

New Possible Evolvment of Floor-Area-Ratio-based Incentive Zoning
Comparative Studies on Tokyo and New York City

Ch. Tomokazu Arita (University of Tsukuba)

Mem. Tomoki Kitazaki (Mitsui-fudosan America)

[S Y N O P S I S]

The objective of this study is to discuss the new possible evolvment of Tokyo's floor-area-ratio based incentive zoning by comparative studies on historical development and current practices of incentive zoning systems in Tokyo and New York City.

We conducted surveys on history and current practices of traditional incentive zoning tools and three cases of urban regeneration special district system as for Tokyo, and special tools such as District Improvement Bonus system or Transfer of Development Rights system as for New York City.

The results of this study is summarized as follows. Tokyo metropolitan government developed the unique incentive zoning system that have made it possible to promote concentration of offices and special mixed-use development in the central area of Tokyo. The urban regeneration special district system urged developers to propose varieties of new facilities and management systems with high public benefits.

There are significant differences in incentive zoning systems between Tokyo and New York City in such points as agents responsible for proposing projects with public benefits, providers of financial resources and agents responsible for implementing the actual projects. As for Tokyo, the principal developer is expected to be responsible for all of proposing plans, managing financial resources and implementation of the projects. In certain cases of New York City, Developers are required to provide only monetary contribution and the city government provides resources to other different agents being responsible for implementing projects with public benefits. New York City also ensure democratic decision making process by Uniform Land Use Review Procedure.

Since the whole reviewing process of urban regeneration projects have become comprehensive in nature, it is desirable to discuss further how to improve the procedures of negotiation between public and private sectors, evaluation criteria, and balances between development benefits and public benefits.