SoHo Survey: METHODOLOGY

There are 734 buildings and empty lots in the zoning area called "SoHo." The SoHo Alliance, with the aid of sociologist Dr. Peter Cookson, Jr., who has had wide experience in survey analysis, prepared a questionnaire in February, 1983, with intent to distribute to a 10% random sample of the district using these 734 buildings as the full population. To ensure that no single area of this diverse district could dominate the data, SoHo was divided into five zones along the cross streets (i.e. Grand, Broome, Spring, and Prince) and buildings were counted within these boundaries. A file card was prepared for each of the lots, and, at a drawing supervised by Father Robert Lott and Tony Dapolito, chairman and vice-chairman of Community Board Two respectively, cards were drawn at random representing 10% of each of the five SoHo zones. When vacant lots were drawn, they were returned and another card was drawn at random. A total of 73 buildings, both residential and commercial, were thus selected for the sample.

Using a rule-of-thumb approach to the number of distinct lofts to be found in a building (doorbells, mailboxes, number of floors, etc.), SoHo Alliance volunteers distributed 297 questionnaires in February, 1983. Many were placed in mailboxes or lobbies of buildings, others were distributed directly to persons in the building with the request that they be passed out to other occupants. Responses were typically collected by the same volunteer two days later (although in a number of cases the questionnaires were returned to the Alliance by mail). Anonymity of the respondents were guaranteed, and where names were placed on the questionnaire by the respondents they were removed by the Alliance before computations were performed.

The questionnaire itself sought to determine the physical character of the loft units in the survey, their rental or cooperative nature, and length of occupancy of the respondent. Commercial respondents were asked whether they were wholesale, manufacturing, or retail businesses. Residential occupants were asked about the number of adults and children living full-time in the loft, the occupation of the principal residents, and artist certification. Both commercial and residential populations were also asked certain questions pertaining to working space and working needs.

The final part of the questionnaire was devoted to the opinions of the respondents on several zoning issues now before various city departments concerning SoHo. This included attitudes toward traffic, parking, and variances for such proposed projects as residential construction, discos, and hotels. Because it was assumed that there would be more than one person per loft (business or residential) who might have and opinion, space was made available for TWO separate sets of

responses. As a result, the 145 individual questionnaires accounted for an additional 60 opinions on each item, or a total of 205 different viewpoints.

In examining the results, the number of respondents in the various populations should be kept clearly in mind. The 10% SoHo sample refers to 10% of the 734 BUILDINGS in SoHo. Of the 73 buildings in the survey, responses came from 64 (87.7%). The number of returned questionnaires was 145 out of 297 distributed among all 73 buildings in the original sample (a return rate of 48.8% of the total); 101 responses came from residential and 44 from commercial respondents. The 101 residential questionnaires, however, provided OPINIONS from 158 residents, while the 44 commercial questionnaires gave opinions from 47 persons.

The actual percentage of SoHo lofts in the survey cannot be determined exactly. One cannot assume that the 297 questionnaires in the survey respresents the actual total of potential respondents within the surveyed buildings. The return rate per responding building (2.3) and the percentage return of buildings (87.7%) would give an overall prediction of 4.07 lofts per building. An actual count of floors in SoHo buildings, however, indicates an average of 5.01 lofts per structure. The difference might be affected by the fact that in a number of cases the respondents to the survey accounted for two or more floors, in some cases entire buildings. This, however, is offset by another fact: some buildings have more than one occupant per floor. Assuming these two factors average out, and taking the 5-lofts-per-building as the probable number of total respondents, the return of the survey would represent approximately 4% of the total number of all lofts in SoHo. This is an impressive sample when it is considered that the survey was conducted randomly, voluntarily, and mostly over a two-day period. Polls in presidential elections rely statistically on far slimmer data.

Results in this survey are given in percentages of the whole, and it is the view of the SoHo Alliance that the results are a valid indication of SoHo in general; but a word of caution about interpretation and extrapolation of this data. In many categories there are very few respondents. The smaller the percentages, the greater the likelihood that a generalization will go astray. For example, 3.3% of the total residential sample listed themselves as "dancer," while 41.8% listed themselves as artist (painter or sculptor). Statistically it is far more valid to assume that the 41.8% result is reflective of SoHo as a whole than to make the same assumption for the 3.3% component.

This point can be emphasized using a completely different test of the statistical reliability of our SoHo sample. If buildings were chosen completely at random, and if the sample is reliable, there should be some correlation between the heights of buildings in the sample to the heights of buildings throughout

all of SoHo. ("Height," here, refers to the number of stories to the building.) Analysis of 93% of all SoHo buildings and of our sample building population yields the following correlation:

Bldg Ht.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7-up
SoHo %	4.72	5.83	9.13	9.76	37.8	21.89	10.87
Sample %	7.14	4.29	4.29	15.7	37.14	25.7	5.7

It is obvious that the five-story building is the most common member of the population, and that here the correlation is close; but for the smaller categories, the percentages vary somewhat from the population as a whole. Grouping related categories, however, will increase the total percentages and therefore the reliability of the results; doing so in the above we now get:

Bldg Ht	1-2	3-4	5	6-up
SoHo %	10.55	18.89	37.8	32.76
Sample %	11.43	19.99	37.14	31.4

The sample is now seen to be in very close agreement with the population as a whole. This lesson applied to the above example with artists and dancers suggests that while a different sampling of SoHo would probably result in approximately the same percentage of artists, the proportion of "dancers" might vary wildly from sample to sample. If, however, dancers are lumped, say, with photographers, musicians, and craftspeople, a different random sample would be much more likely to yield similar results in this broader "other-artist" classification.

The SoHo Alliance was guided in the conduct of the survey by Dr. Peter Cookson, Jr., sociologist and professional in the area of survey analysis. Dr. Cookson wrote of the survey, "I...feel confident that our methods of data collection and analysis are sufficiently rigorous to make the results meaningful and reliable. The respondents to the survey were chosen at random, the return rate was high enough to ensure that a cross section of the community was included in the sample, the questionnaire was anonymous and the statistics applied to the data were appropriate.... I have every reason to believe that this survey is a reliable guide to the background and opinions of the residents of SoHo."

On the basis of the questionnaire, the methodology of the survey, and the total response, there is no reason to believe that a similarly-conducted sample of the SoHo district would give results substantially different from those given here. It must be pointed out, however, that while Dr. Cookson set up the procedure, advised on the conduct of the survey, provided us with a computer analysis of the raw data, and reviewed the results, the analysis of the survey returns is the sole responsibility of the SoHo Alliance.

The SoHo Alliance would like to thank Dr. Peter Cookson, under whose guidance this survey was conducted; Tony Dapolito and Father Robert Lott of Community Board Two, who were overseers to our random draw, and the many SoHo volunteers who carried and collected the questionnaires. Together they made a formidable challenge an achievable one.

SoHo SURVEY: ANALYSIS

"There are no more artists in SoHo: only doctors and stockbrokers." "It's so expensive in SoHo that no artist can afford it." "There is no more manufacturing left in SoHo--there is no industry there to protect."

The SoHo Alliance has heard all of these generalizations about SoHo and has long been irritated by them. While the Alliance survey of SoHo was not originally intended to debunk any of these preconceived notions, the results strongly confirmed what we had felt to be the case from our knowledge of the area. It indicated that a great many artists remain in SoHo, that they have lived there for quite some time, and that their rents are NOT the astronomical figures often quoted in newspaper ads. It also suggests that manufacturing is not dead in SoHo, and that, surprisingly, both business people and residents are in close agreement on issues that affect the SoHo community.

There are two populations in this survey: the residential component and the commercial-manufacturing component. The two populations are shown by the survey to differ slightly in both loft "demographics" and opinion, but the differences are curiously compatible--in much the same way that the artist-industrial mix has traditionally been on a handshake basis in SoHo.

LENGTH OF OCCUPANCY

Both residential and commercial occupants of the lofts responding to the survey have been in place for some time: the average resident for 7.25 years and the average commercial tenant for 11.3 years. These results are skewed toward longevity, however, because a few long-time residents can overwhelm, statistically, a lot of people who moved in yesterday. The median length of residency for both populations is almost the same: about six years. (The "median" indicates that one-half of the population registers below that number and one-half above.)

For the residential component, these results are rather unexpected: the first major wave of residential migration came, in fact, only 15 years ago, at a time when the total population of SoHo was considerably smaller than it is today. Yet the survey reached a surprisingly large number of those early "pioneers;" nearly 30% of the respondents reported living in their lofts 10 years and longer, with 5.9% of those having lived in SoHo 15 years or more. It is difficult to assess these figures simply from the percentages, however. Fifteen years ago the residential population of SoHo was exceedingly sparce; yet one in 17 reached by the survey date back to that time. Ten years ago, residency had increased, but it was still a long way from the current level; yet three out of ten respondents in the survey have remained in place that long a time. While many people believe SoHo prices have driven out its early pioneers, the results of this survey suggest that a high proportion of the original SoHo population

has survived. The responses suggest that there is a very stable residential component within SoHo and that this neighborhood is not the "revolving door" many people claim it to be.

There is, of course, a component of "newcomer" discovered in the survey: 28.6% have been in place for three years and less. These tend to be people paying more for their spaces, as might be expected in the current marketplace (see "Rent" below). It is notable, however, that exactly one-half of SoHo's newer residents gave "artist" as their profession (another 25% gave art-related professions), and there were seven certified artists among them. (These figures include co-oppers as well as renters.) If the survey is any indication, artists still are able to find space in SoHo, despite the current inflation and pinch on space.

Among commercial respondents, the length of occupancy shows a curious valley in the middle range. A large number of the businesses report having moved into SoHo within the past three years: 37.3%; yet another large number (35.7%) have been in place for ten years and more (19% for 26 years and longer). There is another small peak representing 1976-77, when 18.6% of the responding businesses moved in. Comparing these three categories of responses we find that half of the oldest group are manufacturing or related businesses, half of the middle group said they were both retail and manufacturing, while only 20% of the new group fall into this classification. Of the new group, 44% reported themselves to be retail, compared to 33% retailers in the old group and 62% in the middle segment. Of the older businesses, only 7% described themselves as art-related, while 25% of the middle and 25% of the new groups fit that description.

These results are completely consistent with SoHo history. The older businesses would be expected to show more manufacturing and the newer ones more retail. The mid-seventies were a time of rampant ground-floor conversion in the area, but the trend was halted (for a time) by a more restrictive zoning, which became operational in 1977 and which made ground-floor conversions more difficult. The statistics show an appropriate "lump" just prior to this zoning change.

LOFT SIZE AND RENT

The residential and commercial components of the survey show decidedly different characteristics where the size of loft space is concerned. The average residential space is 2100 square feet (median 2000 s.f.), while the average commercial space is 2968 square feet (median 3000 s.f.). Residential space shows a typical distribution curve, with 52.5% of the respondents in the middle range, 1460 to 2800 square feet. Commercial respondents, however, show a propensity for larger spaces: 47.4% of them occupy lofts of 2900 square feet and more. As might be expected, the commercial renters of smaller spaces are likely to be retail and relative newcomers to SoHo. Of businesses in lofts under 1450 square feet, 70% were retail and one-half had been in place for three years and less. Manufacturing businesses, on the other hand, prefer larger space: one-third of the lofts over

3200 square feet were occupied by manufacturing tenants.

Commercial respondents were much more reluctant to report their rents than were residents. While 92% of the SoHo residential population responded with rent figures, only 36.4% of the commercial tenants did so. Not all these rents could be correlated with square footages; but with 34.1% of the commercial population responding, a pattern of rents much HIGHER than those paid by residential tenants was evident. In particular, the average space was 2,553 square feet and the average rent $1,604, an average cost per square foot of $7.54. It must be emphasized here, however, that the percentage return on this item is not sufficient for statistical reliability, and therefore the figures cannot be used to predict SoHo commercial rents in general.

The average rent reported by a SoHo resident was $708, with 92% of the renting population responding. A few high rents, however, skews this data to the high side. The median rent paid by residential tenants was only $600. Comparing rents reported to the square footage occupied, which could be done in only 86% of the rental situations, the average cost per square foot was found to be $5.56. Newer residents in the sample, however, had much higher rentals than others. For loft renters of three years and less who reported both rent and square footage, the average rent was $6.83 per square foot for a 1,473 square-foot space; SoHo renters of 10 years and longer, however, were paying only $3.95 per square foot for 1,593 square feet. Thus latecomers to SoHo are paying more for less.

LOFT SPACE: SOME DEMOGRAPHICS

Both residents and commercial tenants in SoHo appear to enjoy natural light and high ceilings, but not in equal proportions. Few of the residential respondents had light on only one side (13%), while nearly seven out of ten had light on two sides. Among commercial establishments, despite their larger average size, natural light from only one side was the norm: exactly one-half reported in this category.

Ceiling height was another matter. Among residents, only 11% had ceilings under ten feet high, while 82% reported ceilings between 10 and 14 feet. Commercial establishments, perhaps because of their propensity to the ground floor, tended to have very high ceilings. Nearly 80% of these respondents had ceilings 12 feet high and higher.

OWNING vs. RENTING

Ownership of loft space was another surprise of the SoHo survey. While most of the figures presented previously in this report concern the economics of renters only, renters comprise less than one-half of the responding SoHo residents. The survey indicated that slightly more than half of the respondents were owners of their own spaces: in other words, co-opers. With 100% of the residential population responding, 50.5% said they owned their lofts. While this result may seem unusual, it should be remembered that a very high percentage of the first residential wave of SoHo were artist cooperatives, and that co-opping has

become a way of life in SoHo. In fact, the Attorney General's office of the State of New York has three classes of conversion: co-op, condo, and "soho", the last being the classification for all loft cooperatives.

Loft cooperators tend not only to occupy spaces larger than renters, but also to have been in residence longer. The average cooperative loft space is 2,580 square feet (with 100% of the population reporting) as opposed to the tenant average of 1,605, and the average co-opper has been in place 8.1 years as compared with the rental average of 6.5 years (again with 100% of the populations reporting).

The large majority of the rental population has an investment in their loft space, however. Three-quarters of those renters surveyed said that they own their own fixtures--in other words, the improvements made to their spaces belong to the renter rather than the landlord.

RESIDENTIAL DEMOGRAPHICS

Slightly more than one-third of the residential lofts surveyed (both rental and cooperative) contained only one adult resident. More than half (55.7%) contained two adults, with an average of 1.72 adults per loft space.

A much smaller number of respondents answered the "number of children" question, and a non-answer can be presumed to indicate that there were no children present. Interpreting the responses in this way, 10% of the residential lofts are occupied by one child full-time and 11% by two children. The average number of children per loft is .32, which is another way of saying that there is approximately one child for every three residential lofts in SoHo.

PROFESSIONS AND ARTIST CERTIFICATION

The overwhelming majority of respondents to the SoHo survey said they were artists or worked in professions related to the arts. In the 101 residential households were 63 persons who had been certified as artists by the Artist Certification Committee. Because there were six lofts in which two persons had been certified, the number of lofts containing certified artists was 57, or 56.4% of the total. Many other respondents, however, were likely certifiable; in fact, careful examination of the questionnaires indicated that perhaps as many as 82.1% of the lofts in the survey were certifiable (see below).

The questionnaire requested information on second adults in the living space, and the results are divided in the tabulations into "Person A" and "Person B." In the first category, 53.8% responded "artist" to the question of profession; another 10.8% gave professions which are normally certifiable under the procedures of the Artist Certification Committee of the City of New York. Other categories listed 11.9% in art-related fields, such as art teachers, writers, etc., bringing to more than 75% the percentage of "Persons A" in some form of the arts.

Of "Persons B" in the survey, 23.3% reported themselves

to be artists, 6.7% in other art fields, and 10% in art-related professions. The largest percentage (48.3%) listed themselves as "other," which in good part may indicate housewife or househusband status.

Respondents were asked the question "Do you use your loft for at least some of your professional work?" and answers in the affirmative were compared to the professions listed on the questionnaire. A separate tabulation indicated that 26 lofts contain at least one person who is presently uncertified but is likely to be certifiable by the Committee. It would appear, then, that 83 lofts would be likely to pass certification muster under the law, or 82.1% of the total.

A cross-tabulation of artist certification with rental or cooperative status shows some startling differences. Among cooperative respondents, 80.4% of the lofts are ALREADY OCCUPIED BY CERTIFIED ARTISTS, while only 32% of the rental lofts enjoy the same status. This indicates that most cooperatively-owned buildings are adhering to artist certification requirements, which is required for obtaining a Certificate of Occupancy in SoHo. Landlords, however, have been content to ignore this provision of the law--primarily because they have never been under city scrutiny to do so.

CHECKING THE DATA

No survey is free from sampling error which might affect results. To see whether any significant error might be skewing some of the above results, the SoHo Alliance decided to do a recalculation of the survey results, this time removing responses from two buildings in the sample which happened to be cooperatives dating back to the first wave of artist immigration in 1967-68. It was thought that the respondents in these two buildings would be likely to have lived in SoHo longer, be artists, and would also have been more likely to return questionnaires. A recalculation of the data (removing these two buildings) still yielded an average residential length of 6.9 years, a median of 6 years, and a rate of artist certification of 53.4% of all remaining households. Applying the same definitions of "certifiable" to the remaining questionnaires, the percentage of certifiable lofts remained a healthy 79.3%. The results, therefore, change very little when the responses from these "weighted" buildings are removed from the sample, indicating that the results are likely to be a reliable indication of SoHo in general. (It should be emphasized that there is NO statistical reason to remove these two buildings from the data, and in fact that to do so is poor statistics. It was done so only to check the general reliability of the survey.)

SOHO LOFTS AS WORKSPACE

When SoHo was first proposed for legalized artist residency, there were several important logistical reasons to choose this particular 27-block loft area over many others. In the main, they are the same reasons that had motivated so many

item several of those polled objected that the question could also be interpreted to include residential CONVERSIONS in the phrase "new construction." The interpretation of this question may indeed have confused some respondents, as evidenced by the fact that the very similar question on variances for high-rises yields the highest rate of opposition of all.

Despite these variations, respondents opposed variances for discotheques and cabarets, restaurants, shopping malls and arcades, high-rise buildings, hotels and motels in overwhelming numbers. Typical responses were between 94% and 96% in the negative on these questions, and even when blanks were taken into account as a separate category, the opposition rate remained on the order of 85% on each issue.

Commercial responses to the same questions were less unified, but were still significantly in opposition on all counts. New construction and the Hotel/Motel question were the only areas in which commercial responses differed substantially from the opinions of residents, and opponents typically outnumbered those in favor by margins of three and four to one.

Putting the results of the opinion poll into a single table we have as follows:

VARIANCE	RESIDENTIAL	COMMERCIAL
New residential construction	84.9	68.1
Cabarets, discos	94.4	89.4
Restaurants over 3,600 s.f.	93.8	78.7
Shopping malls, arcades	95.9	80.4
High-rise buildings	97.3	82.6
Hotels and motels	94.4	69.6

where the numbers represent the percentage in OPPOSITION to each listed variance. (Those who ignored these questions are not included in these figures. Typically 92% and better of the residential respondents offered opinions, while commercial respondents bordered on 100%.)

The SoHo Alliance concludes from the survey that artists still abound in SoHo, that residents and business exist side-by-side symbiotically, and that an overwhelming majority of both business and residential communities within SoHo support our battle to prevent nonconforming uses from taking over our neighborhood.

SoHo SURVEY: LOFT BOARD SURVEY

The results of the SoHo Survey may be compared to results obtained by Urban Systems Research and Engineering, Inc., in a survey completed May, 1983, for the New York City Loft Board. This survey covered respondents from the 563 buildings which had registered with the Loft Board as of March 31, 1983. The survey excluded all cooperative loft buildings and took its information not from tenants but building owners. Those landlords which registered buildings were mailed a questionnaire and were subject to callbacks from staff members for a five-week period. A total of 49 complete responses (11.5% of the rental lofts) covered 54 buildings and 297 residential loft dwellings, and the results are being used by the Loft Board to determine guidelines for rent stabilization for loft tenants.

The Urban Systems survey discovered that "residential use accounts for just over 60% of total building area...."(p.3-2); the SoHo survey finds that 62.5% of the reported floorspace is residential and 37.5% is commercial. The average number of residential units per building in their sample was 5.5, and the median 4 (p.3-2); the SoHo Survey found 5 to be the average number of floors per building, and because of offsetting conditions (multiple lofts per floor offset by single occupancy of multiple lofts) adjudged the average number of tenants to be five per building. (The SoHo Survey, however, sampled ALL tenants, not only residential rentals.)

The average size of a residential loft unit in the Urban Systems survey was 1,815 square feet (p.3-4), and the average rent charged per residential unit was $460 per month (p.3-5). The Loft Board survey derives from this a rental figure of about $3.10 per square foot per year per tenant. The SoHo survey, by way of comparison, gave $700 per month and 1,604 square feet as its respective findings, indicating a $5.24 per square foot per year figure.

The inference here is that the SoHo renter is paying, on an average, about $240 more per month for a slightly smaller loft space. These figures, however, are probably NOT so different as they at first seem. Rental information in the Loft Board survey was taken primarily from 1982 averages, while the SoHo rental data was up-to-date as of February, 1983. It would therefore be reasonable to expect that current rentals in the Loft Board survey would be higher. If the rental increment were 7% overall, the Loft Board would have gotten a $3.32 figure. (The effect which "creative accounting" might have had on these landlord-derived figures cannot be assessed.)

A second and more important difference is that the average loft size in the Loft Board survey is based on BUILDING size, which is the traditional landlord measurement of square footage (e.g., a 25-by-100-foot building typical of SoHo would be listed as containing a 2,500-square-foot floor). Residents, however, tend to think in terms of NET square footage (the same 25-by-100 floor would probably be reported as 2,200 square feet, subtracting

hallways, airshafts, and the exterior brick walls). If this difference in floor space were to increase the SoHo Survey loft by one-eighth, the same average floor space as in the Loft Board survey would be obtained. Using this figure, the cost per square foot would be $4.63 per year, compared to the revised $3.32 per year for the Loft Board survey. (It must be cautioned that it is not possible to correlate these two factors exactly into the data. It is clear, however, that they both tend to lessen the differences between the results of the two surveys.)

SoHo SURVEY: DATA

RESPONSES BY SECTION	I	II	III	IV	V
Number bldgs in sample	20	11	17	14	11
Buildings responding	19	9	14	12	10
Response by district (%)	31.9	15.3	24.3	11.8	16.7

RESIDENTIAL RESPONSES: 101
NON-RESIDENTIAL: 44
RESPONSES RECEIVED: 145 of 297 (48.8%)
BUILDINGS RESPONDING: 64 of 73 (87.7%)
RESPONSES PER BUILDING: 2.3

LENGTH OF OCCUPANCY (in Years)

	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	Eight	Nine
RES	15.8	5.9	6.9	5.	8.9	8.9	6.9	5.0	6.9
COML	16.3	11.6	9.3	0	2.3	11.6	7.0	2.3	4.7
TOT	16.	7.6	7.6	3.5	6.9	9.7	6.9	4.2	6.3

	10-14	15-25	26-Up	Avg (Yrs)	% Resp.
RES	23.8	4.9	1.	7.3	100.
COML	11.9	4.8	19.	11.2	97.8
TOT	20.3	4.9	6.3	8.6	99.3

LOFT SIZE

	Under 800	800-1199	1200-1450	1460-2000	2001-2800	2900-3200	3201-3900	3901-8000	% Resp.
RES	9.1	8.1	8.1	30.3	22.2	11.1	8.1	3.	98
COML	5.3	13.2	7.9	15.8	10.5	7.9	5.3	34.2	86.4
TOT	8.	9.5	8.0	26.3	19.	10.2	7.3	11.7	94.5

(Average loft size: 2,323 sq.ft.; Residential 2,105, Comcl 2,943)

MONTHLY RENT

	Under 300	300-499	500-599	600-799	800-999	1000-1399	1400-2099	2100-Up	% Resp.
RES	6.5	21.7	17.4	21.7	13.	10.9	8.7	0	92.
CMCL	0	6.3	12.5	12.5	0	18.8	25.	25.	36.4
TOT	4.8	17.7	16.1	19.4	9.7	12.9	12.9	6.5	66.

(Average rental: $944.; Resdtl $708, Cmcl $1627)

CEILING HEIGHT (feet)	8-9	10-11	12-14	15-20	% Resp.
RES	11.0	40.0	42.0	7.0	99
CMCL	5.1	15.4	38.4	41.	88.6
TOTAL	8.7	33.3	41.3	16.7	95.9

(Average ceiling height: 12.3 feet; Resdtl 11.5, Cmcl 14.5)

NUMBER SIDES OF LIGHT	1	2	3	4	% Resp.
RES	13.	69.	12.	6.	99.
CMCL	50.	45.	5.	0	90.7
TOTAL	23.6	62.1	10.	4.3	95.

(Average sides of natural light: 1.95 sides; Resdtl 2.1)

OWN or RENT	OWN	RENT	% Resp.
RES	50.5	49.5	100.
CMCL	16.3	83.7	97.7
TOTAL	39.9	60.1	99.3

OWN FIXTURES (Renters only) (98% response)	YES	NO
	75.5	24.5

NUMBER OF ADULTS LIVING IN LOFT (95% response)	1	2	3	4
%	35.1	55.7	7.2	1.

(Average: 1.72 adults per loft)

NUMBER OF CHILDREN (63.4% response)	None	One	Two	
	67.2	15.6	17.2	(Average: .5 children)

PROFESSIONS	Artist	Photog	Dncr	Mus'n	Art-Rel	Art Tchr	Crfts
Person A	53.8	5.4	4.3	1.1	2.2	2.2	1.1
Person B	23.3	1.7	1.7	3.3	5.	0	0
Total	41.8	3.9	3.3	2.	3.3	1.3	.7

	Profsnl	Fashion	Archtct	Writer	Other	% Resp.
Person A	8.6	3.2	1.1	3.2	14.	93.1
Person B	3.3	6.7	1.7	5.	48.3	91.
Total	6.5	4.6	1.3	3.9	27.5	92.3

ARTIST CERTIFICATION (By Profession)

	(% of Total Loft Spaces)		(Number Certified)	
	Person A	Person B	Person A	Person B
Artist	36.6	9.1	37	6
Other Art	5.9	0	6	
Art-Related	5.9	0	6	
Professional	4.	0	4	
Other (or none)	4.	0	4	
Total	56.4	9.1	57	6

RESIDENTIAL USAGES

	USES LOFT FOR WORK		USES LOCAL BUSINESS		NEEDS NATURAL LIGHT	
	Yes	% Resp.	Yes	% Resp.	Yes	% Resp.
Person A	90.8	90.3	85.9	88.9	69,9	88.9
Person B	84.9	93.	83.	93.	54.7	93.

OPINIONS BY PROFESSION: VEHICULAR

	TRAFFIC a PROBLEM?			PARKING LOTS ESSENTIAL?		
% Response	90.1	87.9	89.2	85.1	80.7	83.5
	Yes A	Yes B	Yes Tot	Yes A	Yes B	Yes Tot
Artists	83.3	84.6	83.8	88.9	92.0	90.
Other Art	66.7	42.9	57.9	90.9	85.7	88.9
Art-Related	53.8	66.7	57.9	92.9	100.	95.
Professional	75.	100.	85.7	85.7	80.	83.3
Other	50.	60.	53.3	88.9	66.7	83.3
RES. TOTAL	72.5	76.	73.8	89.5	89.1	89.4
COMMERCIAL TOTAL			45.			67.5

OPINIONS BY PROFESSION: VARIANCES

	NEW RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION			DISCOS and CABARETS		
% Response	93.1	91.2	92.4	92.1	89.5	91.1
	A No	B No	Tot No	A No	B No	Tot No
Artists	87.8	96.3	90.8	93.9	92.6	93.4
Other Art	84.6	75.	81.	92.3	87.5	90.5
Art-Related	71.4	83.3	75.	100.	100.	100.
Professional	62.5	100.	78.6	85.7	100.	91.7
Other	80.	80.	80.	100.	100.	100.
RES. TOTAL	81.9	90.4	84.9	94.6	94.1	94.4

	RESTAURANTS OVER 3600 s.f.			SHOPPING MALLS and ARCADES		
% Response						
	A No	B No	Tot No	A No	B No	Tot No
Artists	97.9	96.3	97.3	95.9	96.3	
Other Art	100.	100.	100.	100.	100.	100.
Art-Related	92.9	83.3	90.	92.9	100.	
Professional	100.	100.	100.	100.	100.	100.
Other	70.	60.	66.7	90.	80.	86.7
RES. TOTAL	94.6	92.3	93.8	95.7	96.2	95.9

% Response	HIGH-RISE BUILDINGS			HOTELS and MOTELS		
	A	B	Tot	A	B	Tot
	No	No	No	No	No	No
Artists	95.9	100.	97.4	93.6	96.3	94.6
Other Art	100.	100.	100.	100.	100.	100.
Art-Related	100.	100.	100.	92.9	83.3	90.
Professional	100.	100.	100.	87.5	100.	92.9
Other	90.	80.	86.7	90.	100.	93.8
RES. TOTAL	96.8	98.1	97.3	93.4	96.2	94.4

OPINIONS: COMPOSITE, INCLUDING BLANKS

	Residential			Commercial		
	No	Yes	Blank	No	Yes	Blank
New Res. Const.	78.5	13.9	7.6	68.1	31.9	0.
Discos	86.1	5.1	8.8	89.4	10.6	0.
Restaurants	86.1	5.7	8.2	78.7	21.3	0.
Shopping Malls	88.6	3.8	7.6	78.7	19.2	2.1
High-Rises	89.9	2.5	7.6	80.9	17.	2.1
Hotels, Motels	85.4	5.1	9.5	68.1	29.8	2.1

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION DEMOGRAPHICS (in % of Total Response)

	Length of Residency			Rent or Own...			
				Loft		Fixtures	
	1-3	4-9	10-up	Rent	Own	Rent	Own
Artists	9.6	25.5	18.	20.2	33.	4.5	46.6
Other Art	5.3	4.3	3.2	8.5	4.2	2.3	11.4
Art-Related	3.2	3.2	2.1	7.4	7.4	0	14.7
Professional	0	3.2	2.1	5.3	3.3	2.3	6.8
Other	1.0	5.3	4.3	8.5	2.1	4.5	6.8

	Size of Loft (Sq.Ft.)				
	Under 1200	1250-1800	1900-2400	2500-3000	Over 3100
Artists	6.4	17.4	9.8	14.1	6.5
Other Art	2.2	3.3	4.3	2.2	1.1
Art-Related	4.3	4.3	2.2	2.2	2.2
Professional	1.1	2.2	0	3.3	2.2
Other	4.3	0	3.3	0	1.1

	Monthly Rent (Renters Only)			
	Under $500	$519-650	$675-1000	$1001 Up
Artists	22.2	11.1	8.9	2.2
Other Art	2.2	4.4	6.7	2.2
Art-Related	4.4	4.4	4.4	0
Professional	0	2.2	4.4	2.2
Other	6.7	4.4	6.7	0

	Number of Sides of Light				Ceiling Height (Ft.)		
	One	Two	Three	Four	8-10	11-14	15-Up
Artists	6.4	39.4	6.4	1.1	14.	35.5	4.3
Other Art	1.1	9.6	1.1	1.1	0	12.2	0
Art-Related	2.1	8.5	1.1	3.1	4.3	9.6	0
Professional	1.1	5.3	2.1	0	2.2	6.4	0
Other	2.1	8.5	0	0	5.4	3.2	2.1

	Occupation of Other Adult in Household				
	Artist	Othr-Art	Art-Rel	Profsnl	Other
Artist	15.	3.3	10.	1.7	23.3
Other Art	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	5.
Art-Related	5.	1.7	1.7	0	5.
Professional	0	0	0	0	3.3
Other	0	0	0	5.	5.

	Work Needs by Occupation			
	Work in Loft? (Yes)		Need Light? (Yes)	
	Person A	Person B	Person A	Person B
Artist	52.1	48.	43.5	28.
Other Art	12.8	8.	10.9	8.
Art-Related	13.8	12.	8.6	10.
Professional	5.3	10.	1.1	2.
Other	5.3	6.	3.3	4.
Total	88.3	84.	67.4	56