

960 FRANKLIN AVENUE REZONING EIS

Chapter 19: Neighborhood Character

A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter assesses the Proposed Development's potential effects on neighborhood character. As defined in the *2014-2020 City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manual*, 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, open space, historic and cultural resources, urban design and visual resources, shadows, transportation, and/or noise conditions; but not all of these elements contribute to neighborhood character in all cases. For a proposed project, a neighborhood character assessment under CEQR first identifies the defining features of the neighborhood and then evaluates whether the project has the potential to affect these defining features, either through the potential for a significant adverse impact or a combination of moderate effects in relevant technical analysis areas. Thus, to determine the effects of a proposed project on neighborhood character, the salient features of neighborhood character are considered together. According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, neighborhood character impacts are rare, and it would be unusual that, in the absence of a significant adverse 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 adverse impact identified in one of the technical areas that contribute to a neighborhood's character is not automatically equivalent to a significant adverse impact on neighborhood character, but, rather, serves as an indication that neighborhood character should be examined.

As outlined in **Chapter 1, "Project Description,"** the Proposed Development would include a series of land use actions that would facilitate the construction of a two-building development. For conservative analysis purposes, the reasonable worst-case development scenario (RWCDs) anticipates that the Proposed Development would be comprised of approximately 1,578 dwelling units (DUs), 474 of which would be permanently affordable pursuant to MIH, approximately 21,183 gsf of local retail space, approximately 9,678 gsf of community facility space, and approximately 10,790 sf of publicly accessible plazas. Parking for approximately 16 percent of all market-rate DUs would be allocated in two separate parking garages on the ground- and cellar-levels of the Proposed Development.

This chapter includes a preliminary assessment of neighborhood character, which was prepared in conformance with the *CEQR Technical Manual*. This chapter describes the defining features of the existing neighborhood character and considers the potential effects of the Proposed Development on these defining features. This assessment relies on the technical analyses presented in other chapters of this EIS.

B. PRINCIPAL CONCLUSIONS

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts related to neighborhood character. The neighborhood character of the study area is defined by a few key components, including its mix of land uses and building types, an abundance of open space resources, large public facilities and institutions, and the MTA's open subway cut that serves the Franklin Avenue subway shuttle extending north-south through the area. As described elsewhere in this EIS, the Proposed Development would not result in

significant adverse impacts in the areas of land use, zoning, and public policy; socioeconomic conditions; historic and cultural resources; urban design and visual resources; or noise. The significant adverse transportation impacts that are identified and described in the Transportation chapter would not affect any defining feature of neighborhood character, nor would a combination of moderately adverse effects affect such a defining feature. Likewise, the shadows impacts on the open space and natural resources at Brooklyn Botanic Garden and the open space resources at Jackie Robinson Playground would not affect any defining feature of neighborhood character, nor would a combination of moderately adverse effects affect such a defining feature.

The Proposed Development would facilitate the development of a mix of residential, local retail, and community facility uses that would be consistent with the mixed-use character of the surrounding neighborhood. Vacant and underutilized land would be redeveloped at a scale and density that is compatible with, but taller than, the built character of the surrounding area, including the 33-story (315 feet tall) Tivoli Towers and the 25-story (211 feet tall) Ebbets Field Houses apartment buildings. In addition, the proposed 789 DUs of affordable housing (including 473 units of affordable housing that would comply with the City's MIH program under Option 2 (30 percent requirement) and the Applicant's intent to provide an additional 20 percent of affordable units, for a total of 50 percent affordability) would help to ensure that a considerable portion of the new households would have incomes that would more closely reflect existing incomes in the study area and help ensure that the neighborhoods continue to serve diverse housing needs.

As discussed in **Chapter 6, "Shadows,"** incremental shadows from the Proposed Development would result in significant adverse impacts to the Brooklyn Botanic Garden and Jackie Robinson Playground. ~~The Brooklyn Botanic Garden is an open space resource that is fenced off from the surrounding neighborhood, with limited hours of access, and requires a fee during most hours for admission. As such, although it is an important public facility, it is not integrated into the urban fabric of the neighborhood or a defining feature of neighborhood character. As~~ Other shadow impacts as a result of the Proposed Actions would be limited to Brooklyn Botanic Garden and Jackie Robinson Playground which ~~are two~~ is one of many open space resources in the neighborhood. Impacts to this open space would not alter the character of the neighborhood.

While the Proposed Development would result in increased transportation activities and significant adverse transportation impacts, the resulting conditions would be similar to those seen in the study area and would not result in levels of activity or service conditions that would be out of character with the surrounding neighborhood, which is already characterized by moderate vehicle and pedestrian volumes. Thus, the changes in transportation due to the Proposed Development would not result in significant adverse impacts on neighborhood character. In addition, while incremental vehicle volumes introduced as a result of the Proposed Development would increase noise levels adjacent to the Development Site, the increases would not be perceptible to individuals (i.e., would be less than 3 dBA) and would, therefore, not alter the character of the surrounding neighborhood.

C. METHODOLOGY

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, an assessment of neighborhood character is generally needed when a proposed project has the potential to result in significant adverse impacts in any of the following technical areas: land use, socioeconomic conditions, open space, historic and cultural resources, urban design and visual resources, shadows, transportation, or noise. The *CEQR Technical Manual* states that, even if a proposed project does not have the potential to result in a significant adverse impact in any

specific technical area(s), an assessment of neighborhood character may be required if the project would result in a combination of moderate effects to several elements that may cumulatively affect neighborhood character. A “moderate” effect is generally defined as an effect considered reasonably close to the significant adverse impact threshold for a particular technical analysis area.

A preliminary assessment of neighborhood character determines whether changes expected in other technical analysis areas may affect a defining feature of neighborhood character. The key elements that define neighborhood character, and their relationships to one another, form the basis of determining impact significance; in general, the more uniform and consistent the existing neighborhood context, the more sensitive it is to change. A neighborhood that has a more varied context is typically able to tolerate greater change without experiencing significant adverse impacts. If there is no potential for a proposed project to affect the defining features of neighborhood character, a detailed assessment is not warranted.

Study Area

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the study area for a preliminary assessment of neighborhood character is typically consistent with the study areas in the relevant technical areas assessed under CEQR that contribute to the defining features of the neighborhood. Therefore, the study area for this analysis is the same as that used for the analysis of land use, zoning, and public policy, which extends quarter-mile from the Project Area’s boundaries, extending as far north as Union Street, as far east as Ludlam Place, as far south as Lincoln Road, and as far west as East Drive in Prospect Park.

D. PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT

Defining Features

The Project Area is located within the southwestern portion of Crown Heights. The neighborhood character of the study area is defined by a few key components, including its mix of land uses and building types, an abundance of open space resources, large public facilities and institutions, and the MTA’s open subway cut that serves the Franklin Avenue subway shuttle extending north-south through the area.

As presented in **Chapter 2, “Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy,”** the area surrounding the Project Area is characterized by a mix of residential, commercial, industrial/manufacturing, and public facilities and institutions. These uses are not evenly distributed throughout the secondary study area and the neighborhood character varies widely. Areas immediately to the north, northeast, south, and west of the Project Area are predominantly residential and are characterized by a mixture of one- and two-family buildings (6.3 percent of buildings in the secondary study area); multi-family walkup buildings (11.8 percent of buildings); and multi-family elevator buildings (44.0 percent of buildings), including the 33-story Tivoli Towers (49-57 Crown Street) to the north and the seven 25-story Ebbets Field Houses apartment buildings (1720 Bedford Avenue) to the east of the Project Area. Overall, the quarter-mile study area is predominately comprised of residential buildings (62.1 percent of buildings in the secondary study area) with several institutions/public facilities (18.4 percent of buildings) and mixed commercial and residential buildings (11.9 percent of lot area in the secondary study area). Additionally, industrial and manufacturing buildings comprise approximately 3.3 percent of the buildings in the secondary study area. The approximate quarter-mile radius around the Project Area also accommodates smaller amounts of commercial/office space (2.7 percent of the total building area), open space facilities (0.7 percent of the total building area), parking facilities (0.1 percent of the total building area).

Local community facility/institutional uses include: P.S. 241 Emma L. Johnston (976 President Street), P.S. 375 Jackie Robinson School/M.S. 352 Ebbets Field (46 McKeever Place) and the City University of New York's (CUNY's) Medgar Evers College campus (1637 Bedford Avenue). There are also several large open space resources within the secondary study area. A portion of Prospect Park, including the Prospect Park Zoo (450 Flatbush Avenue), is located in the southwestern section of the quarter-mile study area. A majority of the Brooklyn Botanic Garden is also located within the quarter-mile study area, to the west of the Project Area. To the northwest of the Project Area is the 1.36-acre Dr. Ronald McNair Park, bounded by Eastern Parkway, Classon Avenue, and Washington Avenue. Finally, an open subway cut for the MTA Franklin Avenue Shuttle right-of-way extends north-south through the quarter-mile study area and the Project Area also includes a portion of the subway shuttle right-of-way.

This area of Crown Heights is a culturally dynamic community but, like many New York City neighborhoods, faces various challenges, with many residents in need of affordable housing, economic opportunities, and community facilities and services.

The 2012-2016 ACS Five-Year data estimate the average annual household income within the study area to be approximately \$76,354 (in 2018 dollars), which is approximately 35 percent higher than the area's median household income, indicating the presence of higher-income households in the study area. As discussed in **Chapter 3, "Socioeconomic Conditions,"** the New York University Furman Center's State of New York City's Housing and Neighborhoods in 2015 classified Brooklyn CD 8 (Crown Heights/Prospect Gardens) and Brooklyn CD 9 (South Crown Heights/Lefferts Gardens) as low-income gentrifying neighborhoods that have experienced steep rent increases, which are considerably higher than the median sub-borough area in the City. In addition, according to StreetEasy's 2018 Rent Affordability Report, both Prospect Lefferts Gardens and Crown Heights experienced some of the highest rental growths between 2010 and 2018 in the City. Between 2010 and 2018, rents increased by roughly 45 percent in Prospect Lefferts Gardens, and by about 39 percent in Crown Heights. The study area's median and average gross rents increased by approximately 31 and 36 percent, respectively, between 2000 and 2016. During the same time, median and average gross rents in the borough overall increased by approximately 26 and 31 percent, and in New York City by approximately 23 and 21 percent, respectively. Current market reports also indicate increases in rent for both Crown Heights and Prospect Lefferts Gardens. Therefore, it is likely that either: (a) households are housing cost burdened; or (b) the potential renters of these units have higher incomes than many of the existing households in the study area, and higher income households have been moving into the area.

The Project Area is located in an area that has been identified by the City as an area that is well-served by public open space. The abundance of open space resources in the Project Area is a defining feature of the neighborhood's character. Open space resources within the approximately half-mile study area include the 1-acre Jackie Robinson Playground, the 1.36-acre Dr. Ronald McNair Park, the 0.29-acre Dodger Playground, a 134.8-acre portion of Prospect Park (excluding the Prospect Park Zoo as an admission fee is charged), a 7.22-acre portion of Mount Prospect Park, and a 6.26-acre portion of the Eastern Parkway greenspace. The Brooklyn Botanic Garden is another large open space that is located in close proximity to the Project Area. NYC DCP as lead agency in consultation with the NYC Department of Parks and Recreation determined that it should be included in the quantitative open space assessment because it has regular hours that are free to the public, although most opening periods an entrance fee is charged.

As detailed in **Chapter 7, "Historic Resources,"** in the future both without and with the Proposed Actions, the existing buildings on the Development Site, including the S/NR-eligible Consumer Park Brewery Company complex structures, would be demolished. LPC has indicated that the Development Site is not archaeologically sensitive (refer to Appendix 1 for correspondence with LPC). Therefore, the Proposed

Actions would not result in any new direct impacts to historic architectural or archaeological resources as compared to No-Action conditions. Additionally, there is one historic resource within 400-feet of the Project Area that is a designated NYCL and is eligible for listing on the S/NR: the Brooklyn Central Office's Bureau of Fire Communications. There are no other historic architectural resources eligible for listing on the S/NR or designation as NYCLs within the 400-foot study area. As such, historic architectural resources are not defining features of the study area's neighborhood character.

The proposed With-Action building on the Development Site would be constructed on an existing block and would not entail any significant adverse impacts to Urban Design, including block shapes, street pattern and hierarchy, topography, open space, or natural features in the Project Area or secondary study area. The Proposed Actions would not create land uses or structures that would be substantially incompatible with existing and emerging character of the surrounding area. As detailed in Chapter 1, the Proposed Actions, including the establishment of a MIH area in the Project Area, would permit the development of more residential space on the Development Site than the No-Action condition, including approximately 474 units of permanently affordable housing (30 percent of units pursuant to the City's MIH program requirements under Option 2) and an incremental increase of 586 market-rate units (a total of 789 market-rate units), in an area with high demand for affordable and market-rate apartments. The Applicant intends to provide an additional 20 percent more affordable apartments, up to a total of 789 affordable units. The Proposed Development is anticipated to satisfy some of the existing demand for affordable and market-rate units in the Crown Heights neighborhood.

The character of the study area, like that of many neighborhoods in New York City, is, in part, defined by the levels of pedestrian activity that exist. Foot traffic in the immediate vicinity of the project site is moderate, especially along Franklin Avenue south of Crown Street. This is due in part to the presence of the currently vacant 46 Crown Street (construction of a mixed-use development is planned for this site and is anticipated to begin in early 2022⁹), the parking lot located on the east side of Franklin Avenue between Crown Street and Montgomery Street, the low pedestrian demand associated with the current on-site use, and the general lack of mixed-use buildings with ground-floor retail or other pedestrian-oriented uses along this portion of Franklin Avenue. Vehicular activity is concentrated along Franklin Avenue and Washington Avenue and is much lighter along Montgomery Street.

Based on field measurements and noise monitoring, the Project Area is located in an area with moderate ambient noise levels. As noted in **Chapter 17, "Noise,"** noise levels along Franklin Avenue (both noise monitoring locations) and the Montgomery Street monitoring location immediately to the north of the Development Site were within the CEQR "Marginally Acceptable" noise exposure category, with lower noise levels (falling within the CEQR "Acceptable" noise exposure category) documented at the northwest corner of the Development Site at Montgomery Street just to the east of the open subway cut for the MTA's Franklin Avenue Shuttle line. The noise levels in proximity to the Development Site are typical of many neighborhoods in New York City and are not a defining feature of the neighborhood.

Assessment of the Potential to Affect the Defining Features of the Neighborhood

The sections below discuss potential changes resulting from the Proposed Development in the following technical areas that are considered in the neighborhood character assessment pursuant to the *CEQR Technical Manual*: land use, zoning, and public policy; socioeconomic conditions; open space; historic and cultural resources; urban design and visual resources; shadows; transportation; and noise. The assessment uses the findings from the respective chapters of this EIS to identify whether the Proposed Development would result in any significant adverse impacts or moderate adverse effects in these technical areas and whether any such changes would have the potential to affect the defining features of

neighborhood character. As described below, defining features of the study area neighborhood would not be affected either through the potential of any significant adverse impacts or a combination of moderate effects in these technical areas.

Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy

Defining features of the neighborhood would not be adversely affected due to potential effects of the Proposed Development on land use, zoning, and public policy, either singularly or in combination with potential impacts in other relevant technical areas discussed in this section. The Proposed Development would facilitate the development of a mixed-use development project with residential, local retail, community facility, and open space uses that would be consistent with the mix of existing uses in the neighborhood. While changes in land use and zoning would occur, with proposed residential, local retail and community facility uses replacing a spice processing and warehousing facility, the Proposed Actions would facilitate the development of a residential development that would be comprised of affordable residential units under the City's MIH program and additional income-targeted and market-rate residences. The proposed residential, local retail, and community facility uses would be comparable to existing and planned developments in Crown Heights, and would directly support several major City policies aimed at increasing supply of affordable housing in New York City. The Proposed Actions would facilitate the mixed-use development in an area well-served by mass transit.

As described in **Chapter 2, "Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy,"** no significant adverse impacts related to land use, zoning, or public policy would occur in the future with the Proposed Actions. The Proposed Development would not directly displace any land uses so as to adversely affect surrounding land uses, nor would it generate land uses that would be incompatible with land uses, zoning, or public policies in the surrounding area. The Proposed Development would not result in land uses that conflict with surrounding land uses or public policies applicable to the Development Site or the secondary study area.

Socioeconomic Conditions

Defining features of the neighborhood would not be adversely affected due to potential effects of the Proposed Development on socioeconomic conditions, either singularly or in combination with potential impacts in other relevant technical areas discussed in this section. As discussed in **Chapter 3, "Socioeconomic Conditions,"** it was concluded that the Proposed Development would not result in significant adverse socioeconomic impacts.

As noted above, there is an existing trend toward higher-end and middle-income housing in the study area, and rents and sales prices for market-rate housing are already above what is affordable to low- to middle-income households. This trend is expected to continue in the future without the Proposed Actions. The Proposed Development would introduce a mixed-income residential population whose average income would be higher than the overall average income in the half-mile socioeconomic conditions study area, but similar to the average income of the new population expected to reside in the area in the future without the Proposed Actions. The affordable housing units added by the Proposed Development would maintain a diverse demographic composition within the study area and would not alter the character of the neighborhood.

Open Space

Defining features of the neighborhood would not be adversely affected due to potential effects of the Proposed Development on publicly accessible open space, either singularly or in combination with

potential impacts in other relevant technical areas discussed in this section. As discussed in **Chapter 6, “Shadows,”** incremental shadows from the Proposed Development would constitute a significant adverse impact on Brooklyn Botanic Garden and Jackie Robinson Playground (see discussion below under “Shadows” concerning the Neighborhood Character effects of project-generated shadows). No open space would be displaced as a result of the Proposed Actions. The Proposed Development would not affect any particular user group, nor would it introduce a population with any unusual characteristics.

As described in **Chapter 5, “Open Space,”** the Proposed Development would result in reductions to open space ratios in the surrounding area. However, the anticipated reductions would not be expected to result in a significant adverse impact on the character of the neighborhood, of which open space is one of the defining features. In addition, the Proposed Development would result in the creation of new publicly accessible plazas that would contribute to the open space character of the neighborhood.

Shadows

Defining features of the neighborhood would not be adversely affected due to potential shadow effects of the Proposed Development, either singularly or in combination with potential impacts in other relevant technical areas discussed in this section. As discussed in **Chapter 6, “Shadows,”** the incremental shadows from the Proposed Development would result in incremental shadow coverage on area open space resources. All open spaces would continue to receive a minimum of four to six hours of direct sunlight throughout the growing season. However, as described in **Chapter 9, “Natural Resources,”** portions of the Brooklyn Botanic Garden would experience significant adverse impacts as a result of the shading that would result from the Proposed Development due to the highly sensitive character of plants grown there. In addition, the Proposed Actions would result in complete shadow coverage on Jackie Robinson Playground during certain periods, which constitutes a significant adverse shadows impact (see Chapter 6 for details).

Though impacts would result on the Brooklyn Botanic Garden and Jackie Robinson Playground from incremental shading from the Proposed Development, ~~the Brooklyn Botanic Garden is not a defining feature of the neighborhood. The Brooklyn Botanic Garden is an open space resource that is fenced off from the surrounding neighborhood, with limited hours of access, and requires a fee during most hours for admission. As such, although it is an important public facility, it is not integrated into the urban fabric of the neighborhood. For example, as its free hours are limited (currently Friday mornings and weekdays during winters), local residents cannot visit the area at will for activities such as jogging or dog walking as is the case for typical public streets and parks.~~ Other shadow impacts as a result of the Proposed Actions would be limited to Jackie Robinson Playground which is one of many open space resources in the neighborhood. Impacts to this open space would not alter the character of the neighborhood.

Historic and Cultural Resources

Defining features of the neighborhood would not be adversely affected due to the potential effects of the Proposed Development on historic and cultural resources, either singularly or in combination with potential impacts in other relevant technical areas discussed in this section. As noted above, LPC issued a letter indicating that the site is not archaeologically sensitive. Further, while historic architectural resources are not defining features of the study area’s neighborhood character, the existing buildings on the Development Site, which would be removed under future conditions with and without the Proposed Actions, are the S/NR-eligible Consumer Park Brewery Company complex structures. Additionally, there is one historic resource within 400-feet of the Project Area that is a designated NYCL and is eligible for listing on the S/NR: the Brooklyn Central Office’s Bureau of Fire Communications. There are no other historic

architectural resources eligible for listing on the S/NR or designation as NYCLs within the 400-foot study area.

As discussed in **Chapter 7, “Historic and Cultural Resources,”** no direct impacts to historic architectural resources would occur as a result of the Proposed Actions. As detailed above, in the futures both without and with the Proposed Actions, the existing buildings on the Development Site, including the S/NR-eligible Consumer Park Brewing Company structures on Lots 41 and 46, would be demolished. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in any new direct impacts to historic architectural resources as compared to No-Action conditions. Additionally, as the Proposed Actions are Project Area-specific, they would not result in any direct impacts to surrounding historic resources.

The Proposed Actions would not result in development that would diminish the qualities that make the LPC-designated and S/NR-eligible Brooklyn Central Office’s Bureau of Fire Communications building historically and architecturally significant. The built context of the area includes several buildings over ten stories tall to the north and east that serve as a backdrop to this historic resource. Two buildings in the immediate area exceed 25 stories (Tivoli Towers and Ebbets Field Houses), two additional buildings (one on Montgomery Street and one on Carroll Street) are planned in the area that would be 16 stories tall, and a third building on Montgomery Street is a 12-story-tall residential building that has been recently constructed. As the built urban environment already includes numerous tall buildings that can be seen as a backdrop to this historic resource from perspectives west and southwest, the buildings that would be developed as a consequence of the Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse indirect or contextual impacts on historic architectural resources.

Urban Design and Visual Resources

Defining features of the neighborhood would not be adversely affected due to potential effects of the Proposed Development on urban design and visual resources, either singularly or in combination with potential impacts in other relevant technical areas discussed in this section. As described in **Chapter 8, “Urban Design and Visual Resources,”** the Proposed Development would result in a significant change to the urban design of the area as two 39-story towers on contextual bases (421 and 424 feet tall excluding the mechanical bulkhead) would be developed in an area where the tallest existing buildings are the 33-story (315 feet tall) Tivoli Towers and the 25-story (211 feet tall) Ebbets Field Houses. Compared to the future without the Proposed Development, the visual appearance, and thus the pedestrian experience of the area, would change considerably, with lower-density development pursuant to as-of-right zoning replaced with a mix of uses with a taller and bulkier built character. However, the Proposed Actions and subsequent development would not represent an adverse impact on urban design or visual resources.

Development of the 2.76-acre site would contribute to the urban design character of the neighborhood from the pedestrian perspective by creating a continuous streetwall and visual connectivity. New retail uses would activate Franklin Avenue along a stretch of the street that has historically been a long expanse of blank walls, fenced-off accessory parking, and vacant land. Additionally, two new publicly-accessible plazas would be created along the proposed interior roadway that would connect Montgomery Street and Franklin Avenue. These plazas would help to enhance the pedestrian experience under future conditions with the Proposed Actions.

As noted above, the neighborhood’s character is partially defined by its mix of land uses and building types, by the abundance of open space resources, by the large public facilities and institutions, and by the presence of the MTA’s open subway cut that serves the Franklin Avenue subway shuttle extending north-south through the area. The Proposed Development would introduce two new predominantly residential

buildings of up to 39 stories. The Proposed Development would be approximately 106 to 109 feet taller than the next tallest building (the 315-foot-tall Tivoli Towers). The Proposed Development would be a merger of a contextual and tower developments. The resulting development would be bulkier than other buildings in the surrounding area. The area is also experiencing new development in recent years with the completion of a 12-story building at 109-111 Montgomery Street and with a recent rezoning of portions of three blocks directly north of the Project Area from R6 to R8X with a C2-4 commercial overlay and plans for two new 16-story buildings within the rezoning area by 2021 and a third projected development site that could also be developed with a 16-story building by 2023. The recent development has already begun a transformation of the area from a location that had low-slung commercial laundry buildings, a former NYBG warehouse and research facility, and an underutilized property adjacent to the Golombek Spice facility, to an area that will be home to new 12- and 16-story buildings in a few short years. While the proposed contextual base and initial setback of the Proposed Development would be consistent with buildings within the surrounding area and what is permitted under zoning districts nearby, when coupled with the proposed tower height and widths, the proposed With-Action buildings would create a new built form that departs from the surrounding residential development. Therefore, the proposed height of the towers and the overall massing of the new development would result in changes to the urban design and visual resources of the study area but do not constitute significant adverse impacts. The proposed built form reflects the surrounding context through a contextual base, which combined with the proposed setbacks and placement of the towers, sufficiently address the pedestrian experience along the adjacent streets.

Transportation

Defining features of the neighborhood would not be adversely affected due to potential effects of the Proposed Development on transportation, either singularly or in combination with potential impacts in other relevant technical areas discussed in this section. As described in **Chapter 14, "Transportation,"** the Proposed Development would result in significant adverse traffic and pedestrian impacts. The Proposed Development would not result in significant adverse subway, bus, or parking impacts. As discussed in **Chapter 21, "Mitigation,"** the significant adverse traffic and pedestrian impacts could be fully mitigated by standard traffic engineering implemented, if implemented by NYC DOT.

As noted above, the character of the study area, like that of many neighborhoods in New York City, is, in part, defined by the levels of pedestrian activity that exist. While the Proposed Development would result in increases to pedestrian volumes, sidewalks in the surrounding area have sufficient capacity to absorb new pedestrian users and analyzed sidewalks would continue to operate under slightly restricted conditions or better and would not represent a significant adverse impact on the character of the neighborhood. The introduction of new vehicle volumes, despite the anticipated impacts that are disclosed in **Chapter 14,** would also not represent a significant adverse impact on the character of the neighborhood. As noted above, all of the traffic impacts could be fully mitigated, further reducing the potential to result in a significant adverse impact on neighborhood character. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts to neighborhood character would result.

Noise

Defining features of the neighborhood would not be adversely affected due to potential noise effects of the Proposed Development, either singularly or in combination with potential impacts in other relevant technical areas discussed in this section. As described in **Chapter 17, "Noise,"** the Proposed Development would not result in significant adverse noise impacts.

To ensure acceptable interior noise levels, noise attenuation specifications would be mandated through the assignment of an (E) designation (E-586) assigned to the tax lots that comprise the Project Area. The requirements of the (E) designation resulting from the noise analysis, outlined in Section I, "Attenuation Requirements," of **Chapter 17**, state that the future building facades of residential and community facility uses on Block 1192, Lots 1 (p/o), 40, 41, 46, 63, 66, 77 (p/o), and 85 (p/o) with frontage on Franklin Avenue (eastern façade) must provide 28 dBA of composite window/wall attenuation on the base 100 feet. The minimum composite window/wall attenuation for commercial uses would be 5 dBA less than that for residential and community facility uses. In order to maintain a closed-window condition, an alternate means of ventilation must also be provided.

With implementation of the attenuation levels required pursuant to the (E) designation, the Proposed Development would provide sufficient attenuation to achieve the *CEQR Technical Manual* interior noise level guidelines of 45 dBA or lower for residential and community facility uses and 50 dBA or lower for commercial uses. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse noise impacts related to building attenuation requirements. The noise levels in proximity to the project site are typical of many neighborhoods in New York City and would remain so in the With-Action condition; noise is not a defining feature of the neighborhood, and the incremental increase in noise levels resulting from the Proposed Development would not constitute a significant adverse impact on neighborhood character.