

City Environmental Quality Review ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT STATEMENT (EAS) SHORT FORM

FOR UNLISTED ACTIONS ONLY • Please fill out and submit to the appropriate agency (see instructions)

Part I: GENERAL INFORMATION 1. Does the Action Exceed Any Type I Threshold in 6 NYCRR Part 617.4 or 43 RCNY §6-15(A) (Executive Order 91 of NO NO 1977, as amended)? YES If "yes," STOP and complete the FULL EAS FORM. 2. Project Name 600 Columbus Avenue 3. Reference Numbers CEQR REFERENCE NUMBER (to be assigned by lead agency) BSA REFERENCE NUMBER (if applicable) 16DCP152M ULURP REFERENCE NUMBER (if applicable) OTHER REFERENCE NUMBER(S) (if applicable) M920493(K)ZAM; N170302CMM (e.g., legislative intro, CAPA) 4a. Lead Agency Information 4b. Applicant Information NAME OF APPLICANT NAME OF LEAD AGENCY **Columbus Townhouse Associates** Department of City Planning NAME OF LEAD AGENCY CONTACT PERSON NAME OF APPLICANT'S REPRESENTATIVE OR CONTACT PERSON Robert Dobruskin Equity Environmental Engineering LLC ADDRESS 120 Broadway, 30th Floor ADDRESS 500 International Drive, Suite 150 **CITY New York** STATE NY ZIP 10271 **CITY Mount Olive** STATE NJ ZIP 07828 EMAIL EMAIL TELEPHONE 212-720-3423 TELEPHONE 973-527rdobrus@planning.nyc.gov james.heinemann@equityen 7451 vironmental.com

5. Project Description

The applicant, Columbus Townhouse Associates, is seeking a modification, pursuant to ZR Section 78-06(b)(3), of the previously approved West Side Large Scale Residential Development (CP-18505, "LSRD") within the former West Side Urban Renewal Area ("WSURA"), involving 600 Columbus Avenue (the "Development Site" or the "Site"), which is known as Site 35-1. The proposed modification involves changes to the amount of community facility and commercial floor area on the first and second floors of the existing mixed-use building at the Site, which amounts were approved pursuant to a previous modification under ULURP No. M 920493 ZAM. The applicant additionally requests to modify a Restrictive Declaration pertaining to the site that was recorded in 1987 in connection with an authorization (N 870595 ZAM). The Restrictive Declaration limits the amount of community facility and commercial floor area permitted in accordance with the plans approved at the time. The proposed modification to the Restrictive Declaration would make the limits on non-residential floor area contained in the Restrictive Declaration consistent with the proposed modification to the Large Scale Residential Development.

Project Location

BOROUGH Manhattan	COMMUNITY DISTRICT(S) 7	STREET ADDRESS 600 Columbus Avenue							
TAX BLOCK(S) AND LOT(S) Block 1220, Lot 29 ZIP CODE 10025									
DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY BY BOUNDING OR CROSS STREETS West side of Columbus Avenue between West 89 th Street and									
West 90 th Street									
EXISTING ZONING DISTRICT, INCLUDING SPECIAL ZONING DISTRICT DESIGNATION, IF ANY C1-9 ZONING SECTIONAL MAP NUMBER 5D									
and R7-2, Large Scale Residentia	Development								
6. Required Actions or Approva	s (check all that apply)								
City Planning Commission: 🖂 Y	ES NO	UNIFORM LANI	D USE REVIEW PROCEDURE (ULURP)						
CITY MAP AMENDMENT	ZONING CERTIFICATION	[CONCESSION						
ZONING MAP AMENDMENT	ZONING AUTHORIZATION	[UDAAP						
ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT	ACQUISITION—REAL PROP	ERTY [REVOCABLE CONSENT						
SITE SELECTION—PUBLIC FACILITY	DISPOSITION—REAL PROPE	ERTY [FRANCHISE						

HOUSING PLAN & PRO	ојест 🛛 отн	HER, explain: Modification of	f West Side	
	Urban Re	enewal Area Large Scale Resid	dential	
		ment		TE.
				IE.
Board of Standards a				
				-
	propriate, specify type:	modification; i renewal;	other); EXPIRATION DA	IE:
SPECIFY AFFECTED SECTION	NS OF THE ZONING RESOLUTI			
Department of Enviro	nmental Protection:	YES NO	It "yes," specify:	
Other City Approvals	Subject to CEQR (check a	ll that apply)		
			FUNDING OF CONSTRUCTION	DN, specify:
			POLICY OR PLAN, specify:	
	UBLIC FACILITIES		FUNDING OF PROGRAMS, s	pecify:
384(b)(4) APPROVAL			PERMITS, specify:	
OTHER, explain:				
Other City Approvals	Not Subject to CEQR (ch	eck all that apply)		
PERMITS FROM DOT'S	S OFFICE OF CONSTRUCTION	MITIGATION AND	LANDMARKS PRESERVATIO	N COMMISSION APPROVAL
COORDINATION (OCMC)			OTHER, explain:	
State or Federal Actio	ns/Approvals/Funding:	YES 🛛 NO	If "yes," specify:	
7. Site Description: Th	ne directly affected area consi	ists of the project site and the	e area subject to any change	in regulatory controls. Except
where otherwise indicated,	provide the following inform	nation with regard to the dire	ctly affected area.	
Graphics: The following	graphics must be attached a	nd each box must be checked	l off before the EAS is comple	te. Each map must clearly depict
the boundaries of the direc	tly affected area or areas and	d indicate a 400-foot radius d	rawn from the outer bounda	ries of the project site. Maps may
	n size ana, jor paper jillings, n \square	TUSE DE JOIAEA LO 8.5 X 11 INCE		
			SITES, A GIS SHAPE FILE THA	T DEFINES THE PROJECT SITE(S)
		N 6 MONTHS OF EAS SUBINI	SSION AND REYED TO THE SI	
Physical Setting (both a	developed and undeveloped	areas)	•	. 0
Total directly affected area	(sq. ft.): 32,931	wa:	terbody area (sq. ft) and type	2: U d 2 nd story floor area
Roads, buildings, and other	r paved surfaces (sq. ft.):	Oth	er, describe (sq. ft.): 1" and	
8. Physical Dimension	is and Scale of Project (i	t the project affects multiple	sites, provide the total devel	opment facilitated by the action)
SIZE OF PROJECT TO BE DE	VELOPED (gross square feet):	34,219		
Including existing floo	r area. Increment of 1,2	288 SQ TT		
NUMBER OF BUILDINGS: 1		GROSS FLOO	OR AREA OF EACH BUILDING	(sq. ft.): 34,219
HEIGHT OF EACH BUILDING	G (ft.): 25'4" to top of sec	ond floor NUMBER OF	F STORIES OF EACH BUILDING	6: 1 st and 2 st of 14 story
		building		
Does the proposed project	involve changes in zoning on	one or more sites?	S 🔀 NO	
If "yes," specify: The total	square feet owned or contro	lled by the applicant:		
The total	square feet not owned or co	ntrolled by the applicant:		
Does the proposed project	involve in-ground excavation	n or subsurface disturbance, i	ncluding, but not limited to f	oundation work, pilings, utility
lines, or grading?	YES NO			
If "yes," indicate the estimate	ated area and volume dimens	sions of subsurface permanei	nt and temporary disturbance	e (if known):
AREA OF TEMPORARY DIST	UKBANCE: sq. ft. (w	idth x length) VOLUM	E OF DISTURBANCE:	cubic ft. (width x length x depth)
AREA OF PERMANENT DIST	TURBANCE: sq. ft. (w	ridth x length)		
Description of Propos	ed Uses (please complete t	he following information as a	appropriate)	
	Residential	Commercial	Community Facility	Industrial/Manufacturing
Size (in gross sq. ft.)	149,109	25,000	6,625	
Type (e.g., retail, office,	166 units	retail	medical office	
school)				
	increase the nonulation of r	scidents and lar an site work		0

If "yes," please specify: NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL RESIDENTS: 0 NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL WORKERS: 3										
Provide a brief explanation of how these numbers were determined: assume 2 community facility staff per additional 1,000 sf										
Does the proposed project create new open space? 🗌 YES 🛛 NO If "yes," specify size of project-created open space: sq. ft										
Has a No-Action scenario been defined for this project that differs from the existing condition? 🗌 YES 🛛 🕅 NO										
If "yes," see Chapter 2, "Establishing the Analysis Framework" and describe briefly:										
9. Analysis Year <u>CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 2</u>										
ANTICIPATED BUILD YEAR (date the project would be completed and operational): 2020										
ANTICIPATED PERIOD OF CONSTRUCTION IN MONTHS: 18-24										
WOULD THE PROJECT BE IMPLEMENTED IN A SINGLE PHASE? YES NO IF MULTIPLE PHASES, HOW MANY?										
BRIEFLY DESCRIBE PHASES AND CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE: Construction would be limited to alterations of existing 1 st and 2 nd										
floor space and filling in of double height space										
10. Predominant Land Use in the Vicinity of the Project (check all that apply)										
RESIDENTIAL MANUFACTURING COMMERCIAL PARK/FOREST/OPEN SPACE OTHER, specify:										

Part II: TECHNICAL ANALYSIS

INSTRUCTIONS: For each of the analysis categories listed in this section, assess the proposed project's impacts based on the thresholds and criteria presented in the CEQR Technical Manual. Check each box that applies.

- If the proposed project can be demonstrated not to meet or exceed the threshold, check the "no" box.
- If the proposed project will meet or exceed the threshold, or if this cannot be determined, check the "yes" box.
- For each "yes" response, provide additional analyses (and, if needed, attach supporting information) based on guidance in the CEQR Technical Manual to determine whether the potential for significant impacts exists. Please note that a "yes" answer does not mean that an EIS must be prepared—it means that more information may be required for the lead agency to make a determination of significance.
- The lead agency, upon reviewing Part II, may require an applicant to provide additional information to support the Short EAS Form. For example, if a question is answered "no," an agency may request a short explanation for this response.

	YES	NO					
1. LAND USE, ZONING, AND PUBLIC POLICY: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 4							
(a) Would the proposed project result in a change in land use different from surrounding land uses?	\boxtimes						
(b) Would the proposed project result in a change in zoning different from surrounding zoning?		\square					
(c) Is there the potential to affect an applicable public policy?							
(d) If "yes," to (a), (b), and/or (c), complete a preliminary assessment and attach.		•					
(e) Is the project a large, publicly sponsored project?		\square					
 If "yes," complete a PlaNYC assessment and attach. 							
(f) Is any part of the directly affected area within the City's <u>Waterfront Revitalization Program boundaries</u> ?		\square					
 If "yes," complete the <u>Consistency Assessment Form</u>. 							
2. SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 5							
(a) Would the proposed project:							
 Generate a net increase of 200 or more residential units? 							
 Generate a net increase of 200,000 or more square feet of commercial space? 		\square					
 Directly displace more than 500 residents? 		\square					
 Directly displace more than 100 employees? 		\square					
 Affect conditions in a specific industry? 							
3. COMMUNITY FACILITIES: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 6							
(a) Direct Effects							
• Would the project directly eliminate, displace, or alter public or publicly funded community facilities such as educational							
facilities, libraries, hospitals and other health care facilities, day care centers, police stations, or fire stations?							
(b) Indirect Effects							
low/moderate income residential units? (See Table 6-1 in <u>Chapter 6</u>)							
• Libraries: Would the project result in a 5 percent or more increase in the ratio of residential units to library branches?							
(See Table 6-1 in <u>Chapter 6</u>)							
school students based on number of residential units? (See Table 6-1 in <u>Chapter 6</u>)							
 Health Care Facilities and Fire/Police Protection: Would the project result in the introduction of a sizeable new neighborhood? 							
4. OPEN SPACE: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 7							
(a) Would the proposed project change or eliminate existing open space?		\square					
(b) Is the project located within an under-served area in the Bronx, Brooklyn, Manhattan, Queens, or Staten Island?		\square					
 If "yes," would the proposed project generate more than 50 additional residents or 125 additional employees? 		\square					
(c) Is the project located within a well-served area in the Bronx, Brooklyn, Manhattan, Queens, or Staten Island?	\boxtimes						
o If "yes," would the proposed project generate more than 350 additional residents or 750 additional employees?		\square					
(d) If the project in located an area that is neither under-served nor well-served, would it generate more than 200 additional residents or 500 additional employees?		\square					
5. SHADOWS: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 8							

	YES	NO							
(a) Would the proposed project result in a net height increase of any structure of 50 feet or more?		\square							
(b) Would the proposed project result in any increase in structure height and be located adjacent to or across the street from a sunlight-sensitive resource?		\square							
6. HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 9									
(a) Does the proposed project site or an adjacent site contain any architectural and/or archaeological resource that is eligible for or has been designated (or is calendared for consideration) as a New York City Landmark, Interior Landmark or Scenic Landmark; that is listed or eligible for listing on the New York State or National Register of Historic Places; or that is within a designated or eligible New York City, New York State or National Register Historic District? (See the <u>GIS System for</u> <u>Archaeology and National Register</u> to confirm)		\boxtimes							
(b) Would the proposed project involve construction resulting in in-ground disturbance to an area not previously excavated?									
(c) If "yes" to either of the above, list any identified architectural and/or archaeological resources and attach supporting informat	ion on								
whether the proposed project would potentially affect any architectural or archeological resources.									
7. URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 10									
(a) Would the proposed project introduce a new building, a new building height, or result in any substantial physical alteration to the streetscape or public space in the vicinity of the proposed project that is not currently allowed by existing zoning?	\boxtimes								
(b) Would the proposed project result in obstruction of publicly accessible views to visual resources not currently allowed by existing zoning?		\square							
8. NATURAL RESOURCES: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 11									
(a) Does the proposed project site or a site adjacent to the project contain natural resources as defined in Section 100 of <u>Chapter 11</u> ?		\square							
o If "yes," list the resources and attach supporting information on whether the proposed project would affect any of these r	esources								
(b) Is any part of the directly affected area within the Jamaica Bay Watershed?		\square							
 If "yes," complete the <u>Jamaica Bay Watershed Form</u>, and submit according to its <u>instructions</u>. 									
9. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 12									
(a) Would the proposed project allow commercial or residential uses in an area that is currently, or was historically, a manufacturing area that involved hazardous materials?		\square							
(b) Does the proposed project site have existing institutional controls (<i>e.g.</i> , (E) designation or Restrictive Declaration) relating to hazardous materials that preclude the potential for significant adverse impacts?		\boxtimes							
(c) Would the project require soil disturbance in a manufacturing area or any development on or near a manufacturing area or existing/historic facilities listed in <u>Appendix 1</u> (including nonconforming uses)?		\boxtimes							
(d) Would the project result in the development of a site where there is reason to suspect the presence of hazardous materials, contamination, illegal dumping or fill, or fill material of unknown origin?		\square							
(e) Would the project result in development on or near a site that has or had underground and/or aboveground storage tanks (e.g., gas stations, oil storage facilities, heating oil storage)?		\square							
(f) Would the project result in renovation of interior existing space on a site with the potential for compromised air quality; vapor intrusion from either on-site or off-site sources; or the presence of asbestos, PCBs, mercury or lead-based paint?		\square							
(g) Would the project result in development on or near a site with potential hazardous materials issues such as government- listed voluntary cleanup/brownfield site, current or former power generation/transmission facilities, coal gasification or gas storage sites, railroad tracks or rights-of-way, or municipal incinerators?		\square							
(h) Has a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment been performed for the site?		\square							
 If "yes," were Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) identified? Briefly identify: 									
10. WATER AND SEWER INFRASTRUCTURE: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 13									
(a) Would the project result in water demand of more than one million gallons per day?		\square							
(b) If the proposed project located in a combined sewer area, would it result in at least 1,000 residential units or 250,000 square feet or more of commercial space in Manhattan, or at least 400 residential units or 150,000 square feet or more of		\square							
 (c) If the proposed project located in a <u>separately sewered area</u>, would it result in the same or greater development than the amounter listed in Table 12.1 in Chapter 122. 									
 (d) Would the proposed project involve development on a site that is 5 acres or larger where the amount of impervious surface would increase? 									
(e) If the project is located within the Jamaica Bay Watershed or in certain specific drainage areas, including Bronx River, Conev									
Island Creek, Flushing Bay and Creek, Gowanus Canal, Hutchinson River, Newtown Creek, or Westchester Creek, would it involve development on a site that is 1 acre or larger where the amount of impervious surface would increase?		\square							
(f) Would the proposed project be located in an area that is partially sewered or currently unsewered?		\square							

	YES	NO
(g) Is the project proposing an industrial facility or activity that would contribute industrial discharges to a Wastewater		\square
Treatment Plant and/or generate contaminated stormwater in a separate storm sewer system?		
(h) Would the project involve construction of a new stormwater outfall that requires federal and/or state permits?		
11. SOLID WASTE AND SANITATION SERVICES: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 14		
(a) Using Table 14-1 in <u>Chapter 14</u> , the project's projected operational solid waste generation is estimated to be (pounds per week to be a solid waste generation is estimated to be (pounds per week to be a solid waste generation is estimated to be (pounds per week to be a solid waste generation is estimated to be (pounds per week to be a solid waste generation is estimated to be (pounds per week to be a solid waste generation is estimated to be (pounds per week to be a solid waste generation is estimated to be (pounds per week to be a solid waste generation is estimated to be (pounds per week to be a solid waste generation is estimated to be (pounds per week to be a solid waste generation is estimated to be (pounds per week to be a solid waste generation is estimated to be (pounds per week to be a solid waste generation is estimated to be (pounds per week to be a solid waste generation is estimated to be (pounds per week to be a solid waste generation is estimated to be (pounds per week to be a solid waste generation is estimated to be (pounds per week to be a solid waste generation is estimated to be (pounds per week to be a solid waste generation is estimated to be (pounds per week to be a solid waste generation is estimated to be (pounds per week to be a solid waste generation is estimated to be (pounds per week to be a solid waste generation is estimated to be (pounds per week to be a solid waste generation is estimated to be (pounds per week to be a solid waste generation is estimated to be (pounds per week to be a solid waste generation is estimated to be (pounds per week to be a solid waste generation is estimated to be (pounds per week to be a solid waste generation is estimated to be a solid waste	2k): 33	
o would the proposed project have the potential to generate 100,000 pounds (50 tons) or more of solid waste per week?		
(b) Would the proposed project involve a reduction in capacity at a solid waste management facility used for refuse or recyclables generated within the City?		\square
12. ENERGY: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 15		
(a) Using energy modeling or Table 15-1 in <u>Chapter 15</u> , the project's projected energy use is estimated to be (annual BTUs): 278	,594	
(b) Would the proposed project affect the transmission or generation of energy?		\square
13. TRANSPORTATION: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 16		
(a) Would the proposed project exceed any threshold identified in Table 16-1 in <u>Chapter 16</u> ?		\square
(b) If "yes," conduct the screening analyses, attach appropriate back up data as needed for each stage and answer the following q	uestions	:
 Would the proposed project result in 50 or more Passenger Car Equivalents (PCEs) per project peak hour? 		
If "yes," would the proposed project result in 50 or more vehicle trips per project peak hour at any given intersection?		
**It should be noted that the lead agency may require further analysis of intersections of concern even when a project		
generates fewer than 50 vehicles in the peak hour. See Subsection 313 of <u>Chapter 16</u> for more information.		\square
o would the proposed project result in more than 200 subway/rail or bus trips per project peak hour? If "yes " would the proposed project result, per project peak hour, in 50 or more bus trips on a single line (in one).		
direction) or 200 subway trips per station or line?		
 Would the proposed project result in more than 200 pedestrian trips per project peak hour? 		\square
If "yes," would the proposed project result in more than 200 pedestrian trips per project peak hour to any given		
pedestrian or transit element, crosswaik, subway stair, or bus stop?		
(a) Mobile Sources: Would the proposed project result in the conditions outlined in Section 210 in Chapter 17?		\square
(b) Stationary Sources: Would the proposed project result in the conditions outlined in Section 220 in Chapter 17?		
 If "yes," would the proposed project exceed the thresholds in Figure 17-3, Stationary Source Screen Graph in Chapter 		
<u>17</u> ? (Attach graph as needed)		
(c) Does the proposed project involve multiple buildings on the project site?		\square
(d) Does the proposed project require federal approvals, support, licensing, or permits subject to conformity requirements?		\square
(e) Does the proposed project site have existing institutional controls (<i>e.g.</i> , (E) designation or Restrictive Declaration) relating to air quality that produce the potential for significant advorse impacts?		\boxtimes
15. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: CEOR Technical Manual Chapter 18		<u> </u>
(a) Is the proposed project a city capital project or a power generation plant?		\square
(b) Would the proposed project fundamentally change the City's solid waste management system?		
(c) If "yes" to any of the above, would the project require a GHG emissions assessment based on the guidance in Chapter 18?		
16. NOISE: CEOR Technical Manual Chapter 19		
(a) Would the proposed project generate or reroute vehicular traffic?		
(b) Would the proposed project introduce new or additional receptors (see Section 124 in Chapter 19) near heavily trafficked		
roadways, within one horizontal mile of an existing or proposed flight path, or within 1,500 feet of an existing or proposed		\boxtimes
rail line with a direct line of site to that rail line?		
(c) would the proposed project cause a stationary noise source to operate within 1,500 feet of a receptor with a direct line of sight to that receptor or introduce receptors into an area with high ambient stationary noise?		\square
(d) Does the proposed project site have existing institutional controls (e.g., (E) designation or Restrictive Declaration) relating to		\square
noise that preclude the potential for significant adverse impacts?		
17. FUDLIC FEALIF: LEQK LECONICAL MANUAL Chapter 20 (a) Paced upon the analysis conducted, do any of the following technical areas require a detailed analysis: Air Our lity:		
Hazardous Materials; Noise?		\square

		YES	NO						
(b) If "yes," explain why an assessment of public health is or is not wa	rranted based on the guidance in <u>Chapter 20</u> , "Public Heal	th." Attac	ch a						
preliminary analysis, if necessary.									
18. NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER: CEQR Technical Manual Chapt	<u>ter 21</u>	- 1	I						
(a) Based upon the analyses conducted, do any of the following techni	cal areas require a detailed analysis: Land Use, Zoning,								
Resources: Shadows: Transportation: Noise?									
(b) If "yes," explain why an assessment of neighborhood character is a	or is not warranted based on the guidance in Chapter 21, "	Neighbor	hood						
Character." Attach a preliminary analysis, if necessary. No adve	rse impacts would occur to any of the constitue	nt elem	ents						
of neighborhood character.									
19. CONSTRUCTION: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 22									
(a) Would the project's construction activities involve:									
 Construction activities lasting longer than two years? 			\square						
o Construction activities within a Central Business District or alor	ng an arterial highway or major thoroughfare?		\square						
 Closing, narrowing, or otherwise impeding traffic, transit, or pe routes, sidewalks, crosswalks, corners, <i>etc.</i>)? 	destrian elements (roadways, parking spaces, bicycle								
 Construction of multiple buildings where there is a potential fo final build-out? 	r on-site receptors on buildings completed before the		\square						
• The operation of several pieces of diesel equipment in a single	location at peak construction?		\square						
• Closure of a community facility or disruption in its services?			\square						
• Activities within 400 feet of a historic or cultural resource?			\square						
 Disturbance of a site containing or adjacent to a site containing 	natural resources?		\square						
 Construction on multiple development sites in the same geogra construction timelines to overlap or last for more than two yea 	aphic area, such that there is the potential for several rs overall?		\square						
(b) If any boxes are checked "yes," explain why a preliminary construct	tion assessment is or is not warranted based on the guidar	ce in <u>Cha</u>	pter						
<u>22</u> , "Construction." It should be noted that the nature and extent of equipment or Best Management Practices for construction activities	of any commitment to use the Best Available Technology for a should be considered when making this determination	or constru	iction						
All construction activities would be performed in compliance	with relevant DOT and DOB regulations.								
20 ΑΡΡΙ ΙζΑΝΤ'ς ΓΕΡΤΙΕΙζΑΤΙΟΝ									
Lower or offirm under each and subject to the papaltice for paris	ry that the information provided in this Environment		mont						
Statement (EAS) is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge	and belief based upon my personal knowledge and	di ASSESS familiarit	w						
with the information described herein and after examination of th	e pertinent books and records and/or after inquiry or	f persons	.y s who						
have personal knowledge of such information or who have examin	ned pertinent books and records.	percent							
Still under oath. I further swear or affirm that I make this statemer	nt in my capacity as the applicant or representative o	f the ent	itv						
that seeks the permits, approvals, funding, or other governmental	action(s) described in this EAS.		y						
APPLICANT/REPRESENTATIVE NAME	DATE								
James Heineman	November 9, 2017								
SIGNATURE									
Curvey (Server									
PLEASE NOTE THAT APPLICANTS MAY BE REQUIRED	TO SUBSTANTIATE RESPONSES IN THIS FORM A	T THE							

DISCRETION OF THE LEAD AGENCY SO THAT IT MAY SUPPORT ITS DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE.

Pa	rt III: DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE (To Be Comple	ted by Lead Agency)									
IN:	STRUCTIONS: In completing Part III, the lead agency shou	Id consult 6 NYCRR 617.7 and 43 RCNY § 6-(06 (Executi	ive							
	1. For each of the impact categories listed below, consider whether the project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment, taking into account its (a) location; (b) probability of occurring; (c) duration; (d) irreversibility; (e) geographic scope; and (f) magnitude. Potentially										
	IMPACT CATEGORY	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	YES	NO							
ľ	Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy										
ł	Socioeconomic Conditions										
ł	Community Facilities and Services		\neg								
ł	Open Space										
t	Shadows										
ł	Historic and Cultural Resources										
ł	Urban Design/Visual Resources										
ł	Natural Resources		Ħ	X							
ł	Hazardous Materials										
ŀ	Water and Sewer Infrastructure										
ŀ	Solid Waste and Sanitation Services		H								
ł	Energy		Π								
F	Transportation		Ħ								
ł	Air Quality										
ŀ	Greenhouse Gas Emissions		Ħ								
T	Noise		П								
ł	Public Health		- H								
- -	Neighborhood Character										
ł	Construction	· - · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·									
	2. Are there any aspects of the project relevant to the dete	rmination of whether the project may have a									
	significant impact on the environment, such as combined covered by other responses and supporting materials?	d or cumulative impacts, that were not fully									
	If there are such impacts, attach an explanation stating v have a significant impact on the environment.	vhether, as a result of them, the project may									
	3. Check determination to be issued by the lead agend	cy:									
	 Positive Declaration: If the lead agency has determined that the project may have a significant impact on the environment, and if a Conditional Negative Declaration is not appropriate, then the lead agency issues a <i>Positive Declaration</i> and prepares a draft Scope of Work for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Conditional Negative Declaration: A <i>Conditional Negative Declaration</i> (CND) may be appropriate if there is a private applicant for an Unlisted action AND when conditions imposed by the lead agency will modify the proposed project so that no significant adverse environmental impacts would result. The CND is prepared as a separate document and is subject to a subject to the termination. 										
	the requirements of 6 NYCRR Part 617. Negative Declaration: If the lead agency has determined that the project would not result in potentially significant adverse environmental impacts, then the lead agency issues a <i>Negative Declaration</i> . The <i>Negative Declaration</i> may be prepared as a separate document (see template) or using the embedded Negative Declaration on the part page.										
	4. LEAD AGENCY'S CERTIFICATION										
TIT	LE	LEAD AGENCY									
Di	rector, Envionmental Assessment & Review Division	New York City Department of City Plannin	ng								
NA Ro	ME bert Dobruskin, AICP	DATE November 9, 2017									
SIG	Nature Lovent Dobuski										



HII.









1. View of West 89th Street facing northwest (Site at right)



600 Columbus Avenue, Manhattan



2. View of Columbus Avenue facing northeast (Site at left).



3. View of Site facing north from West 89th Street.



4. View of Site facing east from West 89th Street.



600 Columbus Avenue, Manhattan



5. View of West 89th Street facing southeast (Site at left).



6. View of the sidewalk along the north side of West 89th Street facing southeast (Site at left).



7. View of West 89th Street facing west from the Site.



600 Columbus Avenue, Manhattan



8. View of West 89th Street facing south from the Site.



9. View of the sidewalk along the north side of West 89th Street facing northwest (Site at right).



10. View of the sidewalk along the west side of Columbus Avenue facing northeast (Site at left).



600 Columbus Avenue, Manhattan



11. View of Columbus Avenue facing south from the Site.



12. View of Columbus Avenue facing east from the Site.



13. View of the sidewalk along the west side of Columbus Avenue facing southwest (Site at right).



600 Columbus Avenue, Manhattan



14. View of the sidewalk along the south side of West 90th Street facing northwest (Site at left).



15. View of the sidewalk along the south side of West 90th Street facing southeast (Site at right).



16. View of West 90th Street facing east from the Site.



600 Columbus Avenue, Manhattan



17. View of West 90th Street facing north from the Site.



18. View of West 90th Street facing southeast (Site at right).



19. View of the Site facing south from West 90th Street.



600 Columbus Avenue, Manhattan



20. View of the Site facing west from West 90th Street.



21. View of Columbus Avenue facing southwest (Site at right).



22. View of West 90th Street facing northwest (Site at left).



600 Columbus Avenue, Manhattan



23. View of the Site facing west from Columbus Avenue.



24. View of the Site facing north from Columbus Avenue.



Multi da anticia da anticica da anticica











1. Project Description

Actions Necessary to Facilitate the Proposal:

The applicant, Columbus Townhouse Associates, is seeking a modification pursuant to ZR Section 78-06(b)(3) of the previously approved West Side Large Scale Residential Development (CP-18505, "LSRD") within the former West Side Urban Renewal Area ("WSURA"), affecting 600 Columbus Avenue (the "Development Site" or the "Site"), also known as Site 35-1 in the LSRD. The proposed modification involves changes to the first and second floors of the existing mixed-use building at the Site, which were approved pursuant to a previous modification under ULURP No. M920493 ZAM. In addition, the applicant requests to modify a previously approved Restrictive Declaration (N 870595 ZAM) that limits the amount of community facility and commercial floor area permitted in accordance with the plans approved at the time. The modification would adjust the floor area limits of the Restrictive Declaration to be consistent with the modified Large Scale Residential Development. Collectively, the proposed actions would change controls related to non-residential uses within the existing building on the development site, including the location and amount of community facility uses.

The proposed action would facilitate a proposal by the applicant to expand and reconfigure the first and second floors of the existing building located at the Development Site. Under the applicant's proposal, the amount of residential floor area would decrease by 18 gross square feet, from 149,115 square feet to 149,097 square feet due to reconfiguration that would reduce first floor lobby space from 2,182 square feet to 2,164 square feet.

The proposed development would result in a decrease in the amount of commercial floor area by 540 zoning and gross square feet, from 24,996 square feet to 24,456 square feet. This decrease would consist of a 51-foot reduction in first floor commercial space and a 489-square foot reduction in second floor commercial space. Due to double counting of floor space in the original approval, the actual commercial floor area reduction is 530 square feet.

As proposed, the amount of community facility space would increase by 1,846 square feet from 5,323 gross square feet to 7,169 gross square feet. This would consist of a 69-foot increase in first floor community facility space and a 1,777-square foot increase in second floor community facility space. Due to double counting of floor space in the original approval, the actual community facility floor area increase is 1,910 square feet.

The attached site plans illustrate the applicant's intended development that would be permitted by the proposed action.

Background and Site History:

The Development Site was designated Site 35-1 in the West Side Urban Renewal Plan (the "WSURP" or the "Plan"). The WSURP, which was adopted in 1962 and expired in 2002, included twenty blocks bounded by West 87th Street to the south, West 97th Street to the north, Amsterdam Avenue to the west and Central Park West to the east. The Large-Scale Residential Development ("LSRD") Plan was approved by the City Planning Commission ("CPC") in conjunction with the WSURP in 1963 and has been revised several times.

The Plan was implemented to encourage rehabilitation and redevelopment of this area of Manhattan. Specifically, the WSURP supported high-rise residential development with a limited amount of retail and community facility floor area at the street level. The LSRD Plan stipulates the amount of commercial and community facility FAR for all parcels in the West Side LSRD, including Site 35-1. The maximum FARs for these uses were set significantly lower than what underlying zoning allowed at that time in order to encourage primarily residential development.

As the WSURP expired in 2002, WSURP sites are now governed only by the LSRD plan and underlying zoning requirements, as applicable. Although the WSURP has expired, the LSRD is still in place. In July 2008, the City Planning Commission adopted a text amendment to the ownership provisions of the LSRD regulations. This text amendment in ZR Section 78-06(b)(3), allowed individual owners of the LSRD sites to

seek modification of the LSRD controls in order to develop enlargements or conversions that utilize available commercial and community facility floor area in accordance with underlying zoning.

An authorization to modify the LSRD plan to increase the community floor area at the Site (N 870595 ZAM) was adopted in 1987. This modification restricted the amount of community facility floor area to 5,523 square feet and commercial floor area to 24,996 square feet in accordance with the plans approved at that time

When the existing building at the Site was originally constructed, portions of the second floor were carved out to create areas of "double height" above the first floor commercial space. This floor area from the second floor portion of the commercial space was eliminated just prior to the onset of construction to avoid the requirement for a loading berth, which would be required for commercial space over 25,000 square feet.

Description of the Proposed Development Site:

The Development Site is identified as 600 Columbus Avenue (Block 1220, Lot 29). The Development Site is located in the Upper West Side section of Manhattan Community District 7 and occupies the entire eastern block front of Columbus Avenue, between West 89th Street and West 90th Street. The Development Site is a full block front site from West 89th Street to West 90th Street with a lot depth of 103 feet and approximately 201 feet of frontage along Columbus Avenue.

The Development Site has a lot area of 20,746 square feet and is developed at an FAR of 8.73. The Development Site is improved with a 14-story building containing 166 dwelling units, 30,319 gross and zoning square feet of non-residential space located on the first and second floors, and a 101 car parking garage that is located in the cellar. The first floor is entirely Use Group 6 retail space, except for the lobby and core space that leads to the upper floors. The second floor contains a Use Group 3 community facility pre-school and Use Group 6 commercial office space. Formerly Use Group 6 retail spaces on the second floor are now vacant.

The building occupying the development site currently contains 149,115 gross square feet of residential floor area, 5,323 gross square feet of community facility floor area, and 24,996 gross square feet of commercial floor area. The building contains 101 accessory parking spaces.

Description of the Surrounding Area:

The Project Site is located in the Upper West Side section of Manhattan Community District 7. The land uses in the Surrounding Area are predominately mixed residential, commercial and community facility uses. Columbus Avenue is a busy commercial thoroughfare. The portion of the lot within 100 feet of Columbus Avenue is within a C1-9 zoning district. A small portion at the rear of the lot extends into an R7-2 district. The site is identified as Site 35-1 of the Large Scale Residential Development adopted within the former West Side Urban Renewal Area.

The land uses in the Surrounding Area are predominately mixed residential, commercial and community facility uses. Block 1220, on which the Development Site is located, within the R7-2, C1-9 and C2-8 zoning districts, is improved with commercial, multi-family residential, community facility, open space, and parking uses. There are three 5- and 6-story multi-family buildings located directly west of the Development Site. The West Side Community Garden, built by the Applicant in 1987, occupies 17,296 square feet in the midblock portion of Block 1220. The community garden space is located on a through lot that fronts along both West 89th and West 90th streets. The St. Gregory the Great School and St. Gregory's Playground (a 10,070 square foot park adjacent to the community garden) front on West 90th Street. Monterey Garage, a 5,034 square foot parking garage, fronts along West 89th Street. The Claremont Riding Academy, formerly known as the Claremont Stables, is a 4-story, 7,553 square foot building fronting West 89th Street and was designated as a landmark site in 1990.

The blocks located north of the Development Site, within the R7-2, C1-9 and C2-8 zoning districts, are primarily developed with multi-family residential, 1 & 2 family residential, commercial, and community facility buildings. Blocks located east of the Development Site, within the R7-2, C1-9 and R10, are primarily developed with multi-family residential and 1 & 2 family residential buildings. The 1 & 2 family residential buildings range from 3- to 6-stories height, whereas the multi-family buildings range from 4- to 29-stories in height. The multi-family buildings with larger bulk are generally located along Columbus Avenue and Central

Park West.

The blocks located south of the Subject Site, within the R7-2 and C1-9 zoning districts, are primarily developed with 1 & 2 family residential and commercial buildings, and taller buildings on the avenue frontages. There is an 8-story mixed residential and commercial building which occupies the entire eastern block front of Columbus Avenue between West 89th Street and West 88th Street, located directly across the street from the Subject Site. Two mixed residential and commercial buildings, 5- and 11-stories in height, occupy and front the entirety of the block between West 88th Street and West 87th Street.

Description of the Proposed Development:

The proposed modification, pursuant to ZR Section 78-06(b)(3), seeks to amend the LSRD plan to permit the reallocation of existing floor area within the second floor of 600 Columbus Avenue and the creation of 1,362 square feet of new floor area by extending the second floor within existing double height sections of the building that were previously left unbuilt.

With the proposed modification, the building could contain up to 31,625 zoning square feet of non-residential floor area. Up to 25,000 square feet of this non-residential floor area could be commercial space. Commercial space in excess of this amount would trigger a requirement for an off-street loading dock, which is infeasible to provide. The balance of the non-residential floor area, 6,625 zoning square feet, would be community facility space. While this is the maximum development that would be permitted under the proposed modification, the applicant's intended project would result in 24,456 zoning square feet (24,456 gross square feet) of commercial space, a 540-square foot reduction as compared to existing and no-action conditions, and 7,169 zoning square feet (7,169 gross square feet) of community facility space, a 1,846 square foot increase as compared to existing conditions.

The proposed condition is illustrated in the attached site plan.

The requested action includes a corresponding modification of the Restrictive Declaration recorded in 1987 in connection with application No. N 870595 ZAM, which restricts the amount of community facility and commercial floor area permitted in accordance with the plans approved at that time. The modification would make the limitations contained within the Restrictive Declaration consistent with those in the Large Scale Residential Development.

1.5 Build Year:

It is anticipated that public review would be completed in 2018 and that the proposed project would be completed in 2020.

1.6 Purpose and Need:

The proposed action will facilitate the expansion and reconfiguration of the building's current first and second floor uses to meet the applicant's desired programming needs. The requested modification will allow a mix of uses within the building that comply and conform with the Development Site's zoning. Under the current LSRD regulations governing the site, community facility floor area is limited to 5,523 square feet and commercial floor area to 24,996 square feet in accordance with the plans approved at that time. The proposed modification would allow for additional community facility space that would serve local needs.

1.7 No-Action Scenario:

In the no-action condition, the building occupying the subject site would continue to be occupied as permitted under the present controls adopted as ULURP #N870595ZAM. No changes to existing conditions could occur. The building occupying the development site currently contains 149,115 gross square feet of residential floor area, 5,323 gross square feet of community facility floor area, and 24,996 gross square feet of commercial floor area. The building contains 101 accessory parking spaces.

1.8 With-Action Scenario:

The proposed modification would permit the reallocation of existing floor area within the second floor of 600 Columbus Avenue and the creation of 1,288 square feet of new floor area by extending the second floor within existing double height sections of the building that were previously left unbuilt. No exterior

modifications or physical enlargement to the building's exterior are proposed.

While the project description above indicates the applicant's intent, the proposed modification would allow a total non-residential floor area on the Site of 31,625 zoning square feet. The requirement for a loading dock if commercial floor area exceeds 25,000 square feet precludes commercial development in excess of this amount.

For the purposes of a conservative analysis, the future with action scenario will consider non-residential floor area that goes above and beyond the applicant's proposal. The maximum allowable non-residential floor area is 31,625 zsf. Given neighborhood trends it is expected that the expansion and reconfiguration could result in approximately 25,000 zsf of commercial uses (the maximum achievable without providing a loading dock) and the remaining allowable 6,625 zsf of non-residential floor area would be occupied with community facility uses.

		EXI	STING	N	10-	ACTION		WITI	H-A(CTION		
		CONDITION			CONDITION			CONDITION			INCREMENT	
			LAND	USE								
Residential	Хү	ES	NO	X YES		NO	ΧY	'ES		NO		
If "yes," specify the following:												
Describe type of residential structures	Mult	tiple d	lwelling	Multiple	e dı	welling	Mu	ltiple (dwel	ling		
No. of dwelling units	166			166			166			0	0	
No. of low- to moderate-income units												
Gross floor area (sq. ft.)	149,	115		149,115	;		149	,097			(18)	
Commercial	ΧY	ES	NO	X YES		NO	X	/ES		NO		
If "yes," specify the following:												
Describe type (retail, office, other)	Reta	il and	office	Retail a	nd	office	Ret	ail and	l offi	се	1	
Gross floor area (sq. ft.)	24,9	96		24,996			25,	000			4	
Manufacturing/Industrial	YE	S	ΧΝΟ	YES		ΧΝΟ	Y	ES	Х	NO		
If "yes," specify the following:												
Type of use											1	
Gross floor area (sq. ft.)												
Open storage area (sq. ft.)												
If any unenclosed activities, specify:										_		
Community Facility	X ye	S	NO NO	X YES		🗌 NO	Хγ	ES		NO		
If "yes," specify the following:												
Туре	Pre-	schoo		Pre-sch	ool		Pre	-schoc)I			
Gross floor area (sq. ft.)	5,32	3		5,323			6,6	25			1,302	
Vacant Land		YES	ΧΝΟ	YE:	S	X no		YES		X NO		
If "yes," describe:												
Other Land Uses		YES	Х	YE:	S	Χ ΝΟ		YES	Х	NO		
If "yes," describe:												
PARKING												
Garages	X YE	S	NO	X YES		NO	Χү	ES		NO		
If "yes," specify the following:												
No. of public spaces												
No. of accessory spaces	101			101			101				1	
Lots	YES		X no	YES		ΧΝΟ	YE	S		X NO		
If "yes," specify the following:												
No. of public spaces											1	
No. of accessory spaces												
ZONING												
Zoning classification	C1-9	and R	7-2	C1-9 and	l R7	-2	C1-9	and R	7-2		1	
Maximum amount of floor area that can be developed		AR resi	dential, 2 FAR	10 FAR r	esic	lential, 2 FAR	10 F	AR res	ident	ial, 2 FAR		
		mercia	l in C1-9; up	commer	cial	in C1-9; up to	commercial in C1-9; up to		:1-9; up to			
Predominant land use and zoning classifications within	to 3.4	44 FAR	7-2: mix of	3.44 FAR	. IN P 7	K/-2	3.44 FAR in R7-2			+		
land use study area(s) or a 400 ft. radius of proposed	resid	ential.	local	residenti	ial,	local commercial.	resi	dential	, loca			
project	comr	mercia	l, community	commun	ity	facility	com	mercia	il, cor	nmunity		
	facili	ty					faci	ity				

2 Analysis Framework and Screening Analysis

Based on the answers provided in the EAS Form, the proposed action warrants assessment of Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy. Additionally, as required by ZR Section 78-06(b)(3), an assessment of the potential for the proposed action, considered in combination with developments or enlargements previously the subject of modifications under this zoning section, are considered.

The proposed action would not result in any exterior physical changes or ground disturbance to the Development Site that could result in potential impacts to site-specific aspects of the environment including Urban Design and Visual Resources, Shadows, Historic Resources, Natural Resources, Hazardous Materials. The proposed action would not introduce a new sensitive noise receptor that is not currently allowed under LSRD and Zoning regulations, and therefore does not warrant analysis of noise.

The proposed enlargement would occur within existing double-height spaces and would not increase the building volume to be heated and cooled and therefore would not increase emissions associated with the building's HVAC system. The building was converted to natural gas in 2016, prior to the proposed modification. As described in the attached letter from the building's mechanical engineer, the proposal would not add any additional cubic feet to the building, and the building's boiler and other mechanical equipment have always heated the double-height space to be filled in. Therefore, there would be no additional fuel consumption or boiler emissions associated with the proposed action.

The increase of four square feet of retail space and 1,302 square feet of community facility space under the analysis scenario would be below the relevant size thresholds for density related impacts to socioeconomic conditions, community facilities, open space, water and sewer infrastructure, solid waste and sanitation, energy, and greenhouse gas emissions and climate change.

Because action-induced construction would be limited to interior work the proposed action does not have the potential for adverse impacts related to construction activity. No potential impacts to any of the constituent elements of neighborhood character or public health would occur.

3 Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy

According to the 2014 CEQR Technical Manual, a preliminary assessment of existing and future land use and zoning should be provided for all projects that would affect land use or would change the zoning on a site. Since the proposed action includes a modification to a Large Scale Residential Development (LSRD), which is a discretionary action that would affect land use and zoning, a preliminary land use and zoning assessment was performed.

Additionally, an assessment of public policy should accompany the land use and zoning assessment as well, according to CEQR Technical Manual guidelines. Accordingly, because this project is located in the former West Side Urban Renewal Area (WSURA) this analysis includes a discussion of the West Side Urban Renewal Plan (WSURP).

This preliminary analysis of land use, zoning, and public policy follows the guidelines set forth in the 2014 CEQR Technical Manual for a preliminary assessment (Section 320). According to the Manual, a preliminary land use and zoning assessment includes a basic description of existing and future land uses and zoning, and describes any changes in zoning that could cause changes in land use. It also characterizes the land use development trends in the area surrounding the project site that might be affected by the proposed actions, and determines whether the proposed project is compatible with those trends or may affect them.

3.1 Land Use

3.1.1 Existing Conditions

<u>Development Site</u>: The Development Site is identified as 600 Columbus Avenue (Block 1220, Lot 29). The Development Site is located in the Upper West Side section of Manhattan Community District 7 and occupies the entire western block front of Columbus Avenue, between West 89th Street and West 90th Street. The Development Site is a full block front site from West 89th Street to West 90th Street with a lot depth of 103 feet and approximately 201 feet of frontage along Columbus Avenue.

The Development Site has a lot area of 20,746 square feet and is developed at an FAR of 8.73. The Development Site is improved with a 14-story building containing 166 dwelling units, 30,319 gross and zoning square feet of non-residential space located on the first and second floors, and a 101 car parking garage that is located in the cellar. The first floor is entirely Use Group 6 retail space, except for the lobby and core space that leads to the upper floors. The second floor contains a Use Group 3 community facility pre-school and Use Group 6 commercial office space. Formerly Use Group 6 retail spaces on the second floor are now vacant.

The building occupying the development site currently contains 149,115 gross square feet of residential floor area, 5,323 gross square feet of community facility floor area, and 24,996 gross square feet of commercial floor area. The building contains 101 accessory parking spaces.

<u>Study Area</u>: The land uses in the Surrounding Area are predominately mixed residential, commercial and community facility uses. Columbus Avenue is a busy commercial thoroughfare.

Block 1220, on which the Development Site is located, within the R7-2, C1-9 and C2-8 zoning districts, is improved with commercial, multi-family residential, community facility, open space, and parking uses. There are three 5- and 6-story multi-family buildings located directly west of the Development Site. The West Side Community Garden, built by the Applicant in 1987, occupies 17,296 square feet in the midblock portion of Block 1220. The community garden space is located on a through lot that fronts along both West 89th and West 90th streets. The St. Gregory the Great School and St. Gregory's Playground (a 10,070 square foot park adjacent to the community garden) front on West 90th Street. Monterey Garage, a 5,034 square foot parking garage, fronts along West 89th Street. The Claremont Riding Academy, formerly known as the Claremont Stables, is a 4-story, 7,553 square foot building fronting West 89th Street and was designated as a landmark site in 1990.

The blocks located north of the Development Site, within the R7-2, C1-9 and C2-8 zoning districts, are primarily developed with multi-family residential, 1 & 2 family residential, commercial, and community facility buildings. Block 1221, directly north of the Development Site, contains a 100,350 square foot lot improved with three multi-family elevator residential buildings (Sondra Thomas Apartments, Stephen Wise Towers Building, and the Wise Houses Children's Center which is also improved with the Goddard Riverside Daycare Center), all owned by the New York City Housing Authority. The three buildings range from 12-19 floors and contain a total of 1,197 dwelling units. The eastern portion Block 1221, fronting Columbus Avenue directly north of the Development Site, is improved with a 22-story mixed residential and commercial building containing 231 dwelling units and an FAR of 7.93. Blocks 1222 and 1205 in the Surrounding Area's outer boundary, are comprised primarily of community facility and residential uses. Approximately 93,156 square feet of Block 1222 is improved with the Trinity School building for children in kindergarten through 4th grade. The Trinity School was designated as a landmark site in 1989 under the Trinity School and the Former St. Agnes Parish House Designation. The western portion of Block 1222 is improved with the Central Baptist Church of New York City. The remaining buildings on Block 1222 include a 15-story mixed residential and commercial building and 3- to 6-story residential and commercial buildings. Block 1205 is improved with a 22-story mixed residential and commercial building (Wise Towers, WSURA Site B) owned by the New York City Housing Authority. The Sol Bloom Playground and New York City Public School 84 are located in the mid-block portion of Block 1205. The remaining buildings on the western portion of Block 1205 are improved with 19-, 12- and 6-story multi-family residential buildings.

Blocks 1204, 1203, 1202 and 1201 located east of the Development Site, within the R7-2, C1-9 and R10, are primarily developed with multi-family residential and 1 & 2 family residential buildings. The 1 & 2 family residential buildings range from 3- to 6-stories height, whereas the multi-family buildings range from 4- to 29-stories in height. The multi-family buildings with larger bulk are generally located at either end of blocks 1204, 1203, 1202 and 1201 facing Columbus Avenue and Central Park West. Lot 1 on Block 1203, located directly across the street from the Development Site, is improved with an 19-story multi-family residential building with ground floor commercial use. The Dwight School is located on Block 1203, and is 7 stories in height. Block 1202 is improved with the St. Dumitru Roman Orthodox Church, The Trevor School, and a branch of The Dwight School.

The blocks located south of the Subject Site, within the R7-2 and C1-9 zoning districts, are primarily developed with 1 & 2 family residential and commercial buildings. There is an 8-story mixed residential and commercial building which occupies the entire eastern block front of Block 1219, fronting Columbus Avenue

between West 89th Street and West 88th Street, located directly across the street from the Subject Site. Block 1219 is also improved with New York City Public School 166, designated as a landmark building in 2000, and Playground Eighty Nine, both the school and playground front on West 89th Street. 1 & 2 family residential buildings, ranging from 3- to 5-stories in height, front along West 88th Street on Blocks 1219 and 1218. Block 1218 is improved with two mixed residential and commercial buildings, 5- and 11-stories in height, which occupy and front the entirety of the block between West 88th Street and West 87th Street. Block 1218 is also improved with a church and school that each front on West 87th Street.

3.1.2 Future No-Action Conditions

<u>Development Site</u>: In the no-action condition, the building occupying the development site would continue to be occupied as permitted under the present controls adopted as ULURP #N870595ZAM. No changes to existing conditions could occur. The building occupying the development site currently contains 149,115 gross square feet of residential floor area, 5,323 gross square feet of community facility floor area, and 24,996 gross square feet of commercial floor area. The building contains 101 accessory parking spaces.

<u>Study Area</u>: In the future without the proposed action, land use patterns in the surrounding area are expected to remain essentially unchanged. There are five projects within the former WSURA that have received similar LSRD modification approvals and are expected to be developed and occupied in the same time frame as the development proposed for 600 Columbus Avenue. These projects are:

- Leader House 100 Columbus Avenue (between 92nd and 93rd Streets)
- 70 West 93rd Street (east side of Columbus Avenue between 92nd and 93rd Streets)
- The Axton 733 Amsterdam Avenue (between 95th and 96th Streets)
- The Heywood 175 West 90th Street (east side of Amsterdam Avenue between 90th and 91st Streets)
- Columbus House 95 West 95th Street (east side of Columbus Avenue between 95th and 96th Streets)

These developments would permit changes in non-residential development on these sites that is consistent with the sites' underlying zoning, but is not permitted by the LSRD which governs development of WSURA sites.

The modification for Leader House, located on the west side of Columbus Avenue between 92nd and 93rd streets, allows the addition of approximately 17,870 zoning square feet of new retail floor area, and 16,272 zoning square of new community facility floor area. Additional retail floor space, in the amount of 18,870 square feet, would be provided in the cellar level below ground by reducing the size of the existing accessory parking garage. In addition, a previously-approved modification would permit The Axton, located on Amsterdam Avenue between 95th and 96th Streets, to add approximately 8,323 zoning square feet of new retail floor area, and 7,610 zoning square feet of new community facility floor area. A previously approved modification permits the creation of 14,730 square feet of new commercial floor area, to be occupied by restaurant and retail uses, at 70 East 93rd Street, located on the east side of Columbus Circle between 92nd and 93rd Street. The modification approved for the Heywood, at 175 West 90th Street, allows the creation of 2,635 square feet of new commercial space. The modification recently approved for 95 West 95th Street allows the creation of 20,819 square feet of new commercial space and 11,941 square feet of community facility space.

3.1.3 Future With-Action Condition:

<u>Subject Site</u>: The proposed modification would permit the reallocation of existing floor area within the second floor of 600 Columbus Avenue and the creation of 1,288 square feet of new floor area by extending the second floor within existing double height sections of the building that were previously left unbuilt. Incremental development would include four feet of commercial space and 1,302 square feet of community facility space, and a reduction of 18 feet of accessory residential space. No exterior modifications or physical enlargement to the building's exterior are proposed.

3.1.4 Conclusion.

The With-Action development that would occur on the subject site would not introduce new land uses to the

study area. The With-Action development would reflect and be compatible with the existing residential, local commercial, and community facility land use patterns of the surrounding area. The use and size of the spaces proposed is typical to the use patterns in the area, as seen along Columbus Avenue on the blocks to the north and south of the project site which are characterized by small-scale commercial uses such as neighborhood retail, restaurants and community facilities. Therefore, the proposed action would not adversely affect the land use character of the study area and would not result in significant adverse land use impacts.

3.2 Zoning and Public Policy

3.2.1 Existing Conditions:

<u>Subject Site:</u> The portion of the Subject Site within 100 feet of Columbus Avenue is within a C1-9 zoning district. A small portion at the rear of the lot extends into an R7-2 district. The site is identified as Site 35-1 of the Large Scale Residential Development adopted within the former West Side Urban Renewal Area. The LSRD for the site limits commercial development of the site to 24,996 square feet and community facility development to 5,323 square feet.

<u>Study Area</u>: The area within a 600' radius from the center of the Development Site (the "Surrounding Area") is zoned R7-2, C1-9 and C2-8 as shown on the Area Map submitted with this application.

The R7 residential zoning district consists mainly of medium-density apartment houses. R7-2 zoning districts are mapped primarily in upper Manhattan and have lower parking requirements. The FAR in R7 districts range from 0.87 to 3.44 and the open space ratio ranges from 15.5 to 25.5.

The C1-9 and C2-8 zoning districts are commercial zoning districts that are predominantly residential in character. C1-9 and C2-8 zoning districts are mapped along major thoroughfares in medium- and higherdensity areas, such as Columbus Avenue and Amsterdam Avenue. Typical retail uses within these zoning districts include grocery stores, dry cleaners, drug stores, restaurants, and local clothing stores that cater to the daily needs of the immediate residential neighborhood. There are only minor differences between C1 and C2 districts, with a slightly wider range of uses permitted in C2 districts. Residential uses in the C1-9 and C2-8 zoning districts are governed by the R10 residential district equivalent FAR of 10.0. The maximum commercial FAR for C1-9 and C2-8 zoning districts is 2.0.

The former West Side Urban Renewal Area was adopted in 1962 and encompassed 37 redevelopment sites bounded by West 87th Street, West 97th Street, Amsterdam Avenue and Central Park West. The Development Site was designated as Site 35-1 within the former WSURA. The Large Scale Residential Development plan was adopted in 1963 (CP-18505) and has been revised several times since it was adopted. The former WSURA expired in 2002.

3.2.2 Future Without the Proposed Action.

No changes to zoning and public policy are anticipated in the future without the proposed action. As described previously under the discussion of Land Use, previously approved modifications of the LSRP governing the former WSURA would allow new development of five former WSURA sites.

3.2.3 Future With the Proposed Action.

Under the proposed action, no changes to zoning would occur. The proposed modification of the LSRP would allow for a modest increase in non-residential floor area within the existing envelope of 600 Columbus Avenue. The development would be well within the maximum amount allowed under the site's C1-9 and R7-2 zoning. The proposed action would only apply to the Development Site and would not affect any other sites in the study area.

As proposed by the applicant, the proposed action will allow for the conversion of underutilized commercial space to be used for community facility space that will serve the needs of the Surrounding Area, and will create new commercial space by filling in double-height space. For purposes of providing a conservative analysis, a development scenario that maximizes development potential under the proposed action is considered. This scenario would consist of a four-foot increase in commercial space and an 802-square foot increase in community facility space. The requested modification will allow a mix of uses within the building that comply and conform with the Development Site's zoning and the neighborhood's needs.

3.2.4 Conclusion:

The proposed action would not alter zoning patterns in the area, or introduce uses that are incompatible with existing zoning designations. Public policy for the West Side LSRD includes the ability of the City Planning Commission to approve modifications to the LSRD controls to allow sites to develop enlargements or conversions that utilize available commercial and community facility floor area in accordance with underlying zoning. By meeting the required findings for this modification, as specified in Z.R. Section 78-06(b)(3), the proposed modification's consistency with land use policy for the area is demonstrated, and no impacts would occur.

4 Air Quality

The proposed enlargement would allow for a net increase in floor area within the building occupying the subject site. That increase in floor area would occur within existing double-height spaces and would not increase the building volume to be heated and cooled and therefore would not increase emissions associated with the building's HVAC system. The building was converted to natural gas in 2016, prior to the proposed modification. As described in the attached letter from the building's mechanical engineer, the proposal would not add any additional cubic feet to the building, and the building's boiler and other mechanical equipment have always heated the double-height space to be filled in. Therefore there would be no additional boiler emissions associated with the proposed action and no potential for significant adverse impacts related to air quality.

5. Cumulative Analysis

Section78-06(d) of the Zoning Resolution provides that: "any significant adverse impacts resulting from a development or enlargement to such modifications, considered in combination with developments or enlargements within the former urban renewal area listed in paragraph (b)(2), previously the subject of modifications under this paragraph (b)(3), shall have been avoided or minimized to the maximum extent practicable by incorporating as conditions to the modification those mitigative measures that have been identified as practicable."

Under the proposed action, existing floor area would be reallocated between commercial and community facility uses on the first and second floors of the existing building at 600 Columbus Avenue, and additional second floor space would be created within existing double-height sections of the building. Ground floor residential circulation space would be decreased by eighteen square feet. As a consequence, the amount of community facility space at 600 Columbus Avenue would increase by 1,302 square feet and the amount of commercial space would increase by four square feet, from 24,996 square feet to 25,000 square feet. The amount of residential floor area would decrease by 18 square feet. Overall there would be an increase in floor area of 1,288 square feet. This cumulative analysis considers the potential for impacts resulting from the proposed action in combination with other developments or enlargements that were subject of modifications under this section of the zoning resolution.

A previously-approved modification permitted Leader House, located on the west side of Columbus Avenue between 92nd and 93rd streets, to add approximately 35,740 gross square feet of new retail floor area, and 11,722 zoning and gross square of new community facility floor area. A previously approved modification for the Heywood, at 175 West 90th Street, would allow a 2,635-gross square foot increase in retail floor area. A previously-approved modification for The Axton, located on Amsterdam Avenue between 95th and 96th Streets, would allow approximately 8,323 zoning square feet of new retail floor area, and 7,610 zoning square feet of new community facility floor area. A previously approved modification for 70 East 93rd Street permits the creation of 14,730 square feet of new commercial floor area, to be occupied by restaurant and retail uses. A recently approved modification for 95 West 95th Street allows development and reallocation of floor area resulting in the creation of 20,819 gross square feet of commercial floor area and 11,941 gross square feet of community facility floor area.

Project Name	Build	Development Size (GSF)					
	Year	Retail	Community Facility	Total			
Leader House (100 Columbus Avenue)	2008	36,740	11,722	48,462			
The Axton (733 Amsterdam Avenue)	2009	8,323	7,610	15,933			
The Heywood (175 West 90 th Street)	2014	2,635	0	2,635			
70 West 93 rd Street	2017	14,730	0	14,730			
Columbus House (95 West 95 th Street)	2019	20,819	11,941	32,760			
600 Columbus Avenue (proposed project)	2020	4	1,302	1,306			
TOTAL	<u>.</u>	83,251	32,575	115,826			

Incremental development permitted under the proposed action and previous modifications of the West Side LSRD under Z.R. Section 78-06(b)(3) would result in increased commercial and community facility space. This cumulative development could affect those aspects of the environment that are affected by increased density of development within a particular geographic area, including socioeconomic conditions, community facilities, open space, transportation, and air quality.

Cumulative development under the proposed action and previously approved and currently in-review modifications would total 83,251 square feet of commercial space and 32,575 square feet of community facility space.

This level of induced commercial development would be below the relevant CEQR threshold of 200,000 square feet for an assessment of socioeconomic conditions.

Cumulative development would not increase residential population and therefore would not require a detailed assessment of socioeconomic conditions.

Cumulative development would result in the addition of approximately 264 new employees to the area. This level of daytime population increase is below the relevant CEQR threshold of 750 workers for an area identified as being well-served for open space resources.

As described below, vehicular trip generation resulting from cumulative development would be below the relevant CEQR threshold of 170 hourly vehicular trips and therefore would not require a detailed assessment of mobile source air quality.

To determine the net number of peak hour person trips associated with the proposed increase in retail space and increase in community facility space, trip generation and travel mode assumptions were made based on travel demand criteria accepted for use in the EAS for the §78-06 text amendment and Leader House modification (CEQR No. 05DCP071M), and The Axton modification (CEQR No. 09DCP885M), as modified to reflect recent NYC DOT guidance regarding travel mode for local retail travel. The relevant trip assumptions are presented in Tables 1 and 2 below:

				Retail Trip	Generation									
									Peak Hour	Trips				
								a.m.	3.1%					
								midday	19.0%					
	Floor area	(1000 squ	are foot)	0.004				p.m.	9.6%					
	Daily visite	ors (per 100	00 ft)	205				Sat	10.0%					
	Daily visito	ors		1										
	Sat visitors	s (per 1000) ft)	240										
	Sat visitors	S		1										
							Peak Hou	r PersonTr	ips		Net Peak I	Hour Perso	onTrips	
						Inbound	Outbound	Total			Inbound	Outbound	Total	
	AM Trips			0	a.m.		0 0) ()	a.m.	0	0)	0
	Midday Tr	ips		0	midday	/ (0 0) ()	midday	0	0	1	0
	PM Trips			0	p.m.	(0 0) ()	p.m.	0	0	1	0
	Sat peak	Frips		0	Sat		0 0) ()	Sat	0	0)	0
		weekday	Saturday			Net Peak	Hour Subw	ay Trips			Net Peak I	Hour Bus T	rips	
Percent	Auto Use =	2.5%	7.0%			Inbound	Outbound	Total			Inbound	Outbound	Total	
Auto Oc	cupancy =	2	2		a.m.		0 0) ()	a.m.	0	0)	0
Percen	t Taxi Use=	0.5%	0.0%		midday	/ (0 0) ()	midday	0	0)	0
Taxi O	ccupancy=	2	2		p.m.	(0 0) ()	p.m.	0	0	1	0
Percen	t Bus Use=	4.0%	9.0%		Sat	(0 0) ()	Sat	0	0	1	0
Percent Su	bway Use=	16.5%	21.0%											
Per	cent Walk=	76.5%	63.0%			Net Peak	Hour Auto	Trips			Net Peak	Hour Taxi T	rips	
						Inbound	Outbound	Total			Inbound	Outbound	Total	
					a.m.	(0 0) ()	a.m.	0	0	1	0
					midday	/ (0 0) ()	midday	0	0	1	0
					p.m.	(0 0) ()	p.m.	0	0	1	0
					Sat	(0 0) ()	Sat	0	0	í	0
		Truck Trip	S			Net Peak	Hour Walk-	Only Trips						
	AM	0)			Inbound	Outbound	Total						
	Midday	0			a.m.	(0 0) ()					
	PM	0			midday	/ (0 0) ()					
	Sat	0			p.m.	(0 0) ()					
					Sat	(0 0)					

 Table 1: Commercial Trip Generation (four square foot increase in commercial space)

Table 1 shows that the addition of four feet of retail space has essentially no effect on trip generation. No new trips are attributable to this very small increase in floor area.

	Community Escility Trin Genera										
			Communi	ly Facility	Thp Gener	ation					
Floor area	(1000 squa	are foot)	1.3			Percent A	uto Use =	30%			
Daily trips	(per 1000 t	ft)	127			Vehicle O	ccupancy =	1.5			
Daily Trips	3		165			Percent Ta	axi Use =	2%			
						Vehicle O	ccupancy=	1.5			
						Percent W	/alk Only =	17%			
						Percent S	ubway =	33%			
						Percent B	us =	18%			
Temporal I	Distribution			Peak Hour	PersonTrip	S			Peak Hour	Subway T	rips
				Arriving	Departing	Total			Arriving	Departing	Total
AM	4%		AM	6	0	7		a.m.	2	0	2
Midday	11%		Midday	9	9	18		midday	3	3	6
PM	12%		PM	2	17	20		p.m.	1	6	7
Directiona	l Distributio	n			Peak Hour	Auto Trips			Peak Hour	Taxi Trips	
	Arriving	Departing		Arriving	Departing	Total			Staff	Visitors	Total
AM	94%	6%	AM	1	0	1		a.m.	0	0	0
Midday	50%	50%	Midday	2	2	4		midday	0	0	0
PM	12%	88%	PM	0	3	4		p.m.	0	0	0
				Peak Hour	Bus Trips				Peak Hour	Walk-only	Trips
	Truck Trip	S		Arriving	Departing	Total			Arriving	Departing	Total
AM	0		a.m.	1	0	1		a.m.	1	0	1
Midday	2		midday	2	2	3		midday	2	2	3
PM	0		p.m.	0	3	4		p.m.	0	3	3

Table 2:	Community	Facility	Trip	Generation

Table 2 shows that the addition of 1,302 square feet of community facility space would generate a maximum of twenty hourly trps, including six person-trips by vehicle (four vehicular trips), seven subway trips, four bus trips, and three walk-only trips. There would be fourteen trips that include a pedestrian component – subway, bus, and walk-only.

E 1	(1000	4 00 4								
Floor area	a (1000 square foot)	1.304								
Dally visit	ors	128			Dook Hour	DoroonTri		Not Dook	Hour Doroo	nTrino
				Inhound		Tetal	JS	Inel Peak		Tetel
			o m	inbound	Ouibouriu	10101	0 m	Inbound	Outbourid	70101
			d.III.	0	0	10	a.m.	0	0	10
			n m	9	9	20	n m	9	9	20
			p.m. Sat	0	0	20	p.m. Sat	2	0	20
			Gat	0	0	0	Oat	0	0	0
				Net Peak	Hour Subwa	ay Trips		Net Peak	Hour Bus T	rips
				Inbound	Outbound	Total		Inbound	Outbound	Total
			a.m.	2	0	2	a.m.	1	0	1
			midday	3	3	6	midday	2	2	3
			p.m.	1	6	7	p.m.	0	3	4
			Sat	0	0	0	Sat	0	0	0
				Net Peak	Hour Auto 1	Frips		Net Peak	 Hour Taxi T	rips
				Inbound	Outbound	Total		Inbound	Outbound	Total
			a.m.	1	0	1	a.m.	0	0	0
			midday	2	2	4	midday	0	0	0
			p.m.	0	3	4	p.m.	0	0	0
			Sat	0	0	0	Sat	0	0	0
	Truck Trips			Net Peak I	Hour Walk-	Only Trips	Total Net	Trips With F	Pedestrian (Component
ΔΜ	0			Inhound		Total	TOLATINE	Inhound	Outhound	Total
Midday	0		am	1	0000000000	1	am	4	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	5
PM	0		midday	2	2	3	middav	6	6	12
Sat	0		n m	0	3	3	n m	2	12	14
			Sat	0	0	0	Sat	0	0	0

Table 3 – Net Trip Generation

As can be seen in table 3, the proposed modification at 600 Columbus Avenue would generate a total of 7, 18, 20, and 0 net peak hour person trips in the AM, midday, PM and Saturday peak hours, respectively. The following sections will detail the cumulative effects of the 600 Columbus Avenue modification, in conjunction with other modification projects in the former West Side Urban Renewal Area, on operational traffic, parking, transit, and pedestrian conditions.

Trip generation for the other former WSURA sites enlarging pursuant to ZR Section 78-06(b)(3) was taken from the EAS completed for 95 West 95th Street. This information is presented in the following tables:

TABLE 4 VE	HICLE TRIP	GENERATION
------------	------------	------------

		Weekd	ay AM		Weekday Midday		Weekday PM			Saturday Midday			
Development	Mode	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
600 Columbus	Autos	1	0	1	2	2	4	2	2	4	0	0	0
Avenue	Taxis	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Truck	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	1	0	1	2	2	4	2	2	4	0	0	0
95 West 95 th	Autos	11	2	13	19	18	37	18	20	38	15	21	36
Street	Taxis	1	1	2	6	6	12	5	5	10	5	5	10
	Truck	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	12	3	15	26	25	51	23	25	48	20	26	46
70 West 93 rd	Autos	0	0	0	2	2	4	1	0	1	1	0	1
Street**	Taxis	0	0	0	3	3	6	1	1	2	3	3	6
	Truck	1	1	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	1	1	2	6	6	12	2	1	3	4	3	7
Leader House**	Autos	9	2	11	9	8	17	3	10	13	4	4	8
	Taxis	7	7	14	15	15	30	10	10	20	8	8	16
	Truck	1	1	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	17	10	27	25	24	49	13	20	33	12	12	24
The Axton**	Autos	6	0	6	4	4	8	1	5	6	2	2	4
	Taxis	4	4	8	9	9	18	7	7	14	3	3	6
	Truck	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	10	4	14	13	13	26	8	12	20	5	5	10
Heywood	Autos	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Towers**	Taxis	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Truck	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cumulative – All	Autos	27	4	31	36	34	70	25	37	62	22	27	49
Projects	Taxis	12	12	24	34	34	68	23	23	46	19	19	38
	Truck	2	2	4	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	41	18	59	73	71	144	48	60	108	41	46	87

**Numbers taken from each respective project's approved Transportation study/EAS.

TABLE 5 PERSON TRIP GENERATION

		V	/eekday A	M	We	ekday Mi	dday	Weekday PM			Saturday Midday			
Development	Mode	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	
	Bus	1	0	1	2	2	4	2	2	4	0	0	0	
600 Columbus	Subway	2	0	2	3	3	6	3	3	6	0	0	0	
(Project Site)	Walk/Other	1	0	1	2	2	4	2	2	4	0	0	0	
	Total	4	0	4	7	7	14	7	7	14	0	0	0	
	Bus	11	3	14	25	25	50	21	22	43	19	24	43	
95 West 95 th	Subway	24	9	33	69	68	137	49	52	101	48	57	105	
Street	Walk/Other	32	24	56	156	156	312	87	88	175	99	104	203	
	Total	67	36	103	250	249	499	157	162	319	166	185	351	
	Bus	1	0	1	8	6	14	4	3	7	5	4	9	
70 West 93 rd	Subway	4	2	6	32	22	54	17	12	29	21	15	36	
Street**	Walk/Other	14	7	21	112	78	190	60	42	102	72	52	124	
	Total	19	9	28	152	106	258	81	57	138	98	71	169	
	Bus	13	4	17	23	23	46	10	18	28	13	13	26	
	Subway	26	13	39	80	80	160	38	49	87	48	48	96	
Leader House**	Walk/Other	46	41	87	253	253	506	127	131	258	156	156	312	
	Total	85	58	143	356	356	712	175	198	373	217	217	434	
	Bus	7	1	8	7	7	14	3	8	11	4	4	8	
The Autore**	Subway	12	3	15	21	21	42	9	16	25	12	12	24	
The Axton**	Walk/Other	12	10	22	59	59	118	29	31	60	36	36	72	
	Total	31	14	45	87	87	174	41	55	96	52	52	104	
	Bus	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	1	2	1	1	2	
Heywood	Subway	1	1	2	5	5	10	2	3	5	3	3	6	
Towers**	Walk/Other	3	3	6	18	18	36	9	9	18	11	11	22	
	Total	4	4	8	24	25	49	12	13	25	15	15	30	
	Bus	33	8	41	66	65	131	41	54	95	42	46	88	
Cumulative – All	Subway	69	28	97	210	199	409	118	135	253	132	135	267	
Projects	Walk/Other	108	85	193	600	566	1166	314	303	617	374	359	733	
	Total	210	121	331	876	830	1706	473	492	965	548	540	1088	

Vehicular Traffic

Based on the trip generation factors presented in table 1, the proposed addition of 1,306 square feet of community facility and four square feet of commercial space would generate 4 vehicle trips – 2 inbound and 2 outbound - per hour during the midday and PM peak hours. For each peak hour, the number of vehicular trips is far below the fifty-vehicle threshold identified by the 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual* as potentially warranting a detailed traffic assessment.

The assessment of the potential for the combined traffic generated by the previously approved Heywood Towers, Leader House, Axton, 70 West 93rd Street and 95 West 95th Street developments was taken from the EAS prepared for the 95 West 95th Street modification, the most recently conducted WSURA analysis. This document reports that the previously approved projects, and current 600 Columbus Avenue proposal, would generate a total of 144 trips, consisting of 73 inbound and 71 outbound, during the peak period of traffic generation, the midday period.

Because the total traffic generated by these actions would exceed 50 vehicles during the AM, midday, PM and Saturday peak periods, the CEQR Level 1 threshold is exceeded. Therefore, it is necessary to determine whether there would be significant traffic impacts at any locations by performing a traffic assignment. Heywood Towers is located on Amsterdam Avenue, between 90th and 91st street. The Axton is located on Amsterdam Avenue, between 90th Streets. Leader House is located on the west side of Columbus Avenue, between 92nd and 93rd Streets, and 70 West 93rd Street is located on the east side of Columbus Avenue, between 92nd and 93rd Streets. 95 West 95th Street is on the east side of Columbus Avenue between 95th and 96th Streets. Columbus Avenue is a one-way southbound avenue, and Amsterdam is one-way northbound. Central Park West, one block east of Columbus, and Broadway, one block west of Amsterdam, are both two-way avenues. Crosstown streets in the vicinity are generally one-way: 90th and 92nd streets are eastbound, and 89th and 91st streets are westbound.

Traffic generated by the new developments was assigned to the local street network based on these likely arrival and departure routes. For all development sites, it was assumed that approximately 40% of vehicular traffic would come from the north, 40% from the south, 10% from east of Central Park via the 86th or 97th Street Transverses, and 10% from the west. All vehicles were assigned directly to their destination; 50 percent of vehicles were assumed to park on the street near their destination and 50 percent of vehicles were routed past their destination to on- or off-street parking on adjacent streets.

Based on the traffic assignment performed for the 95 West 95th Street EAS, the area intersection likely to receive the highest amount of traffic volume from the combination of Heywood Towers, Leader House, 70 West 93rd Street the Axton, 95 West 95th Street, and 600 Columbus Avenue was Columbus Avenue and West 95th Street. The traffic associated with new development pursuant to authorizations under ZR 78-06(b)(3) would increase volumes by a maximum of 47 vehicles during the midday peak period, at the intersection of Columbus Avenue and West 95th Street. The following Figure Cumulative-1 shows trip assignment for the cumulative traffic generated by WSURA modifications including 600 Columbus Avenue.





Cumulative-1 Total Cumulative Vehicle Increment Volumes Weekday Midday Peak Hour 95 West 95th Street EAS

<u>Parking</u>

The proposed modification would not affect the amount of accessory parking at 600 Columbus Avenue. The net addition of 1,362 square feet of new community facility and commercial space at 600 Columbus Avenue would not affect parking availability. Based on the trip generation analysis, it is not expected to generate significant parking demand when considered cumulatively with other projects in the former WSURA. The traffic analysis indicated that the amount of project-generated vehicular traffic at any single location would be below the fifty per hour threshold warranting a detailed traffic study, and therefore does not warrant a detailed assessment of parking demand.

<u>Transit</u>

Net transit trip generation for the project is identified in Table 3 above. As indicated, the proposed modification would result in the generation of three bus and six subway trips during the midday peak period and four bus and seven subway trips during the PM peak period.

Although the peak hour for transit trip generation from 600 Columbus Avenue would be the PM period, the project increment would be far below the CEQR Technical Manual threshold for transit impacts. The peak period for total cumulative transit ridership from the projects approved under this zoning text is the Midday period. Therefore this is the period that is considered.

Based on the environmental reviews conducted for previously approved modifications pursuant to ZR 78-06(b)(3) and the current project in public review trips generated by the proposed modifications, inclusive of 600 Columbus Avenue, total midday transit trip generation from modifications under ZR 78-06(b)(3) would be 141 bus trips and 409 subway trips. The combined subway trips would exceed the 200-trip Level 1 threshold, therefore warranting further assessment.

The six project sites are located between two MTA NYCT subway lines: the 7th Avenue IRT on Broadway, where the 1, 2, and 3 trains operate during all weekday peak hours, and the 8th Avenue IND on Central Park West, where the A, B, C, and D trains operate during all weekday peak hours. It is likely that subway trips would be distributed between these two lines, based on trip origin points. 600 Columbus Avenue would generate six additional subway travel during the midday period. It is located on Columbus Avenue between 89th and 90th streets, located between the 86th Street and 96th street stations on the 7th Avenue line, located slightly closer to the 86th Street station then to the 96th Street station. However, the 96th Street station has both local and express train services. Therefore, it is assumed that 600 Columbus subway trips would be split evenly between these two stations, with three trips using the station at Broadway and 86th Street and three using the station at Broadway and 96th Street. The Heywood Towers are located between the 86th Street and 96th street stations on the 7th Avenue line, located slightly closer to the 86th Street station then to the 96th Street station. However, the 96th Street station has both local and express train services. Therefore, it is assumed that the Heywood Towers subway trips would be split evenly between these two stations. Trips to the Axton would likely use the 96th Street station of the 7th Avenue line and the 96th Street station on the 8th Avenue line, so these trips are divided evenly between these two stations. Trips associated with Leader House and 70 West 93rd Street would be dispersed between the 86th Street and 96th Street stations of the 7th Avenue line, and the 86th Street and 96th Street stations of the 8th Avenue line, depending on whether the trips are coming from uptown or downtown. It is assumed trips from Leader House and 70 West 93rd Street would be evenly distributed between the four subway stations. 95 West 95th Street is on the east side of Columbus Avenue between 95th and 96th Streets. Subway trips from this project would be spit between the 96th Street stations of the 7th Avenue and 8th Avenue lines. This dispersion of subway trips would result in no single subway station receiving in excess of 200 actiongenerated trips. The greatest incremental ridership attributable to modifications under ZR 78-06(b)(3)

would be 152 trips, at the Broadway and 96th Street station. In addition, no single subway line would receive greater than 200 peak hour subway trips in any direction. Therefore the proposed development, in combination with the previously-approved and currently proposed enlargements, the proposed enlargement of 600 Columbus Avenue is not expected to create significant impacts with respect to Subway transportation.

	Subway	Bway/	Bway/	CPW/	CPW/
Project	Trips	96th	86th	96th	86th
Leader House	160	40	40	40	40
The Axton	42	21	0	21	0
Heywood Tower	10	5	5	0	0
70 West 93rd St	54	14	13	14	13
95 West 95th St	137	69	0	68	
600 Columbus	6	3	3	0	0
TOTAL	409	152	61	143	53

There are a number of bus routes located within a half-mile of the former WSURA development sites. These include the M7, M10, M11, M86, M96, and M106 bus routes. It is anticipated that bus trips will be distributed amongst these different routes. Since there are less than 200 bus trips generated by the seven developments that would be built pursuant to modifications under ZR 78-06(b)(3), no significant impacts with respect to bus transportation are anticipated.. Therefore, no significant cumulative impacts with regard to bus line-haul are expected.

<u>Pedestrians</u>

Pursuant to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, pedestrian conditions are evaluated by adding the walk-only trips to the bus and subway trips. As identified in Table 3 above, the proposed modification at 600 Columbus Avenue would generate up to 12 trips with a pedestrian component in the midday period and 14 in the PM period. This increment is far below the relevant *CEQR Technical Manual* threshold of 200 hourly pedestrian trips. Trips associated with transit would be directed to and from the closest transit service. Bus trips would be directed to the 89th street stops of the M7 or M11 for uptown/downtown service at Amsterdam and Columbus avenues respectively. Subway trips would be to or from the

Peak travel hour for the five previous projects and 600 Columbus Avenue that are the subject of this cumulative assessment is the midday. As indicated, the proposed modification of the commercial and community facility space at 600 Columbus Avenue would generate an increment of fourteen midday pedestrian trips, inclusive of transit trips, as compared to current conditions. The Heywood Towers development would generate up to 49 pedestrian trips in the Midday peak hour. The Leader House and the Axton are anticipated to generate 712 and 174 pedestrian trips respectively in the Midday peak hour. 70 West 93rd Street would generate 258 midday pedestrian trips. 95 West 95th Street would generate 499 trips.

Because of the pedestrian traffic generated by Leader House and 70 West 93rd Street, which are located

across Columbus Avenue from each other, a Level 2 trip assignment was conducted as part of the environmental review for 70 West 93rd Street (CEQR #15DCP148M). This analysis concluded that the one pedestrian element that would receive in excess of 200 incremental pedestrians was the west crosswalk at Columbus Avenue and 93rd Street. Accordingly a pedestrian Level of Service (LOS) analysis was conducted at this location. This LOS analysis determined that the west crosswalk at the intersection of Columbus Avenue and 93rd Street would continue to operate at Level of Service A during the Midday peak period.

The Axton, located four blocks from Leader House, generates fewer than 200 total pedestrian trips. The Axton report also determined that no pedestrian element would experience greater than 200 pedestrian trips during the Midday peak hour.

Heywood Towers is located on Amsterdam Avenue between 90th and 91st Street. Because Heywood Towers is located several blocks away from the other WSURA development sites, it is anticipated that there will be minimal overlap of pedestrians between this development and development on the other sites. The Axton is located five blocks north of Heywood Towers, and it is similarly anticipated that there will be minimal overlap of pedestrians between these two sites.

Because of the pedestrian traffic generated by 95 West 95th Street, a Level 2 trip assignment was conducted as part of the environmental review for 95 West 95th Street. This analysis concluded that no pedestrian element would receive in excess of 200 incremental pedestrians.

The development proposed for 600 Columbus Avenue would add only fourteen midday peak hour pedestrian trips, and is located three blocks south of Leader House and 70 West 93rd Street, and one long block east of Heywood Towers. Pedestrian trips associated with 600 Columbus would be dispersed toward subway stations located at Broadway and 96th Street and Broadway and 86th Street, to multiple bus routes, and from local destinations. Given the distance between 600 Columbus Avenue and the other cumulative analysis sites, the small number of pedestrian trips associated with 600 Columbus Avenue, and the dispersion of these trips to multiple bus and subway stops and local destinations, it is not expected to generate pedestrian traffic that would overlap with traffic from other WSURA development sites.

Because 600 Columbus Avenue and Heywood Towers are located in relatively close proximity to each other, the pedestrian trips associated with these two projects were assigned to the local pedestrian network. The pedestrian component of transit trips was assigned to the most direct route to the nearest subway or bus stations, as described above. Walk-only trips were distributed 40% to the north, 40% to the south, 10% to the east, and 10% to the west. It is assumed that half of walk-only trips are destined for the first block, and that half of the remaining trips have destinations in the next block, etc. Based on these assumptions, the trip assignment for 600 Columbus and Leader House are presented in the following tables. As shown, these projects would not contribute significantly to pedestrian traffic at intersections affected by other projects.

It is anticipated that, with the exception of one location affected by Leader House and 70 West 93rd Street, located across the street from one another, no individual pedestrian element would experience greater than 200 peak hour trips as a result of the cumulative pedestrian volumes for these developments. The analysis conducted for the affected intersection of Columbus Avenue and West 93rd Street indicated that this location would operate at an acceptable Level of Service under the cumulative analysis. Therefore no significant adverse impacts to transportation would occur from the cumulative development that would occur within the former WSURA as a result of new development under ZR Section 78-06(b)(3). Midday ped trips – 600 Columbus and Heywood Tower





Robert F. Germain Jr., PE R. GERMAIN INC. 443 East Fifth Street Mt. Vernon, New York 10553

Tel: (914) 668-7086 • Fax: (914) 699-7589 • E-mail address: <u>robertgermain@verizon.net</u> •

April 21, 2016

Re: 600 Columbus Avenue New York, NY

To whom it may concern:

We are mechanical engineers for 600 Columbus Avenue, NYC N.Y. 10024. I understand that the owner, Columbus Townhouse Associates, has made an application to fill in portions of a double height space within the existing volume of the building. Because this will not add any additional cubic feet to the building and the boilers and other mechanical equipment on site have always heated the double height space in the past, the additional floor area will have absolutely no effect on the performance of the mechanical systems. No additional fuel will be consumed another additional discharge from the chimney will be created.

GINE