# 3 OPEN SPACE

## 3.1 Introduction

This chapter assesses the potential of the Proposed Actions to result in an adverse effect on open space resources. According to the 2020 *CEQR Technical Manual,* an open space assessment is conducted to determine whether a proposed project would have a direct impact resulting from the elimination or alteration of open space or an indirect impact resulting from burdening available open space by the introduction of a new residential or worker population. The *CEQR Technical Manual* defines open space as publicly- or privately-owned land that is publicly accessible and available for leisure, play, or sport, or is set aside for the protection or enhancement of the natural environment.

In addition to the analysis provided in this section, Attachment F, "Shadows" of the Environmental Assessment Statement (EAS) provided an assessment of the Proposed Actions' potential shadow effects on open space resources.

## 3.2 Principal Conclusions

As the Proposed Actions would not directly eliminate or alter an existing open space resource, the Proposed Actions would not result in direct open space impacts. However, as described in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, open space can be indirectly affected by a proposed action if the project would add enough population, either residential or non-residential, to noticeably diminish the capacity of open space in the area to serve the future population. Because the Proposed Actions would generate 1,822 incremental residents in the Study Area over the No-Action Condition, a detailed analysis is warranted to assess the indirect effects of the residential population generated by the Proposed Actions on active and passive open space resources.

The *CEQR Technical Manual* states a significant adverse indirect open space impact may occur if a project would reduce the open space ratio (OSR) – the ratio of acres of open space per 1,000 residents – by more than five percent in areas that are currently below the City's median community district OSR of 1.5 acres per 1,000 residents. The Study Area currently has an

overall OSR of 1.24 acres per 1,000 residents, which is below the citywide median community district OSR. According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, in areas that are extremely lacking in open space, a decrease in the OSR of one percent or greater may result in significant adverse impacts. Based on the No-Action active OSR, the Study Area is extremely lacking in active open space, therefore a decrease in the active OSR of one percent or greater may result in significant adverse impacts. However, passive open space is not extremely lacking, therefore a decrease in the passive OSR of five percent or greater may result in significant adverse impacts.

The With-Action Condition would result in a Study Area decrease in the total OSR of over 10 percent, including active and passive OSRs. The active OSR would decrease by 12.1 percent and the passive OSR would decrease by 10.75 percent, resulting in a total OSR decrease of 11.15 percent in the Study Area compared to the No-Action Condition.

While the With-Action Condition would result in an 11.15 percent decrease in OSR compared to the No-Action Condition in the Study Area, it would not result in a significant adverse impact to passive open space. The reduction in passive open space would be partially offset by the proposed 0.18-acre privately-owned, publicly accessible passive open space on Projected Development Site 1, which would include passive recreational facilities such as benches, lighting, and paved areas, and would be maintained by the Applicant (thereby reducing the City's obligation to maintain open spaces in the Study Area). This commitment for an on-site passive open space would be a project component related to the environment (PCRE), and would be memorialized in a restrictive declaration tied to the Applicant's site.

Further, there are publicly-accessible open spaces beyond the Study Area, such as the Stapleton Waterfront Esplanade, that are easily accessible for residents due to the interconnected nature of passive waterfront open spaces in the Study Area. There are also several projects underway in the Study Area that were not included in the quantitative analysis – such as the proposed Tompkinsville Esplanade (which is estimated would provide approximately two acres of public open space) and the proposed improvements at the site of Lyons Pool – would provide additional resources that would be expected to draw project-generated users. Lastly, development projects that have been recently completed or are under construction in the Study Area, such as at the Empire Outlets or the Lighthouse Point, would provide other high-quality, recently constructed passive open spaces that are easily accessible for residents.

In the No-Action and With-Action conditions, there would be a deficiency of active open space, as the Study Area's No-Action OSR of 0.37 would be well below the City's planning goal of 2.0 acres of active open space per 1,000 residents. Relative to the No-Action Condition, the With-Action Condition's active OSR would be further reduced from 0.37 to 0.33 acres per 1,000 residents. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would result in a significant adverse indirect impact in the area of active open space because the Proposed Actions would decrease the active open space ratio by more than ~~five~~ one percent in an area currently below the City's median community district OSR of 1.5 acres per 1,000 residents; absent mitigation, the Proposed Actions would not introduce new publicly-accessible active open space to partially offset the reduction in active open space per 1,000 residents. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would result in a significant adverse open space impact due to indirect effects (increased user population). Possible measures to address the impact are discussed in Chapter ~~M~~13, "Mitigation."

# 3.3 Methodology

## Direct Effects

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a proposed project would directly affect open space resources if it would encroach upon, limit public access to, or cause a loss of public open space. Direct effects may also occur if the resource would be so changed that the open space no longer serves the same user population, or if the proposed project would result in increased noise or air pollutant emissions, odor, or shadows that would temporarily or permanently affect the usefulness of a public open space. The development facilitated by the Proposed Actions would not directly displace any open space. As detailed in EAS Attachment F, "Shadows," the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse shadows impacts, and as detailed in Chapter ~~F~~6, "Air Quality" and Chapter ~~H~~8, "Noise" of this EIS, the Proposed Actions would not result in noise, air pollutant emissions, odors that would directly affect the usefulness of a public open space.

## Indirect Effects

Open space can be indirectly affected by a proposed action if the project would add sufficient population, either residential or non-residential, to substantively diminish the capacity of open space in a study area to serve the future population. Typically, an assessment is conducted if a proposed project would generate more than 200 residents or 500 employees; however, the need for an open space assessment may vary in certain areas of the City that are considered either underserved or well-served by open space. For areas underserved by open space, the threshold for assessment is more than 50 residents or 125 employees; for areas well-served by open space, the threshold for assessment is more than 350 residents or 750 employees.

The open space maps in Chapter 7 of the *CEQR Technical Manual* show the Project Area is in an area that is neither underserved nor well-served by open space; therefore, the threshold that would warrant a preliminary assessment is 200 or more residents or 500 or more employees. Pursuant to *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines, the residential open space analysis is based on the incremental residents generated by the Proposed Actions. The With-Action Condition would result in an additional 1,822 residents and 95 employees over the development in the No-Action Condition. The Proposed Actions would result in more than 200 incremental residents; therefore, a residential indirect effect assessment is warranted. Based on the number of incremental employees generated by the development in the With-Action Condition, a non-residential indirect effects assessment is not warranted.

The *CEQR Technical Manual* states a significant adverse impact may occur if a project would reduce the open space ratio by more than five percent in areas that are currently below the City's median community district open space ratio of 1.5 acres per 1,000 residents. In areas that are severely deficient of open space, a decrease in the OSR of one percent or greater may result in significant adverse impacts.

## Study Area

The first step to assess potential open space effects is to define the study area for the population that would be generated by a proposed project – in this case a residential population. According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, an open space study area is defined by a reasonable walking distance that users would travel to reach local open space and recreation areas – typically a 0.5-mile radius for projects that require a residential indirect open space

assessment. Therefore, consistent with the guidelines in the *CEQR Technical Manual,* a 0.5-mile radius was used to determine which census tracts have more than 50 percent of their areas within 0.5 miles of the Project Area.

The Study Area shown in Figure 3-1 includes Staten Island Census Tracts 3, 7, 9, and 11. The Study Area was determined based on the 0.5-mile buffer around the Project Area boundary. Census tracts with at least 50 percent of their areas within the 0.5-mile boundary were included in the open space study area. Due to the Project Area's proximity to the Upper New York Bay and Kill Van Kull, 47.5 percent of the area within the 0.5-mile buffer around the Project Area is within these water bodies.

**Figure 3-1: Open Space Resource Map**

Information on publicly accessible open space resources within the Open Space Study Area, including names and acreages, were found on the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation's (NYC Parks) website.

## Open Space Ratio

The OSR is the acreage of open space per 1,000 residents. Because local OSRs vary widely in New York City, as a planning goal, an OSR of 2.5 acres per 1,000 residents represents an area well-served by open space. This ratio is consequently used as an optimal benchmark for residential populations in large-scale plans and proposals. Per the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the City's planning goal is based, in part, on the National Recreation and Park Association's guideline of 1.25 to 2.5 acres per 1,000 residents of neighborhood parks within one-half mile.

If the OSR would increase or remain substantially the same in the With-Action Condition compared to the No-Action Condition, no further analysis of open space is warranted. If there is a decrease in the OSR that approaches or exceeds five percent, it is generally considered to be a substantial change that warrants more detailed analysis. However, a greater percentage of change may be tolerated if open space in the area exceeds the City's open space planning goals. In areas that are extremely lacking open space, a decrease of one percent may be considered significant and could overburden existing open space resources, therefore a detailed analysis is typically required for these areas of the city that are deficient in open space.

For this project, the OSR would be decreased by more than five percent in the With-Action Condition; therefore, a detailed assessment is warranted.

## Impact Criteria

Indirect open space impacts are based in part on how a project would change OSRs in the Study Area. If the decrease in the OSR exceeds five percent, it is generally considered to be a substantial change that warrants a more detailed analysis. If a study area exhibits a low OSR (e.g., below 1.50 acres per 1,000 residents), indicating a shortfall of open space, then smaller decreases in that ratio as a result of a proposed action may constitute a detailed analysis. In addition to quantitative analyses, the *CEQR Technical Manual* also recommends conducting qualitative analyses in order to assess potential open space impacts. Qualitative analyses look at the availability of open space resources, the beneficial effects of new open space resources provided by a project, and the comparison of projected OSRs with established City guidelines.

The planning goals set by the City provide a guide to measure quantitative effects, however, the planning goal is often not feasible for many areas of the City, and the City does not consider these ratios as its open space policy for every neighborhood. Pursuant to CEQR guidelines, the ratios do not constitute an absolute impact threshold, but rather benchmarks that represent how well an area is served by its open space. A determination of significance is based upon the context of a project, including its location, the quality and quantity of the open space in the future With-Action, the types of open space provided, and any new open space provided by the project.

The *CEQR Technical Manual* states a significant adverse impact may occur if a project would reduce the open space ratio by more than five percent in areas that are currently below the City's median community district open space ratio of 1.5 acres per 1,000 residents. In areas that are extremely lacking open space, a decrease in the OSR of one percent or greater may result in significant adverse impacts.

# 3.4 Detailed Assessment

## Existing Conditions

### *Residential Population*

Table 3-1 breaks down the population by age brackets provided in the latest data published by the US Census Bureau according to the 2015-2019 American Community Survey (ACS).[1]

**Table 3-1: Residential Study Area (0.5-mile) Residential Population Age Breakdown**

| Census | Under 5 | | 5 to 17 | | 18 to 24 | | 25 to 44 | | 45 to 54 | | 55 to 64 | | 65 to 74 | | 75+ | | Median |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Tract | Pop. | % | Pop. | % | Pop. | % | Pop. | % | Pop. | % | Pop. | % | Pop. | % | Pop. | % | Age |
| 3 | 82 | *4.1* | 178 | *8.9* | 66 | *3.3* | 790 | *39.4* | 301 | *15.0* | 269 | *13.4* | 226 | *11.3* | 90 | *4.5* | 40.3 |
| 7 | 196 | *4.3* | 556 | *12.2* | 556 | *12.2* | 1,322 | *29.0* | 602 | *13.2* | 620 | *13.6* | 456 | *10.0* | 255 | *5.6* | 38.1 |
| 9 | 139 | *9.2* | 207 | *13.7* | 160 | *10.6* | 390 | *25.8* | 282 | *18.7* | 119 | *7.9* | 181 | *12.0* | 30 | *2.0* | 38.4 |
| 11 | 374 | *11.3* | 481 | *14.5* | 388 | *11.7* | 779 | *23.5* | 606 | *18.3* | 335 | *10.1* | 282 | *8.5* | 70 | *2.1* | 35.0 |
| Study Area | 792 | *7.0* | 1,422 | *12.5* | 1,170 | *10.3* | 3,279 | *28.8* | 1,791 | *15.7* | 1,342 | *11.8* | 1,145 | *10.1* | 445 | *3.9* | 38.0 |
| Staten Island | 27,069 | *5.7* | 76,933 | *16.2* | 39,891 | *8.4* | 123,472 | *26.0* | 66,485 | *14.0* | 65,060 | *13.7* | 44,165 | *9.3* | 31,343 | *6.6* | 40.1 |
| NYC | 545,928 | *6.5* | 1,211,881 | *14.4* | 730,254 | *8.7* | 2,653,031 | *31.5* | 1,070,095 | *12.7* | 992,181 | *11.8* | 686,011 | *8.1* | 535,471 | *6.4* | 37.2 |

Source: US Census Bureau, 2015-2019 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates (Selected Characteristics of the Total and Native Populations in the United States)

Residents between the ages of 25 and 44 make up the largest age cohort (28.8 percent) of the residential population in the Study Area. Residents between the ages of 45 and 54 account for the next largest age cohort at 15.7 percent population. There is a larger percentage of population between the ages of 18 and 54 in the Study Area compared to Staten Island and New York City as a whole, and a lower percent of adults 75 years and over.

Children and teenagers (5 to 17 years old) account for the third largest cohort at 12.5 percent of the Study Area population. The relatively higher percentage of young adults in the Study Area is also evidenced by the median age of the Study Area compared to that of Staten Island and New York City; Table 3-1 shows the Study Area's median age is 38.0, more than two years younger than the median age of Staten Island (40.1). The Study Area's median age is similar to the median age of New York City (37.2). The Study Area median ages by census tract range from a low of 35.0 years (Census Tract 11) to a high of 40.3 years (Census Tract 3).

A population's age distribution affects the way open spaces are used and the need for different types of recreational facilities. According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*:

- Children four years old or younger typically use traditional playgrounds and "tot lots" that have play equipment for toddlers and preschool children.
- Children ages five through nine use traditional playgrounds with play equipment suitable for school-age children, as well as grassy and hard-surfaced open spaces, which are important for activities such as ball playing, running, and skipping rope.
- Children ages 10 through 14 use playground equipment, court spaces, and ball fields. Teenagers and young adults tend to use court facilities such as basketball courts and sports fields.

[1] The 2015-2019 ACS data is the latest data set available that provides a breakdown of population by age within the Study Area, Staten Island, and New York City (source: American FactFinder, United States Census Bureau).

- Adults ages 20 through 64 continue to use court facilities and fields for sports, as well as space for more individualized recreation, such as rollerblading, biking, and jogging, activities that require bike paths, esplanades, and vehicle-free roadways. Adults also gather with families for picnicking, and other recreational activities in which all ages can participate.
- Adults 65 years and older engage in active recreation such as handball, tennis, gardening, and swimming, as well as other passive recreational activities.

Relative to Staten Island and New York City, the Study Area has a high percentage of population between 18 and 54 years old, indicating a need for recreational facilities geared towards this population. The Study Area's demographic data also indicate a there is a larger share of children under the age of 5 in the Study Area compared to Staten Island and New York City.

***Inventory of Publicly-Accessible Open Spaces***

The publicly accessible open space resources in the Study Area include the North Shore Esplanade, St. George Esplanade, Mahoney Playground, Westervelt Family and Community Garden, Davis Playground, Lt. Lia Playground, Fort Hill Park, Liotti Ikefugi Playground, Baker Square, Barrett Triangle, Lighthouse Plaza and Pier 1, and the Empire Outlets privately owned public space (POPS).

Lighthouse Point is currently under construction and will have open space components that will be completed by 2025 independent of the Proposed Actions.

**Table 3-2: Open Space Resources**

| Map No. | Open Space Resource | Owner/ Agency | Amenities | Total Acres | Passive Acres | Passive % | Active Acres | Active % | Category |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | North Shore Esplanade | NYC Parks | Benches and walkways | 2.20 | 2.20 | 100 | 0 | 0 | Passive |
| 2 | St. George Esplanade | NYC Parks | Pathway, artwork, seating, vegetation | 1.18 | 1.18 | 100 | 0 | 0 | Passive |
| 3 | Mahoney Playground | NYC Parks | Basketball courts, handball courts, playgrounds, spray showers, and bathrooms | 2.21 | 0 | 0 | 2.21 | 100 | Active |
| 4 | Westervelt Family and Community Garden | NYRP | Gardens, picnic table, grill | 0.08 | 0.08 | 100 | 0 | 0 | Passive |
| 5 | Davis Playground | NYC Parks | Basketball courts and playgrounds | 0.95 | 0 | 0 | 0.95 | 100 | Active |
| 6 | Lt. Lia Playground | NYC Parks | Playgrounds and spray showers | 1.37 | 0 | 0 | 1.37 | 0 | Active |
| 7 | Fort Hill Park | NYC Parks | Nature area | 0.84 | 0.84 | 100 | 0 | 0 | Passive |
| 8 | Liotti Ikefugi Playground | NYC Parks | Basketball courts and playgrounds | 0.41 | 0 | 0 | 0.41 | 0 | Passive |
| 9 | Baker Square | NYC Parks | Greenstreet with seating and landscaping | 0.07 | 0.07 | 100 | 0 | 0 | Passive |
| 10 | Barrett Triangle | NYC Parks | Benches with monument of Major Clarence Tynan Barrett | 0.16 | 0.16 | 100 | 0 | 0 | Passive |
| 11 | Lighthouse Plaza and Pier 1 | EDC | Benches, tables, chairs, and fishing area | 1.19 | 1.19 | 100 | 0 | 0 | Passive |
| 12 | Empire Outlets POPS | St. George Outlet Development LLC | Benches, bathrooms, walkway | 4.66 | 4.66 | 100 | 0 | 0 | Passive |
| | | | **Total** | **15.32** | **10.38** | **68%** | **4.94** | **32%** | |

In total, the Study Area contains 15.32 acres of publicly accessible open space, including 10.38 acres of passive recreational space and 4.94 acres of active recreational space. All open space resources within the Study Area were determined to be in acceptable condition.[2]

The North Shore Esplanade is a 2.20-acre esplanade that runs along Richmond Terrace between Westervelt Avenue and Nicholas Street. The esplanade contains benches throughout and the walkway offers sweeping views of the Manhattan and Brooklyn skylines across Upper Bay.

The St. George Esplanade is a 1.18-acre waterfront esplanade between Hamilton Avenue and Wall Street. The esplanade runs directly behind the Richmond County Bank Ballpark. Like the North Shore Esplanade along Richmond Terrace, the esplanade provides sweeping views northward. Features include landscaped vegetation, benches, and the Staten Island Postcards September 11th Memorial.

Mahoney Playground is a 2.21-acre neighborhood park bounded by Beechwood Avenue to the east, Crescent Avenue to the south, Cleveland Street to the north and Jersey Street to the west. The park contains active recreational uses such as basketball courts, handball courts, spray showers, playgrounds, and bathrooms.

Westervelt Family and Community Garden is a 0.08-acre community garden at 143 Westervelt Avenue between Cleveland Street and Curtis Place. The garden provides passive recreational opportunities for residents and visitors with on-site green technologies such as composting and rainwater harvesting systems.

Davis Playground is a 0.95-acre jointly operated playground by NYC Parks and the New York City Department of Education bounded by Jersey Street to the west, Crescent Avenue to the north, Beechwood Avenue to the west, and Layton Avenue to the south. The park is behind P.S. 31 and is accessed from Bismark Avenue. The park contains active recreational uses including basketball courts, spray showers, and playgrounds and is not accessible to the public during school hours.

Lt. Lia Playground is a 1.37-acre park bounded by Belmont Place to the west, Wall Street to the south, and residences to the north, and St. Marks Place to the west. The park contains active recreational uses including a playground and spray showers.

Fort Hill Park is a 0.84-acre nature area on Sherman Avenue between Fort Place and Hendricks Avenue. The park is passively used and contains vegetation and informal walking paths.

Liotti Ikefugi Playground is a 0.41-acre park on Winter Avenue between Bismark Avenue and Westervelt Avenue. The park contains active recreational uses including basketball courts and playgrounds.

Baker Square is a 0.07-acre greenstreet at the intersection of Hyatt Street and Stuyvesant Place. The greenstreet contains seating and landscaping for passive use.

Barrett Triangle is a 0.16-acre triangle at the intersection of Hyatt Street and Bay Street. The triangle contains benches for seating and a monument of Major Clarence Tynan Barrett.

Lighthouse Plaza and Pier 1 is a 1.19-acre open space along Borough Place. This resource is next to the National Lighthouse Museum and adjacent to the Upper Bay. Lighthouse Plaza contains benches, tables, and chairs while Pier 1 provides active opportunities for fishing.

[2] Conditions of open spaces were derived from inspection summaries performed by NYC Parks and Langan site visit for the Bay Street Corridor EIS.

Connections are available along the waterfront through the Bay Street Landing Development to destinations further south, such as Lyons Pool and Stapleton Waterfront.

The Empire Outlets are a recently-completed commercial development along Richmond Terrace with a 4.66-acre public open space component. The outlets extend to the waterfront to the north of the St. George Ferry Terminal, and provide sweeping views of the Upper Bay, Brooklyn, and Manhattan. The Empire Outlets contain seating areas and benches open to the public and connections are available to the St. George Esplanade.

The open space resources within the Study Area provide a variety of both passive and active recreational opportunities for residents in the St. George community. There are two esplanades along the waterfront that provide active open space uses such as jogging paths, which would likely be used by residents between the ages of 25 and 64 years old. The largest age cohort of the residential population can also enjoy passive open space through the many squares, triangles, and neighborhood parks that provide walking paths, seating areas, and views of Manhattan and Brooklyn. Children and teenagers are well-supported by three playgrounds within the Study Area, providing a variety of active recreational uses such as spray showers, basketball courts, and playground equipment.

***OSR in the Study Area***

*Quantitative Assessment*

The latest data published by DCP and derived from the 2014-2018 American Community Survey (ACS) indicates the Study Area has a residential population of 12,377 people.[3] Table 3-3 shows there are 15.32 acres of open space within the Study Area, of which 10.38 acres are passive and 4.94 acres are active. Accordingly, the Study Area possesses an OSR of 1.24 acres per 1,000 residents. The Study Area's passive and active OSRs are 0.84 acres and 0.40 acres per 1,000 residents, respectively.

**Table 3-3: Adequacy of Open Space Resources – Existing Conditions**

| | Open Space Acreage | | | OSR per 1,000 Residents | | | *CEQR Technical Manual* Guidelines | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Pop.** | **Total** | **Passive** | **Active** | **Total** | **Passive** | **Active** | **Total** | **Passive** | **Active** |
| 12,377 | 15.32 | 10.38 | 4.94 | 1.24 | 0.84 | 0.40 | 2.50 | 0.50 | 2.00 |

*Qualitative Assessment*

While not included in the quantitative analysis, there are two existing open spaces and two planned open spaces that would be expected to draw project-generated residents. Tompkinsville Park is a 0.42-acre neighborhood park just beyond the Study Area at the southwestern corner of Victory Boulevard and Bay Street. Tompkinsville Park is a passive open space one block (0.1-miles) west of Lyons Pool with amenities such as bench seating and landscaping.

Additionally, Lyons Pool is part of a 2.13-acre recreation center on Murray Hulbert Avenue between Victory Boulevard and Hannah Street, just south of the 0.50-mile Study Area. In addition to the recreation center, Lyons Pool contains bathrooms and an outdoor pool which are available for recreational opportunities during the summer months. NYC Parks has committed to upgrading the recreational center in the future, although details on the specific improvements are not yet known.

[3] Residential population data within the Study Area as found on DCP Population Factfinder, based on the 2014-2018 ACS.

Further beyond the Study Area's southern boundary and to the south of Lyons Pool is the Stapleton Waterfront, a planned mixed-use community situated on a former naval base. Phase I of Stapleton Waterfront opened in 2016, and provided a new 4.61-acre public open space along the waterfront. There are two planned phases that will provide additional open spaces, including a waterfront esplanade along the entirety of the Stapleton Waterfront's shoreline. When complete, the Stapleton Waterfront will provide 12 acres of publicly-accessible open space, including both active and passive recreational programming.

In April 2018, the New York City Economic Development Corporation (EDC) (in partnership with the New York City Department of Transportation) released a Request for Proposals for engineering, design, and related services for the Tompkinsville Esplanade. The Esplanade would consist of a new quarter-mile long public open space between Lighthouse Plaza and Hannah Street that would connect existing open space and would establish a greenway from the Staten Island Ferry Terminal to the Clifton neighborhood, a distance of over 1.5 miles. According to the Request for Proposals, the Tompkinsville Esplanade project would involve reconstruction of the esplanade, shoreline, including proposed streets, pedestrian walkways, and bicycle paths. It is unknown when the esplanade would be completed and fully operational, but, if advanced, it would provide additional passive and active open space in the Study Area. Assuming the esplanade would span over 1,000 feet between Lighthouse Plaza and Hannah Street along the waterfront and would be developed to the citywide minimum width of 40 feet, the esplanade would add more than an acre (an estimated two acres) of additional open space to the Study Area.

Both the Stapleton Waterfront and the Tompkinsville Esplanade are planned destination open space resources along the Staten Island shoreline. These destination open space resources would provide both active and passive recreation options that residents would likely travel farther than 0.5-miles to use. While the Open Space Study Area falls short of the Citywide Community District guideline, it is supported by a mix of recreational open space programming and planned open space improvements that are not accounted for in the quantitative assessment.

## No-Action Condition

### *Project Area*

In the No-Action Condition, only Site B (Lots 82 and 92) of Projected Development Site 1 would be developed and would generate 419 additional residents in the Project Area. There would be no other changes to existing conditions in the Project Area.

### *Study Area*

The assessment framework in Attachment A identified two No-Build projects within the Study Area that would be completed and fully operational by the 2025 analysis year (No-Build Projects, see Appendix C-3). The two No-Build projects within the Open Space Study Area include Lighthouse Point and 38 Bay Street. Collectively, these two No-Build projects would add 436 residents and 1.29 acres of publicly-accessible open space to the Study Area by the 2025 analysis year.

Accounting for the development in the No-Action Condition and the No-Build projects, the total No-Action residential population in the Study Area would be 13,232 residents (see Table 3-4).

**Table 3-4: No-Action – Residential Open Space Study Area Population**

| Existing Population | Residential Population in Study Area (No-Build Projects) | No-Action Residential Population on Projected Development Site 1 | No-Action Population |
|---|---|---|---|
| 12,377 | 436 | 419 | 13,232 |

There would be a total of 16.61 acres of open space in the No-Action Condition, including one new open space resource within the Study Area. The publicly accessible open space at Lighthouse Point would introduce 1.29 acres of passive open space. The OSR in the No-Action Condition is shown in Table 3-5.

**Table 3-5: Adequacy of Open Space Resources – No-Action Condition**

| | Open Space Acreage | | | No-Action OSR per 1,000 Residents | | | CEQR OSR Guidelines | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Population | Total | Passive | Active | Total | Passive | Active | Total | Passive | Active |
| 13,232 | 16.61 | 11.67 | 4.94 | 1.26 | 0.88 | 0.37 | 2.50 | 0.50 | 2.00 |

The No-Action population of 13,232 residents would result in an overall OSR of 1.26 acres per 1,000 residents. The passive OSR would be 0.88 acres per 1,000 residents, while the active OSR would be 0.37 acres per 1,000 residents. In the No-Action Condition, the Study Area would be extremely lacking in active open space. In the No-Action Condition, the overall OSR would be less than the 2.5 acres per 1,000 residents guideline set forth in the *CEQR Technical Manual*. The passive OSR would be more than 1.5 times the *CEQR Technical Manual* guideline of 0.5 acres per 1,000 residents, while the active OSR would be 18.5 percent of the recommended 2.0 acres per 1,000 residents.

***Qualitative Assessment***

While NYC Parks has committed to undertake improvements at Lyons Pool to replace some of the capacity lost with the closure of the Cromwell Center, the details of these improvements are not yet known, and therefore are not included in this quantitative assessment. When complete, these planned improvements would provide additional recreation space just beyond the Study Area, and would be expected to draw some residents generated by the Proposed Actions.

While also not included in the quantitative analysis, the Tompkinsville Esplanade (0.6 miles from the Project Area), if advanced, has the potential to provide additional passive and active waterfront open space. The Tompkinsville Esplanade project is a City-sponsored project led by EDC.

Beyond the Study Area, the future phases of the Stapleton Waterfront project (0.9 miles from the Project Area) would be complete. When complete, the Stapleton Waterfront will provide 12 acres of open space with a variety of active and passive programming, including both active and passive uses. Both the Tompkinsville Esplanade and the Stapleton Waterfront project would be destination open space resources, where residents would travel farther than the 0.5-mile extent of the Open Space Study Area (either by vehicle, transit, or bike) to enjoy the open space and recreational amenities at these resources. Together with Lighthouse Plaza and the planned Tompkinsville Esplanade, there could be a continuous waterfront greenway between the Staten Island Ferry Terminal and Clifton.

## With-Action Condition

### *Project Area*

The With-Action Condition would result in 726 incremental dwelling units over the No-Action Condition. Based on an average household size of 2.51 residents per renter-occupied unit in Staten Island Community District 1, the additional 726 dwelling units would generate 1,822 incremental residents over the No-Action Condition.[4]

In the With-Action Condition, 0.18-acres of privately-owned public space would be developed next to the intersection of Stuyvesant Place and Hamilton Avenue on Projected Development Site 1. The illustrative plans for this open space are provided in EAS Attachment H, "Urban Design and Visual Resources." The project-generated open space would contain passive open space uses such as seating and vegetation and would provide views towards the St. George waterfront and along Stuyvesant Place. Specific amenities of the newly created privately-owned, publicly accessible open space would include hardscaping features such as benches, lighting, and paved areas, and softscaping features such as ground cover plantings and trees. The sloping topography of the Project Area renders active recreational uses such as soccer fields or basketball courts impracticable to develop, however, the proposed 0.18 acres of privately-owned, publicly accessible space would include passive features such as bench seating and landscaping.

### *Study Area*

Table 3-6 shows that with the addition of a 0.18-acre privately-owned, publicly accessible open space at Projected Development Site 1, the Study Area would have 16.79 acres of open space in the With-Action Condition.

[4] The Project Area is in Staten Island Community District 1, which has an average household size of a renter-occupied unit of 2.51, based on 2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates used to establish the reasonable worst case development scenario.

**Table 3-6: Percent Change in Open Space Ratio**

| Residential Population | Type | Acreage | OSR[1] | OSR Planning Goal |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **No-Action Condition** | | | | |
| 13,232 | Active | 4.94 | 0.37 | 2.0 |
| | Passive | 11.67 | 0.88 | 0.5 |
| | **Total** | **16.61** | **1.26** | **2.5** |
| **With-Action Condition** | | | | |
| 15,054 | Active | 4.94 | 0.33 | 2.0 |
| | Passive | 11.85 | 0.79 | 0.5 |
| | **Total** | **16.79** | **1.12** | **2.5** |
| **Increment** | | | | |
| 1,822 | Active | 0.00 | -0.04 | |
| | Passive | 0.18 | -0.09 | |
| | **Total** | **0.18** | **-0.14** | |
| **Percent Change** | | | | |
| | Active (%) | 0.00 | -12.10 | |
| | Passive (%) | 1.54 | -10.75 | |
| | **Total (%)** | **1.08** | **-11.15** | |

[1] Open Space Ratio = Acres of Open Space/ residential population * 1,000.
Note: Numbers may not add due to rounding

***Quantitative Assessment***

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, an action may result in a significant adverse open space impact if it would reduce the OSR by more than five percent in areas that are currently below the City's median community district OSR of 1.5 acres per 1,000 residents. As noted in Table C-6, the open space ratios for the study area are below the City's open space goal and the median community district OSR. Based on the With-Action Condition population of 15,054 residents in the Study Area, the OSR in the With-Action Condition would be 1.12 acres per 1,000 residents (a decrease of 11.15 percent from the OSR from the No-Action Condition), which would be below the City's median of 1.5 acres of total open space per 1,000 residents, and below the City's planning goal of 2.5 acres per 1,000 residents.

As noted in Table C-6, the passive OSR would decrease from 0.88 to 0.79 acres per 1,000 residents, a decrease of 10.75 percent. The With-Action passive OSR of 0.79 would be more than 1.5 times the City's planning goal of 0.5 acres of passive space per 1,000 residents. However, like the No-Action Condition, the With-Action Condition would ~~also experience a deficit of~~be extremely lacking in active open space relative to CEQR guidelines. The active OSR would decrease from 0.37 to 0.33 acres per 1,000 residents, a decrease of 12.1 percent; the 0.33 active OSR would be well below the City's planning goal of 2.0 acres of active open space per 1,000 residents.

As noted in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the determination of what constitutes a significant adverse open space impact is not based solely on the results of the quantitative assessment and may also take into account qualitative factors. Therefore, a qualitative assessment of the Proposed Actions is provided below to determine the overall impact significance.

***Qualitative Assessment***

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the planning goal of 2.5 acres per 1,000 residents is often not feasible for many areas of the City, and the City does not consider these ratios as its open space policy for every neighborhood. The Study Area is part of St. George, the civic center of Staten Island and an urbanized downtown area with a mix of active and passive open space resources. In the With-Action Condition, 71 percent of the Study Area's open space acreage would be dedicated to passive uses and 29 percent would be dedicated to active uses.

The Study Area contains four publicly-accessible open space resources with playgrounds to serve the Study Area's population 17 years old and younger, including a playground within one-quarter mile of the Project Area (Lt. Lia Playground). Over 55 percent of the Study Area population is between the ages of 20 and 64 years old, a user group that seeks a mix of passive and active open spaces. The open space resources in the Study Area already reflect this demographic through active spaces along the waterfront (esplanades) and the many passive neighborhood parks and squares. Recreational centers such as Lyons Pool and planned waterfront open space projects such as the Tompkinsville Esplanade and future phases of the Stapleton waterfront would provide additional passive and active open space resources that would cater to a variety of age groups, including project-generated residents.

The Proposed Actions would introduce a 0.18-acre privately-owned, publicly accessible open space on Projected Development Site 1. This open space would include passive recreational facilities such as benches, lighting, and paved areas. The Proposed Actions would also not result in a significant adverse indirect impact in the area of passive open space because:

- The Study Area would have a passive OSR of 0.79 acres per 1,000 residents in the With-Action Condition, which would be more than 1.5 times the planning goal of 0.5 acres per 1,000 residents;
- The Proposed Actions would facilitate private open space resources for building tenants including indoor amenities, planted areas, and shared rooftop space. The private open space available to tenants would provide an alternative open space amenity for residents in the developments facilitated by the Proposed Actions, thereby reducing the demand for publicly-accessible open space in the surrounding area;
- The maintenance of the proposed privately-owned, publicly accessible open space on Projected Development Site 1 would be the responsibility of the Applicant, reducing the City's obligation to maintain open spaces in the Study Area;
- There are publicly-accessible open spaces beyond the Study Area such as Stapleton Waterfront Esplanade that are easily accessible for residents due to the interconnected nature of passive waterfront open spaces in the Study Area. Projects underway in the Study Area that were not included in the quantitative analysis include the proposed Tompkinsville Esplanade (which is estimated would provide approximately two acres of public open space), and the proposed improvements at the site of Lyons Pool;
- Development projects recently completed or under construction in the Study Area such as at the Empire Outlets or the Lighthouse Point would provide other high-quality, recently constructed passive open spaces;
- According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the City's open space planning goal is often not feasible for many areas, and the Study Area is part of the more urbanized area of Downtown Staten Island; and
- Much of the open space in the Study Area or just outside the Study Area is recently completed, planned, or under construction. By the analysis year, the Study Area would

contain a variety of newer open spaces designed to a high quality. The privately-owned publicly-accessible open space components of the Empire Outlets and Lighthouse Point were designed with input from city agencies such as the Department of City Planning (DCP) and NYC Parks, and these spaces would be developed as high quality open spaces with modern recreational facilities.

The proposed passive open space would be a PCRE, and a commitment to develop this passive open space would be memorialized in a restrictive declaration that would be enforced by the Department of Buildings.

Overall, the Study Area has a variety of open spaces with programming available for a range of age groups and users. The Project Area has steep changes in topography and limited area to accommodate new development, making the provision of larger publicly accessible active recreation impractical on the development sites. Although the With-Action Condition would result in a decreased OSR, the Applicant would develop and maintain a privately-owned, publicly accessible passive open space, and other nearby developments (either new or under construction) would provide additional open spaces designed to a very high quality.

In the No-Action and With-Action conditions, there would be ~~a deficiency~~ an extreme lack of active open space in the Study Area. In the No-Action condition, the Study Area's active OSR of 0.37 would be well below the City's planning goal of 2.0 acres of active open space per 1,000 residents. Per *CEQR Technical Manual*, the Study Area is extremely lacking in active open space resources, and a reduction of one percent may be considered significant. Relative to the No-Action Condition, the With-Action Condition's active OSR would be further reduced from 0.37 to 0.33 acres per 1,000 residents. The Proposed Actions would decrease the active OSR by more than ~~five~~ one percent in an area ~~currently deficient of~~ extremely lacking in active open space, and would result in a significant adverse open space impact in the area of active open space. Possible measures to address the active open space impact are discussed in Chapter ~~M~~13, "Mitigation."