

<http://www.zeitschrift-suburban.de/sys/index.php/suburban/article/view/289/469>

Race Matters... Still

The mayor of New York, Bill de Blasio, took the promise to make the history of a city from the history of two cities - one rich and one poor. His ambitious housing plan should be an expression of this. He called it the largest housing scheme for more affordable housing that has ever been sought at a local level (see Velsey / Colvin 2014). Its goal: 80,000 new affordable apartments and the maintenance of 120,000 apartments in 10 years. "This plan," says de Blasio, "will create opportunity for so many people. (Noun, masculine) (also: to be able to).

De Blasio, however, is based on the instrument that Tom Angotti and Sylvia Morse recorded in their collection *Zoned Out!* As one of the most important planning instruments that has repeatedly reproduced the historical patterns of ethnic discrimination and segregation in New York: zoning.

Under 'zoning' is understood in the USA the regulation of the area use. These are building codes of the city administration, which include the area use, the building density and often also design guidelines. Using the example of land use and housing policies, the editors Tom Angotti and Sylvia Morse as well as their three co-authors in *Zoned Out!* Step by step, how seemingly neutral land use regulations were used to drive low-income New Yorkers out of their historically grown communities of color - starting with the Commissioners' Plan of 1811 on the influential New York City Map of Robert Moses in the 1940s / 1950s to the The time of Bloomberg and finally Bill de Blasio.

In doing so, they particularly reveal two myths that characterize the public and academic debate about zoning: firstly, zoning rules are not neutral land use laws. The proclaimed "race-neutrality" (p. 40) is a misconception, as Angotti and Morse illustrate in a passage through history. Already in the

early days of New York's urban development, we can see how space utilization patterns have contributed to segregation and ethnic inequality: the commissioners' plan of 1811, which involved the implementation of a grid plan and the sale of land in Manhattan, on the establishment of the Central Park To the first Zoning Resolution of 1916, which decisively dominated the skyline of Manhattan and zoned Manhattan into areas where only certain areas were allowed. In particular, it regulated the already heavily urbanized heart of Manhattan, while the surrounding industrialized labor camps and low-income communities of color were excluded and accordingly exposed to the developments of the market. According to Angotti and Morse, all these developments benefited white major landowners and led to the displacement and segregation of minorities (see p. 47f). The version of the Zoning Resolution passed in 1961 extended this zonal division to the other four districts (Brooklyn, Queens, The Bronx and Staten Island). Also, the discriminatory practice of exclusionary zoning, which was used especially after the Second World War, to exclude socio-economically weaker people from the suburbs, was carried on within New York. These are building codes which stipulate the minimum size of land or determine the maximum height of buildings in order to prevent the construction of multi-family houses and thus make the entry of lower income households more difficult. There are still so-called "internal suburbs" (p. 51) in New York City that are protected by zoning and are characterized by a low population density with mainly white property owners.

Other measures, identified as ethnically discriminatory by the authors, which have their origin in area usage patterns and which have been practiced well into the 1970s, include (1) redlining, a practice in areas, in particular residential areas of black and ethnic minorities A city map marked by a red line on the basis of racist and ethnic characteristics in order to make it clear that there is a higher risk for insurance and investment; (2) racial steering, a practice where real estatemakers tried to keep blacks from predominantly whites inhabited areas and place them in existing

communities of color, as well as (3) block-busting: This is a practice in which real estatemarkers warned white householders before, That blacks would soon move into their region, as this was facilitated by the change in land use rules. For fear of loss of value, the majority of white house owners sold their house far below market value, and the blockbusters sold the house far above market value, for example, to emerging black families of the so-called middle class (see p. 50ff).

In addition, according to Angotti and Morse, the urban motorway projects of the New York city-guide Robert Moses in the 1940s and 1950s are among the discriminating mechanisms in planning. They partly led directly through areas that had

been depreciated as 'slums', such as the Bronx, displacing some 250,000 people (cf. p. 57).

The second myth with which the editors of *Zoned Out! (Rezoning)* are imperative steps to resolve the housing crisis (see p. 26). Rather, according to the argument of the editors, they are often the problem and not the solution. The contributions of the band relate in particular to rezonings during the office times of the New York mayor Michael Bloomberg and Bill de Blasio. Under Bloomberg (2002 to 2013), most of the land use changes were made in the city's history - also known as "zoning blitz" (p. 32) - to boost both its new residential construction and its growth-oriented economic policy. Around 37 per cent of the city was converted (rezoned) by 140 individual land use changes: However, particularly areas where whites resided were protected by downzoning from further development and areas where people of color resided by upzoning in particular for new (luxury -) housing construction (see S 32). The three detailed case studies in Williamsburg (Brooklyn), Harlem and Chinatown (Manhattan) show in detail how changes in land use during Bloomberg 's term were triggered by the stimulation of new suburbs leading to gentrification in the traditional

communities of color and to minorities.

For example, the Williamsburg Greenpoint land use change of 2005, as shown by Philip DePaolo and Sylvia Morse (pp. 72ff.), Led to the construction of luxurious high-rise buildings along the East River's promenade, overlooking Manhattan. This resulted in a drastic increase in housing costs in the area and the displacement of the local Latino population. In the case of Harlem, for example, Sylvia Morse (p. 96ff.) Also adds how the upzoning of a street block in Central Harlem follows a long tradition that goes back to the 19th century. According to him, black residents were only displaced from Lower Manhattan, then from Midtown and now increasingly from Harlem. The change of land in Central Harlem opened the market for luxury new-build apartments, attracting new residents, including repressed people from the Upper West Side. Both examples show how the so - called community plans, developed by the local population, were undermined: DePaolo and Morse, for example, show the example of Williamsburg, like the Office of City Planning, the discussion after more than 10 years and within The community-coordinated community plan simply ignored and the upzoning enforced. Unlike Williamsburg, the apparent involvement of the population in the plans of the expansion of the Columbia University served as a cover coat for an area change in the area, which in turn led to the gentrification and displacement of the black population.

With regard to Chinatown, Samuel Stein (p. 122 ff.) Presents another example of how the New York City Office has rejected a community plan for a rezoning, which in its own case, By convening a Chinatown Working Group, consisting of various neighborhood organizations. This working group tried to protect Chinatown by a rezoning plan, as it was excluded from the previous, protective downzoning of the surrounding areas, mainly white-populated areas. As a result, Chinatown has been exposed to an extreme process of gentrification, which has already displaced a large part of the resident population, especially the Asian population.

What appears in all of these presented case studies is the discriminatory housing policy, which is hidden behind the allegedly "race-neutral" (p. 143) planning instruments. On the one hand, it is based on the systematic upgrading of certain areas and thus on the displacement of the resident - mostly ethnic - population and on the other hand on the apparent participation of grassroots initiatives in development plans. In this way, the respective authors show their examples in detail, as well as under Bloomberg by zoning the historical patterns of ethnic discrimination and expulsion in New York were repeatedly reproduced.

It is therefore also not surprising for the editors that Bill de Blasio, despite his progressive promises in the election campaign, directly leads the discriminatory housing policy of his predecessors. With the introduction of Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH), he has implemented the largest city-wide rehousing program since 1961. [1] The program was eagerly awaited by many, in particular politicians, as well as journalists and housing activists, as builders are now obliged to integrate affordable housing construction into their building projects, instead of voluntary under Bloomberg, if they are higher and higher To build more densely than the existing surface usage norms allow. In this way de Blasio promises to generate a considerable part of the urgently needed, affordable housing. He sees this as the solution to counter the housing crisis (see also Mallach / Calavita 2010, NYU Furman Center 2015). In order to get MIH quicker, de Blasio wants however 15 massive areas, including major parts of East New York (already rezoned), South Bronx (The Bronx), East Harlem (Brooklyn) and Inwood (Manhattan) and Flushing (Queens) In building regulations for building investors (upzoning). However, as Angotti and Morse are critical, this also means that in these areas 80 percent of newly built dwellings will be luxury apartments, which will set in motion a strong process of gentrification in areas inhabited mainly by people of color (p.148). De Blasio is thus directly opposed to his own electorate, because it was the communities of color that put their hope of improvement on the housing market in him and voted him over with overwhelming majority (New York

Times 2013).

Zoned Out! Appears at a time when a series of intense zoning battles are taking place in the city in response to de Blasio's housing policy and has established itself as one of the most important ethnic clashes of recent years with "Black Lives Matter". And that is exactly what makes the book so highly contemporary and provocative at the same time. By combining planning tools like zoning with housing policy as a discriminatory practice, *Zoned Out!* Not just a new look at the history of New York's urban development, which is so hard to find in academic literature, but also helps to link it with current political developments and reveal the recurring discriminatory patterns in the map. The strength of the book is not on the scientific-theoretical level. Many of the arguments, which are in some cases enumerated, especially in the historical

derivation, will not necessarily be new to most readers, or can be read in detail elsewhere (eg Brooks / Rose 2013, Caro 1975, Massey / Denton 1993, Mollenkopf / Castells 1992, Rosenzweig / Blackmar 1994). Also, his strength is not necessarily in the offered solution of the community-based plannings by Tom Angotti at the end of the book, which tries to break with the discriminating tradition in the map. His work, *New York for Sale*, was published in 2008. *Community Planning Confronts Global Real Estate* (Angotti 2008) more theoretical and detailed information. Also, one of the main arguments of the book that New York has never had a master plan, and the city is therefore lacking a long-term planning vision and resting instead on "zoning without planning" (p. 164) can not convince. The question is whether a master plan, as it was developed in the 1960s, but which was ultimately not adopted, would have changed a lot in relation to the discriminatory practices in the city planning. However, the reader does not wait for a response or explanation. Also somewhat contradictory is the separation between zoning and planning as if zoning were completely detached from planning policies and visions. Thus, both the three case studies and the zoning practices described under Bloomberg and de Blasio show how strongly political agendas coincide with the discriminatory

practices of zoning. As a result, the book becomes more and more clear: Zoning is planning and planning is political practice! For, as Peter Marcuse (p. 7ff.) Notes in his preface to the volume, "Good zoning can help, but bad zoning can do great harm" (p. 9), it depends on the political will, with tradition To exclude certain population groups by means of planning tools such as zoning.

What makes the book ultimately impressive is the apparent ease with which Angotti, Morse and their co-authors expose the patterns and strategies behind zoning, and their institutionalized discrimination against ethnic minorities from slavery to Bill de Blasio's reign disclose. De Blasio thus follows the footsteps of his predecessors and follows a long tradition of institutionalized ethnic and socioeconomic discrimination by zoning rather than as announced. In addition, the intelligible language and the many and detailed explanations of the complex and often impenetrable planning terms, which are otherwise only to be found in the few textbooks on the subject (eg NYC Department of City Planning 2011, Gaspar 2013). This makes this book not only for academics, but also for activists, journalists, politicians and for those who have always wanted to understand the emergence of social and racist inequalities in the city Global multicultural-integrated world city.