

A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter considers the effects of the ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project on neighborhood character.¹ Neighborhood character is an amalgam of various elements that give a neighborhood its distinct “personality.” These elements may include a neighborhood’s land use, socioeconomic conditions, open space, shadows, historic resources, urban design and visual resources, transportation, and noise. Not all of these elements affect neighborhood character in all cases; a neighborhood usually draws its distinctive character from a few defining elements. According to the 2020 *City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manual*, neighborhood character impacts are rare and occur under unusual circumstances in which, in the absence of an impact in any of the relevant technical areas, a combination of moderate effects to the neighborhood would result in an impact to neighborhood character. Moreover, a significant impact identified in one of the technical areas that contribute to a neighborhood’s character does not automatically result in a significant impact on neighborhood character.

As described in Chapter 1, “Project Description,” the ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project would result in the development of an up to approximately 680,500-gross square foot (gsf) mixed-use building containing market-rate and affordable housing, retail, office, and community facility spaces as well as parking on the Development Site (Block 98, Lot 1; the Development Site), as well as the restoration, reopening, and potential expansion of the South Street Seaport Museum (the Museum) at 89-93 South Street, 2-4 Fulton Street, and 167-175 John Street (Block 74, a portion of Lot 1; the Museum Site). The ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project would additionally include operational changes to facilitate passenger drop off on the Pier 17 access drive as well as minor improvements to the Pier 17 access drive area and building, and may also include streetscape, open space, or other improvements (e.g., planters) under the Proposed Actions within the Project Area.

For each of the key technical areas related to neighborhood character, this chapter describes existing conditions, future conditions without the ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project, and conditions with the ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project. In addition, in accordance with the guidance of the *CEQR Technical Manual*, this analysis considers the potential for the ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project to affect neighborhood character through a combination of moderate effects in relevant technical areas.

¹ Since the publication of the DEIS, the Applicant has withdrawn the application for the previously proposed project and submitted a modified application (Application Number C 210438(A) ZSM; the “A-Application”) with proposed changes to the project—this modified version of the project is described and considered in this FEIS as the Reduced Impact Alternative, as outlined in Chapter 18, “Alternatives.”

PRINCIPAL CONCLUSIONS

Overall, the ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project would not substantially alter the character of the neighborhood and would likely have beneficial effects on a number of the defining features of the neighborhood. While the ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project would result in significant adverse impacts in the contributing technical areas of open space, shadows, historic resources, and transportation, these effects would not be of such a degree that they would result in significant adverse impacts to neighborhood character. The ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project would also not be expected to result in a combination of moderate effects to several elements that could cumulatively impact neighborhood character.

The ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project would support ongoing efforts to revitalize and activate the South Street Seaport neighborhood. The ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project would activate the currently underused Development Site with a new mixed-use building containing ground-floor retail and community facility spaces, creating a more pedestrian-friendly environment. The new mix of uses would be compatible with and support the surrounding neighborhood, and the previously proposed building on the Development Site would be consistent with other nearby buildings.

The ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project would also result in the restoration, reopening, and potential expansion of the Museum on the Museum Site, furthering the preservation and revitalization of the neighborhood. Furthermore, the ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project would increase the resiliency of the Development Site, incorporate sustainability measures, and introduce new affordable housing to the neighborhood.

By activating the Development Site with new mixed uses including affordable housing and by restoring, reopening, and potentially expanding the Museum, the ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project would be expected to sustain and enhance the South Street Seaport neighborhood as a major destination for New Yorkers and visitors to the region alike. Overall, the ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project would be consistent with the existing character of the study area, as well as with the ongoing trend towards revitalization within the surrounding neighborhood. In addition, it is not expected that moderate effects in the relevant technical areas would result in a cumulative adverse impact on neighborhood character.

As a result, the ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project is expected to enhance the neighborhood character of the study area and would not result in any significant adverse impacts to neighborhood character.

B. METHODOLOGY

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, an analysis of neighborhood character begins with a preliminary assessment to determine whether changes expected in other technical areas may affect an element that contributes to neighborhood character. The assessment should identify the defining features of the neighborhood, and assess whether the project has the potential to affect these defining features, either through the potential for significant adverse impacts or a combination of moderate effects. Potential effects on neighborhood character may include the following:

- *Land Use.* When development resulting from a proposed project would have the potential to change neighborhood character by introducing a new, incompatible land use; conflicting with

land use policy or other public plans for the area; changing land use character; or resulting in significant land use impacts.

- *Socioeconomic Conditions.* Changes in socioeconomic conditions have the potential to affect neighborhood character when they result in substantial direct or indirect displacement or addition of population, employment, or businesses; substantial differences in population or employment density; or if a project results in changes to a unique industry.
- *Open Space.* Changes in open spaces have the potential to affect neighborhood character when a proposed project would result in the overburdening of existing open space facilities or would exacerbate an existing deficiency in open space.
- *Shadows.* When an action would result in a substantial reduction in the usability of an open space, or in the use, enjoyment, or appreciation of the sunlight-sensitive features of a historic resource as a result of increased shadow, there is a potential to affect neighborhood character.
- *Historic Resources.* When a project would result in substantial direct changes to a historic resource or substantial changes to public views of a resource, or when a historic resources analysis identifies a significant impact in this category, there is a potential to affect neighborhood character.
- *Urban Design and Visual Resources.* In developed areas, urban design changes have the potential to affect neighborhood character by introducing substantially different building bulk, form, size, scale, or arrangement. Urban design changes may also affect block forms, street patterns, or street hierarchies, as well as streetscape elements such as streetwalls, landscaping, curb cuts, and loading docks. Visual resource changes have the potential to affect neighborhood character by directly changing visual features such as unique and important public view corridors and vistas, or public visual access to such features.
- *Transportation.* Changes in transportation conditions can affect neighborhood character in a number of ways. For traffic to have an effect on neighborhood character, it must be a contributing element to the character of the neighborhood (either by its absence or its presence), and it must change substantially as a result of the project. Such substantial traffic changes can include change in level of service (LOS) to C or below; change in traffic patterns; change in roadway classifications; change in vehicle mixes; substantial increases in traffic volumes on residential streets; or significant traffic impacts, as identified in that technical analysis. Regarding pedestrians, when a proposed project would result in substantially different pedestrian activity and circulation, it has the potential to affect neighborhood character.
- *Noise.* For a project to affect neighborhood character in regard to noise, it would need to result in a significant adverse noise impact and a change in acceptability category.

As detailed in relevant chapters of this ~~Draft Final~~ Environmental Impact Statement (~~FEIS~~~~EIS~~), the ~~Proposed Project~~~~previously proposed project~~ would result in significant adverse impacts in the contributing technical areas of open space, shadows, historic resources, and transportation. Potential mitigation measures to address these im-pacts are detailed in Chapter 19, “Mitigation.”

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a proposed project can also have a combination of moderate effects to several elements that cumulatively may affect neighborhood character. A “moderate” effect is generally defined as an effect that is reasonably close to the significant adverse impact threshold for a particular technical analysis area. A combination of moderate effects that could affect defining features, may occur, for example, with a proposal for a large office complex in an area characterized by quiet residential streets with limited pedestrian and

vehicular traffic. Therefore, this analysis also evaluates the potential for the ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project to affect neighborhood character through a combination of effects.

STUDY AREA

As described in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the study area for a preliminary analysis of neighborhood character is typically consistent with the study areas in the relevant technical areas that contribute to the defining elements of the neighborhood. Therefore, the study area for this analysis reflects those considered for the other analyses, which generally extend ¼-mile to ½-mile from the Project Area.

C. PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT

EXISTING CONDITIONS

LAND USE

As described in Chapter 2, “Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy,” the ¼-mile land use study area is defined by a diverse mix of land uses and building types. Land uses within the study area include residential, mixed residential and commercial, commercial and office, hotel, community facility, open space and outdoor recreation, transportation and utility, and parking uses as well as vacant land and sites that are under construction. Building types range from the historic four-story mixed-use buildings on Schermerhorn Row to the 57-story 161 Maiden Lane.

The study area includes the South Street Seaport neighborhood, which is generally located south of the Brooklyn Bridge with an eastern border at Water Street and southern border at Maiden Lane/Pine Street, as well as portions of the Financial District neighborhood to the west and northwest, Civic Center neighborhood to the north, Two Bridges neighborhood to the northeast, and part of the East River to the east and south. The South Street Seaport neighborhood is generally composed of small-scale, often historic, buildings that are the core of the South Street Seaport Historic District with larger and more modern buildings located at the periphery. The Financial District, historically the City’s primary commercial center, is largely made up of high-density office and other commercial uses. The Civic Center area contains several community facility uses including New York-Presbyterian/Lower Manhattan Hospital, the facilities of Pace University, and City offices, with the Southbridge Towers superblock residential complex being located between the Civic Center and Project Area. Two Bridges is located on the north side of the Brooklyn Bridge and is generally features residential uses with several mid to high rise housing developments including contains New York City Housing Authority developments.

As shown in Figure 2-2, the Project Area spans C5-3, C6-2A, and C4-6 zoning districts, the Development Site is in the C6-2A district while the Museum Site is in the C5-3 district. The Project Area is also located within the Special Lower Manhattan District, as is much of the study area.

SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS

As discussed in Chapter 3, “Socioeconomic Conditions,” in 2018 the socioeconomic study area contained 23,728 residents in 11,403 households, with the majority of households renting in multi-family buildings with 50 or more units. The average annual household income within the study

area was \$182,313, higher than the Manhattan and New York City average household incomes. The median annual household income within the study area was \$141,569, also in excess of the Manhattan and New York City median household incomes. Median monthly rents in the study area range from \$2,542 for studio units to \$5,490 for three-bedroom units.

In 2018 there were an estimated 108,388 employees in the socioeconomic study area, representing 4.3 percent of Manhattan's total employment and 2.4 percent of employment in all of New York City. Within the socioeconomic study area, the Finance and Insurance sector accounts for the largest share of employment (25.2 percent), followed by the Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services sector (18.8 percent). Much of the finance and office-based employment is located within the Financial District northwest and west of the Project Area. The third-largest industry sector in the study area is Public Administration (12.2 percent of total employment). This relatively high concentration of public-sector employment is due to the study area's inclusion of the Civic Center neighborhood, located to the north of the Project Area.

OPEN SPACE

As described in Chapter 4, "Open Space," the ¼-mile nonresidential study area contains 42 publicly accessible open spaces with a total of approximately 20.78 acres of space, of this total space, approximately 4.23 acres is active open space and approximately 16.55 acres is passive open space. The ½-mile residential study area contains an additional 21 publicly accessible open spaces raising the total amount of space to 47.43 acres, of which approximately 11.92 acres is active open space and approximately 35.51 acres is passive open space.

With an estimated worker population of 92,027 in the nonresidential open space study area, the 0.180 acres of passive publicly accessible open space per worker exceeds the City's goal of 0.15 acres of passive open space per worker. There are an estimated 50,415 residents in the residential open space study area, resulting in open space ratios of 0.941, 0.236, and 0.704 acres of total, active, and passive open space per resident respectively. The passive open space ratio exceeds the City's goal of 0.5 acres of passive open per resident, however, the total and active open space ratios do not meet the City's goals of 2.5 acres and 2.0 acres of total and active open space per resident. The predominant natural feature in the study area is the East River; as a result prominent open space resources within the study area include the East River Esplanade and Piers 15-17, which contain walkways, seating, panoramic views, landscaping, tables, and bike lanes and other features.

SHADOWS

As described in Chapter 5, "Shadows," the longest shadows that could be cast by the new structures introduced by the ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project were calculated; using that radius as the shadows study area, potential sunlight-sensitive resources were identified. Within the study area, several publicly accessible open spaces, including the Southbridge Towers complex open spaces, Peck Slip, and Fishbridge Garden were identified for detailed analysis.

HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

As described in Chapter 6, "Historic and Cultural Resources," there are several known architectural resources within the historic and cultural resources study area, including four known architectural resources within the Project Area. Historic resources are defining features of the study area's neighborhood character. The South Street Seaport Historic District and Extension contain the largest concentration of early-19th century commercial buildings in New York. The

district includes Greek Revival counting houses of the 1830s, most built with granite façades on the first floor with brick above. A few of the counting houses have stone fronts. By the second half of the 19th century, when the South Street area had lost its prominence in New York's commercial life, many buildings were converted for the wholesale Fulton Fish Market. The Museum Site is located within the Schermerhorn Row Block, buildings constructed between 1811 and 1849 as warehouses or counting houses that are now at the center of the Historic District.

URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES

As described in Chapter 7, "Urban Design and Visual Resources," the urban design study area is characterized by the low-scale buildings of the Historic District with skyscrapers such as the 442-foot-tall 199 Water Street and 820-foot-tall 28 Liberty Street at its periphery and in the Financial District to the west. North of the Brooklyn Bridge are the NYCHA Governor Alfred E. Smith Houses and the Southbridge towers residential complex occupies a superblock across Pearl Street from the Development Site. North of the Southbridge Towers are the buildings of the New York-Presbyterian/Lower Manhattan Hospital and Pace University as well as the 870-foot-tall New York by Gehry residential tower. The areas along the waterfront within and near the Project Area contain Piers 15-17 in use for recreational, cultural/entertainment, restaurant, and retail purposes, and the elevated Franklin Delano Roosevelt East River Drive (FDR Drive) running along the waterfront is a defining element of the area.

The study area provides unique public view corridors and vistas, including to several visual resources such as the Brooklyn Bridge, which are defining features of the study area's neighborhood character. There are several different view corridors from the study area towards the waterfront and the FDR Drive. The historic buildings and streetscapes of the South Street Historic District are a visual resource, best seen from within the Historic District itself. Notable towers that can be seen from within the study area including 66 Pine Street, New York by Gehry, and One World Trade Center.

TRANSPORTATION

The character of the study area, like that of many neighborhoods in New York City, is in part defined by the levels of pedestrian and vehicular activity that exist in the study area. The Project Area is in a busy part of Manhattan that is densely developed and populated with workers, residents, and visitors. As noted in Chapter 11, "Transportation," the neighborhood generally has high volumes of pedestrian traffic, and traffic volumes are particularly high along the major roads in the study area, including Water Street and Pearl Streets.

NOISE

As noted in Chapter 14, "Noise," the dominant source of noise in the study area is from vehicular traffic on adjacent roadways based on field measurements and monitoring. Measured noise levels are acceptable, marginally acceptable, and marginally unacceptable and reflect the level of vehicular activity on proximate major roadways, including the FDR Drive.

THE FUTURE WITHOUT THE PREVIOUSLY PROPOSED PROJECT

As described in Chapter 1, "Project Description," in the future without the ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project (the No Action condition), the Development Site is anticipated to be redeveloped with a new as-of-right building that would not require any discretionary approvals requiring environmental review. Development under the No Action condition would be

a 120-foot tall, approximately 327,400-gsf building containing approximately 302,670 gsf of residential uses (approximately 302 ~~dwelling units [DU]~~ ~~[dwelling units]~~, all market-rate), 19,730 gsf of retail uses, 5,000 gsf of community facility uses, and 65 parking spaces. While the future of the Museum remains uncertain, for purposes of analysis, it is conservatively assumed that absent the ~~Proposed Project~~ previously proposed project, the Museum would permanently close. As such, there would be no renovated spaces for the Museum, nor would there be a potential expansion of the Museum.

In addition, a number of other planned development projects are expected to be completed within the surrounding study areas by 2026; these planned development projects will further contribute to the study area's neighborhood character. The projects expected to be developed in the No Action condition would not significantly alter the study area's neighborhood character. Rather, these projects represent a continuation of the ongoing trend towards mixed-uses in Lower Manhattan, a result of the area's historic character, diverse employment opportunities, numerous attractions, and increasing amenities.

PROBABLE IMPACTS OF THE ~~PREVIOUSLY PROPOSED~~ ~~PROPOSED~~ PROJECT

The ~~Proposed Project~~ previously proposed project would result in new development of an up to approximately 680,500-gsf mixed-use building containing up to 394 DUs (99 of which would be affordable), 13,353 gsf of retail, 267,747 gsf of office, and 5,000 gsf of community facility space as well as 108 parking spaces on the Development Site. The ~~Proposed Project~~ previously proposed project would also result in the restoration, reopening, and potential expansion of the Museum on the Museum Site with 86,691 gsf of museum space, including 27,996 gsf of renovated space, 26,312 gsf of reopened space, and 32,383 gsf of new space in the potential expansion. The ~~Proposed Project~~ previously proposed project would additionally include operational changes to facilitate passenger drop off on the Pier 17 access drive as well as minor improvements to the Pier 17 access drive area and building, and may also include streetscape, open space, or other improvements (e.g., planters) under the Proposed Actions within the Project Area.

The ~~Proposed Project~~ previously proposed project would support ongoing efforts to revitalize and activate the South Street Seaport neighborhood. It would activate the currently underused Development Site with a new mixed-use building containing ground-floor retail and community facility spaces, creating a more pedestrian-friendly environment and supporting the surrounding neighborhood. The restoration, reopening, and potential expansion of the Museum on the Museum Site under the ~~Proposed Project~~ previously proposed project would further the preservation and revitalization of the neighborhood. It is assumed that the Museum, a key part of the neighborhood and draw for tourists since 1967, would permanently close absent the ~~Proposed Project~~ previously proposed project. Furthermore, the ~~Proposed Project~~ previously proposed project would increase the resiliency of the Development Site, incorporate sustainability measures, and introduce new affordable housing to the neighborhood.

By activating the Development Site with new mixed uses including affordable housing and by restoring, reopening, and potentially expanding the Museum, the ~~Proposed Project~~ previously proposed project would sustain and enhance the South Street Seaport neighborhood as a major destination for New Yorkers and visitors to the region alike.

LAND USE

Overall, the proposed land uses would be compatible with and support of the mix uses in the study area, which include residential, mixed residential and commercial, commercial and office, hotel, community facility, open space and outdoor recreation, transportation and utility, and parking uses as well as vacant land and sites that are under construction. The ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project would activate an underutilized brownfield site, further tying the neighborhood together and enhancing its vitality. The restoration, reopening, and potential expansion of the Museum would also ensure its continued operation as an important regional attraction in the neighborhood. The introduction of affordable housing to the neighborhood and incorporation of sustainability and resiliency features would be consistent with and supportive of applicable public policies.

Overall, the land use changes associated with the ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project would not result in any significant adverse impacts to the neighborhood character of the study area or contribute to a combination of moderate effects with the potential to affect defining features of the neighborhood.

SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS

The ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project would not result in any significant adverse impacts to socioeconomic conditions, and there would be no related effects on neighborhood character, including moderate effects with the potential to affect defining features of the neighborhood.

OPEN SPACE

While the ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project would introduce new workers and residents to the study area. The ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project would result in a small increase in population but would not result in any significant adverse indirect impacts to neighborhood character related to open space. The ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project would not result in the loss of open space or cause any significant adverse open space impacts from direct effects with the exception of one open space resource. The ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project would result in a potential significant adverse shadows impact to the Southbridge Towers complex open spaces resulting from new shadow cast by the ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project, but the impact to one resource would not result in a significant adverse impact to neighborhood character related to open space or contribute to a combination of moderate effects with the potential to affect defining features of the neighborhood.

SHADOWS

While the ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project would result in some incremental shadows, these changes would not adversely affect natural features or vegetation, or the use of open space with the exception of one resource, the Southbridge Towers complex open spaces. In most cases the new shadow would be limited in extent and duration and would not substantially affect the use of the spaces or the health of their trees and plantings. For the Southbridge Towers complex open spaces, a potential significant adverse impact would occur. The potential effects on this one resource would not change the character of the neighborhood as a whole; therefore, the ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project would not result in any significant adverse impacts to neighborhood character resulting from new shadow or contribute to a combination of moderate effects with the potential to affect defining features of the neighborhood.

HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

As noted above, historic resources, particularly the South Street Seaport Historic District, are considered a defining feature of the character of the neighborhood. New construction and renovation on both the Development Site and the Museum Site are subject to LPC review and approval. As noted in Chapter 6, “Historic and Cultural Resources,” for the purposes of this FEIS/DEIS, a new building on the Development Site that would be developed to the maximum building envelope (e.g., up to a maximum height of 395 feet) analyzed under the RWCDs would be considered to have the potential to result in significant contextual adverse impacts to historic resources. See Chapter 6, “Historic and Cultural Resources,” and Chapter 19, “Mitigation.”

URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES

While the proposed mixed-use building on the Development Site containing residential, office, retail, and community facility uses would be larger and taller than the No Action building at a height of up to approximately 395 feet compared to the 120-foot tall No Action building (157 feet tall including bulkhead), it would be compatible in terms of scale, height, massing, and materials with the urban design of the study area. Urban Design and the pedestrian experience would be further enhanced by the restoration of existing buildings for continued Museum use by potentially by the development of an expansion to the Museum on the vacant lot at the corner of John Street and South Street. This expansion would be compatible with the scale, massing, and materials of the Schermerhorn Row block and with the historic district as a whole, creating a consistent streetwall and filling in the gap in the Schermerhorn Row block created by the vacant lot.

The ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project would introduce a new, taller building on the Development Site and potentially a new expansion to the Museum on the Museum Site compared to the No Action condition. Views from Pearl Street to the historic district buildings on Water Street, Beekman Street, and Peck Slip would experience the most changes with the ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project, as the new building on the Development Site, as in the No Action condition, would be visible from these streets. The previously proposed building on the Development Site, like the No Action building, would not block the view corridors along Pearl Street, Water Street, Beekman Street, or Pike Slip, nor would either building block views toward the waterfront, of the lighthouse in Titanic Park, or of the Brooklyn Bridge. The addition of this new taller building would alter certain views in the surrounding area. From a distance, the building would be part of the larger context of Lower Manhattan and act as a transition building from the waterfront to the Financial District.

Overall, the ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project would be expected to have a beneficial effect on the pedestrian experience and neighborhood character. The previously proposed building on the Development Site would have beneficial effects on the pedestrian experience by redeveloping the large parking lot on the site with a new building that includes active ground floor retail, community facility, and residential uses. Further, the previously proposed building, like the No Action building, would fill a large gap within the boundaries of the South Street Seaport Historic District. Therefore, the urban design and visual resource changes resulting from the ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project would not result in any significant adverse neighborhood character impacts or contribute to a combination of moderate effects with the potential to affect defining features of the neighborhood.

TRANSPORTATION

The Project Area and surrounding neighborhood would continue to include busy pedestrian and vehicular thoroughfares, and neighborhood character would not be adversely affected due to effects of the proposed actions on transportation. The character of the study area, like that of much of Lower Manhattan and many neighborhoods in New York City, is in part defined by the levels of pedestrian and vehicular activity that exist—the neighborhood contains roadways that carry relatively high volumes of traffic, including the overhead FDR Drive, Water Street, Pearl Street, South Street and Fulton Street.

As described in Chapter 11, “Transportation,” the ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project has the potential to result in significant adverse pedestrian and traffic impacts at certain locations. For traffic conditions, significant adverse impacts have been identified at three intersections (Pearl Street/Beekman Street, Pearl Street/Dover Street and Pearl Street/Robert Wagner Sr. Place) during the weekday AM, midday, and PM peak hours. For pedestrian conditions, significant adverse impacts are expected at one corner (the southeast corner of Pearl Street and Frankfort Street) during the weekday midday and PM peak hours.

Potential improvement measures that may be implemented to mitigate these impacts are discussed in Chapter 19, “Mitigation.” While the ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project may result in unmitigated traffic and/or pedestrian impacts, the increased presence of vehicles along Pearl Street and additional pedestrians in the area resulting from the ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project would not be such that there would be a significant change to the overall character of the neighborhood and any increase would not be out of character for the densely built neighborhood. Therefore, the increased traffic and pedestrian volumes resulting from the ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project would not result in an overall impact to neighborhood character.

NOISE

With the ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project, the maximum increase in $L_{eq(1)}$ noise levels for the With Action condition would be 1.6 dBA or less at all mobile source noise analysis receptors. Changes of this magnitude would not be noticeable according to *CEQR Technical Manual* guidance and would fall below the CEQR threshold for a significant adverse noise impact. The increase in noise levels with the ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project would therefore be imperceptible and would not affect neighborhood character. Noise conditions would remain in the “acceptable, marginally acceptable, and marginally unacceptable” CEQR categories.

CONCLUSION

The previously proposed project would not result in a combination of moderate effects to several elements that could cumulatively impact neighborhood character. Overall, the ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project would not substantially alter the character of the neighborhood and the Applicant believes that it would likely have beneficial effects on a number of the defining features of the neighborhood. While the ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project would result in significant adverse impacts in the contributing technical areas of open space, shadows, historic resources, and transportation, these effects would not be of such a degree that they would result in significant adverse impacts to neighborhood character.

~~The Proposed Project would also not be expected to result in a combination of moderate effects to several elements that could cumulatively impact neighborhood character.~~ Overall, the ~~Proposed~~

~~Project~~previously proposed project would be expected to result in revitalization that would improve the existing character of the neighborhood; as a result, the ~~Proposed Project~~previously proposed project would not result in any significant adverse impacts on neighborhood character.

*