

CITYWIDE COMMITTEE ON HOUSING RELOCATION PROBLEMS

Membership Meeting

December 8th, 1954

Women's City Club

The meeting was opened with reading of the minutes of the last meeting, March 1954. The minutes were accepted as read.

Mr. Present turned the chair over to Mr. Loeb who officiated during the election of new officers. Mr. Loeb read the report of the Nominations Committee. The membership instructed the secretary to cast one ballot for the officers suggested by the Nominations Committee.

The newly elected officers are:

Mr. Harris L. Present - Chairman
Mr. Meryl Ruoss - Vice Chairman
Mr. Paget L. Alves - Secretary

Mr. Present and Mr. Robbins summarized the relocation developments of 1953 and 1954 as background for our discussion and decision as to our plans for the year 1955. This summary pointed out the work of New York State Committee Against Discrimination in Housing, Citizens' Housing Planning Council, City Planning Commission's Report, and Dr. Gulick's report in focusing public attention on the relocation problem and pointing out action needed to resolve the problem. Considerable disappointment was expressed with the report of Dr. Gulick, as well as subsequent efforts to discuss the areas of the relocation problem the Gulick report did not adequately cover.

Mr. Present and Mr. Robbins reviewed the Capehart Committee's disclosure relative to Manhattantown and the rebuttal of the sponsor's attorney. Mr. Robbins also reported the results of one of their Committee's investigation of municipal controls of the Title I program. Mr. Robbins reported the Comptroller's office was responsible for auditing the sponsor's books and he expected this office would be more active in the future.

Mr. Robbins made the following recommendations:

1. More active regulation of sponsors by City and Federal Agencies
2. A more careful survey of population
3. A more specific program for relocation of site tenants

He also thought we should discuss the implications of the proposed multiple dwelling law before making a decision as to future plans.

Mr. Carpenter summarized recent developments in the Chelsea area and outlined the plan that had been evolved as follows:

1. Meeting of landlords
2. Recruitment of technically-skilled people to counsel landlords in regard to rehabilitation
3. Plan for block by block inspection by Department of Housing and Buildings

4. Decision to take steres out of over-occupied rooms in rooming houses (could upset the applecart).
5. Appeals to municipal atherities to centinue program Block Inspection with addition of a program for relocating displaced tenants has met with no luck.

Miss Bevans reported a slight improvement in maintenance of Godfrey Nurse and a new policy of paying \$150.00 to brokers for off-site apartments.

Mr. Leibowitz reported Nassau Management doing a good job at Morningside.

On the basis of the above reports, the floor was opened for a general discussion. Some members of the group expressed the opinion that perhaps drastic steps need be taken to achieve a positive relocation policy. This group suggested the possibility of enforcing the existing and new multiple dwelling law vigorously even if it meant putting people in the street. Other members of the group were not willing to go quite that far, pointing out that we needed vigorous enforcement of the law as well as a more adequate relocation policy and program.

Recommendation

Mr. Present appear at the public hearing to express the view that the Citywide Committee on Housing Relocation Problems favors the law but points to the need for more adequate relocation policy and program to handle the people to be displaced.

A member of community and civic groups indicated plans to appear to express similar views at the hearing.

Some time was spent in discussing other courses of action. Some suggestions were:

1. Publicity - general agreement as to value
2. Public Meeting - some resistance to such a meeting spearheaded by the Citywide Committee on Housing Relocation Problems
3. Motivate local organizations to protest - thought good but local organizations thought to be weak and insufficient in number, therefore, an inadequate strategy.

Respectfully submitted,

Paget L. Alves, Secretary

6/6/55
crj