

## **A. INTRODUCTION**

Consistent with the City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) requirements, this chapter of this Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) examines alternatives to the proposed Coney Island Rezoning plan.

CEQR requires the examination of a No Action Alternative, in which a proposed project would not be undertaken. The technical chapters of this DEIS have described the No Action Alternative (referred to as “the future without the proposed actions”) and have used it as the basis to assess the potential impacts and associated mitigation for the proposed plan. In addition to the No Action Alternative required for examination under CEQR, this chapter examines three other alternatives.

The four alternatives examined in this chapter are:

- A No Action Alternative;
- A Lesser Density Alternative;
- A 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative; and
- A No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative.

This analysis first examines the No Action Alternative, which describes the conditions that would exist if the proposed Coney Island Rezoning plan were not implemented. The second alternative is the Lesser Density Alternative, which examines zoning changes that differ from those proposed under the Coney Island Rezoning plan, which would result in less projected development. Third is the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative, which considers the effects of mapping 15 acres rather than 9 acres as parkland to be dedicated to amusement uses (with the Special Coney Island District rezoning in place). The final alternative is the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative, in which there is no demapping or mapping of streets or parkland and development occurs under the existing block configuration, but with the Special Coney Island District rezoning (except as modified) in place.

## **B. NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE**

### **DESCRIPTION**

The No Action Alternative has been discussed as the “future without the proposed actions,” or the no build scenario, in the technical chapters of this DEIS. It assumes only modest growth in residential and commercial uses within the proposed rezoning area, with most of the projected growth expected to include further development of local retail space and residential development in existing low-density residential communities. Consistent with recent development trends, and in stark contrast to the proposed actions, there is no anticipated reinvestment in the active

## Coney Island Rezoning

---

amusement uses. The Coney East subdistrict is not expected to undergo any development under the No Action Alternative.

**Table 23-1** shows the development projected to occur within the rezoning area under the No Action Alternative. As shown in the table, it is anticipated that under the No Action Alternative, there would be approximately 627 market-rate residential units, 236,202 square feet of commercial space, and 71,946 square feet of community facility space on projected development sites in the rezoning area.

**Table 23-1**  
**Conditions under No Action Alternative**

	Coney East	Coney West	Coney North/Mermaid Avenue	Total
Commercial (sf)	0	129,500	106,702	236,202
Residential (units)	0	0	627	627
Community Facilities (sf)	0	0	71,946	71,946
<b>Sources: Department of City Planning (DCP), August 2008</b>				

With little new investment and no preservation or development of amusement uses, this alternative does not achieve the principal goals and objectives that define the proposed actions. Compared with the proposed actions, the No Action Alternative does not:

- Develop a year round amusement and entertainment district with open and enclosed amusements, eating and drinking establishments, hotels, or other related uses;
- Provide an opportunity to preserve open amusement areas by creating an integrated and protected network of mapped parkland; or
- Provide neighborhood revitalization or local economic development opportunities.

### **NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE COMPARED WITH THE PROPOSED ACTIONS**

The following sections compare the effects of the No Action Alternative with conditions with those of the proposed actions.

#### *LAND USE, ZONING, AND PUBLIC POLICY*

No changes to zoning or public policy are anticipated in the rezoning area or secondary study area under the No Action Alternative. As described above, the Special Coney Island District that would be created under the proposed actions would not be created under the No Action Alternative.

Under the No Action Alternative, it is expected that existing development trends of sporadic residential and commercial development and the further shrinking of the amusement district would continue. There is only one planned development in the rezoning area: an independent project that would redevelop the existing parkland of Steeplechase Plaza into a 2.2 acre vibrant public park with a public plaza, skate park, concessions, seating, and the relocated B&B Carousel. However, under the No Action Alternative, vacant or underutilized land would continue to be the predominant land use in this subdistrict. The existing C7 zoning district, which allows only limited uses, and has been ineffective in stimulating the development necessary to create a successful amusement area, would remain and the amusement area would continue to decline. Also, under this alternative, open amusement uses would not be protected nor would the area benefit from better access to the Boardwalk or the new east-west connections

south of Surf Avenue. With this alternative, commercial development in the Coney West subdistrict would be limited to the reuse of the Childs Restaurant building, an existing landmark on the Boardwalk. There would be no residential or additional commercial development, and a broadened range of amusement and entertainment-related uses would not occur. Under the No Action Alternative, there could be some residential, commercial, and community facility uses developed in the Coney North subdistrict and along Mermaid Avenue. Although it is expected that there would be some development, it is likely that much of the vacant and underutilized land would remain and, therefore, the area would be less vibrant under this alternative compared to the proposed actions.

Conversely, with the proposed actions, the proposed Coney East subdistrict would be transformed into a year-round entertainment and amusement district and open amusement uses in the historic amusement area would be protected. In addition, the proposed actions would facilitate the future development of an open amusement park, and would create new block configurations that would encourage access to Riegelmann Boardwalk and develop new east-west connections south of Surf Avenue. Under the proposed actions, in addition to the independent Steeplechase Plaza project, many of the largely vacant or underutilized properties in Coney West, Coney North, and Mermaid Avenue would be improved with uses that would complement the existing residential and local commercial character of these areas.

Unlike the proposed actions, which would provide 607 affordable housing units, the No Action Alternative would not help to meet the City's initiatives for housing by providing affordable housing units within the rezoning area. It is noted that 230 units of affordable housing (which include 77 units of senior housing) have been identified as independent no build projects expected to be built by 2019 in the area but outside the rezoning area.

While the No Action Alternative would offer minimal improvement to the visual quality of the area's urban context, it would not result in large-scale redevelopment of vacant and underutilized land, would not result in new mapped parkland, and would not enhance views to the beach or the area's visual resources through street and parkland mapping and demapping.

While the No Action Alternative does not achieve the beneficial land use changes that define the proposed actions, neither the proposed actions nor the No Action Alternative would result in significant adverse impacts related to land use, zoning, or public policy.

#### *SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS*

The No Action Alternative, like the proposed actions, would not result in a significant adverse socioeconomic impact. While the No Action Alternative would directly displace 15 residential units on projected development sites (compared to the proposed actions that would not displace any units since it is assumed that these sites would have been developed already even without the proposed actions), the displacement of these units would not have the potential to alter neighborhood character or lead to indirect displacement of remaining residents. There would be no direct business displacement under the No Action Alternative. Since November 2008 (the baseline for the existing conditions discussion above), Astroland has been permanently closed, and the 15 Astroland businesses inventoried in November 2008 are no longer operating. Therefore, under the No Action Alternative, these Astroland businesses would close, but their closure would not be a result of direct displacement from new development. Furthermore, none of the other projected development sites contain business uses that would be displaced by development projected in the No Action Alternative.

## **Coney Island Rezoning**

---

The No Action Alternative would not result in the direct displacement of amusement-related uses in the rezoning area, as the proposed actions would. However, the No Action Alternative also would not retain and grow amusement uses in the rezoning area, further attracting visitors from the Coney Island neighborhood and broader New York City metropolitan area. Thus, while neither the proposed actions nor the No Action Alternative would result in a significant adverse impact on the amusement industry, the No Action Alternative would not reinvigorate the industry as the proposed actions are intended to do.

Lastly, although the proposed actions would result in some indirect residential and indirect business displacement, this displacement would not constitute a significant adverse impact. Because the development projected under the No Action Alternative is substantially less than the proposed actions, the potential for indirect displacement still exists, but would be reduced, and, therefore, would not constitute a significant adverse impact with regard to indirect residential or commercial displacement.

### *COMMUNITY FACILITIES*

Under this alternative, public schools would continue to operate below capacity and, like the proposed actions, no significant adverse impact on public schools would occur. Also similar to the proposed actions, there would continue to be sufficient library, health care, police, and fire services. Although publicly funded day care facilities would operate at 110 percent capacity in the future under the No Action Alternative,<sup>1</sup> the No Action Alternative would provide far fewer new affordable housing units in the study area, and thus would not generate the same demand for additional public day care seats. Therefore, unlike the proposed actions, the No Action Alternative would not result in a significant adverse impact on publicly funded day care facilities.

### *OPEN SPACE*

The No Action Alternative would directly displace two community gardens, the 0.32-acre Unity Tower Tenants Association Community Garden and the 0.22-acre Cyclone/Senior Association of Mermaid Avenue Community Garden. Under the No Action Alternative, El Jardin de Boardwalk, the Abe Stark Rink, or the Poseidon Playground, would not be displaced while these would all be displaced and relocated under the proposed actions. The proposed actions include the creation of the 1.41-acre Highland View Park and the 3 acres of passive open space within the newly created 9.39 acre mapped parkland amusement area. These new open spaces would not be created under the No Action Alternative.

Unlike the proposed actions, the No Action Alternative would not include the mapping of an open amusement area as parkland, or the alienation of mapped parkland (currently used as a parking lots) for disposition to a private entity for development.

The No Action Alternative would introduce fewer open space users than the proposed actions, but also would not introduce new open spaces within the rezoning area. Like the proposed actions, under the No Action Alternative all passive and active open space ratios for residents and workers would remain above New York City Department of City Planning (DCP)

---

<sup>1</sup> There are a total of 230 affordable housing units expected in the future without the proposed actions, but 77 of those units will be for senior citizen housing and are not included in the analysis of day care facilities.

guidelines, with the exception of the active open space ratio for residents, which would be below DCP guidelines. Under the proposed actions, the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) would commit to providing additional active open space for the future population resulting from the proposed actions (through, for example, expanding existing playgrounds, improving Kaiser Park, or adding more active recreation opportunities on the beach). Such open space additions and improvements would not take place under the No Action Alternative.

### *SHADOWS*

As described in Chapter 6, “Shadows,” development projected to occur in the future without the proposed actions would result in shadows on the windows of the south façade of Our Lady of Solace Roman Catholic Church, an architectural resource on Mermaid Avenue, throughout the December 21 analysis day. Due to the substantial extent and duration of new shadow, the No Action Alternative would result in a significant adverse impact on December 21, which is representative of the winter months. The development projected to occur under the proposed actions also would cast shadow on the church. However, as described in Chapter 6, the duration and extent of shadow on the church would essentially be no worse under the proposed actions than under the No Build scenario (or No Action Alternative). Therefore, a significant adverse impact is not expected to occur as a result of the proposed actions since the identified impact already occurs in the No Action Alternative.

### *HISTORIC RESOURCES*

#### *Archaeological Resources*

The No Action Alternative would result in less ground disturbance than the proposed actions. However, since the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) has determined that none of the lots within the rezoning area or the proposed parking garage site on West 25th Street possess any archaeological significance, neither the No Action Alternative nor the proposed actions would adversely impact archaeological resources.

#### *Architectural Resources*

The No Action Alternative, like the proposed actions, could result in construction-related impacts to two architectural resources located within the rezoning area. The Shore Theater (NYCL-eligible, S/NR-eligible) is located within 90 feet of Projected Development Site 3 which would be developed in the future without the proposed actions. Our Lady of Solace Roman Catholic Church (S/NR-eligible) is located across Mermaid Avenue from Projected Development Site 8 and Potential Development Site F. The Parachute Jump (NYCL, S/NR) and the Childs Restaurant on the Boardwalk (NYCL) also have the potential to be impacted by construction activities; however, since they are designated NYCLs, they would be protected from adjacent construction through the implementation of construction protection measures required under *TPPN #10/88*.

As described above under “Shadows,” the No Action Alternative would result in shadows on the windows of the south façade of Our Lady of Solace Roman Catholic Church (S/NR-eligible) throughout the December 21 analysis day. The extent and duration of new shadows defines a significant adverse impact under CEQR, and therefore, unlike the proposed actions, the No Action Alternative would result in a significant adverse shadows impact on Our Lady of Solace Roman Catholic Church.

## **Coney Island Rezoning**

---

As noted above, Astroland has closed for business as of November 2008 and, while not a consequence of the No Action Alternative, would no longer be in operation in the no build scenario. Unlike the proposed actions, the No Action Alternative would likely not have the potential to result in significant direct impacts on Nathan's Famous (S/NR-eligible). The No Action Alternative would also not have the potential to result in significant adverse visual and contextual impacts to the Shore Theater (NYCL-eligible, S/NR-eligible) by diminishing its visual prominence on Surf Avenue, as the proposed actions would. Under the proposed actions, the proposed Special Coney Island District will define regulations acknowledging the scale and presence of the Shore Theater and use it as a guide for establishing streetwall heights along Surf Avenue thus ensuring new developments enhance its character. These regulations would not be necessary under the No Action Alternative.

### *URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES*

Under the No Action Alternative, the rezoning area would not be transformed into a year-round vibrant entertainment and amusement destination. Although there are some projects planned or under construction in the rezoning area in the future without the proposed actions, the rezoning area under the No Action Alternative would largely remain in its current condition, characterized by a mix of vacant land, parking lots, amusement rides, and low-rise entertainment and commercial buildings in the amusement area, the large recreational facilities of KeySpan Park and the Abe Stark Rink, and low-rise residential buildings, some of which have ground-floor retail. Therefore, overall, the No Action Alternative would not benefit urban design compared with the proposed actions.

With the proposed actions, the topography, street pattern, and block forms of the rezoning area would be altered through the regrading of new and existing streets, mapping of new streets, and demapping of existing streets in the proposed Coney East and Coney West subdistricts. These grade changes would enhance views to Coney Island Beach and the Atlantic Ocean. Under the No Action Alternative, the topography, street pattern, and block shapes would remain in their current configuration and views to Coney Island Beach and the Atlantic Ocean would terminate at the Riegelmann Boardwalk, which is elevated.

Under the proposed actions, the creation of the Special District would improve the streetscape throughout the rezoning area. There would be new mapped parkland, and all new development on projected and potential sites along Surf Avenue would have required streetwalls and be built out to the lot line in order to create a cohesive urban design and streetscape. In addition, under the proposed actions, the pedestrian environment would be enhanced with ground floor retail with transparency requirements, thereby creating a vibrant commercial corridor on Surf Avenue between West 8th and 23rd Streets. However, under the No Action Alternative, the rezoning area would continue to include vacant lots, parking lots, and disjointed amusement parks separated by roadways and fencing, and there would only be minimal improvements to the area's streetscape limited to the area around Steeplechase Plaza and parts of the proposed Coney North and Mermaid Avenue subdistricts.

There would be no significant adverse visual impacts to the visual resources in the rezoning area under either the proposed actions or the No Action Alternative. Under the No Action Alternative, buildings constructed under the No Action Alternative would be shorter than the buildings that would be constructed under the proposed actions, and a large amount of vacant land and parking lots would remain in the area comprising the proposed Coney East and Coney West subdistricts. Thus, the historic amusements such as the Parachute Jump, the Cyclone, and

Wonder Wheel would be more prominent under the No Action Alternative compared with the proposed actions. Furthermore, under the proposed actions, the creation or extension of streets would provide new views to visual resources in the rezoning area. Under the No Action Alternative, these views would not be provided as there would be no changes in the existing street pattern.

#### *NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER*

Under the No Action Alternative, existing development trends of sporadic residential and commercial development would continue and the rezoning area would experience some net increase in residential, commercial, and community facility space in the proposed Coney West, Coney North, and Mermaid Avenue subdistricts. This development would have some positive effects on neighborhood character by replacing some of the vacant and underutilized sites within the rezoning area. However, none of the more substantial changes associated with the proposed actions, including changes to the rezoning area's topography, street network, urban design, and open space resources, would occur. In addition, the Coney East subdistrict would not undergo any development under the No Action Alternative, and the predominant land use in that subdistrict would continue to be vacant or underutilized land. Therefore, while neither the No Action Alternative nor the proposed actions would result in significant adverse impacts to neighborhood character, the No Action Alternative would not result in the same level of benefits to neighborhood character that would be achieved with the proposed actions.

#### *NATURAL RESOURCES*

Under the No Action Alternative, E-designations, Land Disposition Agreements, or Memorandums of Understanding would not be placed on privately and publicly owned land within the rezoning area. Without these controls, soil disturbance from development under the No Action Alternative would not necessarily be conducted in accordance with the health and safety procedures that would be put in place for construction under the proposed actions and, therefore, groundwater resources could be negatively affected.

Flooding conditions would not be exacerbated due to construction under either the proposed actions or No Action Alternative because the floodplain is affected by coastal flooding rather than fluvial or local flooding.

The proposed Coney East and Coney West subdistricts contain a majority of the habitat communities and associated wildlife within the rezoning area. Because no development is expected to occur in these subdistricts under the No Action Alternative (other than the potential reuse of the Childs Restaurant building), terrestrial resources there would be unchanged. In addition, within the urban vacant lot parcels of the rezoning area, the natural succession may result in a greater proportion of woody vegetation, including species typical of disturbed conditions and maritime dune habitat may continue to expand into vacant lots adjacent to the Riegelmann Boardwalk. However, neither the No Action Alternative nor the proposed actions would result in significant adverse impacts to terrestrial resources.

Although the No Action Alternative may not include the same degree of infrastructure planning and may not include all of the Best Management Practices (BMPs) anticipated under the proposed actions, new developments under the No Action Alternative would still be required to incorporate stormwater BMPs or to meet the New York City Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) site connection requirements in order to discharge stormwater to the DEP storm sewer. Implementation of these measures would improve the quality of stormwater and

## **Coney Island Rezoning**

---

reduce the rate of discharge to Coney Island Creek, which could improve water quality of Coney Island Creek during and after precipitation events.

Similar to that of the proposed actions, threatened or endangered species and candidate species identified as having a potential to occur in the Lower New York Bay near the project site as transient individuals would be expected to continue to occur as transient individuals under the No Action Alternative. It is expected that Essential Fish Habitat would also remain unchanged under the No Action Alternative.

Consequently, neither the proposed actions nor the No Action Alternative would result in a significant adverse impact to natural resources.

### ***HAZARDOUS MATERIALS***

Construction anticipated under the No Action Alternative would likely result in shallower and less extensive subsurface disturbance than under the proposed actions, particularly in areas currently zoned for open-air amusement parks, which are not typically densely developed with buildings. However, any construction involving soil disturbance in portions of the rezoning area with identified Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) could potentially increase pathways for human exposure to any subsurface hazardous materials present in those areas. Since no E-designations, Land Disposition Agreements, or Memorandums of Understanding, which require the owner of a property to assess potential hazardous material impacts prior to construction, currently exist on any portion of the rezoning area, such soil disturbance would not necessarily be conducted in accordance with the health and safety procedures that would be put in place for construction under the proposed actions. As such, under the No Action Alternative, the amount of soil disturbance would be less, but potentially the controls on its performance would not be as stringent as under the proposed actions.

### ***WATERFRONT REVITALIZATION PROGRAM (WRP)***

The No Action Alternative would result in less development within the New York City Coastal Zone, and therefore would not fulfill the WRP policy of encouraging commercial and residential redevelopment in appropriate coastal zone areas as fully as the proposed actions. The No Action Alternative would offer minimal improvement to the visual quality of the area's urban context, and would not result in large-scale redevelopment of vacant and underutilized land and the mapping of new parkland and would not enhance views to the beach or the area's visual resources through street regrading and street and parkland mapping and demapping. Therefore, it would not fulfill the WRP policies of providing visual access to coastal lands, waters, and open space, developing waterfront open space and recreation on publicly owned land, improving the visual quality associated with New York City's urban context, and protecting and enhancing scenic resources that contribute to the visual quality of the City's coastal area.

### ***INFRASTRUCTURE***

The No Action Alternative would generate less demand for potable water, sanitary sewage disposal, and stormwater discharge compared to the proposed actions. However, the No Action Alternative would not provide an Amended Drainage Plan, which is likely to be created under the proposed actions and would provide the opportunity to comprehensively review and improve the storm and sanitary system within the rezoning area. Additionally, in contrast to the proposed actions, the No Action Alternative would not: provide a new separate sewer system; mandate that rooftops be landscaped; mandate that BMPs be implemented in future developments to



facilitate on-site stormwater detention and to minimize stormwater runoff, or; provide stormwater attenuation and treatment mechanisms in parks and open spaces created within the rezoning area. Thus, although no significant adverse infrastructure impact would occur under either the No Action Alternative or the proposed actions, the No Action Alternative is unlikely to include the same degree of infrastructure planning and BMP incorporation as the proposed actions.

#### *SOLID WASTE AND SANITATION SERVICES*

As described in Chapter 14, “Solid Waste and Sanitation Services,” the proposed actions would result in a modest increase in demand for solid waste handling services from DSNY and private carters (less than one DSNY truck load per day to serve residential uses and up to 2.5 private contractor truckloads per day for non-residential uses), which would not overburden DSNY or private sector service providers. The No Action Alternative would generate a lower volume of solid waste compared to the proposed actions. Therefore, the burden on DSNY and private carters would be less than under the proposed actions, but like the proposed actions, and there would be no potential for a significant adverse impact.

#### *ENERGY*

The No Action Alternative would generate less energy demand than with the proposed actions. It is anticipated that energy supplies are sufficient to meet the demand from the rezoning area under both the No Action Alternative and the proposed actions, thereby not resulting in a significant impact.

#### *TRAFFIC AND PARKING*

The No Action Alternative would result in 4,373, 12,587, 11,487, 12,926, and 11,092 fewer person trips during the weekday AM, weekday midday, weekday PM, Saturday midday, and Saturday PM peak hours, respectively, than the proposed actions. It would also result in 1,016, 1,791, 1,982, 2,226, and 1,834 fewer vehicle trips than the proposed actions over the same time periods.

#### *Traffic*

The No Action Alternative would eliminate the proposed actions’ significant adverse traffic impacts at the intersections of: Surf Avenue with West 21st Street, West 20th Street, West 19th Street, West 17th Street, West 16th Street, West 15th Street, Stillwell Avenue, and West 8th Street; Mermaid Avenue with West 20th Street, West 17th Street, West 15th Street, and Stillwell Avenue; Neptune Avenue with Cropsey Avenue/West 17th Street, Stillwell Avenue, West 8th Street/Shell Road, and Ocean Parkway; Cropsey Avenue with Bay 50th Street and Bay 52nd Street; and Ocean Parkway with Shore Parkway North and Shore Parkway South as discussed below.

- Under the No Action Alternative, during the weekday AM peak hour, four fewer intersections would operate at overall LOS E or F than under the proposed actions. Similarly, 10 fewer traffic movements would operate at LOS E or F than with the proposed actions. The 15 intersections that would experience significant adverse impacts under the proposed actions would not experience those impacts with the No Action Alternative.
- Under the No Action Alternative, during the weekday midday peak hour, four fewer intersections would operate at overall LOS E or F than under the proposed actions.

## **Coney Island Rezoning**

---

Similarly, 16 fewer traffic movements would operate at LOS E or F than with the proposed actions. The 16 intersections that would experience significant adverse impacts under the proposed actions would not experience those impacts with the No Action Alternative.

- Under the No Action Alternative, during the weekday PM peak hour, seven fewer intersections would operate at overall LOS E or F than under the proposed actions. Similarly, 20 fewer traffic movements would operate at LOS E or F than with the proposed actions. The 18 intersections that would experience significant adverse impacts under the proposed actions would not experience those impacts with the No Action Alternative.
- Under the No Action Alternative, during the Saturday midday peak hour, 10 fewer intersections would operate at overall LOS E or F than under the proposed actions. Similarly, 21 fewer traffic movements would operate at LOS E or F than with the proposed actions. The 17 intersections that would experience significant adverse impacts under the proposed actions would not experience those impacts with the No Action Alternative.
- Under the No Action Alternative, during the Saturday PM peak hour, eight fewer intersections would operate at overall LOS E or F than under the proposed actions. Similarly, 17 fewer traffic movements would operate at LOS E or F than with the proposed actions. The 19 intersections that would experience significant adverse impacts under the proposed actions would not experience those impacts with the No Action Alternative.

### *Parking*

The No Action Alternative would avoid the proposed actions' need for additional parking spaces to accommodate new residents and visitors that would be generated by the proposed actions. However, the No Action Alternative would also not include the creation of 1,173 additional parking spaces in Coney West, 1,531 additional parking spaces in Coney North (of which 300 spaces would accommodate the parking demand for Coney East), 200 additional parking spaces in Coney East, and 600 new parking spaces outside of the rezoning area for a total of 3,504 new parking spaces.

### *TRANSIT AND PEDESTRIANS*

The No Action Alternative would eliminate the proposed actions' significant adverse impacts to the B36, B68, B74, B82, and X38 bus routes during weekday peak periods and to the B36 bus route during Saturday peak periods. However, background growth and trips generated by other developments expected to be completed absent the proposed actions would increase the number of bus riders on area bus routes. Under the No Action Alternative, without any increased bus service, the B36, B68, B74, and B82 bus routes would exceed guideline capacity during the weekday peak periods.

The No Action Alternative would not produce the proposed actions' significant adverse impacts to the east and west crosswalks at the Stillwell Avenue and Surf Avenue intersection during the weekday midday, weekday PM, Saturday midday, and Saturday PM peak periods. However, background growth and trips generated by other developments expected to be completed absent the proposed actions would increase the number of pedestrians in the study area. Under the No Action Alternative, as in existing conditions, the east crosswalk at the Stillwell Avenue and Surf Avenue intersection would operate at unacceptable levels (less than 20 SFP) during the Saturday midday and PM peak periods.

### *AIR QUALITY*

The proposed actions would not result in any significant adverse air quality impacts on sensitive uses in the surrounding community, and the proposed actions would not be adversely affected by existing sources of air emissions in the study area. As discussed above, the No Action Alternative would generate fewer vehicle trips than the proposed actions; therefore, its development would result in lower vehicle emissions at nearby intersections. The No Action Alternative would also result in lower emissions from on-site parking facilities since it would not include the parking facilities that would be added under the proposed actions. Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) emissions would be lower in the No Action Alternative compared with the proposed actions. As a result, E-designation or Memorandum of Understanding restrictions, if available at all under the No Action Alternative, would not be required to ensure that there would be no potential for any significant air quality impacts. Overall, the No Action Alternative would be expected to generate lower emissions than the proposed actions, but neither alternative would result in adverse impacts on air quality.

### *NOISE*

The proposed actions would result in significant adverse noise impacts at receptor site 6 (West 17th Street between Neptune Avenue and Mermaid Avenue) due to large incremental traffic volumes on West 17th Street and at receptor site 11 (Stillwell Avenue between Surf Avenue and the Boardwalk) due to noise generated by the activities in the proposed amusement park. Because the No Action Alternative would not result in a substantial increase in traffic in the vicinity of the project sites, nor would it add new amusement uses, there would be no significant adverse noise impacts as compared with the proposed action.

### *CONSTRUCTION*

Because the amount of new construction under this alternative would be less as compared with the proposed actions, the No Action Alternative would not generate as much temporary construction disruption. However, construction-related impacts on historic architectural resources would be similar, possibly impacting two architectural resources located within the rezoning area: the Shore Theater (NYCL-eligible, S/NR-eligible) and Our Lady of Solace Roman Catholic Church (S/NR-eligible). Unlike the proposed actions, the No Action Alternative would not have the potential to result in significant direct impacts on Nathan's Famous (S/NR-eligible).

The No Action Alternative would also result in a lesser duration of construction-related noise and traffic than the proposed actions. However, neither this alternative nor the proposed actions would result in significant adverse impacts on air quality, noise, traffic, or transit during construction. Economic benefits attributable to construction expenditures and construction jobs under the proposed actions would not be as substantial under the No Action Alternative.

### *PUBLIC HEALTH*

Like the proposed actions, the No Action Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts to public health.

## C. LESSER DENSITY ALTERNATIVE

### DESCRIPTION

The Lesser Density Alternative assumes a redevelopment plan similar to that of the proposed actions, but with considerably less development. While reduced in overall density, the likely parcels to be developed under this Alternative are considered to be the same projected development sites set forth in the reasonable worst-case development scenario (RWCDs) for the proposed actions.

The Lesser Density Alternative would include the same mapping and demapping actions contemplated under the proposed actions: a 9.39-acre amusement park would be mapped in Coney East; a 1.41-acre community park (Highland View Park) would be mapped in Coney West; portions of Highland View Avenue, West 22nd Street, Bowery, West 15th Street, Stilwell Avenue, West 12th Street, and West 10th Street would be demapped; and new streets would be mapped to create new block configurations and enhance access to the Boardwalk and amusement area. Actions related to acquisition and disposition of properties and demapping of existing parkland pursuant to State legislation would also be the same under the Lesser Density Alternative and proposed actions.

Unlike the proposed actions, the Lesser Density Alternative would not create a Special Coney Island District, although the alternative would involve certain changes to the existing zoning, including:

- Coney North and Mermaid Avenue would be rezoned to R6A with a C2-4 overlay (3.0 FAR without the Inclusionary Housing Zoning) 100 feet deep from Surf Avenue and Mermaid Avenue and to R6B (2.0 FAR without the Inclusionary Housing Zoning) at the mid-block;
- Coney West would be rezoned to R6A with a C2-4 overlay on Surf Avenue blocks and 100 feet from Ocean Way on Boardwalk blocks and to R6B on the remaining portion of Boardwalk blocks; and
- Coney East would remain under the existing C7 zoning, with a change of use to allow for eating and drinking establishments without limitation. As with the existing C7 zoning, hotels would not be allowed.

**Table 23-2** shows the net new development projected to occur within the rezoning area under the Lesser Density Alternative. As shown in the table, it is anticipated that with Lesser Density Alternative, the rezoning area would gain approximately 1,033 residential units, 183,371 square feet of local retail space, 10,000 square feet of eating and drinking establishments, and 9.39 acres of mapped amusement park area. This represents a decrease of approximately 1,375 residential units, 220,639 square feet of local retail, and 323,253 square feet of enhancing uses (a category that would include the 10,000 square feet of eating and drinking establishments) compared to the proposed actions. In addition, no hotels would be developed in the rezoning area and no new amusement uses outside of the amusement park would be created under the Lesser Density Alternative.

Because the Lesser Density Alternative would not create a Special Coney Island District, the Inclusionary Housing Program would not be applied to the Coney North, Mermaid Avenue, and Coney West subdistricts, as envisioned under the proposed actions. Without the FAR bonus that is available through the Inclusionary Housing Program, it can not be assumed that the 1,033 residential units projected under the Lesser Density Alternative would include affordable units.

Table 23-2

**Development Projected Under Lesser Density Alternative and Proposed Actions**

Use	Lesser Density Alternative				Proposed Actions			
	Coney East	Coney West	Coney North***	Total	Coney East	Coney West	Coney North/ Mermaid Avenue	Total
Residential (units)*	0	657	376	1,033	0	1,520	888	2,408
Complementary or Local Retail (sf)	0	148,966	34,405	183,371	43,236	131,339	229,435	404,010
Hotel (rooms)	0	0	0	0	468	0	138	606
Amusements (sf)	0	0	0	0	251,411	0	0	251,411
Eating and Drinking Establishments or Enhancing Uses (sf)**	10,000	0	0	10,000	333,253	0	0	333,253
Amusement Park – Active (rounded acres)	6	0	0	6	6	0	0	6
Amusement Park – Passive (rounded acres)	3	0	0	3	3	0	0	3

**Notes:**

\* Residential units developed under the Lesser Density Alternative are expected to be market rate. Under the proposed actions, twenty percent of the projected housing units would be affordable.

\*\* Coney East would remain under the existing C7 zoning, which does not include an “Enhancing Uses” use group category. Eating and drinking establishments are a subset of Enhancing Uses.

\*\*\* No development is projected to occur on Mermaid Avenue under this alternative.

Sources: DCP, August 2008

While the proposed parkland mapping would provide the core of the proposed actions 27 acre amusement and entertainment district, it is noted that the Lesser Density Alternative provides substantially less opportunity to achieve the goals and objectives established for the proposed actions. Most notably, it is less certain that this alternative can generate the investment interest in new development that is key to creating a revitalized and vibrant Coney Island that would attract year-round visitors. Without the creation of the Special Coney Island District and significant revision of the underlying C7 use and bulk regulations, a broader range of enclosed amusement and entertainment uses and hotels would not be permitted in Coney East, therefore limiting the potential for this area to become a year-round amusement and entertainment destination. Some of the goals and objectives of the proposed Coney Island Rezoning plan could be achieved through this alternative. The Lesser Density Alternative would map the 9.39 acres of land fronting the Boardwalk as parkland, streets would be created to connect the existing community to the beachfront, and vacant and underutilized land would be redeveloped. However, the Lesser Density Alternative would not create a Special Coney Island District, which would define development parameters and urban design controls. This alternative would not be subject to the Inclusionary Housing Program and would not help to meet the City’s initiatives for creating affordable housing units. Finally, the Lesser Density Alternative would provide fewer job opportunities for local residents and provide fewer housing and retail services compared with the proposed actions.

**LESSER DENSITY ALTERNATIVE COMPARED WITH THE PROPOSED ACTIONS***LAND USE, ZONING, AND PUBLIC POLICY*

Similar to the proposed actions, the Lesser Density Alternative would replace vacant and underutilized land with a mix of residential, local retail, open space, and eating and drinking establishments, but at a reduced density. Both the Lesser Density Alternative and the proposed actions would strengthen the neighborhood by providing the 9.39 acre amusement park in Coney East and the 1.41 acre community park in Coney West, by providing more year-round local retail uses, and by developing a new mixed-use neighborhood that would provide more jobs and housing opportunities for local residents. However, the Lesser Density alternative would provide

## **Coney Island Rezoning**

---

significantly less development in all proposed subdistricts compared to the proposed actions. No development is projected to occur in the Mermaid Avenue subdistrict under this alternative. In addition, Coney East would be expected to experience minimal development in the future under the Lesser Density Alternative, with only 10,000 square feet of eating and drinking establishments. In contrast, the proposed actions would provide an estimated 251,411 square feet of amusement uses in addition to the mapped amusement park and 333,253 square feet of enhancing uses (such as restaurants, bars, and bath houses) which would serve to further enhance the amusement area.

Like the proposed actions, the Lesser Density Alternative would involve changes to existing zoning. However, unlike the proposed actions, the Lesser Density Alternative would not create a Special Coney Island District and would not be subject to the Inclusionary Housing Program. Therefore, it is assumed that affordable housing units would not be provided under the Lesser Density Alternative, and would not contribute towards the City's goal of providing affordable housing units.

The Lesser Density Alternative, like the proposed actions, would be consistent with the Waterfront Revitalization Program's policies of encouraging commercial and residential redevelopment in appropriate coastal zone areas, providing public access to and along the City's coastal waters, protecting scenic resources that contribute to the visual quality of the City's coastal area, and avoiding adverse effects to historic and cultural resources. However, the Lesser Density Alternative would result in less development within the New York City Coastal Zone and would contribute less to the visual quality of the City's coastal areas.

Both the Lesser Density Alternative and the proposed actions would enliven vacant and underutilized land by providing residential, local retail, eating and drinking establishments, and open space. Both alternatives would meet economic development goals by creating new jobs and tax revenue sources, but because the proposed actions would result in substantially more commercial use, it would result in much greater economic benefit.

Neither the proposed actions nor the Lesser Density Alternative would result in significant adverse impacts related to land use, zoning, or public policy.

### ***SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS***

The Lesser Density Alternative, like the proposed actions, would not result in a significant adverse socioeconomic impact. Because the projected development sites are the same under the proposed actions and Lesser Density Alternative, the number and type of directly displaced businesses would be the same. As described in Chapter 3, "Socioeconomic Conditions," the displacement of these businesses would not result in a significant adverse socioeconomic impact. There would be no direct residential displacement under the Lesser Density Alternative or the proposed actions.

Though the proposed actions would result in some indirect residential and indirect business displacement, this displacement would not constitute a significant adverse impact. Although the development projected under the Lesser Density Alternative provides fewer residential units than the proposed actions, the alternative would not provide new affordable housing in the rezoning area, as the proposed actions would. Therefore, the potential for indirect residential displacement due to the introduction of a new population and housing type that differs from the existing population and housing would be similar under the Lesser Density Alternative and the

proposed actions. Nonetheless, neither the proposed actions nor the Lesser Density Alternative would have a significant adverse indirect displacement impact.

The Lesser Density Alternative, like the proposed actions, would not have a significant adverse impact on the amusement industry. However, because the Lesser Density Alternative would not create a Special Coney Island District, which would permit a broader range of amusement-related uses in the Coney East subdistrict, the amusement industry in Coney Island would not be enhanced.

### *COMMUNITY FACILITIES*

The Lesser Density Alternative would introduce fewer students than the proposed actions. Therefore, like the proposed actions, the Lesser Density Alternative would not result in a significant adverse impact on public schools. Also similar to the proposed actions, there would continue to be sufficient library, health care, police, and fire services.

As described above, affordable housing units are not likely to be developed under the Lesser Density Alternative, as the alternative would not apply the Inclusionary Housing Program to the proposed Coney North, Mermaid Avenue, and Coney West subdistricts. Without an affordable housing component, the Lesser Density Alternative would not generate demand for public day care seats. Therefore, the Lesser Density Alternative, unlike the proposed actions, would not result in a significant adverse impact on publicly funded day care facilities. However, publicly funded day care facilities would still operate at 110 percent capacity due to development projected to occur in the future independent of the proposed actions or Lesser Density Alternative.<sup>1</sup>

### *OPEN SPACE*

Both the Lesser Density Alternative and the proposed actions would directly displace and relocate the El Jardin de Boardwalk community garden, the Abe Stark Rink, and the Poseidon Playground. Like the proposed actions, the Lesser Density Alternative would include the mapping of the 9.39 acres of amusement area as parkland as well as the creation of a new 1.41-acre park (Highland View Park), and the alienation of mapped parkland pursuant to State legislation for disposition to a private developer for development.

Because the development projected to occur under the Lesser Density Alternative is substantially less than the development projected for the proposed actions, the alternative would introduce fewer residents and workers to the rezoning area and the demands on open space would be less. Like the proposed actions, with the Lesser Density Alternative, all passive and active open space ratios for residents and workers would remain above DCP guidelines, with the exception of the active open space ratio for residents, which would be below DCP guidelines. Since DPR would commit to providing additional active open space for the future population resulting from either the proposed actions or Lesser Density Alternative, neither the Lesser Density Alternative nor the proposed actions would result in a significant adverse impact on open spaces.

---

<sup>1</sup> There are a total of 230 affordable housing units expected in the future without the proposed actions, but 77 of those units will be for senior citizen housing and are not included in the analysis of day care facilities.

### *SHADOWS*

As described in Chapter 6, “Shadows,” the proposed actions would not be expected to result in a significant adverse shadows impact on any sunlight-sensitive open spaces, natural features, or architectural resources. Development under the Lesser Density Alternative would take place on the same projected development sites identified for the proposed actions, but building heights and bulk would be less on some sites. Therefore, the Lesser Density Alternative does not have the potential to result in significant adverse shadows impacts.

### *HISTORIC RESOURCES*

#### *Archaeological Resources*

The Lesser Density Alternative would result in the same or more minimal ground disturbance than the proposed actions. Since the LPC has determined that none of the lots within the rezoning area or the proposed parking garage site on West 25th Street possess any archaeological significance, neither the Lesser Density Alternative nor the proposed actions would adversely impact archaeological resources.

#### *Architectural Resources*

The Lesser Density Alternative and proposed actions would have the same potential for impact with regard to architectural resources. The Lesser Density Alternative, like the proposed actions, could result in construction-related impacts to two architectural resources located within the rezoning area: the Shore Theater (NYCL-eligible, S/NR-eligible) and Our Lady of Solace Roman Catholic Church (S/NR-eligible). The Parachute Jump (NYCL, S/NR) and the Childs Restaurant on the Boardwalk (NYCL) also have the potential to be impacted by construction activities, however since they are designated NYCL, they would be protected from adjacent construction through the implementation of construction protection measures required under *TPPN #10/88*.

The Lesser Density Alternative and the proposed actions would have the potential to result in significant direct impacts on Nathan’s Famous (S/NR-eligible). However, the Lesser Density Alternative would not have the potential to cause significant adverse visual and contextual impacts to the Shore Theater (NYCL-eligible, S/NR-eligible) by diminishing its visual prominence on Surf Avenue. Neither the Lesser Density Alternative nor the proposed actions would result in significant adverse shadows impacts on any architectural resource.

### *URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES*

Under the proposed actions and the Lesser Density Alternative, the topography, street pattern, and block shapes of the rezoning area would be altered through the regrading of new and existing streets, mapping of new streets, and demapping of existing streets in the Coney East and Coney West subdistricts. As a result of these changes, views to Coney Island Beach and the Atlantic Ocean would be enhanced in the rezoning area under both alternatives. The newly mapped streets would break up the superblocks in the rezoning area and result in regularly shaped block forms under both alternatives.

Under the proposed actions, the creation of the Special Coney Island District would define development parameters and urban design controls. As a result of these guidelines, the pedestrian environment in Coney East would be enhanced with ground floor retail and transparency requirements that would create a vibrant commercial corridor on Surf Avenue



between West 8th and 23rd Streets. In the Coney West and Coney North subdistricts, residential buildings with ground floor retail uses would improve the streetscape of these areas. However, under the Lesser Density Alternative, the Special Coney Island District would not be created, and the urban design controls would not guide the development of the rezoning area.

Similar to the proposed actions, building uses under the Lesser Density Alternative would include residential, local retail, eating and drinking establishments or enhancing uses, and active and passive open space. Building heights are expected to be lower under the Lesser Density Alternative compared with the proposed actions. As a result of the expected shorter buildings, views to the historic amusements such as the Parachute Jump, the Cyclone, and the Wonder Wheel would be more prominent under the Lesser Density Alternative compared with the proposed actions.

Overall, neither the Lesser Density Alternative nor the proposed actions would have any significant adverse impacts on urban design and visual resources.

#### *NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER*

The Lesser Density Alternative, like the proposed actions, would not result in significant adverse impacts to neighborhood character. However, this alternative also would not result in the same benefits to neighborhood character that would be achieved through the proposed actions. For example, while the Lesser Density Alternative would increase vitality in the rezoning area by introducing new residential population, workers, and visitors, it would not necessarily introduce affordable housing, which would help preserve the mixed-income nature of the study area; it would not create permit the same broad range of uses in Coney East, that would enable the area to become a year-round amusement destination; and it would not create a Special Coney Island District, which would define development parameters and urban design controls. Overall, the positive changes to neighborhood character would not be as dramatic under the Lesser Density Alternative as compared to the proposed actions.

#### *NATURAL RESOURCES*

The Lesser Density Alternative and proposed actions would both utilize a combination of E-designations, Land Disposition Agreements, and Memorandums of Understanding to require further environmental investigation at sites where potential hazardous materials conditions have been identified. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts to groundwater resources would occur under either the proposed actions or the Lesser Density Alternative.

Flooding conditions would not be exacerbated due to construction under either the proposed actions or Lesser Density Alternative because the floodplain is affected by coastal flooding rather than fluvial or local flooding.

Since the projected development sites are the same under the Lesser Density Alternative and proposed actions, the alternative, like the proposed actions, would impact terrestrial resources in the rezoning area. However, the wildlife species expected to occur within this area are common to urban areas, and the loss of some individuals would not result in a significant adverse impact under either the Lesser Density Alternative or the proposed actions.

The Lesser Density Alternative would require the same stormwater management and BMPs as described for the proposed actions. Implementation of these measures would improve the quality

## **Coney Island Rezoning**

---

of stormwater and reduce the rate of discharge to Coney Island Creek, which could improve water quality of Coney Island Creek during and after precipitation events.

The majority of endangered, threatened, and candidate species with the potential to occur within the rezoning area are limited to transient individuals. Like that of the proposed actions, construction of the Lesser Density Alternative would not be expected to result in significant adverse impacts to these individuals. It is expected that Essential Fish Habitat would also remain unchanged under the Lesser Density Alternative.

Neither the proposed actions nor the Lesser Density Alternative would result in a significant adverse impact to natural resources.

### ***HAZARDOUS MATERIALS***

The Lesser Density Alternative and proposed actions would both utilize a combination of E-designations, Land Disposition Agreements, and Memorandums of Understanding to require further environmental investigation at sites where potential hazardous materials conditions have been identified. Where necessary, remediation performed to the satisfaction of DEP would be required before development-related building permits could be issued by the Department of Buildings (DOB). Additionally, construction-phase health and safety plans, which must also be approved by DEP, would be required including procedures to address any known concerns as well as contingencies should unexpected contamination be encountered. With these controls in place, there would be no significant adverse hazardous materials impact under either the Lesser Density Alternative or the proposed actions.

### ***WATERFRONT REVITALIZATION PROGRAM (WRP)***

The Lesser Density Alternative would result in less development within the New York City Coastal Zone and would result in less dramatic improvements to the visual environment. Nonetheless, the Lesser Density Alternative, like the proposed actions, would be consistent with the WRP policies of encouraging commercial and residential redevelopment in appropriate coastal zone areas, providing public access to and along the City's coastal waters, protecting scenic resources that contribute to the visual quality of the City's coastal area, and avoiding adverse effects to historic and cultural resources.

### ***INFRASTRUCTURE***

The Lesser Density Alternative would generate less demand for potable water, sanitary sewage disposal, and stormwater discharge compared to the proposed actions. As with the proposed actions, any incremental development taking place in portions of the rezoning area with limited infrastructure capacity would require some improvement, such as upgrades to critical sewer segments or provision of stormwater detention, to be undertaken by the developer(s). Because the Lesser Density Alternative would result in less development overall as compared to the proposed actions, a greater proportion of the new development could take place based on incremental infrastructure upgrades, and an Amended Drainage Plan for the entire rezoning area may not be put in place. The Lesser Density Alternative would require the same stormwater management and BMPs as described for the proposed actions. With the required improvements in place, neither the Lesser Density Alternative nor the proposed actions would result in a significant adverse infrastructure impact.

### *SOLID WASTE AND SANITATION SERVICES*

As described in Chapter 14, “Solid Waste and Sanitation Services,” the proposed actions would result in a modest increase in demand for solid waste handling services from DSNY and private carters (less than one DSNY truck load per day to serve residential uses and up to 2.5 private contractor truckloads per day for non-residential uses), which would not overburden DSNY or private sector service providers. The Lesser Density Alternative would generate a lower volume of solid waste compared to the proposed actions. Therefore, the burden on DSNY and private carters would be less under the Lesser Density Alternative than under the proposed actions and there would be no potential for significant adverse impact.

### *ENERGY*

The Lesser Density Alternative would generate less energy demand than with the proposed actions. It is anticipated that energy supplies would be sufficient to meet the demand from the rezoning area under both the Lesser Density Alternative and the proposed actions.

### *TRAFFIC AND PARKING*

Travel demand estimates were conducted for the Lesser Density Alternative. Because the land uses proposed for the Lesser Density Alternative are comparable to those under the proposed actions, trip-making characteristics, travel patterns, and directionality are expected to be similar. As shown in **Tables 23-3** and **23-4**, the Lesser Density Alternative is expected to generate 55 to 60 percent fewer peak hour person trips and 60 to 68 percent fewer peak hour vehicle trips than the proposed actions. Compared to the proposed actions, the Lesser Density Alternative is expected to result in fewer significant adverse traffic impacts and impacts of lesser magnitudes. Similarly, the significant adverse traffic impacts under the Lesser Density Alternative would be more readily mitigated than those projected for the proposed actions. Some locations, however, may still be unmitigatable. With regard to parking, the Lesser Density Alternative would require the creation of fewer parking spaces. As with the proposed actions, the Lesser Density Alternative is not expected to result in a potential for significant adverse parking impacts.

**Table 23-3**  
**Person-Trip Comparisons: Lesser Density Alternative vs. Proposed Actions**

Peak Hour	Lesser Density Alternative			Proposed Actions		
	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Weekday AM	615	1,131	1,746	1,591	2,782	4,373
Weekday Midday	2,890	2,799	5,689	6,619	5,968	12,587
Weekday PM	2,549	2,237	4,786	6,125	5,362	11,487
Saturday MD	2,807	2,265	5,072	7,139	5,787	12,926
Saturday PM	2,212	2,731	4,943	5,034	6,058	11,092

**Table 23-4**  
**Vehicle-Trip Comparisons: Lesser Density Alternative vs. Proposed Actions**

Peak Hour	Lesser Density Alternative			Proposed Actions		
	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Weekday AM	94	236	330	339	677	1,016
Weekday Midday	313	299	612	965	826	1,791
Weekday PM	390	300	690	1,104	878	1,982
Saturday MD	410	345	755	1,201	1,025	2,226
Saturday PM	333	392	725	857	977	1,834

### *TRANSIT AND PEDESTRIANS*

Similar to vehicular trip generation, the Lesser Density Alternative is expected to generate substantially fewer transit and pedestrian trips during the analysis peak periods. Consequently, the Lesser Density Alternative may not result in some of the significant adverse impacts to the B36, B68, B74, B82, and X38 bus routes identified for the proposed actions. The Lesser Density Alternative may also avoid the significant adverse pedestrian impacts identified for the east and west crosswalks at the Stillwell Avenue and Surf Avenue intersection.

### *AIR QUALITY*

The proposed actions would not result in any significant adverse air quality impacts on sensitive uses in the surrounding community, and the proposed actions would not be adversely affected by existing sources of air emissions in the study area. As discussed above, the Lesser Density Alternative would generate fewer vehicle trips than the proposed actions; therefore, its development would result in lower vehicle emissions at nearby intersections. The Lesser Density Alternative would introduce fewer parking spaces than the proposed actions and it is expected that the parking facilities would be smaller. Thus, similar to the proposed actions, it is expected that the parking facilities under this alternative would not cause any significant adverse air quality impacts. The building sizes under the Lesser Density Alternative would be smaller than those analyzed under the proposed actions. The demand for heating, ventilation, and air conditions (HVAC) would therefore be lower, and less fossil fuel burning would be required. Nonetheless, as with the proposed actions, it is possible that restrictions would need to be placed on the type of fuel used for HVAC under this alternative. The effects of surrounding industrial uses on the Lesser Density Alternative would be the same as the effects discussed in the context of the proposed actions. Therefore, existing industrial uses would not have a significant adverse impact on air quality under the Lesser Density Alternative. Overall, the Lesser Density Alternative would be expected to generate lower emissions than the proposed actions, but neither the alternative nor the proposed actions would result in adverse impacts on air quality.

### *NOISE*

As discussed in the traffic section above, the Lesser Density Alternative is expected to generate less vehicular traffic than the proposed actions in all time periods. Under the proposed actions, a significant adverse impact was predicted to occur in the weekday AM and midday peak periods at receptor site 6, on West 17th Street between Neptune Avenue and Mermaid Avenue, with an increase in noise levels of 3.5 dBA and 4.5 dBA, respectively, over the future without the proposed actions. This was due principally to noise generated by the large incremental traffic volumes on West 17th Street. With significantly fewer trips in the weekday AM peak hour and in the midday peak hour compared with the proposed actions, the Lesser Density Alternative would likely result in smaller noise increases at receptor site 6, and it could potentially result in an increase below the 3 dBA CEQR impact criteria.

Under the proposed actions, there would be increases in noise levels at receptor site 11 (Stillwell Avenue between Surf Avenue and the Boardwalk) between the Build and No Build scenarios of more than 10 dBA for all analysis periods, except for the weekday AM peak period. This was due to principally to noise generated by activities in the proposed amusement park. Because the 9.39 acre amusement park would be added under both the Lesser Density Alternative and the proposed actions, it would still likely exceed the CEQR impact criteria under this alternative. Therefore, the Lesser Density Alternative, like the proposed actions, is expected to result in

significant adverse noise impacts at receptor site 11. While this impact is now identified as unmitigated, between the Draft and Final EIS, additional studies will be performed to examine whether there are any feasible and practicable mitigation measures that could be implemented to reduce or eliminate this impact. For this site for both the proposed actions and the Lesser Density Alternative, traffic mitigation measures and the use of noise attenuation measures for the proposed amusement uses will be evaluated.

### *CONSTRUCTION*

Because the amount of new construction under this alternative would be less as compared with the proposed actions, the Lesser Density Alternative would not generate as much temporary construction disruption. However, construction-related impacts on historic architectural resources would be similar since the same sites would be impacted. Thus, the Lesser Density Alternative and the proposed actions both have the potential to result in significant adverse construction-related impacts to the Shore Theater (NYCL-eligible, S/NR-eligible) and Our Lady of Solace Roman Catholic Church (S/NR-eligible), and significant direct impacts on Nathan's Famous (S/NR-eligible).

The Lesser Density Alternative could result in a somewhat lesser intensity of construction-related noise and traffic than the proposed actions. However, neither this alternative nor the proposed actions would result in significant adverse impacts on air quality, noise, traffic, or transit during construction. Because the development program would be less under the Lesser Density Alternative, the economic benefits attributable to construction expenditures and construction jobs under the proposed actions would not be as substantial under the Lesser Density Alternative.

### *PUBLIC HEALTH*

Like the proposed actions, the Lesser Development Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts to public health.

## **D. 15-ACRE MAPPED AMUSEMENT PARKLAND ALTERNATIVE**

### **DESCRIPTION**

The 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would create a 15-acre mapped open amusement park rather than the 9.39-acre park envisioned under the proposed actions. This alternative is similar to the proposed actions that were described in the first Draft Scope of Work for the EIS, dated January 2008. The alternative would result in a more outdoor amusement space and less enclosed amusements and entertainment uses than the proposed actions.

The 15-acre park envisioned under the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would include the 9.39 acres delineated under the proposed actions, but would extend farther north to encompass larger portions of Block 7074, 8695, and 8696, larger segments of Stillwell Avenue and West 12th Street, and the entire length of West 10th Street.

Like the proposed actions, the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would involve the creation of a Special Coney Island District. However, the zoning designations for some of the subdistricts would be different. Under this alternative and the proposed actions, Coney North would be rezoned to R7X with a C2-4 overlay. Coney West would be rezoned to R7X with a C2-4 overlay under this alternative, compared to R7D with a C2-4 overlay under the proposed

## Coney Island Rezoning

---

actions. Allowable FAR would range from 4.35 to 5.8 FAR across the Coney West subdistrict, compared to the proposed actions, in which FAR would range from 4.12 and 5.5 between West 19th and 20th Streets and from 4.35 to 5.8 on the two westernmost blocks. Coney East would be rezoned to the amended C7 under both the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative and the proposed actions, however allowable FAR would range from 2.0 to 5.0 under the alternative, compared to 2.6 to 4.5 under the proposed actions.

The 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative is less likely to achieve the goals and objectives established for the proposed Coney Island Rezoning. Most notably, with less land available in Coney East dedicated to private investment in the development of enclosed amusements, restaurants, and entertainment uses, it would be less likely that the district would grow to realize its full potential as a year-round destination. Further, because there would be less land available in Coney East for private development under this alternative, the footprints for private development would be smaller compared with the proposed actions. With smaller footprints, it is possible that redevelopment would be less economically viable compared with larger footprints under the proposed actions, and could possibly hinder the area's redevelopment into a year-round destination. Under this alternative, the amusement district is likely to be seasonal because many of the uses that are so vital in making Coney Island a year-round destination would be precluded. Because it is expected that there would be less enclosed amusements, restaurants, entertainment venues and amusement-enhancing uses compared with the proposed actions, the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would provide fewer jobs and tax revenue sources compared with the proposed actions.

Similar to the proposed actions, the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative, would, however, achieve some of the goals and objectives of the proposed Coney Island Rezoning plan would be achieved—the land fronting on the Boardwalk would be protected in perpetuity through the mapping of parkland, and new streets would be created between Surf Avenue and the Boardwalk. This alternative would also promote housing and commercial opportunities through the redevelopment of vacant and underused land in the area surrounding the amusement district and provide the existing community with a wider range of housing options and with much-needed neighborhood amenities.

**Table 23-5** shows the net new development projected to occur within the rezoning area under the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative. As shown in the table, the alternative would result in the same net increase in residential units (2,408 units with 607 affordable) and hotel rooms (606 rooms) as the proposed actions. The 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would allow Coney East to be developed with 7,500 square feet of complementary retail uses to the amusement and beach uses such as gift stores, clothing stores, or photographic equipment stores. In comparison, 43,236 square feet of complementary retail would be added under the proposed actions. In addition, it is anticipated that this alternative would result in less development in the following categories: amusements (160,499 square feet less) and enhancing uses (226,341 square feet less). As indicated above, the mapped open amusement park would be 15 acres under this alternative rather than 9.39 acres under the proposed actions.

All other mapping, demapping, disposition, and acquisition actions would be the same under the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative and the proposed actions.

**Table 23-5**

**Development Projected under 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative and Proposed Actions**

Use	15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative				Proposed Actions			
	Coney East	Coney West	Coney North/Mermaid Avenue	Total	Coney East	Coney West	Coney North/Mermaid Avenue	Total
Residential (units)*	0	1,520	888	2,408	0	1,520	888	2,408
Complementary or Local retail (sf)	7,500	131,339	229,435	368,274	43,236	131,339	229,435	404,010
Hotel (rooms)	468	0	138	606	468	0	138	606
Amusements (sf)	90,912	0	0	90,912	251,411	0	0	251,411
Enhancing uses (sf)	106,912	0	0	106,912	333,253	0	0	333,253
Amusement Park – Active (rounded acres)	10	0	0	10	6	0	0	6
Amusement Park – Passive (rounded acres)	5	0	0	5	3	0	0	3
<b>Notes:</b> * Twenty percent of housing units would be affordable under both the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative and the proposed actions. <b>Sources:</b> DCP, August 2008								

## 15-ACRE MAPPED AMUSEMENT PARKLAND ALTERNATIVE COMPARED WITH THE PROPOSED ACTIONS

### LAND USE, ZONING, AND PUBLIC POLICY

Similar to the proposed actions, the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would strengthen and grow the open amusements and develop a new mixed-use neighborhood in the surrounding area that would provide jobs and housing opportunities for local residents. Under the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative, there would be more land dedicated to open amusement uses compared with the proposed actions; however, there would be less enclosed amusements, entertainment and district-enhancing uses in Coney East compared to the proposed actions. These decreases would result in less year-round activity in Coney East compared with the proposed actions. In addition, these decreases would result in fewer jobs and tax revenue sources compared with the proposed actions.

Both the proposed actions and the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would include the creation of a Special Coney Island District. Similar to the proposed actions, the zoning changes would be compatible with zoning in the study areas.

The 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would not provide sufficient opportunity to achieve the critical balance between open and enclosed amusement and entertainment uses needed to transition the Coney Island amusement and entertainment district into a year-round destination. Both alternatives would help to meet the City's initiatives for housing by providing affordable housing units. The 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would meet economic development goals by creating new jobs and tax revenue sources, but because this alternative would provide less local retail, amusements, and enhancing uses, it would provide fewer jobs and tax revenue sources compared with the proposed actions.

Neither the proposed actions nor the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would result in significant adverse impacts related to land use, zoning, or public policy.

### *SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS*

The 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative, like the proposed actions, would not result in a significant adverse socioeconomic impact. The 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would map part or all of certain sites projected for development under the proposed actions (sites 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15) as parkland, and direct displacement would occur on these sites under the alternative. However, as described in Chapter 3, “Socioeconomic Conditions,” field surveys indicate that a substantial number of remaining Astroland rides and games have recently closed, and it is expected that the remaining Astroland retail uses would not be economically viable and would close by 2019 in the future without the proposed actions. Therefore, these businesses would not be displaced as a result of development occurring under either the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative or the proposed actions. In total, both the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative and proposed actions would directly displace 40 businesses. There would be no direct residential displacement under the Lesser Density Alternative or the proposed actions.

Though the proposed actions would result in some indirect residential and indirect business displacement, this displacement would not constitute a significant adverse impact. Because the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would introduce the same number of residential units (and proportion of affordable units) and a similar amount of non-residential development as the proposed actions, the potential for indirect displacement would be similar. Neither the proposed actions nor 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would have a significant adverse indirect displacement impact.

The 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative, like the proposed actions, would not have a significant adverse impact on the amusement industry. To the contrary, as with the proposed actions, the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would retain and enhance open amusement uses in the rezoning area. However, there would be less enclosed amusement development under this alternative. Unlike the proposed actions, which would transform Coney East into a year-round destination, this alternative would limit retail development in this subdistrict with 7,500 square feet of complementary retail uses to the amusement and beach uses such as gift stores, clothing stores, or photographic equipment stores, limiting the ability for the district to grow into a year-round destination.

### *COMMUNITY FACILITIES*

The number of new residential units and school-age children would be the same under both the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative and proposed actions. Therefore, the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative, like the proposed actions, would not have a significant adverse impact on public schools. Also similar to the proposed actions, there would continue to be sufficient library, health care, police, and fire services.

The 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative and proposed actions would generate the same demand for public day care seats. Under either scenario, publicly funded day care facilities would operate substantially over capacity, resulting in a significant adverse impact.

### *OPEN SPACE*

The 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would create a 15-acre mapped open amusement park rather than the 9.39-acre park envisioned under the proposed actions and would add 5 acres rather than 3 acres of passive open space within the newly created amusement area.



The 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would result in more outdoor amusement space and less enclosed amusements and entertainment uses than the proposed actions.

Both the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative and the proposed actions would directly displace and relocate the El Jardin de Boardwalk community garden, the Abe Stark Rink, or the Poseidon Playground. Also like the proposed actions, the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would involve the creation of the 1.41-acre Highland View Park and the alienation of mapped parkland (currently used as a parking area) for disposition to a private developer for development.

The 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would introduce more amusement park space than the proposed actions. Under the proposed actions, it is estimated that the new amusement park would attract a total of approximately 1.01 million additional visitors per season, which would be an average of approximately 10,111 additional visitors per day over the summer season.<sup>1</sup> Compared to the proposed actions, the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would introduce an additional 1.79 million annual visitors, or 16,851 visitors per day for the summer season, the 100-day period between Memorial Day and Labor Day. At the same time, the alternative would introduce fewer workers (because commercial and amusement-related development outside of the amusement park would be less than under proposed actions) and the same number of residents (because the number of projected dwelling units is the same as under the proposed actions). Therefore, the demands on open space would be less under the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative than under the proposed actions. Overall, like the proposed actions, under the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative, all passive and active open space ratios for residents and workers would remain above DCP guidelines, with the exception of the active open space ratio for residents, which would be below DCP guidelines. Since DPR would commit to providing additional active open space for the future population resulting from either the proposed actions or 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative, neither the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative nor the proposed actions would result in a significant adverse impact on open spaces.

### *SHADOWS*

As described in Chapter 6, “Shadows,” the proposed actions would not be expected to result in a significant adverse shadows impact on any sunlight-sensitive open spaces, natural features, or historic resources. Development under the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would take place on the same projected development sites identified for the proposed actions, but with certain lots in Coney East developed as additional amusement park rather than other uses. Therefore, the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative does not have the potential to result in significant adverse shadows impacts.

---

<sup>1</sup> The projected additional visitor population to the amusement park is based on a 2007 report prepared for the New York City Economic Development Corporation by Grubb & Ellis which included conservative, moderate, and aggressive attendance scenarios for a 15-acre amusement park. The moderate attendance projection was 2,808,553 visitors per season. This figure was reduced proportionately for the proposed 9-acre amusement area. Based on the 1989 Steeplechase Park FEIS, it is assumed that 60 percent of visitors to the amusement park would constitute new visitors to the area (i.e., visitors who would not already be in the area for other destinations such as the beach). It was again assumed that these visitors would be spread over the approximately 100-day period between Memorial Day and Labor Day.

### *HISTORIC RESOURCES*

#### *Archaeological Resources*

The 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would result in the same ground disturbance as the proposed actions. Therefore, the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative like the proposed actions would not adversely impact archaeological resources.

#### *Architectural Resources*

The 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative and proposed actions would have the same potential for impact in regards to architectural resources. The 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative, like the proposed actions, could result in construction-related impacts to two architectural resources located within the rezoning area: the Shore Theater (NYCL-eligible, S/NR-eligible) and Our Lady of Solace Roman Catholic Church (S/NR-eligible). The Parachute Jump (NYCL, S/NR) and the Childs Restaurant on the Boardwalk (NYCL) also have the potential to be impacted by construction activities, however since they are designated NYCL, they would be protected from adjacent construction through the implementation of construction protection measures required under *TPPN #10/88*.

Both the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative and the proposed actions would have the potential to result in significant direct impacts on Nathan's Famous (S/NR-eligible), as well as significant adverse visual and contextual impacts to the Shore Theater (NYCL-eligible, S/NR-eligible) by diminishing its visual prominence on Surf Avenue. Neither the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative nor the proposed actions would result in significant adverse shadows impacts on any architectural resource.

### *URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES*

Under the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative, the street pattern would have fewer east-west connections in Coney East compared to the proposed actions. Under the proposed actions, Wonder Wheel Way and Bowery would both provide east-west connections in Coney East, while the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would provide only one east-west connection in Coney East. With the proposed actions, Wonder Wheel Way would connect the Parachute Jump, the Cyclone, and the Wonder Wheel, while this alternative would not. As a result, there would be better connectivity in Coney East under the proposed actions compared with the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative.

Block shapes in Coney East under the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would vary from the block shapes under the proposed actions. However, under both alternatives, smaller blocks would be created in Coney West due to the mapping of new streets, providing improved access through the rezoning area.

Under the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative and the proposed actions, the Special District would improve the streetscape throughout the rezoning area. Both plans would provide an enhanced pedestrian environment with ground floor retail and transparency requirements that would create a vibrant commercial corridor on Surf Avenue between West 8th and 23rd Streets. In the Coney West and Coney North subdistricts, residential buildings with ground floor retail uses would improve the streetscape of these areas.

Building uses would be consistent under both alternatives in all subdistricts. However, under the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative, there would be more open amusements and

less enclosed amusements, restaurants, enhancing uses, and local retail compared with the proposed actions. The 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would provide significantly less enclosed amusement and entertainment uses compared with the proposed actions, limiting this alternative's ability to transform Coney Island into a year-round amusement and entertainment district.

Both the proposed actions and the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would provide enhanced views of Coney Island Beach and the Atlantic Ocean due to the proposed grade changes in Coney East and Coney West.

Overall, neither the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative nor the proposed actions would have any significant adverse impact on urban design and visual resources.

#### *NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER*

The 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative and the proposed actions would result in the same type and amount of development in the Coney West, Coney North, and Mermaid Avenue subdistricts but the alternative would result in less development within the Coney East subdistrict. This alternative, like the proposed actions, would positively affect the character of the rezoning area and surrounding neighborhoods in a number of ways. However, because there would be less land available in Coney East for private development, this area would be less likely to realize its full potential as a year-round destination. Therefore, while neither the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative nor the proposed actions would result in significant adverse neighborhood character impacts, some of the positive effects on neighborhood character that are associated with year-round active ground floor uses and year-round pedestrian activity would not be fully realized.

#### *NATURAL RESOURCES*

The 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative and proposed actions would both utilize a combination of E-designations, Land Disposition Agreements, and Memorandums of Understanding to require further environmental investigation at sites where potential hazardous materials conditions have been identified. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts to groundwater resources would occur under either the proposed actions or Lesser Density Alternative.

Flooding conditions would not be exacerbated due to construction under either the proposed actions or the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative because the floodplain is affected by coastal flooding rather than fluvial or local flooding.

The 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative, like the proposed actions, would impact terrestrial resources in the rezoning area. However, the wildlife species expected to occur within this area are common to urban areas, and the loss of some individuals would not result in a significant adverse impact under either the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative or the proposed actions.

The 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would require the same stormwater management and BMPs as described for the proposed actions. Implementation of these measures would improve the quality of stormwater and reduce the rate of discharge to Coney Island Creek, which could improve water quality of Coney Island Creek during and after precipitation events.

## **Coney Island Rezoning**

---

The majority of endangered, threatened, and candidate species with the potential to occur within the rezoning area are limited to transient individuals. Construction of the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would not be expected to result in significant adverse impacts to these individuals. It is expected that Essential Fish Habitat would also remain unchanged under the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative.

Neither the proposed actions nor the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would result in a significant adverse impact to natural resources.

### ***HAZARDOUS MATERIALS***

The 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative and proposed actions would both utilize a combination of E-designations, Land Disposition Agreements, and Memorandums of Understanding to require further environmental investigation at sites where potential hazardous materials conditions have been identified. Where necessary, remediation performed to the satisfaction of DEP would be required before development-related building permits could be issued by DOB. Additionally, construction-phase health and safety plans, which must also be approved by DEP, would be required including procedures to address any known concerns as well as contingencies should unexpected contamination be encountered. With these controls in place, there would be no significant adverse hazardous materials impact under either the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative or the proposed actions.

### ***WATERFRONT REVITALIZATION PROGRAM (WRP)***

The 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative, like the proposed actions, would be consistent with the WRP policies of encouraging commercial and residential redevelopment in appropriate coastal zone areas, providing public access to and along the City's coastal waters, protecting scenic resources that contribute to the visual quality of the City's coastal area, and avoiding adverse effects to historic and cultural resources.

### ***INFRASTRUCTURE***

The 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would result in approximately an additional 6 acres of mapped amusement area compared to the proposed actions, but approximately 422,576 square feet less of commercial uses. Therefore, the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would generate somewhat less demand for potable water, sanitary sewage disposal, and stormwater discharge compared to the proposed actions. As with the proposed actions, any incremental development taking place in portions of the rezoning area with limited infrastructure capacity would require some improvement, such as upgrades to critical sewer segments or provision of stormwater detention, to be undertaken by the developer(s). Because the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative and proposed actions would result in a generally similar amount of development, the alternative, like the proposed actions, would most likely prompt the development of an Amended Drainage Plan for the rezoning area. The 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would require the same stormwater management and BMPs as described for the proposed actions. With the required improvements in place, neither the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative nor the proposed actions would result in a significant adverse infrastructure impact.

### *SOLID WASTE AND SANITATION SERVICES*

As described in Chapter 14, “Solid Waste and Sanitation Services,” the proposed actions would result in a modest increase in demand for solid waste handling services from DSNY and private carters (less than one DSNY truck load per day to serve residential uses and up to 2.5 private contractor truckloads per day for non-residential uses), which would not overburden DSNY or private sector service providers. The 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would generate a similar volume of solid waste compared to the proposed actions since the amusement park area would increase but the amount of local retail and enhancing uses would decrease. Therefore, the burden on DSNY and private carters would be similar under the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative and proposed actions and there would be no potential for significant adverse impact.

### *ENERGY*

The 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would generate less energy demand than with the proposed actions. It is anticipated that energy supplies would be sufficient to meet the demand from the rezoning area under both the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative and the proposed actions.

### *TRAFFIC AND PARKING*

Travel demand estimates were conducted for the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative. Because the land uses proposed for the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative are comparable to those under the proposed actions, trip-making characteristics, travel patterns, and directionality are expected to be similar. As shown in **Tables 23-6** and **23-7**, the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative is expected to generate similar levels of peak hour person and vehicle trips as the proposed actions. Compared to the proposed actions, the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative is expected to result in a similar number of significant adverse traffic impacts and impacts of similar magnitudes. As a result, the significant adverse traffic impacts under the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative are expected to require similar measures to mitigate as defined for the proposed actions. Those impacts that were projected to be unmitigatable under the proposed actions would also likely be unmitigatable under the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative. With regard to parking, the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would require the creation of a similar number of parking spaces. Although the distribution of parking demand among the subdistricts may vary slightly, as with the proposed actions, the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative is not expected to result in a potential for significant adverse parking impacts.

### *TRANSIT AND PEDESTRIANS*

Similar to vehicular trip generation, the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative is expected to generate similar numbers of transit and pedestrian trips during the analysis peak periods. Consequently, the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative is likely to result in similar significant adverse impacts to the B36, B68, B74, B82, and X38 bus routes identified for the proposed actions. The 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative is also likely to result in similar significant adverse pedestrian impacts identified for the east and west crosswalks at the Stillwell Avenue and Surf Avenue intersection.

**Table 23-6**

**Person-Trip Comparisons: 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alt.  
vs. Proposed Actions**

Peak Hour	15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative			Proposed Actions		
	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Weekday AM	1,499	2,754	4,253	1,591	2,782	4,373
Weekday Midday	6,527	5,978	12,505	6,619	5,968	12,587
Weekday PM	5,891	5,068	10,959	6,125	5,362	11,487
Saturday MD	6,541	5,291	11,832	7,139	5,787	12,926
Saturday PM	4,880	5,928	10,808	5,034	6,058	11,092

**Table 23-7**

**Vehicle-Trip Comparisons: 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alt.  
vs. Proposed Actions**

Peak Hour	15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative			Proposed Actions		
	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Weekday AM	316	664	980	339	677	1,016
Weekday Midday	912	785	1,697	965	826	1,791
Weekday PM	1,050	815	1,865	1,104	878	1,982
Saturday MD	1,092	930	2,022	1,201	1,025	2,226
Saturday PM	815	938	1,753	857	977	1,834

### *AIR QUALITY*

The 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would generate a similar number of vehicle trips compared to the proposed actions; therefore, the overall concentration of mobile source pollutants are likely to be similar to the proposed actions. Like the proposed actions, it is not expected that this alternative would result in any significant adverse air quality impacts on sensitive uses in the surrounding community, and the alternative would not be adversely affected by existing sources of air emission in the study area.

The 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would introduce a similar number of parking spaces compared to the proposed actions and it is expected that the parking facilities would also be similar. Thus, similar to the proposed actions, it is expected that the parking facilities under this alternative would not cause any significant adverse air quality impacts.

Development under this alternative would take place on the same projected development sites identified for the proposed actions, but with certain lots in Coney East developed as additional amusement parkland, rather than other uses. Under the proposed actions, two projected and three potential sites failed the screening analysis using the No. 4 oil as the fuel source, but passed assuming No. 2 oil. Thus, like the proposed actions, it is likely that air quality E-designations or MOUs would be necessary to preclude the potential for significant adverse impacts.

The effects of surrounding industrial uses on the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would be the same as the effects discussed in the context of the proposed actions. Therefore, existing industrial uses would not have a significant adverse impact on air quality under the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative. Overall, the 15-Acre Mapped

Amusement Parkland Alternative would be expected to generate similar emissions as the proposed actions, and neither alternative is expected to result in adverse impacts on air quality.

### *NOISE*

As discussed in the traffic section above, the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative is expected to generate similar vehicular traffic as the proposed actions in all time periods. Under the proposed actions, a significant adverse impact was predicted to occur in the weekday AM and midday peak periods at receptor site 6, on West 17th Street between Neptune Avenue and Mermaid Avenue, with an increase in noise levels of 3.5 dBA and 4.5 dBA, respectively, over the future without the proposed actions. Because the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would generate similar vehicular traffic as the proposed actions, it is expected to result in significant adverse noise impacts at receptor site 6.

Under the proposed actions, there would be increases in noise levels at receptor site 11 (Stillwell Avenue between Surf Avenue and the Boardwalk) between the Build and No Build scenarios of more than 10 dBA for all analysis periods, except for the weekday AM peak period. This was due to principally to noise generated by activities in the proposed amusement park. The 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would include the 9.39 acre amusement park under the proposed actions, but would extend farther north and include a total of 15 acres. Thus, it would still likely exceed the CEQR impact criteria under this alternative. The 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative, like the proposed actions, is expected to result in significant adverse noise impacts at receptor site 11.

As discussed in Chapter 19, “Noise,” these impacts are now identified as unmitigated. Between the Draft and Final EIS, additional studies will be performed to examine whether there are any feasible and practicable mitigation measures that could be implemented to reduce or eliminate these impacts. Thus, similar to the proposed actions, the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would require the implementation of the same measures to mitigate the significant increases in noise levels around receptor sites 6 and 11.

### *CONSTRUCTION*

Although the amount of new construction under this alternative would be approximately 422,580 square feet less as compared with the proposed actions, the amount and type of temporary construction disruption would be substantially the same under the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative and proposed actions. Construction-related impacts on historic architectural resources would be similar since the same sites would be impacted. Thus, the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative and the proposed actions both have the potential to result in significant adverse construction-related impacts to the Shore Theater (NYCL-eligible, S/NR-eligible) and Our Lady of Solace Roman Catholic Church (S/NR-eligible), and significant direct impacts on Nathan’s Famous (S/NR-eligible).

Because the amount of development projected for the Coney East subdistrict is less under the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative as compared to the proposed actions, this alternative could result in a somewhat lesser intensity of construction-related noise and traffic in Coney East. However, neither this alternative nor the proposed actions would result in significant adverse impacts on air quality, noise, traffic, or transit during construction. The economic benefits attributable to construction expenditures and construction jobs would be somewhat less under the Lesser Density Alternative compared to the proposed actions, as the development program is smaller.

### *PUBLIC HEALTH*

Like the proposed actions, the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts to public health.

## **E. NO DEMAPPING AND MAPPING ACTION ALTERNATIVE**

### **DESCRIPTION**

The No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative would develop the rezoning area with uses that are similar to those described for the proposed actions, but without mapping or demapping any streets or parkland. Under this alternative, the 9.39-acre amusement park and the 1.41-acre Highland View Park would not be mapped, and the mapped parkland comprising the Abe Stark Rink and the two asphalt parking lots west of KeySpan Park would not be demapped.

Most notably, no street segments would be demapped, including: portions of Highland View Avenue, West 22nd Street, Bowery, West 15th Street, Stilwell Avenue, West 12th Street, and West 10th Street all of which would be demapped under the proposed actions. Thus, under the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative, any new development would occur under the existing block configuration. The public access corridors that would be mapped under the proposed actions at West 16th and West 19th Streets from Surf Avenue to Boardwalk and along West 22nd Street would not be created under the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative.

As with the proposed actions, the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative would include the creation of a Special Coney Island District. The district text would be similar under the proposed actions and this alternative; however the proposed Coney East subdistrict would remain under the existing C7 zoning, with a change of use only to allow for eating and drinking establishments without limitation (and this change would not allow for the range of uses or densities as established in the proposed actions). The allowable FAR in Coney East would remain at 2.0 rather than being increased to range from 2.6 to 4.5 under the proposed actions.

Because the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative would retain the existing block forms, the rezoning area would have fewer feasible or optimal development sites and new development would have to follow the physical setting that has resulted in little or new investment in Coney Island over the past several decades. This is especially an issue in the proposed Coney West subdistrict where the absence of the new street mapping and parkland demapping actions will significantly alter the capacity of the non-parkland sites to be developed. As a result, the projected development program would be less than under the proposed actions and provides substantially less opportunity to achieve the balanced goals and objectives established for the proposed actions.

Similar to the proposed actions, the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative would facilitate the creation of affordable housing units through Inclusionary Housing provisions of the Special Coney Island District. However, under the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative, no new parkland would be created and this alternative would not establish a network of Boardwalk recreational parks. Furthermore, open amusement uses will not be protected in perpetuity through the mapping of parkland. It would not create new streets that would promote connectivity between the existing community and the beachfront. This alternative would not provide hotel rooms or amusements, and it would provide significantly less eating and drinking establishments or enhancing uses. Thus, the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative



would provide fewer amenities compared with the proposed actions and falls short of achieving the ultimate goal of providing for a year round amusement and entertainment destination.

**Table 23-8** shows the net new development projected to occur within the rezoning area under the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative. As shown in the table, it is anticipated that under the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative, there would be approximately 888 residential units (including 177 affordable units), 330,435 square feet of local retail space, and 10,000 square feet of eating and drinking establishments on projected development sites in the rezoning area. This represents a decrease of approximately 1,520 residential units, 73,575 square feet of local retail, and 323,253 square feet of enhancing uses (a category that would include the 10,000 square feet of eating and drinking establishments) compared to the proposed actions. In addition, there would be no hotel, no new amusement uses, and no new amusement park under the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative.

**Table 23-8**

**Development Projected Under No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative**

Use	No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative				Proposed Actions			
	Coney East	Coney West	Coney North/Mermaid Avenue	Total	Coney East	Coney West	Coney North/Mermaid Avenue	Total
Residential (units)*	0	0	888	888	0	1,520	888	2,408
Complimentary or Local retail (sf)	0	101,000	229,435	330,435	43,236	131,339	229,435	404,010
Hotel (rooms)	0	0	0	0	468	0	138	606
Amusements (sf)	0	0	0	0	251,411	0	0	251,411
Eating and drinking establishments or Enhancing Uses (sf)**	10,000	0	0	10,000	333,253	0	0	333,253
Amusement Park – Active (rounded acres)	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	6
Amusement Park – Passive (rounded acres)	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3
<b>Note:</b> * Twenty percent of housing units would be affordable under both the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative and the proposed actions. ** Coney East would remain under the existing C7 zoning, which does not include an “Enhancing Uses” use group category. Eating and drinking establishments are a subset of Enhancing Uses. <b>Source:</b> DCP, August 2008								

## NO MAPPING ACTION ALTERNATIVE COMPARED WITH THE PROPOSED ACTIONS

### LAND USE, ZONING, AND PUBLIC POLICY

Similar to the proposed actions, the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative would develop the rezoning area with a mix of uses similar to the proposed actions. Under the proposed actions, Coney East would be transformed into a year-round entertainment and amusement district. However, under the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative, this subdistrict would only be improved with 10,000 square feet of eating and drinking establishments and there would be no new amusement uses, thereby limiting the potential for generating a diverse or vibrant base of year-round economic activity.

## **Coney Island Rezoning**

---

Both the proposed actions and the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative would include the creation of a Special Coney Island District. Similar to the proposed actions, the zoning changes would be compatible with zoning in the study areas. However, Coney East would remain under the existing C7 zoning, with a change of use to allow for eating and drinking establishments without limitation. The FAR in Coney East would be 2.0 compared with a maximum FAR of 4.5 under the proposed actions.

Both alternatives would help to meet the City's initiatives for housing by providing affordable housing units. In both alternatives, twenty percent of housing units would be affordable housing units. However, fewer affordable housing units are expected to be provided under the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative compared with the proposed actions.

Neither the proposed actions nor the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative would result in significant adverse impacts related to land use, zoning, or public policy.

### *SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS*

The No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative, like the proposed actions, would not result in a significant adverse socioeconomic impact. As indicated above, sites anticipated to receive new development (projected development sites) are the same under the proposed actions and the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative, with the exception of the skating rink and parking lot properties which would remain mapped parkland and unimproved under the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative. Under the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative, Coney East would be developed with 10,000 square feet of eating and drinking establishments, which is significantly less development than that which would occur under the proposed actions. Thus, it is likely that there would be less direct business displacement in Coney East under the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative compared with the proposed actions.

The No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative, like the proposed actions, would not have a significant adverse impact on the amusement industry.

The No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative would introduce less non-residential development than the proposed actions. This could to some degree limit upward pressures on commercial rents as compared to the proposed actions. However, the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative and proposed actions are both expected to result in a large increase in new residential units (888 for the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative and 2,408 units for the proposed actions), and the new residential populations could result in changes in consumer preferences that might lead to some indirect business displacement under either the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative or the proposed actions. Likewise, the residential population introduced under the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative could lead to some indirect residential displacement, but the extent would be no more than under the proposed actions and the displacement would not constitute a significant adverse impact.

### *COMMUNITY FACILITIES*

The No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative would introduce fewer residential units and fewer students than the proposed actions. Therefore, like the proposed actions, the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative would not result in a significant adverse impact on public schools. Also similar to the proposed actions, there would continue to be sufficient library, health care, police, and fire services. With 177 affordable housing units compared to 607

under the proposed actions, the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative would generate a lower demand for publicly funded day care seats. However, publicly funded day care facilities would operate at 136 percent capacity under the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative. Therefore, the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative, like the proposed actions, would result in a significant adverse impact on publicly funded day care facilities.

#### *OPEN SPACE*

Under the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative, the Abe Stark Rink site or the two surface parking lots west of KeySpan Park would not be demapped pursuant to State alienation legislation, as envisioned under the proposed actions. Neither would this alternative map and create Highland View Park in Coney West or map a 9.39-acre amusement park in Coney East. Unlike under the proposed actions, the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative would not directly displace and relocate the El Jardin de Boardwalk community garden and the Poseidon Playground. Under the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative, the parking lot that serves KeySpan Park would remain in its existing condition. Overall, the amount of open space in the future with the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative would be substantially less than in the future with the proposed actions.

Because the development projected to occur under the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative is less than the development projected for the proposed actions, the alternative would introduce fewer residents and workers to the rezoning area and the demands on open space would be lessened. Like the proposed actions, under the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative, all passive and active open space ratios for residents and workers would remain above DCP guidelines, with the exception of the active open space ratio for residents, which would be below DCP guidelines. Since DPR would commit to providing additional active open space for the future population resulting from either the proposed actions or No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative, neither the alternative nor the proposed actions would result in a significant adverse impact on open spaces.

#### *SHADOWS*

As described in Chapter 6, “Shadows,” the proposed actions would not be expected to result in a significant adverse shadows impact on any sunlight-sensitive open spaces, natural features, or historic resources. Any new development under the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative would occur under the existing block configuration, so building placement and resulting shadows would be different in some areas than anticipated under the proposed actions. However, based on the location of sun-sensitive resources within the rezoning area and the anticipated development sites under the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative, this alternative, like the proposed actions, would not be expected to result in significant adverse shadows impacts.

#### *HISTORIC RESOURCES*

##### *Archaeological Resources*

Because the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative would retain the existing block forms, it would result in less ground disturbance than the proposed actions. Like the proposed actions, the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative would not adversely impact archaeological resources.

### *Architectural Resources*

The No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative and proposed actions would have the same potential for impact in regards to architectural resources. The No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative, like the proposed actions, could result in construction-related impacts to two architectural resources located within the rezoning area: the Shore Theater (NYCL-eligible, S/NR-eligible) and Our Lady of Solace Roman Catholic Church (S/NR-eligible). The Parachute Jump (NYCL, S/NR) and the Childs Restaurant on the Boardwalk (NYCL) also have the potential to be impacted by construction activities, however since they are designated NYCL, they would be protected from adjacent construction through the implementation of construction protection measures required under *TPPN #10/88*. Under this alternative, the proposed Coney East subdistrict would be developed with 10,000 square feet of eating and drinking establishments, which is significantly less development than under the proposed actions. Thus, it is likely that the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative would result in fewer impacts in the proposed Coney East subdistrict than under the proposed actions. However, depending on the location of construction, there is still the possibility that impacts could occur under this alternative.

Both the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative and the proposed actions would have the potential to result in significant direct impacts on Nathan's Famous (S/NR-eligible) through redevelopment of the property, as well as significant adverse visual and contextual impacts to the Shore Theater (NYCL-eligible, S/NR-eligible) by diminishing its visual prominence on Surf Avenue. Neither the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative nor the proposed actions would result in significant adverse shadows impacts on any architectural resource.

### *URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES*

Under the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative, no streets would be mapped or demapped. Development would occur under the current block configuration. Under this alternative, the existing topography would remain and there would be limited visibility of the Atlantic Ocean and Coney Island Beach from within the rezoning area due to the elevated Boardwalk. Conversely, under the proposed actions, the topography would be altered through street grading, thereby creating new views to these natural resources.

Under the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative, no new streets would be developed such that any redevelopment would occur under the existing block configuration. However, under the proposed actions, new streets would break up the large, irregular blocks found in Coney East and there would be more access through the proposed Coney East and Coney West subdistricts. These new east-west and north-south connections would provide an enhanced streetscape compared with the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative.

As discussed above, the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative is expected to provide no north-south and east-west view corridors in the rezoning area compared with the proposed actions. Under the proposed actions, the creation of Wonder Wheel Way would provide unobstructed views to the historic visual resources, including the Wonder Wheel, Cyclone, and Parachute Jump. In addition, under the proposed actions, the extension of West 19th Street south of Surf Avenue would provide direct views to the Parachute Jump. However, under the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative, existing street configurations would remain the same, and would not provide unobstructed views of these historic resources.

Building uses would be similar under this alternative and the proposed actions. Building height, bulk, and setbacks would also be similar, but overall, there would be less density under this alternative due to the retention of existing C7 zoning in Coney East and the reduced development potential in Coney West. Like the proposed actions, this alternative would not have significant adverse impacts on these urban design features.

Overall, neither the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative nor the proposed actions would have any significant adverse impact on urban design and visual resources. However, there would be greater benefits to the area's urban design with the proposed actions compared with the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative.

#### *NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER*

The No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative, like the proposed actions, would not result in significant adverse impacts to neighborhood character. However, this alternative also would not result in the same benefits to neighborhood character that would be achieved with the proposed actions. Because the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative would retain the existing block forms, new development would have to follow the physical setting that has resulted in little or new investment in Coney Island over the past several decades. This would result in overall lesser development than anticipated under the proposed actions. The No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative also would not create new parkland or establish a network of Boardwalk recreational parks, protect open amusement uses in perpetuity through the mapping of parkland, or create new streets that would promote connectivity between the existing community and the beachfront—all things that would enhance neighborhood character in the rezoning area under the proposed actions.

#### *NATURAL RESOURCES*

The No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative and proposed actions would both utilize a combination of E-designations, Land Disposition Agreements, and Memorandums of Understanding to require further environmental investigation at sites where potential hazardous materials conditions have been identified. But under this alternative, fewer sites in Coney West would be developed. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts to groundwater resources would occur under either the proposed actions or No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative.

Flooding conditions would not be exacerbated due to construction under either the proposed actions or No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative because the floodplain is affected by coastal flooding rather than fluvial or local flooding.

The No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative, like the proposed actions, would impact terrestrial resources in the rezoning area. However, the wildlife species expected to occur within this area are common to urban areas, and the loss of some individuals would not result in a significant adverse impact under either the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative or the proposed actions.

Development under the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative would require the same stormwater management and BMPs as described for the proposed actions. Implementation of these measures would improve the quality of stormwater and reduce the rate of discharge to Coney Island Creek, which could improve water quality of Coney Island Creek during and after precipitation events.

## **Coney Island Rezoning**

---

The majority of endangered, threatened, and candidate species with the potential to occur within the rezoning area are limited to transient individuals. Construction of the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative would not be expected to result in significant adverse impacts to these individuals. It is expected that Essential Fish Habitat would also remain unchanged under the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative.

Neither the proposed actions nor the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative would result in a significant adverse impact to natural resources.

### ***HAZARDOUS MATERIALS***

The No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative and proposed actions would both utilize E-designations, Land Disposition Agreements, and Memorandums of Understanding to require further environmental investigation at sites where potential hazardous materials conditions have been identified. Where necessary, remediation performed to the satisfaction of DEP would be required before development-related building permits could be issued by DOB. Additionally, construction-phase health and safety plans, which must also be approved by DEP, would be required including procedures to address any known concerns as well as contingencies should unexpected contamination be encountered. With these controls in place, there would be no significant adverse hazardous materials impact under either the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative or the proposed actions.

### ***WATERFRONT REVITALIZATION PROGRAM (WRP)***

Though it would not facilitate development to the same degree as the proposed actions, the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative, like the proposed actions, would generally be consistent with the WRP policies of encouraging commercial and residential redevelopment in appropriate coastal zone areas, providing public access to and along the City's coastal waters, protecting scenic resources that contribute to the visual quality of the City's coastal area, and avoiding adverse effects to historic and cultural resources. However, under the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative, two large parking lots would remain in proposed Coney West subdistrict and no new mapped neighborhood park would be created to enhance community access and enjoyment of the waterfront.

### ***INFRASTRUCTURE***

The No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative would generate less demand for potable water, sanitary sewage disposal, and stormwater discharge compared to the proposed actions. As with the proposed actions, any incremental development taking place in portions of the rezoning area with limited infrastructure capacity would require some improvement, such as upgrades to critical sewer segments or provision of stormwater detention, to be undertaken by the developer(s). Because the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative would result in less development overall as compared to the proposed actions, a greater proportion of the new development could take place based on incremental infrastructure upgrades and, therefore, an Amended Drainage Plan for the entire rezoning area may not be put in place. The No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative would require the same stormwater management and BMPs as described for the proposed actions. With the required improvements, neither the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative nor the proposed actions would result in a significant adverse infrastructure impact.

*SOLID WASTE AND SANITATION SERVICES*

As described in Chapter 14, “Solid Waste and Sanitation Services,” the proposed actions would result in a modest increase in demand for solid waste handling services from DSNY and private carters (less than one DSNY truck load per day to serve residential uses and up to 2.5 private contractor truckloads per day for non-residential uses), which would not overburden DSNY or private sector service providers. The No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative would generate a lower volume of solid waste compared to the proposed actions. Therefore, the burden on DSNY and private carters would be less than under the proposed actions and would also not cause a significant adverse impact on solid waste services.

*ENERGY*

The No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative would generate less energy demand than with the proposed actions. It is anticipated that energy supplies are sufficient to meet the demand from the rezoning area under both the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative and the proposed actions.

*TRAFFIC AND PARKING*

Travel demand estimates were conducted for the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative. Because the land uses proposed for the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative are comparable to those under the proposed actions, trip-making characteristics, travel patterns, and directionality are expected to be similar. As shown in **Tables 23-9** and **23-10**, the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative is expected to generate 32 to 60 percent fewer peak hour person trips and 53 to 70 percent fewer peak hour vehicle trips than the proposed actions. Compared to the proposed actions, the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative is expected to result in fewer significant adverse traffic impacts and impacts of lesser magnitudes. Similarly, the significant adverse traffic impacts under the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative would be more readily mitigated than those projected for the proposed actions. Some locations, however, may still be unmitigatable. With regard to parking, the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative would require the creation of fewer parking spaces and not yield additional on-street spaces on the new mapped streets that would otherwise be created under the proposed actions. However, as with the proposed actions, the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative is not expected to result in a potential for significant adverse parking impacts.

**Table 23-9**

**Person-Trip Comparisons: No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative vs. Proposed Actions**

Peak Hour	No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative			Proposed Actions		
	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Weekday AM	805	1,280	2,085	1,591	2,782	4,373
Weekday Midday	4,280	4,242	8,522	6,619	5,968	12,587
Weekday PM	2,733	2,421	5,154	6,125	5,362	11,487
Saturday MD	2,790	2,342	5,132	7,139	5,787	12,926
Saturday PM	2,232	2,636	4,868	5,034	6,058	11,092

**Table 23-10**

**Vehicle-Trip Comparisons: No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative vs. Proposed Actions**

Peak Hour	No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative			Proposed Actions		
	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Weekday AM	111	240	351	339	677	1,016
Weekday Midday	420	409	829	965	826	1,791
Weekday PM	367	284	651	1,104	878	1,982
Saturday MD	357	314	671	1,201	1,025	2,226
Saturday PM	286	319	605	857	977	1,834

#### *TRANSIT AND PEDESTRIANS*

Similar to vehicular trip generation, the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative is expected to generate substantially fewer transit and pedestrian trips during the analysis peak periods. Consequently, the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative may not result in some of the significant adverse impacts to the B36, B68, B74, B82, and X38 bus routes identified for the proposed actions. The No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative may also avoid the significant adverse pedestrian impacts identified for the east and west crosswalks at the Stillwell Avenue and Surf Avenue intersection.

#### *AIR QUALITY*

The proposed actions would not result in any significant adverse air quality impacts on sensitive uses in the surrounding community, and the proposed actions would not be adversely affected by existing sources of air emissions in the study area. The No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative would generate fewer vehicle trips than the proposed actions; therefore, its development is expected to result in lower vehicle emissions at nearby intersections. The No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative would also result in lower emissions from on-site parking facilities since less parking would be added compared to the proposed actions. Both the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative and the proposed actions would generate point source emissions from new heating, ventilation, and air conditions (HVAC) systems, but since the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative would include less commercial development, the HVAC emissions would be lower. Overall, the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative would be expected to generate lower emissions than the proposed actions, but neither alternative would result in adverse impacts on air quality.

#### *NOISE*

Under the proposed actions, a significant adverse impact was predicted to occur in the weekday AM and midday peak periods at receptor site 6, on West 17th Street between Neptune Avenue and Mermaid Avenue, with an increase in noise levels of 3.5 dBA and 4.5 dBA, respectively, over the future without the proposed actions. This noise impact was principally due to noise generated by the large incremental traffic volumes on West 17th Street. Compared with the proposed actions, the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative results in substantially fewer trips in the weekday AM peak hour and in the midday peak hour. As a result, this alternative would likely result in smaller noise increases at receptor site 6, and it would likely not reach the 3 dBA CEQR impact criteria threshold for a significant adverse impact.



Under the proposed actions, there would be increases in noise levels at receptor site 11 (Stillwell Avenue between Surf Avenue and the Boardwalk) between the Build and No Build scenarios of more than 10 dBA for all analysis periods, except for the weekday AM peak period. This noise impact was due principally to noise generated by amusement park activities which is not expected to be developed under the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative. Therefore, unlike the proposed actions, the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative would not be expected to result in significant adverse noise impacts at receptor site 11

### *CONSTRUCTION*

Because the amount of new construction under this alternative would be less as compared with the proposed actions, and the street network within the rezoning area would not be reconfigured, the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative would not generate as much temporary construction disruption. However, construction-related impacts on historic architectural resources would be similar since the same sites would be impacted. Thus, the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative and the proposed actions both have the potential to result in significant adverse construction-related impacts to the Shore Theater (NYCL-eligible, S/NR-eligible) and Our Lady of Solace Roman Catholic Church (S/NR-eligible), and significant direct impacts on Nathan's Famous (S/NR-eligible).

The No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative could result in a lesser intensity of construction-related noise and traffic than the proposed actions. However, neither this alternative nor the proposed actions would result in significant adverse impacts on air quality, noise, traffic, or transit during construction. Because the development program would be less under the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative, the economic benefits attributable to construction expenditures and construction jobs under the proposed actions would not be as substantial under this alternative.

### *PUBLIC HEALTH*

Like the proposed actions, the Lesser Development Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts to public health.

## **F. CONCLUSIONS**

The **No Action Alternative** describes the conditions that would exist if the proposed Coney Island Rezoning plan were not implemented. This alternative would result in only modest growth in residential and commercial uses within the proposed rezoning area. It would not result in the large-scale redevelopment of vacant and underutilized land, nor would it result in new mapped parkland, or in enhanced views to the beach and to the area's visual resources through street and parkland mapping and demapping. With this alternative, the area would remain largely in its current condition, characterized by a mix of vacant land, parking lots, amusement rides, and low-rise entertainment and commercial buildings in the amusement area, large recreational facilities, and low-rise residential buildings. This alternative would avoid the proposed actions' significant adverse impacts related to publicly funded day care facilities, traffic, transit and pedestrians, and noise. Unlike the proposed actions, no affordable housing units would be provided under the No Action Alternative. The No Action Alternative would not require the relocation of El Jardin de Boardwalk, the Abe Stark Rink, or the Poseidon Playground, which would be displaced and relocated under the proposed actions. However, the 1.41 acre Highland View Park and newly created amusement area would not be created under the No Action

Alternative. The No Action Alternative would create a shadows impact on the Our Lady of Solace Church. Overall, with little new investment and development, and no preservation or expected development of amusement uses, the No Action Alternative would not achieve the principal goals and objectives that define the proposed actions.

The **Lesser Density Alternative** assumes a redevelopment plan similar to that of the proposed actions, but with less development. Like the proposed actions, the 9.39-acre amusement park would be mapped in Coney East, a 1.41 acre community park would be mapped in Coney West, and several streets would be mapped and demapped. Views to Coney Island Beach and the Atlantic Ocean would be enhanced in the rezoning area under both the Lesser Density Alternative and the proposed actions. The Lesser Density Alternative would avoid the proposed actions' significant adverse impact related to publicly funded day care seats and would result in fewer significant adverse impacts to traffic, and transit and pedestrians. However, the Lesser Density Alternative would not create a Special Coney Island District, which would define development parameters and urban design controls under the proposed actions, and would not provide for the development of affordable housing units since no Inclusionary Housing Program would be established. In addition, the proposed Coney East subdistrict would only be developed with 10,000 square feet of eating and drinking establishments. This amount of development is significantly lower than under the proposed actions, and would not enable the Coney East subdistrict to transform into a year-round entertainment and amusement destination—one of the primary goals of the proposed actions. Both plans would create new jobs and tax revenue sources, but because the Lesser Density Alternative would result in substantially less commercial use, its economic benefits would be similarly reduced compared with the proposed actions. Overall, this alternative would not meet the project's goals as effectively as the proposed actions.

The **15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative** would create a 15-acre mapped open amusement park rather than the 9-acre park that would be added under the proposed actions. Unlike under the proposed actions, Wonder Wheel Way would not be created and would not connect the Parachute Jump, the Cyclone, and the Wonder Wheel. Both the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative and the proposed actions would generate the same demand for public day care seats, and under both scenarios, publicly funded day care facilities would operate substantially over capacity, resulting in a significant adverse impact. Both plans are expected to generate a similar number of significant adverse traffic, transit, and pedestrian impacts. At the same time, the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative would not offer all of the benefits associated with the proposed actions. Because there would be fewer enclosed amusements, entertainment, and district-enhancing uses in Coney East under the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative, this alternative would not transform Coney East into a year-round entertainment and amusement destination—one of the primary goals of the proposed actions. Further, because there would be less complementary retail, amusements, and enhancing uses under the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative, it would provide fewer new jobs and tax revenue sources compared with the proposed actions. Overall, the 15-Acre Mapped Amusement Parkland Alternative is less likely than the proposed actions to achieve the balance of goals and objectives established for the proposed Coney Island Rezoning.

The **No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative** would develop the rezoning area with uses that are similar to those described under the proposed actions, but without mapping or demapping any streets or parkland. Under this alternative, the 9.39-acre amusement park and the 1.41 acre Highland View Park would not be mapped, and the parking lot that serves KeySpan Park would remain in its existing condition rather than being redeveloped as active parkland

under the proposed actions. Because no streets or parkland would be mapped or demapped under this alternative, development would occur under the existing block configuration. Thus, this alternative would not facilitate connections between the existing community and the beachfront as the proposed actions would. Under the No Mapping Action Alternative, there would be fewer significant adverse impacts to traffic, transit and pedestrians, and noise compared with the proposed actions. However, both the proposed actions and the No Demapping and Mapping Action Alternative would result in a significant adverse impact on publicly funded daycare facilities. Development in Coney East would be limited to 10,000 square feet of eating and drinking establishments. Because there would be less development in Coney East under this alternative, it is likely that fewer businesses would be displaced compared with the proposed actions. However, the amount of development that would take place in Coney East as a result of this alternative would be substantially less than under the proposed actions, and would fall short of achieving the ultimate goal of providing for a year-round entertainment and amusement destination. \*