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01 Introduction

Why: Development, Informed by the Community

On October 3rd, 2019, the Department of Housing Preservation and Development (HPD), with the help of City Council Member Vanessa Gibson, Bronx Community Board 4, Bronx Borough President Ruben Diaz, Jr., and the Department of City Planning (DCP), facilitated a community visioning workshop to gather public input for the future development of new affordable housing and neighborhood amenities on two public sites: the NYC Health + Hospitals Morrisania Diagnostic Treatment Center parking lot (“clinic parking lot”) and a vacant lot at 1640-1642 Anthony Avenue (“Anthony Ave site”) in Bronx Community District 4. Development of these two sites is part of the Jerome Avenue Neighborhood Plan.

The purposes of the workshop were to enable meaningful and interactive participation, better understand community priorities, and gather ideas for future development on these sites from those who live and work in the vicinity and have an intimate understanding of neighborhood conditions and needs.

This public report summarizes the results of the workshop and additional feedback received through online and paper questionnaires. This report is also available on HPD’s website at nyc.gov/ Jerome-anthony-rfp and is attached to the Request for Proposals (RFP) issued for these sites. Development teams responding to the RFP are encouraged to consult the report and thoughtfully respond to the community visions heard as part of their proposals.
The workshop was held at the Family School, and provided opportunities for attendees to participate in interactive, facilitated activities to gather their vision for each site. Participants could choose which site they wanted to discuss. The majority of participants (six tables) wanted to discuss the clinic parking lot in contrast to the Anthony Ave site (one table). In small group discussions facilitated by City staff, participants explored preferences around programming and urban design. Participants at the tables discussing the clinic parking lot explored housing types, affordability levels, and programming for a potential new community facility on the ground floor. Workshop participants who chose to focus on the Anthony Avenue site also engaged in a broader discussion on affordable homeownership on the site.

With the help of the Bronx Borough President, Council Member Vanessa Gibson, Bronx Community Board 4, local community organizations, and the Family School, the City conducted extensive outreach to invite people to the workshop and provide input for the project. Outreach for the workshop included flyering in English and Spanish, as well as email blasts through local networks. In addition to the workshops, HPD created a paper and online questionnaire that asked similar questions to those asked in the workshop activities. HPD staff also conducted additional street outreach after the workshop to share and collect questionnaires. The workshop was well attended by a variety of community members, including extremely low- to middle-income residents, public housing residents, renters, parents of students at the Family School, representatives from local community-based organizations, and Community Board 4 members. To accommodate the broad range of participants, HPD provided interpretation services, activities in English and Spanish, snacks and refreshments, and activities for children.

Workshop outreach and participation in numbers:

- **400+** Bilingual flyers distributed
- **120+** Community participants attended
- **28** City staff facilitated at 8 tables
- **94** Online and paper surveys collected
What: Jerome-Anthony RFP Sites

The City is issuing an RFP for two public sites in Bronx Community District 4: (1) the NYC Health + Hospitals Morrisania clinic parking lot, located on River Avenue between East 167th Street and East 168th Street, and (2) the Anthony Avenue site, located at 1640-1642 Anthony Avenue between Belmont Street and East 173rd Street, adjacent to the Labor-Bathgate Childcare Center that is operated by the NYC Administration for Children’s Services (ACS).

The clinic site is approximately 26,000 square feet in size and is currently used as a paid surface parking lot. The RFP will require that the new building includes a new parking facility that can accommodate replacement parking for the clinic.

The Anthony Avenue site is approximately 10,000 square feet in size and is located across from Claremont Park. This site was formerly used as a play lot for the adjacent daycare center. In response to the community’s expressed desire for affordable homeownership opportunities during the Jerome Avenue neighborhood planning process, HPD is issuing an RFP for an affordable condominium or cooperative building for moderate- to middle-income first-time buyers on the Anthony Avenue site.

What Does the RFP Process Look Like?

Community Engagement
HPD gathers community input and priorities to inform the development of the RFP.

Workshops: October 2019

RFP Release
HPD publishes a Request for Proposals for the sites. We expect to release the Jerome Avenue RFP Fall 2019.

A pre-submission conference is held by HPD. Development teams prepare their proposals and submit them before the deadline. (three months to prepare submissions)

Competitive Review
Proposals are evaluated on several criteria, including but not limited to:
•  Response to community vision
•  Affordability levels
•  Financial feasibility
•  Quality and creativity of design
•  Development team experience and capacity
•  Targeted hiring outreach plan (minimum five months)

Developer Selection
The strongest proposal based on the Competitive Review is selected. Background checks to evaluate the integrity of the development team are also conducted. Pre-development work commences.

Environmental & Land Use Review
Environmental impacts of the proposed development are studied, and the project goes through a public review process involving the Community Board, elected officials, and the City Planning Commission. These processes are commonly referred to as CEQR and ULURP. (14-18 months)

Financial Closing & Construction Start
For large projects, construction is typically done in multiple phases. Approximately six months prior to construction completion, developers begin to interview tenants for the units, through a marketing process overseen by HPD and HDC to ensure adherence to fair housing practices. Applicants can apply through Housing Connect and get help from a Housing Ambassador to prepare an application. (about two to three years)
The Jerome Avenue Neighborhood Plan

Feedback on these sites build on the planning framework identified in the Jerome Avenue Neighborhood Plan, a community planning process concluded in March 2018. The Plan outlines a number of strategies to preserve and develop new affordable housing including these two public sites. Many of the sentiments highlighted during the Community Visioning Workshop were similarly emphasized during the Jerome Avenue Neighborhood Plan process.

Previously Stated Community Goals

- Provide new opportunities for affordable housing development
- Improve quality of life and health
- Ensure a safe, walkable and more accessible Jerome Avenue beneath the elevated train
- Support the local economy

Source: General principles paraphrased from the Jerome Avenue Neighborhood Plan recommendations related to public sites. For more information, please visit www.nyc.gov/jerome
02 Summary of Findings

Though there were many different visions for the sites, the following points were common threads that workshop and questionnaire participants identified as priorities:

Clinic Parking Lot - Programming

Housing Types:
• Affordability for a mix of household incomes from extremely low- to low-income, with a specific preference for deep affordability
• Options for larger household sizes (5+ people)
• Housing for seniors, formerly homeless, and veterans

Community Facility:
• A multipurpose community space that brings different cultures together
• Activities for youth with after-school programming
• Workforce/economic development center
• Arts and culture

Clinic Parking Lot - Site Layout & Urban Design

• Maximize the number of affordable apartments
• Activate the Jerome Avenue and River Avenue corridor and promote safety through use of lighting and street trees/greenery
• Place entrances to residential portion and replacement parking on 168th Street where there is less traffic
• Promote high quality design and green/sustainable features
• Incorporate community-sourced murals that invite community to help design art projects
• Set back building at multiple levels to create a larger sidewalk

Anthony Avenue - Site Layout & Urban Design

• Maximize the number of affordable apartments
• Increase street lighting and other design strategies that promote safety
• Improve connection to Claremont Park to increase the feeling of safety there
• Incorporate active and healthy design features for building residents
• Incorporate streetscape improvements such as trees, benches, and bike racks
• Create recreational space with art that welcomes people from all cultural backgrounds

These findings were presented to the Community Board 4 Land Use Committee Meeting on November 4, 2019. RFP submissions will be evaluated based on the quality and feasibility of the proposals, as well as how well they respond to the priorities articulated by the community.
Many long term individuals have been in rental apartments for many years and we would like homeownership opportunities - affordable homeownership.

This is a great idea, but measures should be taken to keep housing prices affordable in perpetuity so future families can purchase at affordable rates.
03 Affordability and Housing Types

There were two different activities at the workshop to gather feedback on the programming for affordable housing.

For the tables that provided input on the clinic parking lot, facilitators led an activity on mix of affordability desired at the site. The activity began with a warm-up questionnaire for participants to individually reflect on and identify the populations that need affordable housing most on this site. HPD facilitators then provided an overview of how the City finances the construction of affordable housing. Each participant received an activity sheet that outlined the various HPD new construction housing subsidy programs that showed the populations served, the mix of household incomes, sample affordable rents, and local examples of projects with similar affordability mixes. Participants gave their top two priorities for affordability mix and discussed as a group. See the next page for the activity sheet. Those that were not able to attend the workshop and instead participated in the online and paper surveys were asked what populations need affordable housing most.

"The building should house a mixed population comprised of veterans, senior citizens, and people living in shelters."
For the tables that focused on Anthony Avenue, facilitators first explained how HPD finances affordable homeownership through its new Open Door program. The table then focused on a broader discussion regarding homeownership for moderate-income households on this site. Specifically, we asked participants for feedback on the appropriateness for homeownership on this site and responded to general questions and concerns.

### AFFORDABILITY MIX EXAMPLES IN HPD-FINANCED DEVELOPMENTS

**VOTE! Please place a sticker on the type of affordable housing you’d like to see on the site**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>A. Senior Affordable Rentals</th>
<th>B. Affordable Supportive Rentals with On-Site Social Services</th>
<th>C. Affordable Rentals for Extremely-Low to Low-Income (Option 1)</th>
<th>D. Affordable Rentals for Extremely-Low to Low-Income (Option 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population Served</td>
<td>Extremely Low to Low-Income Seniors</td>
<td>Formerly Homeless Households with Special Needs</td>
<td>Extremely Low-Income Households, with some Formerly Homeless Households</td>
<td>Extremely Low-Income Households, with some Formerly Homeless Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formerly Homeless Seniors</td>
<td>Low-Income Households</td>
<td>Moderate-income households</td>
<td>Moderate-income households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30% of apartments serve formerly homeless seniors*</td>
<td>60% of apartments serve formerly homeless households with disabilities*</td>
<td>10% of apartments serve formerly homeless households* [Rent: 30% of income]</td>
<td>30% of apartments serve formerly homeless households* [Rent: 30% of income]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70% serve extremely low to low-income seniors with fixed incomes ranging from below $33,685 (50% AMI) to a maximum of $81,240 for a family of four (80% AMI)</td>
<td>20% of apartments serve households earning between $35,446-$64,599 for a family of three (40-50% AMI)</td>
<td>20% of apartments serve households earning $35,446-$64,599 for a family of three (40-50% AMI)</td>
<td>Sample 2BR: $828-$1,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rent: 30% of income</td>
<td>Sample 2BR: $1,300</td>
<td>Sample 2BR: $1,300</td>
<td>Sample 2BR: $1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40% serve households earning at or below $35,690 for a family of three (50% AMI)</td>
<td>40% serve households earning at or below $35,690 for a family of three (50% AMI)</td>
<td>0-30% serve households earning at or below $71,380-$98,490 for a family of three (80% AMI-50% AMI)</td>
<td>0-30% serve households earning at or below $71,380-$98,490 for a family of three (80% AMI-50% AMI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sample 2BR: $1,742-$1,960</td>
<td>Sample 2BR: $1,742-$1,960</td>
<td>Sample 2BR: $1,742-$1,960</td>
<td>Sample 2BR: $1,742-$1,960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Participants were given four existing HPD affordable housing new construction financing programs with examples of nearby similar developments and were asked to vote on which scenario best suited their desires for affordability. Most participants chose option C, a development that could serve extremely low- to low-income households, the formerly homeless, and some moderate-income families.
In the questionnaires, participants identified housing for low-income households, formerly homeless individuals and families, and seniors as top priorities in the community. At the workshop, while most participants envisioned housing on this site to serve a mix of extremely low- to low-income households, others envisioned the mix to include housing for people with special needs and moderate-income households to create a development that is socioeconomically diverse and resourced for residents. Overall, the vast majority of participants emphasized the urgency for housing to serve those earning extremely-low and very low-incomes (up to 50% of AMI and below).

The chart on the below compiles the results from the questionnaire of what populations are most in need of affordable housing on the Clinic Parking Lot Site.

### Top Housing Priorities at the Clinic Parking Lot Site

- **Extremely Low-Income Households**: 80
- **Formerly Homeless Individuals & Families**: 34
- **Seniors and Elderly Households**: 28
- **Very Low-Income Households**: 27
- **People with Special Needs**: 27
- **Low Income Households**: 12
- **Moderate Income Renters**: 8
- **Low-Income Artists Live/Work Space**: 3

Participants commenting on the Anthony Avenue site engaged in a discussion on affordable homeownership. Participants had mixed opinions about homeownership on this site. While most validated the need for affordable homeownership for moderate-income households to help to stabilize and promote ownership in the neighborhood, many also noted that homeownership remains unachievable for the low-income households in the area. Still, participants conceded that homeownership at this site could foster an increased sense of security and more ownership opportunities for residents whose only option to live in the area is to rent.
New development on the clinic parking lot allows for an opportunity to enliven River Avenue with a community facility that can benefit residents, even those that will not ultimately live in the development. In this activity to gather input on desired ground floor programming, each participant first individually filled out a questionnaire and defined their top three types of community facility uses needed in the neighborhood. Participants then worked together to design their ideal ground floor programming for the clinic parking lot site, using a hypothetical building activity. Participants used tiles with images of different types of community facilities and prioritized the uses they wanted to see built in the limited amount of space. The results are summarized in the following pages.
Based on questionnaire results, the top programming and services desired include: after school and early education activities, workforce development, recreation, and arts and cultural activities. In general, workshop participants expressed interest in having a multifunctional space that can serve children and adults, and would celebrate the diversity of cultures present in the neighborhood. There was a mix of opinions on what resources are needed or already accessible in the neighborhood. Almost all tables agreed that the space should be an outlet for workforce development, childcare, and enrichment for all youth, as well as allow for cultivation of arts and culture.

IDEA: Many tables discussed how to make this space multifunctional for all ages. Participants mentioned having a S.T.E.A.M. (Science, Technology, Engineering, Architecture, and Mathematics) center or a library that could house enrichment programs for children, and a workforce center for adults. Others discussed the idea of having a workforce center that also provided services for women, childcare, or an art and culture component.
Community involvement will encourage new ideas and make the area more livable.

Community centers that offer learning and healthy recreation.

Community involvement will encourage new ideas and make the area more livable.
05 Site Layout & Urban Design

The final activity brought in urban designers from the Department of City Planning to help visualize what participants envisioned in terms of building design and public realm improvements. The facilitators asked participants: “Where should the entrances go? What public amenities would you like to see and where? What should it feel like walking down the street past this building?” Each table completed a site diagram and street-view sketches.

Clinic Parking Lot

For the clinic parking lot, most residents agreed that the entrances to the residential portion and the replacement parking should be placed on East 168th Street rather than River Avenue. Participants commented that the combination of high traffic along River Avenue and the noise from the elevated train justified locating the residential entrance on the quieter side street. However, for the ground floor programming, most agreed there should be a separate entrance on River Avenue, preferably on the first floor to promote a safer feeling on the street at night under the elevated train. Participants commented that currently, walking along River Avenue after hours from the nearby station can feel unsafe because most of the retail on the corridor closes early and there is insufficient lighting.

“It should have access to wheelchairs and mothers with strollers, people with walkers (ramps on the entrance).”
The urban designers also asked participants to consider the building density and envision what the buildings might look like. Participants liked the idea of having a building that would have a more modern, contemporary look with a lighter color incorporated into the design. Most also agreed that the building should maximize the number of affordable apartments and possible services that could be located at the site, even if it means a taller building. Some suggested that the structure should incorporate setbacks at the higher levels to ensure that the building does not seem so dense from the street. The setbacks would also allow for greenery and passive recreational space for residents. Some also commented that this type of space would be best suited for the side facing East 168th Street rather than the side facing River Avenue and the elevated train.
Anthony Ave Site

At Anthony Avenue, participants noted that currently, the street at this location is not well lit and feels unsafe. They felt that the surrounding area and the adjacent Claremont Park had high instances of crime. For this reason, lighting on the street and at the park, are top priorities for residents who provided feedback on this site. All agreed that an opportunity for homeownership might promote a more widespread sense of ownership/investment, security, and can potentially bring even more neighborhood-wide improvements. As for the density of the building, residents wanted to maximize the number of homeownership opportunities. Participants also expressed a high interest in having private and communal passive recreation space. The group unanimously agreed that they would like apartments with terraces, as well as recreational landscaped rooftop space, including gardening space for building residents.

“Something to embrace the cultures in the area. Like murals - inviting community to come help design art projects.”
Other amenities that community members asked to see include indoor bike storage and a gym. Many participants also expressed a desire to see colorful art that reflects the cultural diversity of the neighborhood in the interior and exterior design of the building. At both locations, participants commented that they’d like to see murals and other art that felt inviting, communal, and celebrates cultural diversity.
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