

## **Appendix F**

### **Development Site 2 Conceptual Analysis**

## A. INTRODUCTION

This conceptual analysis considers the potential impacts of the proposed actions under an alternative development scenario for projected development site 2 (Block 1104, Lots 25 and 29) in response to information and comments that were made available after the issuance of the DEIS.

As described in Chapter 1, “Project Description,” as part of the development of reasonable worst-case development scenarios for the proposed rezoning area, the applicant and its architects considered the potential for development site 2 to be developed as a mixed-use residential building with ground floor retail and determined that it would not be likely due to site constraints and setback requirements.<sup>2</sup> As such, for analysis purposes, the EIS assumes that the proposed actions would result in redevelopment of development site 2 with an approximately 117,612 gross-square-foot (gsf) hotel. Following publication of the DEIS, the owner of development site 2 stated that it could be redeveloped as mixed-use combination of residential, office, mixed-use hotel mixed-use.<sup>3</sup> In addition, subsequent to the DEIS the proposed actions have been revised to include a text amendment to ZR §96-34 that would allow transient hotel uses by CPC special permit only, in the portion of the rezoning area currently mapped M2-3.

Therefore, considering the development site 2 owner’s statement as well as mixed-use development options available without a hotel special permit under the C4-7 zoning district, this appendix presents a conceptual analysis of a mixed-use retail, residential and commercial office building on development site 2 instead of the hotel considered elsewhere in the EIS.

Based on the property owner’s stated intentions, this analysis considers a 22-story mixed-use building with retail, commercial office, and residential uses. It is assumed that the conceptual mixed-use development would include approximately 10,000 sf of ground floor retail space, approximately 40,000 sf of commercial office space, and residential space totaling approximately 60 market rate dwelling units (based on the assumption of approximately 840 sf per unit). The conceptual mixed-use building is not assumed to include any hotel space, as this use would only be allowed by special permit (pursuant to the proposed actions) and would therefore require a separate discretionary action; in addition, a hotel use on the site is already

---

<sup>1</sup> This appendix is new to the FEIS.

<sup>2</sup> The residential scenario considered by the applicant and found unlikely to be developed is substantially the same as the 125-unit residential scenario noted in the Borough President’s recommendation as a possible development option.

<sup>3</sup> “We own the office building on 56th and 11th Avenue where the Lexus dealership is, and we have the same zoning, so right now our architects say we can build 22 stories there. It might be part hotel, residential or office — we don’t know.” John A. Catsimatidis, in an interview with Vivian Marino. *New York Times*, February 18, 2014.

analyzed in the EIS. The inclusion of a mix of uses in the conceptual development program ensures that a range of potential environmental impacts are assessed in this analysis.

The analysis below considers the potential impacts of the proposed actions including the conceptual mixed-use development and compares them to those identified for either of the two Reasonable Worst-Case Development Scenarios (RWCDs 1 or RWCDs 2) used for the relevant technical analyses elsewhere in this EIS.

As described in detail below, the analyses demonstrate that the conceptual mixed-use development of development site 2 would not result in significant adverse impacts that are not identified in the preceding sections of this EIS.

## **B. ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK FOR CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS**

The conceptual mixed-use development would be similar in built form as analyzed for RWCDs 1 and RWCDs 2 in the other sections of this EIS, although it could be shorter. The overall square footage of the conceptual mixed-use development would be comparable. Technical areas that would not be affected by the potential change of use of development site 2 under the conceptual mixed-use development are: historic and cultural resources, natural resources, hazardous materials, water and sewer infrastructure, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, public health, neighborhood character, and construction. In other technical areas, such as shadows and urban design and visual resources, due to the modest nature of variations in design, the potential impacts of this option would be the same or less as those identified elsewhere in this EIS.

For the remaining technical areas, a conceptual analysis is provided below to determine whether the potential change of use of development site 2 could result in significant adverse impacts that are not identified in the preceding sections of this EIS.

The (E) designations identified in Chapter 1, “Project Description,” would apply to development site 2 regardless of the uses developed on the site. This would include (E) designations for hazardous materials, air quality, and noise to avoid significant adverse impacts in these technical areas. An (E) designation is a mechanism that ensures no significant adverse impacts would result from a proposed action because of procedures that would be undertaken as part of the development of a rezoned site. For air quality and noise, hotel and residential uses are considered comparably sensitive uses and therefore the conclusions presented in their respective EIS analyses would be the same regardless of whether development site 2 were developed as a hotel or a mixed-use building.

## **C. ALTERNATIVE MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT SITE 2 SCENARIO— ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

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

The land use effects of the conceptual mixed-use development of development site 2 would be similar to those of RWCDs 1 or RWCDs 2, as analyzed in Chapter 2, “Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy.” Instead of resulting in a hotel on development site 2, this conceptual development program would result in a mixed-use building with approximately 10,000 sf of ground floor retail uses, approximately 40,000 sf of commercial office uses on floors 2 through 6, and approximately 60 market-rate residential dwelling units on floors 7 through 22. Therefore,

the conceptual mixed-use development of development site 2 would result in a modest increase in residential, commercial office, and retail uses, and a reduction in hotel uses, compared to RWCDS 1 or RWCDS 2.

As with RWCDS 1 or RWCDS 2, this conceptual development program would be compatible in use and scale with the surrounding area, and would continue the existing trend toward higher-density mixed-use development in the study area, particularly new residential units and ground level retail. No additional zoning actions would be required for the conceptual mixed-use development of development site 2, which would also be consistent with the City's Waterfront Revitalization Program. Overall, the conceptual mixed-use development of development site 2 would not alter the findings of Chapter 2, and would not result in any significant adverse impacts to land use, zoning, and public policy.

### **SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS**

The conceptual mixed-use development would not alter the conclusions of Chapter 3, "Socioeconomic Conditions." As with RWCDS 1 and RWCDS 2, the conceptual mixed-use development would not introduce a trend or accelerate an existing trend of changing socioeconomic conditions in a manner that would have the potential to substantially change the socioeconomic character of the neighborhood.

As with the program analyzed in Chapter 3, this scenario would not result in any direct displacement of residents or businesses. The additional 60 market-rate residential units added by the conceptual mixed-use development would not alter the conclusions of the assessment of indirect residential displacement—the study area has already experienced a readily observable trend toward increasing rents, and the residential units added by the conceptual mixed-use development would represent a continuation of this existing trend.

The additional retail space added by the conceptual mixed-use development would be expected to support the existing and project-generated populations, as well as the consumer demand that would be added to the study area in the future without the proposed actions. While the additional 40,000 sf of office space would be a new use compared to the development program analyzed in the FEIS, it would not represent substantial new development that is markedly different from existing uses, development, and activities within the neighborhood. Overall, the conceptual mixed-use development of development site 2 would not result in any significant adverse impacts to socioeconomic conditions.

### **COMMUNITY FACILITIES**

Compared to the development program analyzed in Chapter 4, "Community Facilities," the conceptual mixed-use development on development site 2 would result in somewhat higher demand for public elementary/intermediate schools and libraries. This alternative development program would not result in greater demand on public child care facilities, as it would not be expected to result in any affordable units. As with RWCDS 1, the conceptual mixed-use development of development site 2 would not have the potential to affect police and fire protection services, health care facilities, or public high schools.

#### *PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND INTERMEDIATE SCHOOLS*

The conceptual mixed-use development would add 60 residential units to the study area that would generate approximately seven elementary school students and two intermediate school

students (using the *CEQR Technical Manual* student generation rates of 0.12 elementary school students and 0.04 intermediate school students per dwelling unit in Manhattan). This would be in addition to the 143 elementary school students and 48 intermediate school students expected to be introduced to the study area under RWCDS 1.

With the additional elementary students introduced by the conceptual mixed-use development, the deficit of elementary schools seats would increase from 516 to 523, and the change in utilization would be 4.95 percent with this scenario, compared to 4.72 percent with RWCDS 1. Therefore, the percentage increase in utilization attributable to the proposed actions with the conceptual mixed-use development would not exceed the 5 percent *CEQR Technical Manual* threshold and there would not be a significant adverse impact to elementary schools. As noted in Chapter 4, "Community Facilities," design funding has been allocated for additional school seats in the study area, but construction funding is not yet available; therefore, although these projects are expected to increase school capacity in the future, they are not included in the quantitative analysis.

With the additional intermediate students introduced by the conceptual mixed-use development, the surplus of intermediate schools seats in the sub-district in the With Action condition would be 112 (compared to 114 under RWCDS 1), and the change in utilization would be 2.39 percent (compared to 2.29 percent under RWCDS 1). Because intermediate schools would operate with surplus capacity in this scenario, the proposed actions with conceptual mixed-use development would not result in a significant adverse impact on intermediate schools.

Therefore, the conceptual mixed-use development would not affect the conclusions presented in Chapter 4, "Community Facilities," regarding schools.

#### ***LIBRARIES***

The conceptual mixed-use development is estimated to add 99 new residents to the area. With these additional residents, the population of the catchment area for the Columbus Library would be 101,615 (compared to 101,516 under RWCDS 1), and the population increase compared to the No Action condition would be 2.07 percent (compared to 1.97 percent under RWCDS 1). The population of the catchment area for the Riverside Library would be 119,567 (compared to 119,468 under RWCDS 1), and the population increase compared to the No Action condition would be 1.75 percent (compared to 1.67 percent under RWCDS 1).

For both the Columbus Library and Riverside Library, the catchment area population increases are below the five percent threshold cited in the *CEQR Technical Manual*. Therefore, the conceptual mixed-use development of development site 2 would not result in any significant adverse impacts to libraries.

#### **OPEN SPACE**

The proposed actions with the conceptual mixed-use development would be expected to introduce approximately 2,061 additional residents to the rezoning area. With the addition of these residents, the residential population in the study area would increase to 49,053. The available open space in the study area would be 41.93 total acres, with 14.45 acres of active space and 27.48 acres of passive space.

With the conceptual mixed-use development, the residential open space ratios within the study area would decrease slightly as compared to RWCDS 1 and would remain below the median citywide community district ratio of 1.5 acres of open space per 1,000 residents. The total open

**Appendix F: Development Site 2 Conceptual Analysis**

space ratio and active open space ratio would remain below the City guidelines, while the passive open space ratio would remain above the planning guideline. As compared to the No Action condition, the total open space ratio would decrease by approximately 4.15 percent, the active open space ratio would decrease by approximately 3.91 percent, and the passive open space ratio would decrease by approximately 4.27 percent.

As compared to the analysis in Chapter 5, “Open Space,” the conceptual mixed-use development would result in greater decreases in all three ratios. As noted in Chapter 5, the decrease in the total, active, and passive open space ratios would be less than five percent, which following the guidelines of the *CEQR Technical Manual* would generally be considered a significant adverse impact. In addition, the study area would continue to benefit from the presence of large “destination” publicly accessible open spaces—such as Central Park, Riverside Park, and Hudson River Park—that are in the adjacent area and available to study area residents. The open space resources outside the study area would continue to serve the study area’s residential population. Overall, the conceptual mixed use development would not result in a significant adverse open space impact.

**TRANSPORTATION**

While the proposed actions including the conceptual mixed-use development would result in more total person trips than RWCDs 2, there would be fewer overall vehicular trips, as hotel users typically generate more vehicle trips than residential and commercial office and local retail users based on standard trip generation rates and methodologies (see **Table F-1**). Therefore, potential significant adverse traffic impacts in this scenario could be expected to be less than the impacts identified for RWCDs 2.

**Table F-1**  
**Trip Generation Summary: RWCDs 2 and Conceptual Mixed-Use Alternative**

| Development Program                                   | Peak Hour      | In/Out | Person Trip |      |        |     |      |       | Vehicle Trip |      |          |       |
|---|----------------|--------|-------------|------|--------|-----|------|-------|--------------|------|----------|-------|
|   |                |        | Auto        | Taxi | Subway | Bus | Walk | Total | Auto         | Taxi | Delivery | Total |
| Development Site 2 (RWCDs 2)                          | Weekday AM     | In     | 5           | 10   | 13     | 2   | 24   | 54    | 3            | 10   | 1        | 14    |
|   |                | Out    | 7           | 15   | 20     | 2   | 38   | 82    | 5            | 10   | 1        | 16    |
|   |                | Total  | 12          | 25   | 33     | 4   | 62   | 136   | 8            | 20   | 2        | 30    |
|   | Weekday Midday | In     | 10          | 19   | 17     | 4   | 78   | 128   | 7            | 14   | 0        | 21    |
|   |                | Out    | 9           | 16   | 14     | 3   | 67   | 109   | 6            | 14   | 0        | 20    |
|   |                | Total  | 19          | 35   | 31     | 7   | 145  | 237   | 13           | 28   | 0        | 41    |
|   | Weekday PM     | In     | 13          | 26   | 35     | 4   | 66   | 144   | 9            | 15   | 0        | 24    |
|   |                | Out    | 7           | 14   | 19     | 2   | 36   | 78    | 5            | 15   | 0        | 20    |
|   |                | Total  | 20          | 40   | 54     | 6   | 102  | 222   | 14           | 30   | 0        | 44    |
|   | Saturday       | In     | 8           | 15   | 21     | 3   | 39   | 86    | 6            | 11   | 0        | 17    |
|   |                | Out    | 6           | 12   | 16     | 2   | 31   | 67    | 4            | 11   | 0        | 15    |
|   |                | Total  | 14          | 27   | 37     | 5   | 70   | 153   | 10           | 22   | 0        | 32    |
| Development Site 2 (Conceptual Mixed-Use Development) | Weekday AM     | In     | 22          | 3    | 45     | 11  | 31   | 112   | 18           | 1    | 1        | 20    |
|   |                | Out    | 4           | 3    | 21     | 4   | 34   | 66    | 4            | 1    | 1        | 6     |
|   |                | Total  | 26          | 6    | 66     | 15  | 65   | 178   | 22           | 2    | 2        | 26    |
|   | Weekday Midday | In     | 17          | 6    | 40     | 16  | 131  | 210   | 15           | 6    | 1        | 22    |
|   |                | Out    | 18          | 6    | 42     | 16  | 131  | 213   | 16           | 6    | 1        | 23    |
|   |                | Total  | 35          | 12   | 82     | 32  | 262  | 423   | 31           | 12   | 2        | 45    |
|   | Weekday PM     | In     | 8           | 4    | 28     | 10  | 79   | 129   | 6            | 5    | 0        | 11    |
|   |                | Out    | 25          | 5    | 56     | 16  | 80   | 182   | 21           | 5    | 0        | 26    |
|   |                | Total  | 33          | 9    | 84     | 26  | 159  | 311   | 27           | 10   | 0        | 37    |
|   | Saturday       | In     | 8           | 4    | 24     | 9   | 86   | 131   | 7            | 4    | 0        | 11    |
|   |                | Out    | 7           | 4    | 19     | 8   | 84   | 122   | 4            | 4    | 0        | 8     |
|   |                | Total  | 15          | 8    | 43     | 17  | 170  | 253   | 11           | 8    | 0        | 19    |

The proposed actions including the conceptual mixed-use development would result in some additional pedestrian trips, but would be expected to result in substantially the same potential for significant adverse pedestrian impacts. As described in Chapter 11, "Transportation," RWCDS 2 would result in a significant adverse pedestrian impact at the south crosswalk at Eleventh Avenue and West 57th Street. Since the routes leading to the project site from area's transit facilities and other destinations would not change notably based on different potential uses on the site, additional pedestrian trips associated with the conceptual mixed-use development would be expected to follow similar circulation patterns as those associated with RWCDS 2. As such, the impacted crosswalk is expected to experience significant adverse impacts under this scenario as well, and would be expected to remain unmitigated. Therefore, the pedestrian impacts under this scenario are expected to be substantially the same as those that have been identified for RWCDS 2.

The proposed actions including the conceptual mixed-use development would also result in a modest increase in bus trips as compared to RWCDS 2. However, these additional trips would be expected to result in the same potential for significant adverse bus impacts on the M31 and M57 lines. Therefore, the bus impacts under this scenario could be mitigated using the same measures identified for RWCDS 2. \*