



THE REAL ESTATE BOARD OF NEW YORK

RENT STABILIZED UNITS ON LANDMARKED PROPERTIES

RENT REGULATED UNITS IN LANDMARK DISTRICTS

This analysis was conducted to examine the frequent assertion¹ that landmarking helps preserve existing affordable housing. It is based on data that recently became publicly available that provides a snapshot of the number of rent-stabilized units in 2007 and again in 2014.

Contrary to statements made by advocates², affordable housing is not preserved at higher levels in NYC's historic districts. The data shows that properties located within New York City's historic districts showed a greater net loss³ of rent regulated apartments than those located in non-landmarked parts of the City.

FINDINGS

An analysis of the data found that, from 2007 to 2014, the decline in the number of rent regulated apartments located within New York City's landmarked properties was four times higher than in non-landmarked parts of the City.

Citywide, landmarked properties showed a much greater decrease in the number of rent-stabilized units (-22.5%) than non-landmarked properties (-4.75%). At the end of this seven year period, there was a net loss of nearly 10,000 rent-stabilized units in landmarked districts in the City.⁴

The Manhattan and Brooklyn numbers are particularly startling. Manhattan landmarked properties lost 24.5% of their rent-stabilized units compared to a loss of 11.5% in non-landmarked properties. And Brooklyn landmarked properties lost 27.1% of their rent-stabilized units compared to 3.4% in non-landmarked properties. **See Table 1.**

The historic districts that had the highest net loss of rent stabilized units were Greenwich Village (-1432 units) and the Upper West Side/Central Park West (-2730 units). Combined, these two historic districts showed a decrease of 30% in rent stabilized units during this seven-year period. **See Table 2.**

¹ Anuta, Joe. "Preservationists say REBNY's wrong on landmarks." *Crain's New York Business*. 28 Oct 2013

² Berman, Andrew. "Op-Ed: Preservation Can Contribute to Affordability." *Gotham Gazette*. 06 Aug 2013

³ All of the decreases in the number of rent-regulated units discussed in the report are net decreases.

⁴ Approximately 22 historic districts were calendared and designated after 2007. Since it is not possible to definitively know whether or not the properties in these historic districts lost rent stabilized units during the period of study, a conservative approach was taken, and they were excluded. **Table 3** contains data on the loss of rent stabilized units in these newer historic districts.

Table 1: Change in Rent Regulated Units, 2007-2014

	2007 Rent Stabilized Units	2014 Rent Stabilized Units	Difference	% Change
MN Landmark	30,308	22,859	-7,449	-24.58%
MN-Non Landmark	265,989	235,425	-30,564	-11.49%
Manhattan	296,297	258,284	-38,013	-12.83%
BK Landmark	8,675	6,322	-2,353	-27.12%
BK-Non Landmark	233,066	225,126	-7,940	-3.41%
Brooklyn	241,741	231,448	-10,293	-4.26%
QN Landmark	4,100	3,892	-208	-5.07%
QN Non Landmark	156,268	147,242	-9,026	-5.78%
Queens	160,368	151,134	-9,234	-5.76%
BX Landmark	1,340	1,378	38	2.84%
BX Non-Landmark	203,095	206,806	3,711	1.83%
Bronx	204,435	208,184	3,749	1.83%
SI Landmark	11	6	-5	-45.45%
SI Non-Landmark	7,093	6,650	-443	-6.25%
Staten Island	7,104	6,656	-448	-6.31%
City Landmarks	44,434	34,457	-9,977	-22.45%
City Non-Landmarks	865,511	821,249	-44,262	-5.11%
Citywide	909,945	855,706	-54,239	-5.96%

Table 2: Historic Districts with Highest Loss of Rent Stabilized Units, 2007- 2014

Historic District	2007 Rent Stabilized Units	2014 Rent Stabilized Units	Difference	% Change
Upper West Side/Central Park West	8,238	5,508	-2,730	-33.1%
Greenwich Village/Extension	5,639	4,207	-1,432	-25.4%
Brooklyn Heights	2,192	1,411	-781	-35.6%
Park Slope	1,518	899	-619	-40.8%

Table 3: Loss of Rent Stabilized Units in Historic Districts Designated between 2008-2014

	2007 Rent Stabilized Units	2014 Rent Stabilized Units	Difference	% Change
MN Landmark	8,607	6,108	-2,499	-29.03%
BK Landmarks	3,300	2,144	-1,156	-35.03%
QN Landmarks	1,647	1,487	-160	-9.71%
BX Landmarks	3,919	3,749	-170	-4.34%
SI Landmarks	0	0	0	0.00%
Citywide	17,473	13,488	-3,985	-22.81%

PREVIOUS STUDIES

- In 2013, REBNY analyzed properties in Manhattan and discovered that 27.7% of its properties were landmarked—either as individual landmarks, or much more commonly, as a part of historic districts.
- In 2014, REBNY analyzed housing construction and affordable housing development on landmarked properties over a ten year period of time (2003-2012). The study revealed that only 0.64% of all housing units—or 1,318 units—were constructed on landmarked properties citywide.
 - The study also found that only five units of affordable housing were built in Manhattan landmark districts, and only 100 new affordable units were constructed in historic districts throughout the City during that timeframe.
 - Analyzing demographics, the study also found that the population in landmarked districts is significantly less diverse in terms of racial and ethnic makeup than the rest of Manhattan, Brooklyn, or New York City as a whole. Additionally, landmarked properties have residents with much higher household incomes, a lower percentage of renters, and smaller household sizes than non-landmarked properties.

SOURCES

Landmarked Properties

The data on landmarked properties in each borough is from the City's Primary Land Use Tax Lot Output (PLUTO) data files⁵, which contain data maintained by the Department of City Planning (DCP), Department of Finance (DOF), Department of Citywide Administrative Services (DCAS), and from the Landmarks Preservation Commission's (LPC) publications and website. The PLUTO data was analyzed in a geographic information system (GIS) program so that basic calculations could be made about landmarks and land use in the City.

Rent Stabilized Housing

Changes in the number of rent stabilized units from 2007 to 2014 were collected from scraped tax bills from the Department of Finance. All data is available on <http://taxbills.nyc>.

⁵ November 2014 version of PLUTO data