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Introduction to the Urban Planning Studio

The Mayor’s Office of Comprehensive Neighborhood Economic Development (CNED), in keeping with its mission to find appropriate uses for city-owned parcels in order to achieve comprehensive community revitalization and strengthen retail corridors, charged the Columbia University Graduate School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation (GSAPP) Urban Planning Studio GSAPP Urban Planning Studio with developing innovative strategies for bolstering commercial revitalization in Bedford-Stuyvesant.

The Studio’s analysis contributes to the CNED mission in three important ways: first, by offering development scenarios and a feasibility study for utilizing four undeveloped publicly-owned properties, commonly referred to as “Saratoga Square” located in the southeastern section of Bedford-Stuyvesant; second, by providing an inventory of retail along the primary commercial corridors; and third by expanding the retail potential of Fulton St and the North-South corridors of Tompkins Ave, Lewis Ave, and Malcolm X Blvd, and by exploring retail linkage strategies for connecting the Saratoga site and existing nodes of retail activity.

The primary purpose of this report is to describe the research approach and the development scenarios encapsulated in the Studio presentation for the CNED stakeholders. For each scenario there are a set of alternatives, many of which are outlined here. In addition each development scenario is proposed with a preliminary financial analysis. However, it is important to note that due to time constraints of this Studio, the operating budgets are merely intended as broad estimates and general overviews of conventional practice. If interested in further exploring the development scenarios a more in-depth financial feasibility study would be required.

Studio Guidelines from CNED

In addition to a broad focus on economic development, it was requested that the Studio specifically investigate the highest and best uses for four undeveloped city-owned parcels in Saratoga Square that could foster the comprehensive community revitalization goal of CNED and strengthen the retail corridors. Accordingly, the Studio strove to design sustainable proposals that included job creation, a more robust retail mix, greater access to healthy food, green initiatives and enhanced Bedford-Stuyvesant’s cultural identity.

The Studio was also asked to consider mixed-use developments and sustainable development. Early conversations with CNED suggested that we explore various types of incubators; food production facilities, food distribution such as specialty shops, restaurants, grocery stores and markets; as well as art spaces.
Studio Development Proposals
The Studio has designed three proposals for the four City-owned site. While situated in Saratoga Square, the proposals are intended to foster comprehensive economic development across Bedford-Stuyvesant. The proposals are as follows: artist live/work units; culinary incubator and shared kitchen; and indoor vendor market. These three proposals will be discussed in depth later on in the report.

Brief Overview of CNED
In 2005, the Mayor’s Office of Comprehensive Neighborhood Economic Development (CNED) was formed as a pilot program developed by New York City Economic Development Corporation in an effort to devise a neighborhood development model that could support the economic growth of the city’s low-income neighborhoods.

CNED is a collaborative effort between 12 city agencies—with significant support from the Department of Small Business Services, Housing, Preservation and Development, and Economic Development Corporation—and the community, represented by the Coalition for Improvement of Bedford Stuyvesant (CIBS). CIBS is comprised of 23 community organizations, elected officials and governing bodies. Given the GSAPP Studio mission and objectives, we worked most closely with two community organizations: Bedford Stuyvesant Restoration Corporation and Bridge Street Development Corporation.
The City employed a rigorous criterion for site selection in which Bedford-Stuyvesant emerged as the logical pilot site for CNED. Each neighborhood’s socioeconomic condition was assessed for poverty rate, unemployment level, education attainment level and crime rate. Melrose and Bushwick both presented strong opportunities for economic development, community revitalization and personal asset building. However, Bedford-Stuyvesant was selected based on the existing institutional capacity expressed through the CIBS, which had already embarked on a neighborhood planning process and coalesced around a set of broad neighborhood improvement goals. The capacity of CIBS instilled greater confidence in the Mayor’s Office that the pilot could be launched in Bedford-Stuyvesant.

CNED’s primary goal is to “enable low-wage and unemployed residents to gain financial independence and access to economic opportunity; and to enhance the capacity of local business, non-profits and city agencies to serve the needs of Bedford-Stuyvesant residents” [1]. CNED’s objectives for Bedford-Stuyvesant are organized around three main areas: workforce development, commercial revitalization, and personal asset development. Each of these areas incorporates institutional support from relevant city agencies and CIBS member groups. Despite the comprehensive neighborhood change scope, the mandate for our Studio was to focus on the Business Development Network.

**Neighborhood Profile**

Set in the north-central heart of Brooklyn bordered by Flushing, Saratoga, Classon and Atlantic avenues, Bedford-Stuyvesant is widely known as the borough’s African American cultural capital. With a large stock of classic brownstones and row houses, built during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, Bedford-Stuyvesant has earned its position as part of “Brownstone Brooklyn,” desired by both community incumbents and newcomers.

### Race In New York City, Brooklyn, and Bedford-Stuyvesant

![Chart 1](image)

*Source: American Community Survey 2007*
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Population
As of 2007, the population of Bedford-Stuyvesant was 125,699—with approximately 71 percent black, 17 percent Hispanic, and 14 percent white. Brooklyn’s total population in 2007 was 35 percent black, 42 percent white, and 19 percent Hispanic [2]. The racial demographics in New York City for 2007 showed that 44 percent of the total population was white, 25 percent black, 11 percent Asian and 27 percent Hispanic.

Employment
The percent of civilian labor force unemployed was much higher in Bedford-Stuyvesant than in all of Brooklyn and all of New York City. In Bedford-Stuyvesant, 17.9 percent of the population was unemployed in 2007, while only 11 percent was unemployed in all of Brooklyn and 9.7 percent in New York City [3]. Analysis of the 2007 employment figures demonstrated that unemployment remains as great of a challenge as when CNED selected Bedford-Stuyvesant for its pilot site.

Income
The median household income for Bedford-Stuyvesant was $30,575 in 2007. This figure is much lower than both the median household income in all of Brooklyn, which was $40,942, and that in New York City, which was $47,581. For a reference, the red line shows the U.S. Poverty Line for a family of four at $21,263.

Percent of Civilian Labor Force Unemployed

![Chart showing the percent of civilian labor force unemployed in New York City, Brooklyn, and Bedford-Stuyvesant.](chart2.png)

Education
Education attainment by the population 25 years and older shows that in Bedford-Stuyvesant, 58 percent of the population had a high school education or less, 23 percent had some college education, and 19 percent had a bachelors degree or higher. The education attainment in Bedford-Stuyvesant is quite similar to that in Brooklyn, where 53 percent of the population 25 and older had a high school education or less, 19 percent had some college education, and 28 percent had a bachelors degree or higher. These numbers were almost reversed in New York City, where only 19 percent of the population 25 and older had a high school education or less, 7 percent had some college, and 74 percent of the population had a bachelors degree or higher [4].

Crime
Crime statistics for Bedford-Stuyvesant show that the crime rate overtime significantly decreased from 1990 to 2008. In 1990, there were over 30,000 total crimes in Bedford-Stuyvesant [5]. This number was decreased in half in 2008, mostly due to the New York City Police Department’s 2005 designation of Bedford-Stuyvesant as an “impact zone” which increased police protection in the intersection of Nostrand and Fulton Avenues and decreased crime by 15 percent [6].
Methodology

In order to best meet CNED’s request and follow the aforementioned guiding principle the Studio began researching Bedford-Stuyvesant. The Studio conducted market, demographic and institutional analysis. The data sources included CNED provided ESRI data, census data, past local studies including the 2002 Fulton Street Redevelopment Plan and the Community Board 3’s Need Assessment Plan, RefUSA, Site Solutions, a Studio generated inventory and a bodega assessment.

Retail Inventory

The purpose of the Bedford-Stuyvesant Studio was not only to find the best use for four city-owned sites, but also find ways to incorporate these uses into the broader Bedford-Stuyvesant community. To do so, a better understanding of the Bedford-Stuyvesant retail environment was necessary.

One valuable tool in this process was the 2002 Fulton Street Redevelopment Plan conducted by the Brooklyn Alliance, which includes an in-depth analysis of retail conditions and makes recommendations for the commercial corridor. The study incorporates community input, which helped inform the Studio of the neighborhood’s desired retail mix.
Blank tax lot maps of Fulton Street, Tompkins Avenue, Lewis Avenue, and Malcolm X Boulevard were used to plot retail uses. Retail uses were determined based on storefronts and storefront signs. The data collected included the business name, street address, type of use based on the NAICS codes (as determined by the Studio), and other notes about the storefront. When necessary (and possible) stores were contacted for more information. The plotted tax lot maps were subsequently coded to match the uses to the address.

Once data gathering was completed, the information was transferred to an Excel spreadsheet. The database was put into the program Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and was once again plotted to illustrate the spatial locations of different retail uses and of vacancies. Each retail location recorded in the inventory was mapped using the geocoding function in GIS. Next, each geocoded address was spatially joined to the appropriate tax lot. In an effort to limit the number of industry categories represented on the map, in addition to the NAICS codes, two new categories were created that are an amalgamation of categories with fewer than five entries with more robust but related uses. One new category, “home and leisure services” houses together retail uses related to the home and services such as travel agencies and postal services. The second new category combines all of the cultural, social, health and religious institutions into one category. Although institutions are not retail establishments we decided to map their locations because of their heavy presence in the retail corridors.

This database can be updated and used to map further changes in the retail mix. The inventory provided the Studio with an idea of the existing retail clusters and facilitated our brainstorming of appropriate ideas for the linkage of these corridors. The inventory also led to ideas for the possible uses for the four city-owned parcels in Saratoga Square.

Market Analysis
The retail inventory was supplemented with a comprehensive market analysis. In order to perform this analysis, the Studio identified two central nodes to anchor the two study areas. The first of these is Saratoga Square, the location of the four city-owned sites, in the Southeast corner of Bedford-Stuyvesant. The second is the intersection of Nostrand Avenue and Fulton Street near the Southwest corner of Bedford-Stuyvesant. The second study area was selected because it encompasses the North-South corridors otherwise excluded.

The use of radial study areas is a widely accepted convention in market analyses. However, given focus areas located in the southern corners of the Bedford-Stuyvesant neighborhood, the use of such convention has limitations. The study areas do not capture all Bedford-Stuyvesant residents, particularly those toward the Northern boundaries. Nonetheless, neighborhood market data was not readily available. Further, while it would better incorporate target residents and businesses, neighborhood data would not best represent potential consumers and competitors of the proposed uses.
Retail Leakage

Using data provided by ESRI, the Studio analyzed the retail leakage of the Saratoga Square and Nostrand-Fulton study areas. Retail leakage is defined as the gap between the potential and actual sales of area businesses. The potential sales are often referred to as demand and the actual sales as supply. A leakage/surplus factor measures supply against demand so that an area with a factor of 100 captures none of the existing demand. Although data was provided for ¼, ½ and 1-mile radii, the Studio sought to identify uses that will be catalytic to the economic development of a large portion of Bedford-Stuyvesant and the surrounding community and therefore relied heavily on data from the 1-mile radii. Starting with 3-digit NAICS codes, the Studio assessed retail leakages across thirteen retail sectors. It is important to point out that not all of these leakages require immediate action. It may, in fact, be perfectly acceptable that residents of Bedford-Stuyvesant leave their neighborhood to go car shopping. However, many of these leakages represent substantial opportunities. The Nostrand-Fulton Study area has a combined

**Nostrand-Fulton**
- Sales: $590 Million
- Leakage: $817 Million

**Saratoga Square**
- Sales: $531 Million
- Leakage: $361 Million
retail leakage of nearly $600 Million, which is 90% higher than Saratoga Square’s $297 Million. However, a higher retail leakage does not equate to a higher need for economic development. In fact, the Nostrand-Fulton area retail leakage is higher due to higher supply, while demand in both areas is relatively equal. In addition to study area comparison, leakages were examined based on observations during the inventory process. Shown in chart 5, Saratoga square has a combined food related retail leakage of $89 million per year. The Nostrand-Fulton study area has a leakage of $147 million per year.

**Retail Purchasing Power**

The Studio also performed an analysis of Bedford-Stuyvesant’s retail purchasing power, which represents the aggregate retail expenditure of area residents. Data was gathered through NYC Site Solutions, which is provided by the Department of Small Business Services. The expenditure data includes non-retail expenses like rent and utilities, which were subtracted for the purposes of a retail-specific analysis. While a 1-mile radius was used to measure retail leakage, using such a large area proved difficult for comparing other areas in a city crossed by highways and waterways, and in which neighborhoods change drastically over short distances. For this reason, ½ mile radii were used. Comparing Bedford-Stuyvesant with several neighborhoods around the city revealed that despite a lower mean income, the area’s aggregate purchasing power is much higher than areas like those that surround Jamaica Avenue in Queens. Despite roughly half the mean income, the Nostrand-Fulton area has a retail purchasing power similar to that of Downtown Brooklyn.

Looking at food-related data, the Nostrand-Fulton study area has a food at home purchasing power of $61 Million, which is greater than that of Downtown Brooklyn.
Retail Clusters

With this compelling market data in mind, the Studio mapped existing retail establishments using the retail inventory and ReferenceUSA, an online database of United States businesses. As shown in figure 4, mapping area restaurants, specialty food markets and art galleries revealed retail use clusters as shown below. The mapping also revealed an opportunity to extend these clusters to the Saratoga Square study area and provide linkage to an area currently devoid of retail activity.

Bodega Analysis

In addition to the inventory and market analysis the Studio evaluated the availability of healthy food in local bodegas. The assessment was based on the Department of Health (DOH) “Healthy Bodega Initiative” assessment tool. The assessment instrument is not publicly available therefore is not reproduced in this report. However the assessment evaluates whether the bodegas stock fresh produce, healthier varieties of canned fruits and vegetables and healthier meal options among other things. In the ten bodegas that were assessed none of them satisfied the DOH’s first level even though some of the bodegas did meet certain aspects of the higher levels. This will be further expounded upon in the vendor market proposal section.

Zoning

The Studio’s deliverables consisted of creating proposals for each of the four vacant city-owned parcels located in the southeast corner of Bedford-Stuyvesant.

The M1-1/R7D Special Mixed Use District allows for light manufacturing, commercial and/or residential uses. The C2-4 Commercial Overlay allows for commercial and/or residential uses.
Rezoning

Saratoga Square underwent a rezoning affecting each of the four sites. Prior to the rezoning, the Atlantic Site was located in a light-manufacturing district. As one of only ten special mixed-use districts in New York City, the Atlantic Site permits simultaneous “as-of-right” [8] uses, which are residential, commercial and/or light industrial in nature. Fulton Sites #1, #2, and #3 were located in a strictly residential district prior to the rezoning. Pursuant to the rezoning, Fulton Site #1, #2, and #3 were rezoned as a contextual R7D zoning district with a C2-4 commercial district overlay [9].

Bulk, Height, Lot Coverage and Parking Restrictions

The Atlantic Site's bulk and height regulations are found in the section of regulations pertaining to the MX-10 as well as the applicable residential, commercial and manufacturing regulations referred to therein. The Atlantic Site has no lot coverage requirements. The number of parking spaces required is one parking space for every two residential units and one parking space for every 1,000 square feet of commercial or manufacturing space. Below is a matrix providing the bulk and height restrictions for the Atlantic Site.

The bulk and height regulations for Fulton sites #1, #2 and #3 are found in the section of the zoning regulations pertaining to residential and commercial districts. Fulton site #1 is a corner lot charac-
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 characterized by 80 percent lot coverage maximum. Fulton sites #2 and #3 are interior lots characterized by 65 percent lot coverage maximum. The parking requirements for all of the Fulton sites are identical to those determined for the Atlantic Avenue site. Below is a matrix providing the bulk and height restrictions for each of the three Fulton sites.

**Use Regulations**

Fulton Sites #1, #2 and #3 permit residential uses “as-of-right” since it is located in a residential district. In addition to such residential uses, these sites permit accessory uses to the residential use, including home occupation such as an artist studio or office. The commercial space, which is required to be located below the residential use, permits a number of “as-of-right” uses which include, among other use groups, Use Group 6A (food stores and supermarkets), Use Group 6B (offices) and Use Group 6C (antique stores, commercial art galleries, clothing or accessory stores, eating and drinking establishments).

The Atlantic Site permits residential, commercial and manufacturing uses “as-of-right”. The permitted use groups include those discussed above for the Fulton sites. In addition, the Atlantic Site permits a number of light-manufacturing uses “as-of-right”, including, but not limited to, Use Group 11A (certain manufacturing establishments), Use Group 12A (certain eating and drinking establishments) and Use Group 13B (catering establishments). Other uses such as those found within Use Group 17B (certain food production) are subject to certain requirements before permitted on the Atlantic Site [10].
Proposal One: Artist Live△Work

Two of the client’s recommendations for the Saratoga Square sites were to provide affordable housing and to incorporate some form of art space into our proposal. Given these requests, the Studio felt that proposing an artist live/work model would best suit residents’ needs. The proposed artist live/work space is on the larger Fulton Street site. The site was chosen because its large size can accommodate several live/work units, and its location on Fulton Street makes it an ideal place to include first floor retail. The Studio’s feasibility study for such a development focused on five dimensions: history, demand and current trends, the area’s institutional landscape, potential ownership structures, and financing.

Live/work studio units are a combination of housing and artist studio space in the same unit. The combined workspace with residence reduces the cost of rent borne by the artist. Live/work philosophy boasts that “a properly designed live-work space provides the artist with the amenities of a home and the open studio space necessary to create and store finished works securely. While commercial loft space has always been a hot commodity amongst the artistic community, the advent of live-work space has made the concept of living close to the project even more appealing” [11].

Though there are several models of artist space, they can be divided into studio and live/work space [12]. Studio spaces, which are workspaces only, are often built in former industrial facilities, while live/work spaces combine art space with a
residential component. This arrangement can further be divided into single family or multi-family, depending on how many families a building can accommodate. Single-family live/work units generally contain a floor studio or gallery space with an upper floor residence. This model lends itself to scattered site developments.

Multi-family live/work space is more dynamic and can be arranged in a variety of ways. Multi-family art space can be self-contained in that the workspace and residential facility for each family is in one single unit. This arrangement is most common as it allows for greatest flexibility with few interior partitions so that residents can decide how much space to dedicate to “live” and how much space to dedicate to “work” [13]. Multi-family art space can also be divided into separate studio and residential units with a common kitchen and bathroom facility (similar to single-room occupancy). Both models of multi-family live/work space allow for mixed-uses. Often the live/work space is combined with a shared, arts-related use, such as a gallery, classroom, performance space or a community and youth center.

History
The artistic history of Bedford-Stuyvesant makes it a hotbed for cultural institutions and local artists. Like Harlem, Bedford-Stuyvesant has become known as a center for African-American culture. African-Americans from the South and immigrants from the West Indies relocated to Bedford-Stuyvesant in the early and mid-20th century, and the construction of the A train facilitated transportation between Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant. By mid-century, racial segregation and discrimination from real estate brokers and mortgage lenders further intensified Bedford-Stuyvesant’s position as a center of black culture and politics. The Civil Rights Movement and reactions to racism, injustice, and poverty also informed Bedford-Stuyvesant’s political identity. This political identity, in turn, was and still is an integral part of Bedford-Stuyvesant’s unique characteristics. Visual artists, musicians, and performers from Bedford-Stuyvesant have drawn on this rich culture and have reflected on its struggles with crime, drugs, poverty, and racism through artistic expression.

Bedford-Stuyvesant is a stronghold for film, music, and performance. Many of Spike Lee’s films depict Bedford-Stuyvesant, most notably Do the Right Thing, as well as Joe’s Bed-Stuy Barber Shop: We Cut Heads and Crooklyn. Lee uses semi-autobiographical elements in his films that draw upon his childhood in Brooklyn. In addition, Bedford-Stuyvesant remains a center for hip-hop musicians. Several artists, including Jay-Z, Notorious B.I.G., Talib Kweli, and Mos Def, are from Bedford-Stuyvesant and draw inspiration from the neighborhood for their music. Comedian and actor Chris Rock also hail from Bedford-Stuyvesant; his sitcom Everybody Hates Chris is a semi-autobiographical account of his youth based in the neighborhood. In addition, the presence of galleries throughout the neighborhood, the proximity of Pratt Institute, and the prevalence of musicians make Bedford-Stuyvesant a welcoming neighborhood for the arts.
Demand

According to Brooklyn Community Board 3’s District Needs Assessment, Bedford-Stuyvesant “is currently home to many artists and the former home to many others. It is also the home of a significant number of art and cultural organizations ... however, many, if not all of them, exist at the edge of financial peril-undercapitalized, under-funded and under-staffed.” It is evident that there are a number of artists in Bedford-Stuyvesant whose capacity to maintain their livelihoods is in jeopardy. In light of this finding, the Studio felt it would be appropriate to further explore artist live/work studios.

To determine the specific needs of the community, employment data from the American Community Survey’s 2005-2007 data set was analyzed at the Public Use Microdata Area (PUMA) level, which in New York City is roughly equivalent to a community district. As shown in Figure 6, New York City has about 185,300 people employed in the arts, or about 5% of the total employed population. In comparison, Bedford-Stuyvesant’s arts employment represents 1,300 people, or about 2.7% of its total employed population. Adjacent districts, however, such as Brooklyn Community Boards 1 and 2 had about 13% of their employed populations in the arts, which could increase the
housing demand in Bedford-Stuyvesant. The accompanying map (Figure 6) shows employment in the arts by PUMA level and highlights Bedford-Stuyvesant [14].

In neighboring areas, there are significant developments in the field of live/work artist housing. Across Bedford-Stuyvesant’s southeastern edge, along the Broadway border with Bushwick, there are a number of semi-legal loft apartments, as well as quasi-legal arts and music performance spaces along Broadway and Bushwick Avenues. Within such apartments, there is a current trend of using one’s living space for informal, not-for-profit galleries, with semi-regular coordinated exhibitions and gallery walks among these developments. Increasing rents in Williamsburg, which have pushed out established artists in that area, have exacerbated the trend [15].

**Institutional Landscape**

The development of live/work space often requires the partnership of local arts institutions. Within and around the community there are two artists’ associations, one existing legal live/work studio on the western edge, and a number of smaller shops, galleries, cafes, and performance spaces. Across the street from the western edge of the community district is the Pratt Institute, one of the preeminent arts-oriented colleges in the country. Results of our institutional inventory are summarized in the accompanying map (Figure 7). The yellow dots indicate BeSAA, SONYA, 35 Claver Pl., House of Art, Skylight Gallery, Zion Gallery, AfroArt Designs, Brooklynite Gallery, 123 Community Space, Magnolia Earth Tree Center, Central Brooklyn Jazz Consortium, IronworkNY, 178 Walworth Street, Sputnik, Lab 24/7, 20/20 Art, Fish Gallery, Lewis Gallery, Red Creative Art Concept Studio, and Welancora Gallery.
Interviews were conducted with representatives from two of the area’s artist associations – the Bedford-Stuyvesant Artist’s Association (BeSAA) and South of the Navy Yard Artists (SONYA). BeSAA’s membership is limited to artists living and working in Bedford-Stuyvesant, while SONYA’s catchment area also includes the adjacent neighborhoods of Fort Greene and Clinton Hill. Kathleen Hayek, President of SONYA, stated that most of their Bedford-Stuyvesant based constituent artists currently live in apartments in brownstones and had studios elsewhere. Meanwhile, their members residing in Fort Greene and Clinton Hill were being displaced by rising rents and moving into Bedford-Stuyvesant in search of lower housing costs. Both organizations mentioned that paying multiple rents for studio space and housing was a real barrier to encouraging artists as professionals in New York. They believed that affordable artist live/work space would provide a tangible benefit to the community.

Ownership Structure
The ownership structure of the artist live/work space was determined based on affordability considerations. Affordability will help ensure that not only artists, who are often compelled to pay two rents (one for living, one for work space), will have access, but artists specifically from Bedford-Stuyvesant. In order to preserve and strengthen the existing artist community, Bedford-Stuyvesant artists will be specifically targeted and given priority. Other issues of concern in identifying an appropriate ownership structure were tenure and residential control. The ability to provide long-term access to affordable artist live/work space set the criteria for an ownership structure model.

Models that were considered, but ultimately rejected, were private ownership with rental units, nonprofit ownership with rental units (ex. Spinning Plate- Pittsburgh, PA), and market-rate cooperatives (ex. Brickbottom Artists Association- Somerville, MA) and condominiums. The first two options, which offer rental units, could help to ensure some affordability with landlord commitment, but do not fully satisfy the desire to produce a long-term tenure scenario and do not offer sufficient tenant control [16]. The cooperative and condominium structures are appealing in terms of residential autonomy and increased tenure, and sold at a market-rate would allow residents to accrue equity. In the case of the cooperative an additional advantage is that residents retain control over the disposition of units. This could help to ensure that local artists are admitted. Market-rate housing, however, does not satisfy the affordability criterion. Given the drawbacks of all four of the aforementioned models, the Studio decided to look for alternatives.

One model, the Community Land Trust (CLT) – a long-term structure where a property owner (CDC, local government, etc.) holds land for a given community – showed promise. The CLT model can be applied to affordable housing, commercial properties and open space, and therefore presents an attractive flexibility [17]. This structure could help to ensure long-term affordability as well as relevant occupancy in the ground-floor commercial spaces.
However, while a Community Land Trust affords many benefits, a residential ownership model would best ensure tenure and in-house management of shared facilities.

The ownership structure that best meets the criteria set forth by the Studio is the Condop model, a condominium and limited equity cooperative. A Condop allows a building to be partitioned into mixed-use segments, with each segment receiving a condominium deed [18]. A non-profit organization or private firm may own the commercial segment. The residential segment however is a limited equity cooperative (ex. 249 A Street Cooperative, Boston; Fort Point Artists Community, Boston), which is both a cooperative (individual residents own a share of stock in a corporation made up of building residents) as well as a form of non-speculative homeownership [19]. A limited equity model restricts the value of residential units, but ensures long-term affordability. In a classic cooperative, any revenue accrued to the co-op corporation from a source other than tenant-shareholders exceeding twenty percent would negatively impact IRS tax deductions [20]. Under the Condop structure, however, the tax benefits typically awarded to cooperatives are preserved, while some form of commercial use (i.e. ground floor retail) is permitted. A Condop affords the greatest level of sustained affordability, tenure, ownership, residential control, and permits a commercial use to better serve the occupants as well as their neighbors.

**Financing**

The Studio made a number of assumptions in order to determine the financial feasibility of developing artist live/work space in Bedford-Stuyvesant. The financial projections, shown in Table 1, for artist live/work space assume a for-profit development model and an ownership model as outlined in the Condop structure. The five-floor building will total 116,000 square feet, with four floors of artist live/work space, one floor retail, and 13,000 square feet of parking. Under the current zoning of C2-4, the parking requirement for residences is one space per two units, and the parking requirement for retail is one space for 1,000 square feet. With these restrictions, it is estimated that around 13,000 square feet would provide roughly 67 parking spaces, 44 designated for the Studios and 23 designated for retail.

The remaining 23,000 square feet can be developed into a 5-story artist live/work space with first floor retail. Using the average cost of artist live/work construction per square foot ($151), we estimated construction cost to be $17,495,615. We also based the number of units on the minimum studio size of 1,000 square feet/artist space as outlined in the Boston Redevelopment Authority's document on artist live/work space [21]. Based on the minimum studio size, the building will house 88 units, 52 to be sold at market rate and 36 to be sold at below-market rate. The market rate units are priced at $360,000. This figure is the average home sale for a one-bedroom apartment in Bed-
The below-market rate units were determined by multiplying the Area Median Income (AMI), $30,575 [23], by 80 percent, which is the maximum one could earn and still be considered moderate income, and multiplying that by 30%, which is the amount of expendable income that could service debt (i.e. support a loan) before housing becomes unaffordable. This number was then divided by 0.1, which is a standard mortgage rate, to come up with the price of $80,000 for the below-market rate units.

To finance construction, developers will likely take out a loan of $13,121,711, which is 75% of the total construction cost, a loan percentage developers typically use. Developers will contribute the remaining 25%, estimated at $4,373,903, in equity. The total revenue from sales, of both the market rate and below-market rate condos, is estimated at $21,600,000. The net income (revenue minus the loan) is estimated at $8,478,289 and the return on equity (net income minus equity) is estimated at $4,104,386, which is roughly 25 percent of total construction costs and can be considered a strong investment.
Proposal Two: Culinary Use

The 2002 Fulton St Redevelopment Plan was conducted by Brooklyn Alliance, a not-for-profit affiliate of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce. According to the 2002 study, successful retail streets have a balanced mix of services, specialty retail, food and restaurants with a minimum amount of duplication of uses and a low percentage of vacancy – conditions that create vibrant and active streets that attract people to them. The 2002 study performed an in depth analysis of retail conditions in order to provide retail recommendations that could revitalize the Fulton Street corridor. The 2002 Fulton St Redevelopment Plan is salient to consider for this analysis because it incorporated community input in its planning process. Community members attended five town hall meetings and participated in workshops and intercept studies.

Merchant and shopper surveys were conducted by Brooklyn Alliance in an effort to assess the retail landscape of Fulton Street. Survey questions were designed to find out what categories of stores merchants might like to attract to the area. The most often mentioned answers included better restaurants and specialty stores. Almost all shoppers interviewed were from the Bedford-Stuyvesant neighborhood. Furthermore, 90% of all respondents lived within ten blocks or of less of Fulton Street (in total there were 130 completed surveys). When shoppers were asked what types of stores might attract them to shop there, the most frequently mentioned categories included sit-down, family style restaurants and specialty stores.

In addition to questionnaires, the 2002 report conducted an inventory of the mix of ground level spaces and their type of use in order to assess the existing conditions on Fulton Street. The analy-
sis of the merchandise mix examined retail sites on Fulton Street between Classon and Utica Avenues. Since seven years have passed, the Bedford-Stuyvesant studio conducted a similar inventory and corresponding analysis in order to paint a more accurate picture of the retail landscape of Fulton Street. By comparing the two inventories, we discovered that the 2009 retail inventory had consistent findings to the 2002 inventory. The major uses of occupied storefronts on the ground level are represented in the following table.

Based on this information, there is far too much duplication of certain uses such as fast food/take out and grocery/deli/fruit/vegetable categories, which include mostly Bodegas that are limited in their offerings to consumers and tend to have few healthy food-related alternatives. Market areas that are seriously underrepresented include sit-down restaurants, coffee/cafés, and specialty shops. The overrepresented categories of stores are not appropriate to fill vacancies along Fulton Street because these uses will not add vitality to the commercial area.

Based on the inventories and questionnaires, the 2002 plan recommends that vacancies be filled with underserved and appropriate categories such as family-style; sit down restaurants, coffee/cafés, upscale bars, and specialty shops, such as quality meat markets, prepared foods, and quality green grocery stores.

These underrepresented market areas are, thus, opportunities for culinary-related uses to fill vacancies and needs not currently being fulfilled by the commercial corridor. In addition, it is recommended that categories of stores be clustered together to complement each other and create stronger retail attractions and destinations.

The retail recommendations offered by the Fulton Street Redevelopment Plan emphasize a demand...
by the community for culinary uses, which corresponds to the conclusions drawn from the retail leakage analysis in this 2009 study. Culinary-related industries in the area are not meeting the current and potential market.

Employment and Justification

The analysis of employment wages for culinary-related occupations provides an indication as to which of the culinary-related occupations are desirable to promote and, thus, which types of culinary businesses to attract to the area. Employment wages are also examined to determine the occupations that can achieve the goals of personal wealth creation, economic self-sufficiency, and higher quality of life for the residents of Bedford Stuyvesant.

We examined average wage information pertaining to culinary-related employment. The minimum wage and living wage for New York are indicated on the following graph in relation to the culinary occupation wages. The employment opportunities that could benefit from our culinary use proposal include both low skilled and high-skilled jobs of varying wages, almost all of which are above the living wage.

Financing

Startup equipment is a significant cost for shared-use kitchens. Table 3 shows a detailed equipment budget based on costs at Pure Food and Wine, a restaurant in New York City. Following the budget is a table indicating certain costs associated with this use. The startup equipment cost for the shared-use kitchen allows the facility to have three shared-use kitchen spaces, which can minimize the likelihood of time conflicts between users.

The revenue consists of rental income from the use of kitchen, dining space, and storage. Also, small amount of revenue is expected from providing education and consulting programs. The kitchen rental is calculated based on $25/hour as a general rental fee. The kitchen space is expected to operate 20 hours a day, and 50% of the use of the three shared-use kitchen spaces is projected for the first year. The use of the kitchen spaces is expected to grow as the awareness of the facil-
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The net operating cost is projected to be negative for the first year. However, as the awareness of the facility increases and the number of users increases, the net cost is projected to be positive for second and third year. Thus, the facility is projected to reach breakeven operational status within three years.

Financial Assistance

There are several financial institutions available to entrepreneurs and small culinary-related businesses from various government levels and non-profit entities. The financial institutions address tax incentives, workforce training incentives and loan assistance.

Several institutions provide tax incentives for culinary businesses. Self-employment Tax Initiative (SETI) is a nonprofit of CNED and the National Fund for Enterprise Development (NFED). SETI partners with community-based tax preparers to identify the needs of the self-employed population [25]. The informational sessions enable employers to better understand their microenterprise. In response to the recent financial crisis, the Obama administration recently passes the 'IRS Making Workers Pay Tax Credit', part of the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act. The credits are designed to help workers weather tough economic times and encourage asset building [26]. Each
small business will receive an estimated tax credit of $532. There are 1,432,884 eligible returns in New York State. Microenterprises will be able to file the income tax return in 2010. Another tax break is available from the New York State and Local Sales and Use Tax [27]. Purchases of machinery and equipment are exempt when the items are used in direct manufacturing production.

The New York State Department of Labor offers a couple of financial incentives for employee training. The 'On-the-Job Training Program' will pay usually 40% - 50% of journey worker wages [28] of the salaries of full-time employees for a period between 20 to 60 days. Employers may apply for an extending training period, however, less funding for employees' salaries is available. The 'Labor ADVANCE Grants' enable small businesses located in NYS can access up to $50,000 in funds per year [29] for worker training. Workforce training must encourage career growth and increased wages for employees. The New York City Department of Small Business Services has a similar program as well. The 'New York City Business Solutions Training Funds' provides up to $400,000 to fund 60-70% of eligible training costs, with the employer paying the balance [30].

The 'New York Business Development Corporation (NYBDC)' provides loan assistance at the state level by working with partner banks [31]. The public/private venture offers loans to small and medium-size businesses ranging from $25,000 to $1,300,000 over a three to seven year period. Another public-private lending program, Accion USA, enables banks to make loans to small and medium-sized businesses. They offer flexible loans (up to $50,000) and provide affordable alternatives to high-cost sources of capital for minorities and women [32]. Loans can be used for working capital, real estate acquisitions, machinery and equipment, and physical improvement to real es-

### Financial Projection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st Year ($)</th>
<th>2nd Year ($)</th>
<th>3rd Year ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECTED REVENUE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen Rental</td>
<td>264,600</td>
<td>291,060</td>
<td>320,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining Space Rental</td>
<td>20,160</td>
<td>22,176</td>
<td>24,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Rental</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational &amp; Consulting Programs</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>292,760</td>
<td>329,236</td>
<td>365,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECTED EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Salaries</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities (electricity, water, gas)</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>79,200</td>
<td>87,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Rental, Maintenance &amp; Repair</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td>8,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>9,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>303,000</td>
<td>326,900</td>
<td>353,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET OPERATING COST</strong></td>
<td>(10,240)</td>
<td>2,336</td>
<td>12,060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Brooklyn Credit Union has partnered with Restoration Corporation for Brooklyn-based businesses. Applicants must have equity equal to 10% of the project's cost. Loans are available to retailers, manufacturers, wholesalers, non-profit organizations, contractors and distributors who conduct their business or live in Brooklyn [33]. The New York City Business Express (part of SBS) helps businesses identify restrictions from various levels of government regarding the requirement to start, operate and expand a business in New York City [34].

Workforce Development

There are several workforce development resources for culinary businesses. The NYC SBS has a ‘FastTrac’ program to help entrepreneurs acquire the skills to start, manage and grow a successful business [35]. Microenterprises in their initial stages can apply for the ‘NewVenture’ program, which entails a six-week training program including individual assistance from an experienced entrepreneur.

The ‘Growth Venture’ program follows a similar format for existing business that aims to help them continue growing. The Brooklyn Economic Development Corporation is a non-profit organization that provides workforce training in an intensive, 15-session, 60-hour classroom program for entrepreneurs [36]. The Business Outreach Center Network is a non-profit organization that has credit and technical assistance programs available for entrepreneurs located in communities with significant immigrant and minority populations [37]. Their local branch is in Fort Greene. Workshop in Business Opportunities (WIBO), the workforce development arm of Restoration Corporation, offers a flagship 16-week workshop entitled “How to Build a Growing Profitable Business” [38]. Applicants must have two years of industry-related experience and the cost of the program is determined by household income. Brooklyn Kitchen in Williamsburg is a for-profit business that offers individual training sessions for specialized culinary tasks [39]. Classes are intended for both professionals and amateurs.

Culinary Incubator Examples

There are at least five facilities offering shared use kitchen or culinary incubator services in New York City. The largest, the Artisan Baking Center, is located in Long Island City, Queens. It partners with the LaGuardia Community College's Small Business Development Center and Workforce 1 Career Center, (a SBS program) [40]. These institutions offer workforce development programs to participants. Kitchen for hire is a shared-use kitchen located in Prospect Heights. The industrial-sized kitchen meets state regulations and is available for culinary-related entrepreneurs. There are two culinary incubators in Manhattan- Simply Divine and Kitchen NY [41]. Simply Divine has evolved from a catering company to an event planning company. Kitchen NYC is a shared use kitchen for caterers as well as other culinary related events. Mi Kitchen es su Kitchen is a time-share rental facility available to up-and-coming food entrepreneurs in Queens [42].
This shared-use kitchen and culinary incubator offers kitchen services and consultation assistance for culinary related businesses. Culinary incubator and shared-use kitchens are not unique to New York City. There are several hundred types of these institutions located throughout the United States. Some institutions manage to combine a culinary incubator with a shared-use kitchen. The Food Ventures Center located in New Jersey is an example of one of the newest and most highly regarded shared-use kitchen and culinary incubator combinations in the nation. The Food Ventures Center provides an example of a state of the art facility that can be rented and utilized for training and food production. It also offers high quality culinary, business, and financial training. Most importantly, the Food Ventures Center exhibits how a strong institutional partner can make a shared-use kitchen and incubator successful.

The location of our proposed shared-use kitchen and culinary incubator can benefit from its proximity to similar not-for-profits and educational institutions. In particular, Medger Evers College in Crown Heights might be a strategic partner for establishing a shared-use kitchen/incubator. Medger Evers offers culinary educational programs and degrees. Several other educational institutions located in Brooklyn, including Kingsborough Community College, appear to have programs related to the services and training intended to be provided by the proposed shared-use kitchen/culinary incubator. Another possible partner includes Kitchen for Hire, which could help obtain shared-use kitchen facility clients for the Bedford-Stuyvesant location.

Ownership and management

Under this proposal the ownership and management of the culinary use would be separate from the building housing it. We recommend that a developer finance the construction of the facility and housing units above it. The developer could be a non-profit or for-profit corporation. Based upon the models outlined above and the institutional support needed to manage a successful shared use kitchen and culinary incubator, we would recommend that the owner be a non-profit such as an educational institution. The City could also retain ownership and a non-profit corporation could manage the facility.

Proposed Site

The Atlantic Avenue offers the best opportunity for the proposed shared-use kitchen and culinary incubator. The Atlantic Avenue site is the only one of the four sites which permits food production without a special permit, variance or rezoning. While use of the site for food production requires certification by an architect that it meets certain environmental restrictions, a carefully designed shared-use kitchen and incubator with food production capabilities can obtain such certification. Using the Atlantic Avenue site for food production incorporates light manufacturing that provides potential economic value to the neighborhood in the form of both low and high-skilled jobs. The Atlantic Site’s dimensions also allow access to vehicular traffic, including truck deliveries and shipments, from both Prescott Street and Bancroft Place. Atlantic Avenue is a major road providing convenient access by automobile or trucks in addition to nearby public transportation [43].
Proposal Three: Indoor Vendor Market

The Studio is proposing that an indoor vendor market occupy the ground floor space in the larger Fulton Street (‘Big Fulton’) site beneath the live/work space. The zoning for this building is a residential district with a commercial overlay, where use of the first floor for an indoor vendor market is permitted ‘as of right’. The space will allow for approximately 23,000 sqf of vendor space. 23 of the 67 parking spaces allocated for the building will be dedicated to the vendor market. This indoor vendor market will complement the artist live-work units as a mixed-use retail space. The market will invite vendors of food, art, and various other wares, with an emphasis on local, sustainable, healthy products.

Community Need

The intent behind the indoor vendor market proposal is to support CNED’s mission of local economic development while also responding to the community’s urgent need for increased access to healthy food. In terms of economic development, the market would enhance local workforce development and personal asset management by providing self-employment opportunities for users of the live/work and culinary spaces and other local residents. Additionally, this use would support various local food-related organizations and businesses.

Lack of access to full-service grocery stores in inner cities has been a growing concern since the 1970s. As a response to this, the American Planning Association (APA) has adopted guidelines to address food security with an increased emphasis on food retail in economic development initia-
New York City’s Department of City Planning (DCP) is already working with the Mayor’s office, EDC, HPD, DOH, and The Food Trust, a nonprofit based in Philadelphia that led a $120 million initiative in Pennsylvania, to finance supermarkets and healthy bodegas in underserved communities.

In April 2008, by request of the Mayor’s Office, DCP published a study on supermarket needs in New York City. DCP identified areas in the city with the greatest need for grocery stores as those with the highest levels of diet-related diseases and limited opportunities to purchase fresh foods. Bedford-Stuyvesant was designated as one of these areas. As evident in Figure 8, 15 out of 18 of the Community Districts in Brooklyn fall short of the City’s Average Ratio of supermarkets to population (which is 15,000 sqf for every 10,000 people) [44].

While performing the retail inventory, the Studio noticed that most food stores in the area are discount stores, convenience stores, and bodegas. DCP’s study found that the line of food products in these stores is often limited, of poor quality, and generally more expensive than the same products sold at supermarkets. The Studio decided to go back into the field to do a more in-depth analysis of the local bodegas. Using a criterion currently under development by DOH’s Healthy Bodega’s Initiative, the Studio determined that none of the assessed bodegas met the Initiative’s standards. Only two of the ten bodegas studied offered at least two fresh fruits and two fresh vegetables. Clearly, the site area is in desperate need of local, healthy food options and we feel that a vendor market will best address this need [45].
Institutional Support

Bedford-Stuyvesant has a variety of organizations and programs that make up a supportive institutional landscape for a vendor market. In Bedford Stuyvesant, the Bedford-Stuyvesant Farm Share, a Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) Project run out of Magnolia Tree Earth Center brings fresh, locally grown vegetables to the community for twenty to twenty-two weeks out of the year, starting in June. Bedford-Stuyvesant Farm Share prioritizes purchasing produce from local farmers of color. Share cost is based on household income.

Other local farmers markets include the Weeksville Farmer’s Market, which sells fresh produce grown in Weeksville’s own garden by local teenagers and from select New York State farms. The Red Hook Farmer’s Market and the Bedford-Stuyvesant farmer’s market operate during the summer and early fall months run by Added Value’s youth participants and are supervised by staff and volunteers.

New Amsterdam Market is a non-profit organization dedicated to reinventing the indoor public market as a civic institution in the City of New York. New Amsterdam Market’s director is Robert LaValva, a trained architect who has previously worked as a planner for the City of New York. There is no set location for the market yet. Organizers are in the process of raising support and money to establish a permanent location. New Amsterdam Market represents a potential institutional partner.

Indoor Vendor Market Models

There are many models throughout the country of successful indoor vendor markets that sell fresh produce, prepared food, specialty foods, and more. Because of the Studio’s intent to use the indoor market as a venue to sell the art produced in the live/work spaces in addition to the food made in the culinary space, we chose models that were not simply food markets.

Lexington Market [46], located in Baltimore, MD, is “quasi-public” in that the property is city-owned but the market is privately operated as a not-for-profit. There is a Board of Directors, with at least two positions reserved for city officers, and one Executive Director for the market. The other employees are the property management staff—nine people who are also in charge of five other public markets in the city (Cross Street, Northeast, Hollins, Avenue Broadway, and West Baltimore).

Lexington Market’s pricing structure is based on the type of food sold. Staple foods are charged the least amount ($20.00/sqf), followed by fast food ($27.25/sqf), and restaurants ($32.00/sqf). The pricing is also based on square footage (individual stalls range from 180 sqf to 400 sqf), and all vendors are charged a common area fee. Based on each individual stall’s size and particular needs, vendors are charged extra for electric, water, liability insurance, promotion, steam, and
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air conditioning. Stall remodeling may cost several thousand dollars. When taking into account the additional expenses for individual operations, monthly costs can be as high as $45/sqf. Vendors at Lexington Market range from those selling baked goods, carry-out, deli food, grocery, produce, seafood, meats, international foods, specialty foods, and services (tax service, Bank of America kiosk, H&R Block, shoe repair, Provident Bank), as well as gifts and accessories (florist, tobacco, cosmetics, etc.). The director of the market, Robert Thomas, says that Lexington is a “community centered market and serves the needs of a specific community... when starting a market you need to know two things: what do the people want that live there, and how can you get it to them at an affordable price” [47].

Essex Street Retail Market [48] is located in Manhattan’s Lower East Side and is over 70 years old. The market is a staple for local residents to purchase food and other amenities and to connect and share ideas in a social environment. There are many different types of vendors selling both food and non-food products, and even an art gallery. The building is approximately 15,000 sqf, divided into approximately 35 stalls that vary in size from 90 sqf to 600 sqf. Essex Street Market is run by EDC, who leases spaces at an average rate of $34/sqf, with monthly permit rates varying depending on the size and location of the stall. Merchants are offered a one-year revocable permit, with two additional one-year renewal options. EDC also owns and manages 4 other markets in the city including Moore Street Market in Brooklyn.

Moore Street Market is located in the East Williamsburg neighborhood of Brooklyn, and is housed in a building that is 15,000 sqf. On January 29, 2009, NYEDC reached an agreement with Brooklyn Economic Development Corporation (BEDC) to take over operations of the market and administer a 5-yr lease on behalf of SBS. Congresswoman Nydia M. Velazquez had secured $250,000 in funding for the market to improve and expand operations, with the help of Project for Public Spaces. The market currently has 11 vendors and about 40 employees.
In Kentucky, the Community Farm Alliance (CFA) has facilitated the opening of a new cooperative-ly-owned distribution center (“Grasshoppers”) in the inner city neighborhood of West Louisville. The center makes it easier for local producers to distribute their products to local restaurants and institutions. The operation has received funding help through grants from Project for Public Spaces funded by the Ford Foundation.

Having studied these models and various others from inner city areas around the country, the Studio feels that an indoor vendor market would be an economically and socially beneficial use of the space on Fulton Street. A market will help provide access to healthier, local food options for the neighborhood. It can provide local entrepreneurs with employment opportunities, including those working in the live/work space and shared-use kitchen. It can support local farmers markets and CSAs to help give business to local farmers and community gardens and expand their distribution networks.

Financial Evaluation
In conducting research for the indoor vendor market, the Studio explored several ownership and management models. The research indicates that the best option would be for the city to retain ownership of the bottom floor of the building, with the market operating as a not-for-profit. The financial analysis was based on Lexington Market and two of the five EDC-owned markets in the city.

Based on our interviews with Robert Thomas and discussions with EDC about indoor vendor markets the Studio is suggesting that the indoor vendor market adopt a staggered rent scale. At Essex Street Market it is estimated that of the $35/sqf rent $15/sqf covers operational costs. However over the past 10 years Essex Street Market has spent over $1 million in capital improvements. Therefore the financial feasibility of the indoor vendor market likely hinges on provisions in the (future) RFP for a developer to assist with the capital costs of building the market. Our research indicates that about 60% of space within a market can be rented. Therefore of the 23,000 sqf in Big Fulton 13,800 sqf would potentially be available for rent. This is similar to other vendor markets.

Financial Assistance
As the director of Lexington Market put it, “we have a challenge ahead of us” [49]. Funding will undoubtedly pose a challenge, however there are various funding sources and grant opportunities including Project for Public Spaces, USDA Community Food Projects, and Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, in addition to whatever support from the city is available.

Green Roof
The Studio explored the possibility of installing a green roof garden at this site to be used in conjunction with the culinary use and indoor vendor market. Aside from the many environmental benefits, including runoff control, and urban heat island mitigation, a rooftop garden would also provide many social benefits, including production of organic, nutritional food, educational opportunities, and community space. In addition,
the rooftop garden would help the site financially as the city recently announced a green roof tax credit equal to approximately 25% of overall costs.

Challenges
As discussed above securing adequate funding may be difficult. The vendor market only generates one form of labor: self-employment. In addition providing adequate support to entrepreneurs may pose a challenge. Workshops and outreach services may be necessary to ensure that start-up operations are sustainable. However CNED’s efforts to create strong institutional capacity for CIBS member groups may present an opportunity for local institutions to create entrepreneurial support services for the vendor market.
The three proposals represent new opportunities for retail, residential and industrial expansion in Saratoga Square. In addition, each of these proposals also offers opportunities to connect the two study areas. Saratoga square will serve as an artistic and culinary center of production. The artwork and artisan food produced on the specified sites can be sold in stores along the commercial corridors. Creating this local industry will help foster sustainable economic development in Bedford-Stuyvesant. The Bedford-Stuyvesant Gateway Business Improvement District has created the Bedford-Stuyvesant Gateway Streetscape Beautification Project that aims to visually link the separate commercial spheres [50]. The streetscape project will encompass Fulton Street from Classon Avenue to Troy Avenue as well as a small portion of Nostrand Avenue. The project, which will be completed in 2011, will cost $10 million and have an annual operating budget of $675,000.

Intersection of Lewis Avenue and Fulton Street
Saratoga Square is well integrated by a variety of transportation modes, as shown in figure 10, making it an attractive location for residences and businesses. Bus #25 runs through Bedford-Stuyvesant and the A and C subway lines can be used to move between the southwest of Bedford Stuyvesant and the southeast of Bedford-Stuyvesant where Saratoga Square is located. Other subway lines, such as L and J lines, and the Long Island Rail line, can serve as transportation modes that connect Bedford-Stuyvesant with the outside the neighborhood. The map below shows Bedford-Stuyvesant’s transportation nodes.

The new streetscape will likely change transit usage patterns. The pedestrian-friendly built environment will encourage public transit use and deter car travel. The new streetscape will entice new businesses, thereby creating new jobs in the area [51]. Bedford-Stuyvesant will be perceived as a unique, inviting shopping destination.

The streetscape project, however, fails to encompass Lewis Avenue and Malcolm X Boulevard. These two corridors, without the same level of economic activity found on Fulton Street and Tompkins Avenue, lack an immediate connection to Fulton Street. Without funding for a comprehensive project, minor improvements can be made, such as enhancing lighting with banners, improving landscaping, signage, and adding street furniture.

The streetscape project is a microcosm of the Studio’s comprehensive economic development proposals, embodying the goals of organic and sustainable growth. It is the Studio’s philosophy that only by improving every street corner will commercial corridors be enhanced and Bedford-Stuyvesant as a community be revitalized. Every street, every store, every person in Bedford-Stuyvesant gives the community its unique character.
Concluding Remarks

The culinary, live/work and vendor market proposals, as well as the streetscape analysis provide the culmination of the Studio’s work. Each of these proposals has been designed to stand on their own while also supporting and enhancing the other proposals. For example, the commercial kitchen and culinary incubator can conceivably provide space for budding entrepreneurs to create their products for the vendor market. In addition, the artist’s live/work space could be expanded to include chefs as culinary artists.

The proposals for the city-owned sites are envisioned as catalysts for greater density of culinary and artist retailing in Bedford-Stuyvesant. While living and working in Saratoga Square any of these entrepreneurs once successful and independently sustainable could venture to expand their business to the underutilized, vacant stores in the North-South Corridors or along Fulton Street. In a recent presentation of these proposals to CIBS members and representatives from Community Board 3, community participants voiced a need for greater access to healthy food, everyday staples and greater opportunities for entrepreneurs. These proposals answer the community’s needs while enhancing Bedford-Stuyvesant’s strengths.

Studio Perspective on CNED and the Project

Working with CNED has been a rewarding and educational experience for the Studio. We had the opportunity to experience firsthand the potential for City-led comprehensive economic development. CNED’s ambitious vision for community revitalization in Bedford-Stuyvesant focuses on economic development at various scales including: the community, retail corridors, individual businesses, the household and the individual. CNED’s uniqueness and strength is manifested in its ability to simultaneously foster institutional capacity building and develop city-owned sites.

The complexity of CNED complicated the Studio’s mission. First, the organizational structure often made it difficult to determine whom exactly our client was—the community organizations, the city agencies, or the residents. Focusing on the city agencies led us to focus most of our attention on Saratoga Square even though Restoration and Bridge Street also requested that we analyze various parcels in their catchment area.

Second, the community organizations—Restoration and Bridge Street—strive to represent the community’s best interest but may not include all community voices. The disconnect between our work and direct interaction with the community led us to rely heavily on reports published by CB3, the local community board.

The City-owned Saratoga Square parcels are located in the SE corner of Community Board 3. Though relatively small parcels, they provide great opportunities for designing innovative development schemes that can produce spillover effects for Bedford-Stuyvesant and the surrounding neighbor-
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This Studio focused on three distinct yet integrated thematic development models – live/work space, culinary, and vendor market – that are physically, socially and potentially economically appropriate for the specified sites. An alternative comprehensive approach might identify all City-owned parcels located in or around CB3 and develop a set of development proposals that seek to take advantage of the strategic location of each parcel and the broader thematic development vision. For example, building on the established and nascent “food movement” manifest in sections of Brooklyn, the City could support the sustainability and growth of various aspects of the food sector – from the production and distribution of specialty foods to the retailing and consumption of products.
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[22] HotPads.com: Bedford-Stuyvesant, New York, NY http://hotpads.com/search/#lat=40.6928912175035&lon=73.9047618076387&zoom=22&previewId=984259527&previewType=area&detailsOpen=true&listingTypes=rental,sublet,room,corporate&includeVaguePricing=false&loan=30,0.0525,0&visibility=new,viewed,favorite&points=lowes


[27] New York State: Department of Taxation and Finance. www.tax.state.ny.us/sbc/sell.htm


[34] NYC Business Express. www.nyc.gov/portal/site/businessexpress


[37] Business Outreach Center Network. www.bocnet.org/boc/about_us.asp


[41] Simply Divine: Kosher Catering and Event Planning www.simplydivine.com


[43] Fulton Sites #2 and #3 are both too small to provide for a sufficiently sizeable shared use kitchen and culinary incubator as well as accommodate the requisite number of parking spaces.


[45] If CNED chooses to pursue a supermarket for any of its Bed-Stuy properties, the Studio recommends looking into Pennsylvania’s Fresh Food Financing Initiative (FFFI), which is believed to be the nation’s only statewide public-private funding initiative dedicated to opening grocery stores in underserved areas.

[46] Information on Lexington Market was collected during a phone interview with Robert Thomas, director on Lexington Market on April 8th 2009.

[47] Phone interview with Robert Thomas, April 8th.

[48] EDC provided information via email regarding the rents and cost structure of Essex Street Market.

[49] Phone Interview with Robert Thomas, April 8th.
