost a design studio. However, like many other studios at Columbia it has within it a variety of components that are intended to support the design work. The primary aspect of the studio is desk critiques of student work, but to coordinate and present content in regard to housing we will also spend in-studio time for seminars and lectures.

A. Studio Desk Critiques—during studio hours each instructor organizes a desk crit schedule with their students.

B. In-Studio Seminars—Two In-Studio seminars are organized for the Housing Studio to introduce course content and bring invited guests to discuss the studio goals.

C. Studio Lectures—three In-Studio lectures will be offered by Core Faculty coordinated with studio design work. These lectures will address architectonic or material aspects of building design and fabrication. See Syllabus for dates.

Scott Marble, "After fabrication—Ubiquitous Production"
Karla Rothstein, "Highest and Best Use: The Political Mechanics of Urban Property Takings"
Michael Bell, "Systems of interiority"
David Turnbull, "Guns and Roses"

D. Reading—Two Readers are prepared and available at the Village Copier on Broadway. Address available from Teaching Assistant

E. Research—Studio design work is supplemented by collective and individual research. Organized across the entire Housing Studio and in relation to each studio critic’s goals.

F. Studio Times—Monday / Wednesday / Friday: 2-6PM / 500 South Avery Hall. Studio layout is coordinated by the Teaching Assistant after the results of the lottery had determined the studio groups.

Schedule

September 6, Wednesday
Housing Studio Lottery
4PM
Room 114

September 13, Wednesday
Studio Conference: "Policy and Power / Instrumental or __________?"
Moderator: Michael Bell and Laura Kurgan

September 27, Wednesday, Review, Programming for Two Sites

October 2, Monday, Interior(ity): Inside the New Domestic Environment
Moderated by and with talks by Mark Rakatansky, Karla Rothstein, David Turnbull, Michael Bell

October 6, Monday, Mid Terms, Sections 2, 3
October 8 Wednesday, Mid Terms, Sections 4, 5, 6, 7

October 23, Monday, Ubiquitous Production: Post Detail Detailing. Scott Marble and LO-TEK

December 5, Tuesday, Finals Sections 4, 5, 6, 7
December 6, Wednesday, Finals, Sections 1, 2, 3
Common Ground’s Plan:

I. HomeLink Program
Located in PS/IS 323, HomeLink connects families to free services designed to prevent eviction and homelessness, including benefits screening, health insurance, tax assistance, counseling, job and housing search assistance, legal assistance, credit counseling, and cash assistance.

Families at risk of homelessness receive intensive case management coordination with the goal of preserving permanent housing, or when necessary, identifying new safe and stable housing in the community.

We work closely with neighborhood partners that include East Brooklyn Congregations, Brooklyn Legal Services, and the Coalition for Eviction Prevention.

A tenant education course will provide clients with housing difficulties certificates of completion marking them as desirable tenants to local landlords.

II. Increase the supply of existing housing by 200 units

The Real Estate Services Unit will work closely with Community Preservation Corporation (CPC) and Housing Preservation and Development (HPD) to provide technical assistance to landlords to bring 200 additional units to the market through our anti-abandonment initiative. In exchange, these units will be made available for families who would otherwise become homeless.

In situations where tenants are facing homelessness because they cannot live safely in their apartments, the Real Estate Services Unit will assist the tenants in advocating that landlords comply with appropriate building codes.

I.III. Development of 300 New Units of Housing

- Development of 300 new housing units in Brownsville over 5 years
  - Approximately 80 units will be LAMP (low income affordable marketplace) housing made up of 1, 2, and 3-bedroom family units
  - 70-80 units will be created as Section 202 Housing for the Elderly which will include common space and support services

For Brownsville families, we will provide:

A “Single Stop” center, funded by the Robin Hood Foundation, that will consolidate access to government benefits and legal assistance for neighborhood families. This center, which opened in February 2005, will serve as a triage center to identify families at risk of homelessness.

A presence at Brooklyn Housing Court that will flag cases involving Brownsville families facing eviction to enable mediation with landlords or time to secure financial assistance.

A community-wide outreach and education effort, led by EBC, that will engage tenant associations, churches, schools, and other community institutions in educating their members about the availability of homelessness prevention services, and to enlist community members in offering help, housing, and support to their neighbors facing homelessness.

Emergency financial assistance that will preserve tenancies when such help will resolve, not simply postpone, a housing crisis.

Family mediation services that will support families who are providing housing to other dependent family members.
Case coordination and service to ensure families are not locked in bureaucratic "silos" and obtain all of the benefits to which they are entitled.

Collaborations with local hospitals and schools to identify and offer services to those families with known predictors of instability. Very young mothers of very young children living in the household of another family member and families who have previously experienced homelessness are among those known to be at "high risk."

Links to other community services, particularly employment, healthcare, and childcare, that will stabilize families in crisis.

Assistance with accessing affordable housing in the community through new family supportive housing units developed by Common Ground, existing units improved and made accessible by Common Ground, and a brokerage service that includes a neighborhood directory of vacancies.

For Brownsville landlords, we will provide:

Mediation services as an alternative dispute mechanism to eviction.

Assistance in accessing City loan programs to improve their properties, in return for making vacant units available at affordable rents to families referred by the Prevention program.

Technical assistance with building design and management improvements, in return for making vacant units available at affordable rents to families referred by the Prevention program.

In those cases where vacant units are "off line" due to poor conditions, technical assistance in restoring those units, in return for their being pledged to families referred by the Prevention program. Technical assistance in accessing and managing rental subsidy programs.

Relief from advertising, tenant screening, and legal costs by serving as an intermediary for placing and supporting tenants, by preparing families with a comprehensive tenant education curriculum.
A New Type of Housing Prototype

Columbia University in the City of New York
Fall 2007: The Columbia Housing Studio

Columbia University Graduate School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation
Michael Bell (Director Core Studios) w/ William Arbizu; Laura Kurgan; Scott Marble; Giuseppe Lignano and Ada Tolla; Ana Miljacki; Karla Rothstein; David Turnbull
Second Year Teaching Assistant: Aaron Davis
In the United States the number of housing starts are a key benchmark indicator of the country’s economic health. As a commodity, housing is understood to produce value on behalf of investors at its point of sale, but it also produces long and short term forms of value in how it is financed and how the debt associated with its purchase is secured and traded.

Housing in the United States is a critical financial instrument that is simultaneously laden with countless narratives of private life, domestic rituals and everyday life. The degree to which these narratives can be jointly addressed has predominated in the production of housing design; that is, housing has managed its financial risk in large part by managing the narratives of its visual and social roles. To this end it is possible to say that housing has suffered a deep lack of technological innovation as the financial risk associated with its production and financing has been assuaged by its semiotic and linguistic appeal; its pandering to memory. Despite the outward appearances and figural qualities of housing design, few architectural programs are as saturated by deeply rooted forms of political, economic and social thought—indeed political and social ideologies—as housing.

In the United States alternatives to market based housing—i.e., public or social housing—have rarely found firm ground. Housing is primarily a product of private markets save for large concentrations of federal Public Housing in the northeast and in Chicago and Detroit. In New York City almost 400,000 people live in Public Housing (8% of the city’s rental apartments are NYCHA units) and today there is not a serious, or even minor, backlash against public housing in the city. New York has been a model of success for Public Housing. Yet New York is a rare circumstance in the United States, and instead there has been a steady march in most cities towards reducing the role and presence of public housing.
The 2007 Housing Studio at Columbia will research a history of housing, as it has had to navigate these shifts. In particular we will examine housing as a prototype that meets unique sites and political histories in New York City, but also along a vector that traces a path from a site in the Bronx; to Armonk, New York (Westchester County) and to Bridgeport, Connecticut (Fairfield County). Your work will be primarily focused on the production of not only new prototypes for housing but also in a re-invention of the term itself—that is, what is a prototype and how would you employ and develop one today, and how does site affect prototype.

To accomplish this we will work simultaneously on three sites—developing a prototype that can address aspects of each site. Your work will progress towards an in depth proposal for a single site—but it is important to note that the first half of the studio is intended to address all three sites as having characteristics that are critical to the future of housing design. One of our model sites is the city of Bridgeport, Connecticut—the following text applied directly to Bridgeport—but you are expected with your partner and faculty critic to create a critical vantage on each of the three sites.

Site 1. Bridgeport, Connecticut

Bridgeport is a perfect collection of the aspects that have, over the years, come to define a once American center city that has become an edge city, only to find itself at the center again of new speculative development. The Bridgeport Housing Authority is seeking your assistance in designing its future housing stock. As a hybrid of directly subsidized and market rate housing, the new housing will be built in the context of an array of other new market rate projects and long existing public housing sites. The Bridgeport Housing Authority has acquired as many as ten small-scale scattered sites throughout Bridgeport in a mutually beneficial land swap with the city of Bridgeport. The BHA gave control of a larger, 10 acre property (a single urban site to the city recently cleared of BHA housing) in return for scattered residential scaled properties.

In an era of diminished federal financial support for Housing Authorities nationwide, the BHA, like the New York City Housing Authority, is seeking entrepreneurial ways to leverage their often-formidable property holdings. Public Housing Authorities nationwide hold large-scale sites that are increasingly understood to be underdeveloped and newly desirable development sites by cities—in terms of density these sites have historically been characterized by large open spaces that are now seen as developable as markets adjust to housing demands. While simultaneously seeking to develop new scattered sites of housing stitched into the wider urban fabric, Housing Authorities are also seeing the economic value of the older properties rise, allowing land swaps that often can assist both the city and the Housing Authority.

There are opportunities and pit-falls: of particular concern is the problem of scale—the pricing and financial aspects of smaller development weigh against and diminish the cost saving economics of larger scale development. Still, it is the desirability of scattered sites and mixed income development that reflect a federal shift away from centrally planned/large scale and homogeneous public housing development of the past.

At Bridgeport we will allow its idiosyncratic specificities of the sites and the city to wash over our prototypical lens, unless of course it is precisely the existence of an array of idiosyncratic characteristics that we find somehow prototypical of the American edge city and therefore necessarily have to address those systemically in the proposals that follow. Either way, to look at a city through a prototypical lens will require both having a sophisticated understanding of the contemporary urban condition and having a plausible theory of the prototype that, even if it might not be completely verifiable, would be at least believable.
KATHLEEN VILA was 9 months old in 1943, the year her family moved into the first public housing complex in the state, a sprawling modern community called Yellow Mill Village. Later renamed after Father Stephen Panik, a priest who had worked for decent housing in the poor neighborhoods of east Bridgeport, the project was trumpeted nationally as a bold sign of social progress designed to abolish poverty and rid the city of crime and disease.

At the groundbreaking ceremony in 1939, Father Panik called the public housing development “the greatest Christmas present Bridgeport has ever received.”

For Kathleen Vila and her parents, living in the village along the Yellow Mill Canal was indeed a blessing compared to the squalor they had witnessed in other neighborhoods. From their second story window in building No. 25, the view resembled a park, landscaped with trees and benches and playgrounds. Lace curtains hung in the windows and copper awnings rested above the doorways.

“It was a beautiful, special place in those days,” said Ms. Vila, who has lived in Father Panik Village for a total of 40 years. “Everyone wanted to live in Father Panik’s.” From Pride to Notoriety

But by the early 1980’s the once proud village had evolved into a notorious crime-ridden slum and a symbol of failure for the city. One of the focal points for the city’s crack cocaine trade during the last decade, the area became the scene of dozens of homicides and other violent crimes.

Those who lived there routinely barricaded themselves in their apartments for fear of being hit by stray gunfire and some even resorted to wearing bullet-proof vests.

In 1986 the city began leveling the project, leaving 15 of the buildings standing. But last month city officials decided to raze the rest of Father Panik Village, saying the intensity of the crime and deterioration of the buildings made it uninhabitable for the 300 families that remained. The Federal Government has approved a plan to provide rental subsidies for the families, who will be moved to new housing units in other parts of the city within the next four to six months. Chiseling away an image.
Site 2. Rye Brook, New York

BelleFair is a new urbanist community constructed in 1999 immediately adjacent to and directly beneath the landing approach at the Westchester Airport. A completely planned community, it includes daycare, a meeting hall, two retail stores and a community run town square. BelleFair is unique in that its topography is instrumental in its overall design and it affords a level of public and private relations between houses. Bellefair includes a sector of lower income housing mandated by zoning codes. BelleFair contains 261 single family homes and town homes and is located approximately 30 miles north of Manhattan, via Metro North and the BelleFair train station shuttle.

In the Region/Westchester;
A Rye Brook Project Invokes New Urbanism’s Ideas
By ELSA BRENNER Published: April 8, 2001

TWO years after the first homes at BelleFair at Rye Brook went on the market, a meeting house and country-style store have opened at the development, fulfilling what its developer, Mitchell C. Hochberg, describes as his long-held dream of introducing concepts of New Urbanism to Westchester.

“I wanted to tie a lifestyle to a way of life -- to build a neighborhood, not just houses,” said Mr. Hochberg, president of Spectrum Skanska, the home-building and development division of Skanska A.B., based in Stockholm, the fifth-largest construction company in the world.

The meeting house, the village green, houses with front porches and the sidewalks where children can ride their bikes remind Mr. Hochberg of a more neighborly way of life. “When I was growing up, everyone was out on the streets,” he said. “You met people at the local candy store. I want to bring that feeling back with my projects.”

Watching the children at BelleFair debark from a school bus one recent afternoon and make a dash for the candy section of the Corner Stone Market, a nostalgic Mr. Hochberg said, “This all hits a nerve in me.”

But sentimentality aside, eschewing the cookie-cutter model of suburban tract housing has also been good for business. Among other things, the New Urbanism concept with its features of the old-fashioned hometown is a strong selling device.

“Yes, we’re in this to make money -- not just out of the graciousness of our hearts,” the builder said, explaining that many of the life-style extras at BelleFair -- like the 20,000-square-foot meeting house and the store stocked with licorice and “sweet and sours” -- also help offset the harsh reality of the development’s noisy next-door neighbor: the Westchester County Airport.

Without the extras that allow BelleFair to stand out among other developments, buyers leery of planes flying low over their homes may have passed it up, he conceded.

His strategy appears to have worked. Almost all 261 units at the former site of High Point Psychiatric Hospital on King Street have been sold, and the few resales that have come on the market are being snapped up fast, said Peter Raider, an associate broker for Houlihan/Lawrence in Rye.

On BelleFair’s oval-shaped village green, about the size of a football field, the 20,000-square-foot meeting house -- complete with a New England-style clock tower -- was designed to foster interaction among residents. It offers three floors of recreational options in a structure built into a hillside.
Leila Namin, the mother of two small children, said the concept has clearly worked for her. “I’ve met more people and made more friends in the last two weeks since the pool opened than in the first nine months after I moved here,” she said.

The main level of the meeting house, actually the third floor, features a lounge with a fireplace, a 60-inch television, a study, pool table, kitchen, children’s playroom and library with computer stations. The lounge overlooks a gymnasium and basketball court, which is next to a large fitness area. On the lowest level, residents can use either a heated indoor pool and a whirlpool spa during the colder months, or an outdoor pool. This level also leads out to an old-fashioned bandstand for special events.

Site 3. New York City: The Bronx

Marble Hill is a New York City Housing Authority site immediately adjacent to the Number 1 Subway Line and the Harlem River in the Bronx. Sites such as Marble Hill are a key focus in the Bloomberg Administrations 2030 Plan: the lower density of public housing sites in New York City is being targeted as sites for new housing development. NYCHA units would remain undiminished in number—but new mixed income units would be added to these sites as infill in the otherwise open spaces of the current conditions.
Housing Authority Is Facing $225 Million Deficit in ’07
By JANNY SCOTT Published: April 11, 2007

One year after announcing plans to raise rents, cut costs and appeal to federal and state officials for help in closing a $168 million budget gap, the New York City Housing Authority is facing an even bigger budget shortfall.

The agency, which serves as landlord to more than 400,000 low-income New Yorkers and is the largest public housing authority in the country, is confronting a $225 million deficit in its operating budget for the 2007 calendar year.

Authority officials blame a continuing rise in expenses like pensions over which they have no control, a widening gap between operating costs and federal subsidies, and their inability to get federal permission to cover day-to-day expenses with money usually intended for other purposes.

Main Address: 5210 Broadway, Bronx, NY 10463
Total Number of Apartments: 1682
Total Population: 3471
Completion Year: 1952

Site Description: Marble Hill Houses has eleven buildings, 14 and 15-stories tall with 1,682 apartments. Completed March 6, 1952, the 16.64-acre Bronx development is bordered by Broadway, and Exterior, West 225th and West 230th Streets. Marble Hill Houses is home to 3,471 residents.
Levitating the Sites

What aspects of these three sites are significant enough to truly impact design decisions that in their turn will constitute our housing prototypes? We will be levitating above the sites — and levitating the sites themselves—as specific places in order to focus on their significance as urban / ex-urban conditions. Their own prototypical cores—will be that which allows us to transfer our prototypical design to a series of other locations.

In some regard your work may indeed be site-less, yet the following annotated theories of prototype also offer readings and interpretations that posit the prototype as more culturally specific and shared than deeply sited forms of design.
Three Forms of Prototype

Locate and present your work in terms of a theory of the prototype.

In particular you are asked to determine how you make use of at least three forms of prototypes:

1. At the top of a Category

A robin is a prototypical bird more so than a penguin.

Seek a prototype, which is determined by sorting and categorizing from the existing; that is determining the prototype for our existing conditions. A prototype as defined by Eleanor Rosch can be more culturally sited and grounded than one might expect.

Prototype Theory is a model of graded categorization in Cognitive Science, where some members of a category are more central than others. For example, when asked to give an example of the concept of furniture, chair is more frequently cited than, say, stool. Prototype theory also plays a central role in Linguistics, as part of the mapping from phonological structure to semantics.

As formulated in the 1970s by Eleanor Rosch and others, prototype theory was a radical departure from traditional necessary and sufficient conditions as in Aristotelian logic, which led to set-theoretic approaches of extensional or intentional semantics.

Thus instead of a definition based model - e.g. a bird may be defined as elements with the features [+feathers], [+beak] and [+ability to fly], prototype theory would consider a category like bird as consisting of different elements which have unequal status - e.g. a robin is more prototypical of a bird than, say a penguin. This leads to a graded notion of categories, which is a central notion in many models of cognitive science and cognitive semantics, e.g. in the work of George Lakoff (Women, fire and dangerous things, 1987) or Ronald Langacker (Cognitive Grammar, vol. 1/2 1987/1991).


From Wikipedia.
2. Rapid Prototype

A prototype, which projects a future world from existing conditions—a contagion that instigates new forms of behavior and life.

At Columbia key figures in design and architecture began work in the early 1990’s that attempted to disconnect architectural theory and design from a question of origins or deep sources of meaning. The hermeneutic aspects of work by Peter Eisenman and others gave way instead to practices based on diagrams of emergence and becoming—digital aspects of programming gave rise to work in algorithms and scripting event horizons rather than the production or analysis of form.

This work often posited the engine of design as a theory of the diagram in which a protocol of emergent behavior was “designed” or set into motion. The results of these protocols were less important than the momentum or self perpetuated behavior of the systems. During this time the term “rapid prototype” emerged; linked with new “3-D Printers” and CNC Mills it became possible to quickly produce an object that was neither model or actual product—that is, neither representation nor full-scale or real product.

Rapid Prototyping has persisted—in all industries, in fact—in part due to this ambiguous role it plays—it is possible that it is a new form of representation that is part diagram, part “actual”, part model—most importantly perhaps, it is part residual (a by product of experimentation).

But is it actually still a prototype?

Stan Allen and Greg Lynn, as members of a wider group including Bill Macdonald and Sulan Kolatan, based and continue to base much of their work in theories (if not actual forms) of calculus. The goal was to experi-ment with the mathematics of movement and time — describable without recourse to fixed points of origin. In this way this work, which was often considered prototypical or realized in rapid prototypes, was in fact not at all prototypical in the way Eleanor Rosch used the term. It is not based in a connection to origins or bases of categories.

The experiments are ongoing—but in short you are asked to consider what new forms of prototype exist today that were not available even a decade ago. When coupled with the question of prototypes that are derived from historical analysis—that which has been and is—the theme of a new form of prototype places architecture at a cusp of a past and a future — unknown models and “not yet real” spaces that nonetheless may have deep cultural connections to millions of people.

“The role of life is to insert some indeterminacy into matter.” Henri Bergson
[source: Architectures of Time, Sanford Kwinter, MIT Press]

“The universe is not made, being made continually. It is growing, perhaps indefi-nitely, by the addition of new worlds.” Henri Bergson
[source: Architectures of Time, Sanford Kwinter, MIT Press]
3. Mutant Materials

During the early 1990’s the exhibition *Mutant Materials* curated by Paola Antonelli opened at the Museum of Modern Art. Subsequent exhibitions at the Cooper-Hewitt, the National Building Museum and the Pompidou in Paris all focused on material and in particular on “new materials.”

Material here was understood to have a renewed ability to instigate design and to affect prototypes and known design artifacts and categories in “new” ways.

The ambiguity in the term “new” was to a large degree left unchecked—while a heady chase ensued in which material was given a kind of zeitgeist quality. Could Material instigate a new quasi utopia?

Yet not all of these new materials were in fact the real focus of any of this research; instead, it was the formlessness of the networks that shaped them and the paraphernalia that surrounded the material and the digital networks and processes that shaped them.

Housing prototypes have everything to gain from this realm of research and design—if the processes can be understood for their form-fulness and form-lessness.

Prototypes become archetypes become form and then formless.

A casual young man—in cargo shorts—his computers on sawhorse table adorned the cover of the Design Life Now. The era of personal computing, distributed forms of community and communication prevailed when linked with a renewed interest in synthetic materials and plastics.

See also: Matilda McQuaid Head of Textiles Smithsonian Cooper-Hewitt Museum, New York
The March to the Political Center:
A Formal Prototype and a New Economic Plan

To further complicate matters the 2007 Housing Studio will also ask you to site your work in two political realms: one having a didactic formal presence; the other too newly implemented to yet have clear formal results.

In 1996, the Clinton administration’s plan to reduce the concentration of public housing in city centers was accelerated by the allocation of federal funding for housing down payment vouchers. Intended to encourage property ownership among a wide spectrum of lower-income Americans, vouchers provided a one-time subsidy at the time of sale—in effect, supplying a down payment for the buyer. In 1998, the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act augmented this effort. These initiatives were both pragmatic and ideological, dealing with issues of poverty, the deconstruction of the racial and ethnic territories created by previous federal housing programs, and historic urban paradigms of density and centripetal concentration.

Between 1996 and 2001, as U.S. federal housing policy moved toward relying on voucher programs that enabled public-private partnerships to produce more of the country’s low income housing, more than fifty-one thousand public housing rental units were razed or converted to subsidized private housing. In most cases, these efforts were successful, and former tenants of low-income apartments were relocated to traditional single-family houses, low rise housing blocks, condominiums, and townhouses dispersed throughout the outer edges of urban centers. These changes were evident nationally more than in New York City, where the demands for density and other key factors undermined a return to smaller scale works, or to the loss or razing of public housing.

Yet these plans toward decentralization were not in themselves small in scale or less grand than the previous era of centralized public housing (like that in New York City between 1937 and 67). The financial instruments and tax incentives that support these newly distributed forms of low-income housing are as economically large as former public housing budgets—indeed they are larger. This form of lower rise and quasi-traditional housing has not been a benefit to the architectural profession, as it essentially blocks architects from participating in its production (routine developer housing is done without significant input from the architectural profession). Indeed the new forms of low income housing are increasingly financial projects as much as design projects: the New York City initiative to address a projected increase of 1 million people in the New York City’s population by 2030 is just that. Mayor Bloomberg’s proposals are financial and without a single architectural drawing or proposal. The city intends to provide incentives to private development that will produce housing within the markets’ techniques. A focus of this program is under-utilized sites owned by the New York City Housing Authority.
At first glance the scope of the Bloomberg initiative is striking in how it addresses housing as a mass project in an era that has tried to break the scope and implementation of work down to smaller parts. Yet the Bloomberg initiative is also striking in its lack of architectural form or urban planning. It appears to be a sophisticated financial tool that could easily fail to produce a sophisticated architectural result.

The 2007 Housing Studio examines the architectural implications of the national trend towards dispersal eleven years after the QHWRA was implemented but couples this tendency with the centralized aspects of finance and demographic research that large forms of capital could provide to architecture.

Pragmatically, the studio focuses on the urgent need for inventive lower-income housing—but there is no mandate to encourage that your work address housing for a specific or narrow income group or even demographic strata. Instead, we are asking you to focus on the role of the prototype first—its relations to technology and to finance and its promise as a form of experimentation that can deeply affect social or financial goals.

In broad terms you should anticipate that your work address a new condition that is often called the “world city”—but it is critical that as a designer you recognize this term also includes the outskirts of major metropolitan areas and indeed couples areas that face rapid new growth as well as areas that face new and older forms of disinvestment and neglect.

Each studio will seek its own definitions of site and prototype but at the outset each of the seven studios will focus on refining a theme of what the term prototype can and has meant in housing design. This will include aspects of construction, function, use and material; each of these arenas should be re-written based on your own findings and research.
Housing and Institutions
Control / Fear of Control

During the past half century two major arenas of thought have greatly affected how we imagine a mass population and have made design for this scale of enterprise difficult — writing by Norbert Weiner, and Michel Foucault both pointedly outlined a crisis of un-intended effects and of institutions and protocols that operated as inversions of—rather than outlines for—freedom or liberation. In this context we again imagine our work on housing and indeed on prototypes for mass housing.

Norbert Weiner: Cybernetics:
Engineering and Social Science Joined.

“Wiener is asking the user of powerful automated tools to reflect upon what their true objectives are -- to appreciate that multiple objectives usually conflict with each other and that to be able to articulate what one truly wishes implies a profound and sophisticated understanding of things and people, including oneself. This constitutes an important shift from the traditional view of technology: instead of thinking of a new technology merely as something that enables you to do such-and-such (the attitude of the ‘gadgeteer’), you come to realize that by making it part of your ecological system you grant it the power to alter your future, for better or worse. Just what part you wish it to play in your life and what relation to it you wish to have are the choices at issue.”

Heims, Ch. 13, Wiener, the Independent Intellectual, p 341

Michel Foucault: The Birth of the Prison:
Engineering and Social Science Un-Joined.

“The functional inversion of the disciplines. At first, they were expected to neutralize dangers, to fix useless or disturbed populations, to avoid the inconveniences of over-large assemblies; now they were being asked to play a positive role, for they were becoming able to do so, to increase the possible utility of individuals. Military discipline is no longer a mere means of preventing looting, desertion or failure to obey orders among the troops; it has become a basic technique to enable the army to exist, not as an assembled crowd, but as a unity that derives from this very unity an increase in its forces; discipline increases the skill of each individual, coordinates these skills, accelerates movements, increases fire power, broadens the fronts of attack without reducing their vigour, increases the capacity for resistance, etc. The discipline of the workshop, while remaining a way of enforcing respect for the regulations and authorities, of preventing thefts or losses, tends to increase aptitudes, speeds, output and therefore profits; it still exerts a moral influence over behaviour, but more and more it treats actions in terms of their results, introduces bodies into a machinery, forces into an economy.”

Prototypes do have Locations. But are these locations actually “sites” or do they need a new term?

Studio work will focus on an in-depth analysis of the history and future of the applications of the term prototype. The history of the prototype requires a careful reading of the terms’ use and characterization.

Our studio narrative begins with the Mayor’s initiative for One Million New Yorkers—but it is cast backwards towards LeCorbusier “City for Three Million.”

**Location: 1927:** The City for Three Million is a bold new prototype cast without doubt.

**Location: 1937:** The New York City Housing Authority emerges as the largest Public Housing Authority at the dawn of federal housing funding. Anticipating a great new stream of federal monies, the city, and in particular Robert Moses, position New York to receive more of this new funding than any other city. The northeast United States and Chicago receive the lion’s share of the funds. (Today the movement in public housing is decidedly away from these major cities and into a more dispersed proto-urban landscape. Indeed public housing authorities are facing deficits and are forced to achieve new means of raising money to carry out their mandate. It becomes a city for just shy of 1/2 Million residents.)

**Location: 1967—75:** New York is called the “Ungovernable City” and its mayor, John Lindsay, is characterized as presiding over the fall of the city. In this turmoil housing is not only called a “crisis” but it is also often called a “right” setting a stage for a battle that have never been far from the center of any NYC Mayor’s agenda.
Location: 1983: Post Modern Classicism manages to “sample” the film of the destruction of Pruitt Igoe—the notoriously troubled public housing block in St. Louis. The author of the book—here unnamed—a genius at riffing the conditions of the moment—signals that modern architecture is not so much the cause of Pruitt Igoe’s ills but that it can be “killed” nonetheless. A broad and troubling message is given: modern architecture and its prototypes are discredited if not outright destroyed because the opportunity to do so emerged. In Europe the closing of the door on modern architecture is not so conclusive: consider Rafael Moneo, Álvaro Siza, Richard Rogers, Renzo Piano, and finally Zaha Hadid and Rem Koolhaas.

Location: 1987: New Urbanism reverts to a simulacrum of the past “town” plan—managing the real time fear and paranoia of a society that realizes it has not been “home” in some time. Still, it gains a greater hold on the imagination of government and developers and becomes the significant force in development. Between 1996 and 2001, as U.S. housing policy increasingly moved toward less reliance on direct subsidy of low income and poverty housing, more than fifty-one thousand public housing units were razed or converted. Most of this transformation—directed to a nationwide network of U.S. Housing Authority sites—was done through a program based within the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The program is titled Hope VI. Hope VI supplies funding to demolish “distressed” public housing units, and is intended also to create a greater demographic mix in public housing blocks. While income is a standard denominator used to reveal the social demographic, any number of other variables such as race or family make up was also used. Hope VI has been understood as both a boost to public housing—it does fund renovation—but also as a force that at its core diminishes the number of public housing units available. The program is now more than ten years old, and its ramifications, while clearly visible, are also far from understood: it is only beginning.

Hope VI programs have had a very clear architectural and urban design impact and expression: this places the program’s initiatives firmly within our profession’s expertise, yet in its social and political dimensions it tests the limits of what architecture can address. Or does it? This is a central question facing our studio. In most cases, former tenants of public housing apartments—almost universally designed within formal traditions of CIAM inspired modernism—were relocated to newly constructed low-rise housing blocks, condominiums, and townhouses (containing apartments). Within architectural paradigms the debate about this has often centered on the overt changes in building design. Its roots in this arena are deep, and can be traced to an evolution that included housing design in Europe—the Berlin Internationale Bauausstellung (IBA) of 1984-87, for example—and U. S. post modernism and what has become known today as New Urbanism. While the formal antecedents for Hope VI redevelopment can be argued to be clear, it is the structural changes in the policies that are less scrutinized and perhaps as compelling to architectural design and to conceptions of space.

Hope VI is at its a core program of remediation—funds are literally for architectural renovation and repair; and for a far more ambiguous—some critics would say unjust—project of social renovation. Critics contend it is the commitment to low income, and poverty housing that is being renovated, i.e., diminished. The dynamics of the market, and its potential for innovation, are increasingly the force that is expected to provide sustenance to lower income people. The question that comes with programs such as Hope VI is to what degree they represent a move away from state initiated practices that run contrary to markets.
Location: 2006: New York City: The City for One Million has no architectural plan—that is has no drawings. It’s a financial incentive package designed to spur the market to act. Innovation, the markets’ historic “genius”—think of Apple, Nike, Citi, Chase, Volkswagen and BMW—is granted the faith to solve problems that have perplexed and baffled the brightest minds. The Bloomberg Plan for New York Housing is not a new planning tool—incentives are perhaps the oldest tool in planning—but the degree to which is it without an architectural antecedent is new.

Location: GSAPP_Avery Hall Housing Studio_2007: A new prototype is needed: the policy has been declared but it has no form, no space, no materials and no real user. Architects are called to action—not because they are valued—but because if they don’t act, who will?

An exciting situation is in place: a financial model will lead the architectural one unless the architect can conjure a new faith in some tool for forecasting and indeed dramatically harnessing the future. To do this there are needs for immense talent and drive—but more so for a type of vision that is not shackled by indecision or lack of faith, or undermined by the grand schemes of the past and the troubled histories many of these unintentional.

The original prototypes were run for one generation: there was one cycle of feedback before a new prototype was installed. The new prototype must re-acclimate itself with past prototypes; or abandon them and re-situate its goals.
Studio Wide Essential Parameters

Each studio section is responsible to determine key responses to each of these studio wide parameters.

A. Number of Units: 16 units on a single property.

Note: The unit count is set based on a relatively small development that could be implemented as multi-unit housing on scattered sites in many United States cities.

B. Size of Units: Varying sizes based on determined need but composed of seeking

Prototype_0_Bedroom_1 Bath_450 sq. feet
Prototype_1_Bedroom_1 Bath_750 sq. feet
Prototype_2_Bedroom_1 Bath_1000 sq. feet
Prototype_3_Bedroom_2 Bath_1250 sq. feet

C. Zoning/Set Backs: Assume your prototype must account for no more than a six story height. Also: set backs at the side and front of properties as well as an allowance for parking of one car per dwelling unit. These set backs should be considered a design project and also a statement of urban design implication or intention.

D. Construction Methods: Any means of labor or material as determined by designer and critics.

E. Materials: any materials including Concrete, Steel and Wood trades with anticipated standard components or a strong statement as to replacement strategies.

F. Climate and Weather: North East United States

Temperature sways from -7 degrees to 107 degrees or 100 degree weather shifts.

H. Energy Codes and Typical Insulation: Meet Energy Codes or Use Trade Off Methods

I. Building Cost and Unit Costs: To be determined by designer with research into prevailing conditions. Cost should be considered and argument made for costs initiatives. Hard data is not expected.

J. Replication and Implementation Plans:

Plan for implementation of your prototype on at least 10 sites with varying urban conditions.

K. Typical Lot Size: 50’ x 150’

L. Typical Household Size: To be determined by your research but must account for at least these four categories of household.

4-person family
1 Individual with child
1 Individual
2 individuals as a couple or sharing a unit

M. Financial Conditions: Expect work to be financed with multiple loan and funding streams; as such building must satisfy financial risk analysis of many organizations. This is currently typical of all low-income housing.

N. Political Conditions: A reduced role of direct state subsidy produces an environment where economic and financial apparatuses must be expected to abet social needs—and improve conditions. General Conditions indicate work must be accomplished with minimal state assistance.
Drawing and Representation Requirements

**Details**

½” scale drawings of details

Dwelling Unit

¾” scale drawings

Dwelling Unit

Model

**16 unit Building Assembly**

¾” scale drawings

¾” scale model

**Prototype: Studio Wide Requirements**

1. Structural Systems must be explicitly shown.

2. Building Envelope must be shown in detail and at scales of at least 1” per foot.

3. Mechanical Systems: Must be accounted for and shown.

4. Unit Plans and Layouts should be presented at a large format.

**Group Presentations**

The semester will include two group presentations: each of the Seven Studio Sections will present a collective project or body of research for a total of 10 minutes.

Each studio will coordinate and present a single presentation—in any format that addresses the over-all studio findings and direction. Extra time is not permitted: each studio must complete the presentation in the allotted time and rehearsal of timing is essential.

The goal is to present the unique aspects of each studio—and to have synthesized the work to a collective point of view that can be shared studio wide.
Studio Schedule and Production

**Week 1: Introductions**
9/5_Wednesday  
All School Orientation, Wood Auditorium, Avery Hall  
Studio Presentation and Lottery, Room 114, Avery Hall

**Week 2: The Prototype and your work**  
9/14_Friday  
*The Prototype and Three Sites* by Michael Bell & *Proto-tope* by Scott Marble

**Week 3: Imagining the Political Context of Housing**  
9/19_Wednesday  
*Robert Moses New York* by Karla Rothstein, *Spatial Information Design* by Laura Kurgan and *Imagining the Future* by Ana Miljacki

**Week 4: The Prototype: How does material affect a Prototype?**  
9/28_Friday  
*Engineered Transparency* Conference: Keynote Lecture by Kazuyo Sejima  
10:00am—6:00pm, Wood Auditorium  
Note: See Hitoshi Oki lecture on Prototyping the Glass Pavilion, SANAA, Toledo

**Week 5: Presenting As a Collective**  
10/1_Monday  
GSAPP Debate: *Million Dollar Blocks* (6:30pm)

10/5_Friday  
Group Presentation (7 Sections x 10 minutes)

**Week 7: Reviews + The Prototype and the Role of Place**  
10/15_Monday  
Mid Term Review  
Studio Sections: LO-TEK / DT / LK / AM - Room TBA

10/17_Wednesday  
Mid Term Review  
Studios Sections: MB / SM / KR - Room TBA

10/19_Friday  
*San Francisco Housing Prototypes* by Stanley Saitowitz, Architect and Professor U.C. Berkeley  
Time: TBA

**Week 8: New Global Sites may not Seem Global.**  
10/24_Wednesday  
*Hard Facts & Infrastructure* by LO-TEK and *Architecture’s Suicide Notes* by David Turnbull

**Week 11: Development of Site and Project**  
11/9_Friday

**Week 15: Final Reviews**  
12/5_Wednesday

**Week 16: Post Review**  
12/11_Monday_6:30PM to 8:30PM Buell East Gallery  
Final Group Presentation (7 Sections x 10 minutes)
Syllabus Addendum

Four Quadrants for a New Housing Model

Your prototype housing is situated at the apex of a century long arc that has prototyped housing before.

Housing is a unique architectural project in the degree to which it is emblematically linked to political theory and finance. While all architecture is indeed deeply rooted in law and finance, housing as both a didactic program and a social term—i.e. “housing” meaning public housing, social housing, “the projects,” etc—is often discussed in relation to urban policy, issues of poverty, race and income. Housing is a benchmark component of the contemporary world economy—but it is also a term laden with social and political connotations.

Your work should situate within an intellectual as well as pragmatic history of housing—the following Four Quadrants or scenarios reflect four major thrusts in housing today. They are here provided as prompts and scripts—

**Quadrant 1. The Rise of a New or First Public House**

Is it possible that public housing has never existed in the United States? And that it could be invented for the first time in our generation? What would it be? Where would it be? Who would it be for? How would you conceptualize and design it in relation to standardization? Location?

Is it possible that public housing never materialized, appeared or even took hold, despite what we could commonly say is a broad public perception that it not only existed, but systemically failed on numerous levels, causing countless social maladies? Can now be universally understood as ready for whole sale renovation and partial destruction?

The appearance of public housing is, of course, far more than a fiction, but also less than a fact—less than verifiable. As it stands today, what we commonly call public housing, the CIAM inspired housing developments, (centrally planned and executed by federal housing agencies in the United States since the establishment of the Federal Housing Act of 1937) do indeed exist. They have, however, achieved a mythic status—something brutally real, but also in fact more emotionally complex and spectacular in the public imagination than the facts of their existence reveal. What would public housing be—if we imagine that we are indeed preparing it for the first time?

Despite the facts of its existence, public housing has never been what many imagined and believed public housing should be. Attacked at its outset as quasi-Socialist—public housing in the United States has never found easy acceptance except as an anti-market zone of last resort. Instead of serving as transitional housing, it has instead often been fabricated as a generation long separate society that isolates its constituents—racially and demographically — in precincts embedded within, but separate from the urban site that hosts these federal works. What can we learn from those that have lived in this realm, withstood the circumstance of intense interiority, sustained in the most public of ways. Is it possible that a far wider group of people, citizens of the top tier first world, are indeed now living in a new form of unintentional public housing? Not one that appears easily as centrally planned, constructed or monolithic in its constituency but is in fact produced by distributed but still centrally organized means—and one that is increasingly produced between tremendously public processes, massive market systems, and yet intends to house the most private aspects of life.

**Quadrant 2. Where was public housing? Where could it be in the future?**

Between 1937 and 1968 the United States built public housing in each major American City. The greater bulk of this housing was built in the North East and Chicago—forming a belt of public housing in the United States that today is being re-evaluated on all fronts.
What shape demonstrates the locations and contexts of a new lower-middle class working poor in the United States? How do we understand their economic conditions in relation to income—to variables such as housing ownership and location, but also to conditions such as assets, commuting time, energy costs per household? What “New Map of Public Housing” might exist if these sites were conceived in contemporary terms: urban public housing locations become sub-urban; federal government financial structures became privately based and demand new performance. The new public housing is situated in three zones and it no longer is created against the overt images of urban life, overt poverty, or an urban population. It does appear next to current public housing in urban situations, but it also is now situated in the U.S. south, in the southwest and mid-west—it is situated in the wider American edge city and appears at the conflation of broadly urban technologies and the intimate aspects of private space. It shows up in the form of countless market rate housing units/houses that are subsidized via income tax deductions on mortgage tax: It is the site of a new working poor.

Quadrant 3. Post Ethical City: A new site for architects and a hard terrain.

As market practices are continually naturalized, valorized, and un-tethered from 19th and 20th critiques based on themes of equity or moral and ethical judgment, upon what grounds does the production of the Post Ethical city base itself? The primary counter arguments for the free market city of the 20th Century—in the U.S. or Europe—were largely based within socialist or Marxist philosophies; these, of course, constituted a basis from which to challenge those deemed to be morally irresponsible, or unworthy of the gains tendered by market systems. Power derived from disproportionate aggregations of capital or non-responsive or non-representative forms of state was understood as morally inferior—and worthy of critique (if not outright reorganization). The weaker constituents might suffer and fail at this task, yet withholding their anger and expressing indignation, remained as a tool to show moral superiority over those who maintain undue and unjust power, and to possibly hinder their progress. As financial systems increasingly naturalize power within unchallenged domains of monetary techniques is there a role for indignation by which the non-moneyed—the NON-rich—can assert power against the economically mighty? What does this imply about the long-term demographics of world cities. In his introduction to Looking for a City in America, Kurt Forster offered a view of the city where the social and political realm where inequality could expect to be addressed, if not solved: “The physically compact historic city,“ wrote Forster, “has long been considered the crucible where the alchemy of new multiracial and multicultural life could take hold; but the reality of inner-city conditions in the United States has rarely been able to sustain these hopes.” How does the Post-Ethical city respond to and sustain the mix of constituents the city has often historically idealized, and made central to its identity? Is there a new left for architecture—or has the crisis of post-9/11 security infantilized the former social crises of the left, and created a new city of non-security/Security?

Parallel Conditions: in an era of globalization it has long been clear that within each first world condition lies a third world milieu. New precincts of populations are not participating in the new fluidity and tributaries of wealth. Like those nations that have not participated in the first tier of wealth, these internalized zones, though hosted by the first world, do not receive the benefits of first world prosperity. How do these zones in the United States reveal themselves in the context of non-U.S. sites—and what can the U.S sites learn from this growing population and its conditions?

The studio presents housing development as a set of competing rights—not always in the banner form of protest or overt political action, but by linking themes of property—to ownership—that are newly potent (and potentially destructive) in federal low-income housing goals to historic goals of inequity. The Housing Studio has been deeply influenced by concepts of land tenure, and titling un-titled property—by moving towards legal forms of agency prior to design; in this regard we have been influenced by economist Hernando de Soto, but also figures closer to our own field such as Teddy Cruz.

Hernando de Soto has been a leading figure in attempting to show property title and value to land and housing assets on behalf of poor occupants—de Soto’s work ascribes market value to un-titled property and does so on behalf of those who have tenancy. Cruz also works in this manner—solving problems of poverty with the tools of market capitalism.
The housing studio increasingly sees a potential parity between housing development in the United States and non-US sites. In fact, in light of the absence of a history of advocacy and government support for housing provisions in developing countries it is possible to look to developing countries and how they are now creating means of addressing populations at risk, as useful sources of positive invention for work in US cities where support and advocacy for populations at risk are decreasing.

**Quadrant 4. Prevention rather than Remediation**

The current Housing Studio has situated its work in the context of both an actual and imagined former Housing Studio—and in the context of numerous regimes of power that might be more easily addressed in schools of law or public policy—but it has done so not to artificially justify our work or to bring extra-architectural qualities to our design practice. It has been an attempt to develop a theory of space and practice that could address a larger picture of how poverty/wealth issues are changing globally—and to examine both what housing programming would look like if the legal or financial aspects were better addressed. It has also been an attempt to organize the studio both in relation to the school’s location in New York City, and in response to the wider world in which New York City situates itself today. This question seems to be the key that would both allow the Housing Studio to re-affirm its relation to New York City—and to its own history, by re-conceiving what it means to ply a latent practice of design as advocacy, not only within a tough market driven New York City economy, but one that is now global. We believe the Housing Studio has the potential to stand as more than a New York City studio. Does the history of social equity that strongly affects the studio offer a lever that can become newly unique in the school? In addressing this question the Housing Studio increasingly finds itself tending towards themes or prevention rather than remediation; towards situating its work within emerging ideas of public health, energy use and natural resources rather than responding to questions of injustice after they occur or of poverty after it has done its damage. To do this the studio is increasingly substantiating its relations to planning, but also to public health and law, and a wide range of experts who could serve as consultants.
Public Housing in the United States (and worldwide) is being forced to confront these questions in new ways: below are transformations in funding and policy for Housing support in Germany, The US, Russia and China.

The Market and the Subsidized Dwelling: 2000 to 2007 Case Studies

1. Germany: Sells Public Assets to Private International Equity Funds at Highest Price Possible: Public Housing in Private Hands by Mark Landler
   Published: May 5, 2006
   Mr. Rossberg reached a deal in March to sell Dresden’s entire stock of 48,000 city-owned apartments to an American private equity firm, the Fortress Investment Group, for $1.2 billion. In a single stroke, Dresden wiped out its burdensome public debt. “We had to move fast,” he said, “because if you had 10 German cities selling their property, it would be a buyer’s market.” That may soon be the case. German cities are lining up for a mammoth wave of foreign investment in their property. Lured by a German real estate market that is the most stagnant in any major European country, and a vast supply of well-kept public housing, American and other foreign companies have already snapped up dozens of projects in Berlin, Bremen, Essen and other German cities.

   Fortress manages approximately $11 billion in private equity capital on behalf of leading institutional investors and high net worth individuals. The private equity funds primarily make control-oriented investments in cash flowing businesses and asset portfolios in the United States and Western Europe.

   Published: August 30, 2006
   Metropolitan Life is putting Stuyvesant Town and Peter Cooper Village — a stretch of 110 apartment buildings along the East River — on the auction block. The sale of Stuyvesant Town and Peter Cooper Village, shown in 1947, would transform a complex built for World War II veterans. With a target price of nearly $5 billion, the sale would be the biggest deal for a single American property in modern times. It would undoubtedly transform what has been an affordable, leafy redoubt for generations of Manhattan’s middle class: teachers and nurses, fire fighters and police officers, office clerks and construction workers. The deal is likely to lead to profound changes for many of the 25,000 residents of the two complexes, where two-thirds of the apartments have regulated rents at roughly half the market rate. Any new owner paying the equivalent of $450,000 per apartment is going to be eager to create a moneymaking luxury enclave, real estate executives say.
The first prototypes were built as anti-market machines—thousands of units built and rented at below market rates by a private company concerned with moderating housing prices for the lower and middle class worker. In 2007 the prototypes, now nearly half a century old, were sold to the highest bidder.

The tide had changed and the land became too valuable. There is a demand for a new prototype; one to be realized within a new world economy and for a wide array of new and old world sites. It is again time to forecast a future for mass housing — what are the new prototypes?

From the Speech at the Meeting with the Cabinet Members, the Heads of the Federal Assembly, and State Council Members, September 5, 2005
“The goal of the Affordable Housing project is to lower interest rates on mortgage loans over a period of two years and almost triple the total mortgage loans made, bringing them to a total of 260 billion roubles. By 2007, our task is to encourage significant growth in housing construction. Compared with 2004, the amount of construction should have increased by at least a third. For this reason, budgets of all levels must allocate funds for the development of housing infrastructure. I emphasise that budgets of all levels should do this. Recently, a lot has been said about mortgages. However, in practice not enough has been done. I ask that we complete the legal basis on which to issue mortgage securities. I charge the government of the Russian Federation to develop a mechanism for subsidising mortgage credits, and to considerably increase the authorised capital of the Agency for mortgages and housing credits, after giving it state guarantees”.

U.S. Housing and Urban Development Secretary Andrew Cuomo today (Sunday) took the first step in implementing a housing finance pilot project that will help China establish a secondary mortgage market and ultimately securitize residential mortgages. The program, under development by HUD and Chinese Ministry of Construction officials, is expected to result in a pilot securitization program that will be implemented by Chinese financial institutions. The development plan calls for a series of substantive working groups comprised of U.S. public and private sector officials, U.S. private sector financial institutions and Chinese government and financial officials. Discussion from these working groups will result in an action plan for the securitization program.