#### **TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM 001**

# Potential City Council Modifications River North (formerly Liberty Towers) CEQR No. 20DCP140R

ULURP Nos.: C 210289 ZMR, N 210290 ZRR, C 210291 ZSR 29 October 2021

#### A. INTRODUCTION

River North (formerly Liberty Towers) is the subject of a Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP) application currently under consideration by the New York City Council. On August 20, 2021, a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) was completed and a Notice of Completion was issued. On September 1, 2021, the Applicant, Richmond SI Owner LLC, received approval from the New York City Planning Commission (CPC) for a series of discretionary land use actions (Land Use Application numbers C 210289 ZMR, N 210290 ZRR, and C 210291 ZSR) including a zoning map and text amendments and a special permit (the "Proposed Actions"). The FEIS analyzed the development of a mixed-use project comprising residential and commercial uses, open space, and accessory parking in the St. George neighborhood of Staten Island, Community District 1. The Department of City Planning (DCP) is the Lead Agency on behalf of the CPC. The Proposed Actions include:

#### 1. A zoning map amendment to:

- a. change an area bounded by Nicholas Street, Richmond Terrace, Stuyvesant Place, Hamilton Avenue and a line 185 feet from and parallel to Richmond Terrace and Stuyvesant Place between Hamilton Avenue and Nicholas Street from an R6 district with a C2-2 commercial overlay at a depth 100 feet located within the Special Hillsides Preservation District ("SHPD") to an R7-3 district with a C2-4 commercial overlay at a depth of 185 feet within the Special St. George District ("SSGD"); and
- b. change an area bounded by Richmond Terrace, Hamilton Avenue and Stuyvesant Place from an R6 district with a C2-2 commercial overlay to an R6 district with a C2-4 commercial overlay within the SSGD.
- 2. A series of zoning text amendments to the New York City Zoning Resolution (ZR), Article II including to:
  - a. ZR 21-15 to allow an R7-3 district to be mapped in the SSGD; and
  - b. ZR 23-011(c) to allow optional quality housing regulations to apply to the SSGD.
- 3. A series of zoning text amendments to ZR Article XII, Chapter 8 (Special St. George District) to:
  - a. ZR Section 128-00 (General Purposes) to include an additional goal to foster economic diversity by supporting a broad range of housing including affordable housing with the SSGD.
  - b. ZR Section 128-03 (District Plans and Maps) to include the Project Area within the Upland Subdistrict.
  - c. ZR Section 128-056 to clarify that the optional Quality Housing Program would be applicable in the R7-3 district within SSGD.

- d. ZR Section 128-21 (Maximum Floor Area Ratio) to establish the maximum floor area ratio of 6.0 within R7-3 Districts under the MIH program.
- e. ZR Section 128-22 (Maximum Lot Coverage) to establish lot coverage of 70 percent for interior lots and 100 percent for corner lots for residential buildings in R7-3 districts.
- f. ZR Section 128-30 (Height and Setback Regulations) to clarify that R7-3 is subject to regulations under this Section.
- g. ZR Section 128-31 (Street Wall Location) to clarify that street wall location requirements are inapplicable in the R7-3 district.
- h. ZR Section 128-33 (Maximum Base Height) to establish a maximum street wall height of 75 feet in an R7-3 district.
- i. ZR Section 128-34 (Maximum Building Height) to establish a maximum building height of 185 feet or 18 stories within an R7-3 district.
- j. ZR Section 128-51 (Required Off-street Parking and Loading) to make the underlying R7-3 and R6 parking and loading regulations applicable to such districts within the SSGD. R7-3 regulations would be governed by R7-2 district regulations.
- k. ZR Section 128-60 (Special Approvals) to create a new special permit (ZR 128-62) to allow bulk and mandatory improvements modifications for R7-3 districts within the Upland Subdistrict.
- I. Proposed ZR Section 128-62 (Special Permit for Buildings in R7-3 Districts) to facilitate the Proposed Project and allow modification to bulk and mandatory improvements regulations.
- 4. A zoning text amendment to Appendix F (Inclusionary Housing Designated Areas and Mandatory Inclusionary Housing Areas) to establish the Project Area as a Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH) area.
- 5. A CPC Special Permit pursuant to ZR Section 128-62 (Special Permit for Buildings in R7-3 Districts) modifying the following sections:
  - a. ZR Section 128-33 (Maximum Base Height) and ZR Section 128-34 (Maximum Building Height) to allow Building 1 and Building 2 to exceed the maximum height limit of 185 feet, and to allow Building 1, 2 and 3 to encroach within the required setback along Stuyvesant Place and Richmond Terrace in order to facilitate the proposed massing and site plan.
  - b. ZR Section 128-31 (Rooftop Regulations) to allow the bulkheads and other equipment at the top of Building 2 to exceed 20 percent up to 38 percent of the building lot coverage in order to allow more flexibility including screening and articulation at the top of buildings.
  - c. ZR Section 23-47 (Minimum Required Rear Yard) to allow a waiver to the underlying rear yard requirement for a small portion where Building 1 encroaches into the rear yard required beyond a hundred feet from Hamilton Avenue varying from 9.13 feet to 10.38 feet in an area approximately 95 square feet as a result of the irregularity of the side lot and rear lot lines of the Development Site.
  - d. ZR Section 128-42 (Planting Areas) to facilitate the inclusion and location of the proposed publicly-accessible passive open space at the corner of Stuyvesant Place and Hamilton Avenue and the proposed 5,700-sf active open space, as well as areas where the sidewalk would be widened beyond the sidewalk widening line. The publicly accessible open space would have landscaping, as well as paved areas for seating and circulation.

Following the publication of the FEIS, potential modifications to the proposed actions have been identified by the City Council. This Technical Memorandum examines whether the proposed City Council modifications have



the potential to result in any new significant adverse environmental impacts that were not previously disclosed in the FEIS.

#### **B. PROJECT ANALYZED IN THE FEIS**

The RWCDS presented in the FEIS assumed the Proposed Actions would result in two projected development sites. It assumed that the Applicant's site – Projected Development Site 1 – would be developed with up to 797 dwelling units (DUs), up to 23,145 gsf of retail, 366 enclosed accessory parking spaces (the minimum accessory parking required by zoning for the assumed programming), and two publicly accessible private open spaces. In terms of height, the FEIS considered:

- Building 1 would rise to a roof height of 273 feet (298 feet including a 25-foot-tall bulkhead);
- Building 2 would rise to a roof height of 245 feet (270 feet including a 25-foot-tall bulkhead); and
- Building 3 would rise to a roof height of 132 feet (157 feet including a 25-foot-tall bulkhead).

Projected Development Site 2, which is not controlled by the Applicant, does not have any specific development proposal. However, the RWCDS assumed that Projected Development Site 2 (Block 13, Lots 68, 71, and 73) would be developed with 4,929 gsf of retail, 100,019 gsf of residential space, and 43 accessory parking spaces.

#### C. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED CITY COUNCIL MODIFICATIONS

City Council is considering the following "Modified Actions":

- 1. Reconfiguring the Rezoning Area to exclude, from Staten Island Block 13, Projected Development Site 2 (Lots 68, 71, and 73) and Lot 60<sup>2</sup>; and
- 2. Reducing the height of Buildings 1, 2, and 3 to 16, 11, and 13 stories, respectively. This reduced height would negate the need for a building height waiver (waiving the height provisions of tentative ZR 128-34) proposed through the CPC special permit pursuant to (tentative) ZR 128-62.

The Modified Actions would remove Projected Development Site 2 from the Rezoning Area and reduce the heights of Buildings 1, 2, and 3 on Projected Development Site 1 to maximum roof heights (top of roof) to 173.03 feet, 104.64 feet, and 132.14 feet, respectively. The height modifications to the buildings on Projected Development Site 1 would result in a reduction of floor area and dwelling units and the reconfiguration of parking facilities.

Figure 1 shows the Modified Rezoning Area, and Table 1 shows the change in programming between the FEIS and the programming that is projected to result from the Modified Actions. The special permit drawings for the Modified Project are provided in Appendix A.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The "Modified Rezoning Area" would include the area bound by Richmond Terrace, Stuyvesant Place, Hamilton Avenue, a line 185 feet westerly of Stuyvesant Place, a line located 260 feet (as measured along the streetline) southeasterly from the point of intersection of the southwesterly streetline of Richmond Terrace and the southeasterly streetline of Nicholas Street.



<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The active open space between Buildings 2 and 3 was identified as a measure that would partially mitigate a significant adverse open space impact (indirect residential active open space).

Figure 1: Modified Rezoning Area






Table 1: Changes between FEIS Program (Proposed Actions) and the Modified Project

Programming	FEIS Program )	<b>Modified Project</b>	Change
Gross Square Footage by Use			
Residential	787,813	525,226	-262,587
Retail	28,074	19,123	-8,951
Parking	114,999	54,763	-60,236
Total	930,886	599,112	-331,774
Gross Square Footage by Building			
Building 1	403,547	279,799	-123,748
Building 2	237,559	121,587	-115,972
Building 3	171,932	197,726	+25,794
Building 4 <sup>1</sup>	117,848	(Removed)	-117,848
Total	930,886	599,112	-331,774
Dwelling Units <sup>1</sup>			
Market Rate DUs	627	437	-190
Affordable DUs (>80% AMI)	90	63	-27
Affordable DUs (≤80% AMI)	180	125	-55
Total Dwelling Units	897	625	-272
Estimated Population	2,251	1,569	-682
(2.51 Residents per DU)	2,231	1,309	-082
Accessory Parking Capacity (Spaces)			
Building 1 (Upper)	146	0	-146
Building 1 (Lower)	78	100	+22
Building 3	142	166	+24
Building 4 <sup>1</sup>	43	0	-43
Total Parking Spaces	409	266	-143
Building Roof Height (Elevation) <sup>2</sup>			
Building 1	273.03 (329.50)	173.03 (229.50)	-100
Building 2	244.64 (293.00)	104.64 (153.00)	-140
Building 3	132.14 (171.00)	132.14 (171.00)	0
Building 4*	185	(Removed)	(Removed)
Proposed Publicly Accessible Private (	Open Space (sf) - Project	ted Development Site 1	
Passive	7,790	7,790	0
Active	5,700	5,700	0

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The Modified Project would remove Projected Development Site 2 (Building 4) from the Rezoning Area.

In addition to removing Projected Development Site 2 from the analysis framework, the Modified Actions would change the development programming on Projected Development Site 1. With the Modified Actions, Projected Development Site 1 would contain 525,226 gsf of residential space (625 DUs), 19,123 gsf of retail, and 54,763 gsf (266 spaces) of enclosed accessory parking (the "Modified Project").

As shown in Table 1, the Modified Project would result in fewer DUs than what was assessed in the FEIS, representing a decrease of 272 DUs, including 82 fewer affordable DUs (of which approximately 55 would be for low-income households and approximately 27 would be for households earning more than 80 percent the AMI).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The building bulkhead would rise up to 25 feet above the roof height – see Figure 2.

Commercial floor area would decrease by 8,951 gsf. Enclosed accessory parking would be reconfigured across the site resulting in a decrease of up to 143 accessory spaces; the upper parking facility in Building 1 (accessed from Hamilton Avenue) would be removed. Overall, the gross square footage of the Modified Project would decrease by approximately 331,774 gsf compared to the RWCDS established for the FEIS. There would be no modification to the proposed publicly accessible private open spaces, which would include an approximately 7,790-sf passive open space near the intersection of Stuyvesant Place and Hamilton Avenue, and an approximately 5,700-sf active open space (a partial mitigation measure, as noted in the FEIS) between Buildings 2 and 3.

Figure 2 shows the building bulk that would result on Projected Development Site 1 from the Modified Actions; the Modified Project would be wholly within the building envelopes analyzed in the FEIS.




Figure 2: Modified Building Massings

Note: The red lines show the maximum building envelopes analyzed in the FEIS.

# D. ASSESSMENT OF POTENTIAL FOR SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS UNDER PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS

This section considers whether the Modified Project would result in any new or different significant adverse environmental impacts not already identified in the FEIS. A detailed comparative assessment is provided below for each impact area analyzed in the FEIS.

#### **Initial CEQR Screening**

The Modified Project does not have the potential to modify the conclusions of the FEIS in many of the CEQR analysis areas because the Modified Project would:

- Remove Projected Development Site 2 from the analysis framework;
- Not introduce new land uses or increase the square footage of the land uses analyzed in the FEIS;



- Reduce the building heights within the envelopes analyzed in the FEIS; and
- Reduce the residential floor area, the number of DUs, and project-generated residents.

Specifically, the Modified Project does not have the potential to result in new or different significant adverse impacts in the following CEQR analysis areas: Socioeconomic Conditions; Community Facilities and Services; Shadows; Historic and Cultural Resources; Urban Design and Visual Resources; Natural Resources; Hazardous Materials; Water and Sewer Infrastructure; Solid Waste and Sanitation Services; Energy; Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change; Neighborhood Character; and Construction.

The Modified Project has the potential to alter the FEIS's conclusions in the following CEQR technical areas: land use, zoning, and public policy; open space; transportation; air quality; noise; public health; and construction.

#### Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy

#### **Land Use**

Compared to the Proposed Actions, the Modified Project would reconfigure the floor area by use and remove the need for a height waiver (to waive the height provisions of [tentative] ZR 128-34). Therefore, a land use, zoning, and public policy analysis is warranted.

The FEIS concluded that the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse indirect impact to land use, zoning and public policy. The Proposed Actions would allow additional floor area for residential, commercial, and accessory parking uses in the Rezoning Area over the No-Action Condition. The Proposed Actions would allow Projected Development Site 1 to transform a vacant site in Downtown Staten Island into a mixed-use development comprising residential, commercial, accessory parking, and publicly accessible private open space. The Proposed Actions have the potential to displace two two-family residences on Projected Development Site 2. The land uses anticipated to result from the Proposed Actions already exist within the Study Area and would not result in a significant adverse land use or zoning impact.

The Modified Project would not introduce any new land uses not contemplated in the FEIS. However, compared the Proposed Actions, the gross floor area of residential, commercial, and parking uses would respectively be reduced in the Modified Project by 262,587 gross square feet (gsf), 8,951 gsf, and 60,236 gsf. The acreage of the publicly accessible private open spaces would not be reduced by the Modified Actions. Therefore, the Modified Project would not result in any new or different significant adverse impacts to land use compared to the FEIS.

#### Zoning

The Proposed Actions would allow new, higher-density mixed-use development along Richmond Terrace, reflecting the Rezoning Area's gateway location in St. George. With the Proposed Actions, the Block 13 portion of the Rezoning Area would be rezoned from R6 and R6/C2-2 to an R7-3/C2-4 district. The Special Hillsides Preservation District (HS) would be demapped in the Rezoning Area and replaced with the Special St. George District (SG). In the Block 13 portion of the Rezoning Area, the Proposed Actions would increase maximum permitted base and building heights, and increase the maximum permitted floor area ratio (FAR) for residential uses. The FEIS determined that the Proposed Actions would not be incompatible with surrounding residential districts and would produce zoning that would be similar in use and scale to existing zoning districts.

Like the Proposed Actions, the Modified Project would rezone the Block 13 portion of the Modified Rezoning Area to an R7-3/C2-4 (SG) district, and would modify zoning provisions of the SG district through a CPC special



permit pursuant to (tentative) ZR 128-62. The Modified Project would remove the height waiver provided by the ZR 128-62 special permit, thereby reducing the degree of height waivers from the underlying zoning compared to the Proposed Actions. Therefore, the Modified Project would not result in any new or different significant adverse impacts to zoning compared to the FEIS.

#### **Public Policy**

The FEIS concluded that the Proposed Actions would support the goals of *OneNYC 2050*, *Housing New York 2.0*, *North Shore 2030*, North Shore Bus Rapid Transit, and FRESH. The Project Area is wholly outside of the New York City Coastal Zone Boundary and outside the 100-year and 500-year flood zones delineated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. The Proposed Actions would not conflict with applicable public policy and would not result in a significant adverse public policy impact.

The Modified Project would continue to provide affordable units, although reduced from the Proposed Actions. Therefore, the Modified Project would also further the goals of *OneNYC 2050*, *Housing New York 2.0*, and *North Shore 2030*.

#### **Open Space**

The FEIS found that the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse indirect impacts to active open space. The Study Area is extremely deficient of active open space, and, absent mitigation, residents generated by the Proposed Actions would decrease the Study Area's active open space ratio (OSR) by 12.1 percent, which would exceed the one percent impact threshold. The significant adverse impact would be partially mitigated with the provision of an on-site 0.13-acre (5,700 sf) active open space located between Buildings 2 and 3. This partial mitigation would decrease the change in the active OSR to 9.79 percent.

The Modified Project would result in 272 fewer DUs than what was assessed in the FEIS, equating to approximately 672 fewer residents (10 residents would continue to occupy the former Projected Development Site 2 in the Modified Project). The active open space partial mitigation would also be provided in the Modified Project. Table 2 shows the change in open space conditions between the No-Action, Proposed Actions, and the Modified Project.

**Table 2: OSR Percent Change by Condition** 

	_	Open	Space Acrea	ge	OSR (Acres	per 1,000 Res	idents)
Condition	Pop.	Total	Passive	Active	Total	Passive	Active
No-Action	13,232	16.61	11.67	4.94	1.26	0.88	0.37
Proposed Actions <sup>1</sup>	15,054	16.92	11.85	5.07	1.12	0.79	0.34
Modified Project <sup>1,2</sup>	14,382	16.92	11.85	5.07	1.18	0.82	0.35
Absolute Change	-672	0	0	0	+0.06	+0.03	+0.01
OSR Change Between	n No-Action	-6.35	-6.81	-5.41			

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Includes active open space partial mitigation on Projected Development Site 1.

With the Modified Project, the OSR compared to the No-Action Condition would be reduced by 5.41 percent, a reduction of 4.38 percentage points. Because the Open Space Study Area is severely deficient of active open space, a reduction in the OSR relative to the No-Action Condition by as little as one percent would constitute a significant adverse impact to active open space. Accordingly, like the Proposed Actions, the Modified Project



<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Includes 10 existing residents who would remain on Projected Development Site 2 in the Modified Project.

would also result in an indirect significant adverse impact to active open space; however, the degree of the impact would be reduced with the Modified Project.

The Modified Project would not result in significant adverse direct impacts to an open space resource.

#### **Transportation**

The Modified Actions would not result in any new significant adverse transportation impacts. A detailed trip generation analysis was performed to estimate person and vehicle trips generated by the Modified Actions. The Modified Actions would introduce a development that is different from the RWCDS analyzed in the FEIS. With the Modified Actions, Projected Development Site 2 would be removed from the analysis framework, and Projected Development Site 1 would contain fewer DUs, less retail space, and fewer accessory parking spaces. In addition, the upper parking facility in Building 1 (accessed from Hamilton Avenue) would be removed resulting in reassignment of auto trips to the Building 1 lower parking facility accessed from Stuyvesant Place. Travel demand projections were prepared for the Modified Project during the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday peak hours, using transportation planning assumptions from the FEIS.

#### **Trip Generation**

The total person and vehicle trips generated by the Modified Project are summarized in Table 3. In total, the Modified Project would generate approximately 384, 604, 464, and 526 person trips during the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday peak hours, respectively. In terms of vehicle trips, the Modified Project would generate approximately 118, 118, 116, and 130 vehicle trips during the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday peak hours, respectively.

In comparison, the FEIS Program was expected to generate 626, 1052, 780, and 884 person trips, and 190, 199, 190 and 213 vehicle trips during the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday peak hours, respectively. As shown in Table 4, a comparison of the person and vehicle trips generated by the FEIS Program indicates an incremental change of approximately 242, 447, 316, and 359 person trips, and 72, 80, 74, and 83 vehicle trips during the AM, midday, PM and Saturday peak hours, respectively. Therefore, the number of person and vehicle trips expected to be generated by the Modified Project would be lower than the FEIS Program during AM, midday, PM and Saturday peak hours.



**Table 3: Modified Project Trip Generation Summary** 

						-	Person Tri	ps					Veh	icle Trips	
Use	Peak Hour	In/Out	Auto	Taxi	Subway	Bus	Railroad	Ferry	Bicycle	Walk	Total	Auto	Taxi	Delivery	Total
		In	25	0	8	17	1	16	1	6	74	24	0	2	26
	Weekday AM	Out	88	0	29	61	2	57	3	20	261	84	0	2	86
		Total	113	0	38	79	3	73	4	25	334	108	1	3	112
		In	38	0	13	26	1	24	1	8	111	36	0	1	37
	Weekday Midday	Out	38	0	13	26	1	24	1	8	111	36	0	1	37
Residential		Total	75	0	25	52	2	49	3	17	223	72	0	2	75
Residential		In	63	0	21	44	1	41	2	14	187	60	0	0	61
	Weekday PM	Out	37	0	12	26	1	24	1	8	110	35	0	0	36
		Total	100	0	33	70	2	65	4	22	297	96	1	1	97
		In	57	0	19	40	1	37	2	13	168	54	0	0	55
	Saturday Midday	Out	55	0	18	38	1	35	2	12	162	52	0	0	53
		Total	111	0	37	77	3	72	4	25	330	106	1	1	108
		In	5	0	0	2	0	0	0	19	25	3	0	0	3
	Weekday AM	Out	5	0	0	2	0	0	0	19	25	3	0	0	3
		Total	9	0	0	3	0	0	0	38	50	6	0	0	6
		In	34	0	0	11	0	0	0	145	191	21	0	0	22
	Weekday Midday	Out	34	0	0	11	0	0	0	145	191	21	0	0	22
Local Retail		Total	69	0	0	23	0	0	0	290	382	43	0	0	43
accur return		In	15	0	0	5	0	0	0	64	84	9	0	0	9
	Weekday PM	Out	15	0	0	5	0	0	0	64	84	9	0	0	9
		Total	30	0	0	10	0	0	0	127	167	19	0	0	19
		In	18	0	0	6	0	0	0	74	98	11	0	0	11
	Saturday Midday	Out	18	0	0	6	0	0	0	74	98	11	0	0	11
		Total	35	0	0	12	0	0	0	149	196	22	0	0	22
		In	29	0	8	19	1	16	1	25	99	27	0	2	29
	Weekday AM	Out	93	0	29	63	2	57	3	39	286	87	0	2	89
		Total	122	0	38	82	3		4		384	114	1		
		In	72	0	13	38	1	24	1	153	302	57	0	1	59
	Weekday Midday	Out	72	0	13	38	1		1		302	57	0	1	
Total		Total	144	0	25	75	2		3		604	115	0	3	
		In	78	0	21	49	1		2	78	271	70	0	0	
	Weekday PM	Out	52	0	12	31	1		1	72	194	45	0	0	
		Total	130	0	33	80	2		4	150	464	115	1	1	
		In	74	0	19	45	1		2		266	65	0		
	Saturday Midday	Out	72	0	18	44	1		2		260	63	0	0	
		Total	147	0	37	89	3	72	4	174	526	129	1	1	130



Table 4: Net Incremental Trips (FEIS Program vs. Modified Project)

							Person Tri	ps					Veh	icle Trips	
Use	Peak Hour	In/Out	Auto	Taxi	Subway	Bus	Railroad	Ferry	Bicycle	Walk	Total	Auto	Taxi	Delivery	Total
		In	-15	0	-5	-10	0	-10	-1	-3	-44	-14	0	-1	-15
	Weekday AM	Out	-53	0	-18	-37	-1	-34	-2	-12	-156	-50	0	-1	-52
		Total	-68	0	-22	-47	-2	-44	-2	-15	-200	-65	0	-2	-67
		In	-23	0	-7	-16	-1	-15	-1	-5	-67	-22	0	-1	-22
	Weekday Midday	Out	-23	0	-7	-16	-1	-15	-1	-5	-67	-22	0	-1	-22
Residential		Total	-45	0	-15	-31	-1	-29	-2	-10	-133	-43	0	-1	-45
Residential	-	In	-38	0	-13	-26	-1	-24	-1	-8	-112	-36	0	0	-37
	Weekday PM	Out	-22	0	-7	-15	-1	-14	-1	-5	-66	-21	0	0	-22
		Total	-60	0	-20	-42	-1	-39	-2	-13	-178	-57	0	0	-58
		In	-34	0	-11	-24	-1	-22	-1	-8	-101	-33	0	0	-33
	Saturday Midday	Out	-33	0	-11	-23	-1	-21	-1	-7	-97	-31	0	0	-32
		Total	-67	0	-22	-46	-2	-43	-2	-15	-198	-64	0	0	-65
		In	-4	0	0	-1	0	0	0	-16	-21	-2	0	0	-2
	Weekday AM	Out	-4	0	0	-1	0	0	0	-16	-21	-2	0	0	-2
		Total	-7	0	0	-2	0	0	0	-31	-41	-5	0	0	-5
		In	-28	0	0	-9	0	0	0	-119	-157	-18	0	0	-18
	Weekday Midday	Out	-28	0	0	-9	0	0	0	-119	-157	-18	0	0	-18
Local Botoli		Total	-56	0	0	-19	0	0	0	-238	-314	-35	0	0	-36
Local Retail		In	-12	0	0	-4	0	0	0	-52	-69	-8	0	0	-8
	Weekday PM	Out	-12	0	0	-4	0	0	0	-52	-69	-8	0	0	-8
		Total	-25	0	0	-8	0	0	0	-105	-138	-15	0	0	-16
		In	-15	0	0	-5	0	0	0	-61	-81	-9	0	0	-9
	Saturday Midday	Out	-15	0	0	-5	0	0	0	-61	-81	-9	0	0	-9
		Total	-29	0	0	-10	0	0	0	-122	-161	-18	0	0	-18
		In	-19	0	-5	-12	0	-10	-1	-19	-65	-17	0	-1	-18
	Weekday AM	Out	-56	0	-18	-38	-1	-34	-2	-27	-177	-53	0	-1	-54
		Total	-75	0	-22	-50	-2	-44	-2	-46	-242	-69	0	-2	-72
		In	-51	0	-7	-25	-1	-15	-1	-124	-224	-39	0	-1	-40
	Weekday Midday	Out	-51	0	-7	-25	-1	-15	-1	-124	-224	-39	0	-1	-40
Total		Total	-102	0	-15	-50	-1	- <b>2</b> 9	-2	-249	-447	-78	0	-2	-80
iotai		In	-50	0	-13	-30	-1	-24	-1	-61	-181	-44	0	0	-44
	Weekday PM	Out	-35	0	-7	-20	-1	-14	-1	-57	-135	-29	0	0	-29
		Total	-85	0	-20	-50	-1	-39	-2	-118	-316	-73	0	0	-74
		In	-49	0	-11	-29	-1	-22	-1	-69	-181	-42	0	0	-42
	Saturday Midday	Out	-47	0	-11	-28	-1	-21	-1	-69	-177	-40	0	0	-41
		Total	-96	0	-22	-56	-2	-43	-2	-137	-359	-82	0	-1	-83

#### Traffic

As shown in Table 3, the Modified Project would generate approximately 118, 118, 116 and 130 vehicle trips during the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday peak hours, respectively. In comparison, the FEIS Program was expected to generate 190, 199, 190 and 213 vehicle trips during the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday peak hours, respectively. As shown in Table 4, a comparison of the vehicle trips generated by the FEIS Program to the Modified Project indicates an incremental change of approximately -72, -80, -74, and -83 vehicle trips during the AM, midday, PM and Saturday peak hours, respectively. Therefore, the number of vehicle trips



expected to be generated by the Modified Project would be lower than the FEIS Program during AM, midday, PM and Saturday peak hours.

Although, this incremental vehicle trip activity is negative during the four peak hours, the change in the Building 1 trip assignments resulting from the removal of the Hamilton Avenue parking facility could potentially affect the traffic conditions at study area intersections. Therefore, a Level 2 screening assessment was conducted to distribute the incremental vehicle trips through the study area intersections to assess potential increases in traffic volumes.

#### Transit and Pedestrians

The FEIS did not identify any potential significant adverse impacts for either transit or pedestrians. As shown in Table 4, the Modified Project would generate fewer transit and pedestrian trips than the FEIS Program. Therefore, like the Proposed Actions, the Modified Project would not result in significant adverse transit or pedestrian impacts.

#### **Trip Distribution**

#### Traffic

A CEQR Level 2 detailed trip distribution and assignment of projected vehicle trips was conducted for the four peak hours, in line with trip assignments for the FEIS Program. Specifically, the trips generated by Building 1 in the FEIS Program were distributed to the two parking facilities accessed via Hamilton Avenue and Stuyvesant Place. With the removal of the Hamilton Avenue parking facility in the Modified Project, all the trips generated by Building 1 were assigned to the Stuyvesant Place facility.

The FEIS analyzed 13 intersections in the study area. The incremental vehicle trips resulting from the Modified Project at the study area intersections are shown in Table 5. Based on these increments, none of the study area intersections would experience a net increase in vehicle trips with the Modified Project. However, three individual traffic movements could experience an increase in traffic volume in one or more peak hours (maximum of up to 18 vehicles in any given peak hour).



**Table 5: Incremental Vehicle Trips at Study Area Intersections** 

		Vehicle Tr	ip Increment (Modife	d Project minus F	EIS Program)
Intersection ID	Intersection	Weekday AM	Weekday Midday	Weekday PM	Saturday Midday
1	Richmond Terrace & Jersey Street	-18	-21	-19	-21
2	Richmond Terrace & Westervelt Avenue	-17	-21	-19	-21
3	Richmond Terrace & Nicholas Street	-23	-29	-31	-31
4	Richmond Terrace & Stuyvesant Place	-39	-22	-12	-22
5	Richmond Terrace & Hamilton Avenue	-33	-39	-36	-40
6	Richmond Terrace & Wall Street	-33	-39	-36	-40
7	Victory Boulevard & Bay Street	-16	-26	-27	-27
8	Victory Boulevard & St. Marks Place/Bay Street	-29	-22	-16	-22
9	Fort Place & St. Marks Place	-36	-31	-26	-32
10	Wall Street & St. Marks Place	-36	-31	-26	-32
11	Hamilton Avenue & St. Marks Place	-58	-59	-53	-62
12	Hamilton Avenue & Academy Place	-56	-53	-45	-55
13	Hamilton Avenue & Stuyvesant Place	-7	-40	-48	-42

#### Traffic Analysis

The FEIS identified significant adverse traffic impacts at four study area intersections in at least one peak hour. Out of these, two intersections remained unmitigated with standard traffic engineering measures in at least one peak hour. A traffic analysis was conducted for the Modified Project to determine if the Modified Actions would result in significant adverse impacts as compared to the FEIS, and if any mitigation measures identified previously in the FEIS would require any modification.

Based on the traffic analysis results, the Modified Project would not result in new significant adverse traffic impacts. In addition, with the Modified Project, one intersection that the FEIS identified as an unmitigated significant adverse impact in three peak hours would be fully mitigated in two of the three peak hours when a significant adverse traffic impact was projected to occur. Furthermore, under the Modified Project, the mitigation measures proposed to improve the traffic operations at one of the impacted intersections would be reduced.

The key results of the traffic analysis are summarized as follows:

- At the intersection of Bay Street and Victory Boulevard, like the Proposed Actions, significant adverse
  impacts identified at this intersection would remain unmitigated with the Modified Project. However,
  as described in the FEIS, as part of the Bay Street Rezoning and Related Actions FEIS, the City committed
  to a Traffic Monitoring Plan, which includes the intersection of Bay Street and Victory Boulevard.
  Therefore, this intersection will be monitored in the future as changes to the area's traffic network arise
  over time.
- At the intersection of Richmond Terrace and Jersey Street, the significant adverse impacts during the
  weekday AM peak hour could be mitigated by shifting only four (4) seconds from the NB left-turn/SB
  left-turn phase to the EB/WB phase with the Modified Project. The additional shifts of four (4) seconds



from the EB phase and one (1) second from the NB/SB phase as identified as mitigation in the FEIS would not be required with the Modified Project.

#### **Parking**

The Modified Project would provide 100 and 166 parking spaces in Building 1 and Building 3, respectively, totaling 266 parking spaces on Projected Development Site 1. A 24-hour parking accumulation analysis was conducted for the Modified Project based on the With-Action Trip Generation Estimates (see Table 3) and 24-hour temporal distributions from the Bay Street Rezoning and Related Actions FEIS. The 24-hour parking accumulation for the Modified Project in comparison to the total proposed on-site parking supply is shown in Table 4 and Table 5 for a typical weekday and Saturday, respectively.

Based on the 24-hour parking accumulation projected in the Modified Project, parking demand is anticipated to peak overnight for both the typical weekday and Saturday conditions, when approximately 331 spaces would be in demand (see Table 6 and Table 7). During these overnight periods, a parking shortfall of approximately 65 spaces is projected; however, this demand could be accommodated at the public parking facilities within ¼-mile of the Project Site. Additionally, any anticipated on-site parking shortfalls outside of the overnight period would also be accommodated at the public parking facilities within ¼-mile of the Project Site (see Table 8).

Table 6: Modified Actions Project-Generated Hourly Parking Accumulation – Weekday

	I .			1 .		_	ı		-
	Proje	cted Site	e 1-A	Proje	cted Site	e 1-B			
	D	D-4-11	T-4-1	B	D-4-11	T-4-1	Total	s . (1)	61 .6.11
Time period	Res	Retail	Total	Res	Retail	Total	Demand	Supply (1)	Shortfall
Overnight <sup>(2)</sup>	155	0	155	176	0	176	331	266	(65)
12:00 AM 1:00 AM	155	0	155	176	0	176	331	266	(65)
1:00 AM 2:00 AM	155	0	155	176	0	176	331	266	(65)
2:00 AM 3:00 AM	155	0	155	176	0	176	331	266	(65)
3:00 AM 4:00 AM	155	0	155	176	0	176	331	266	(65)
4:00 AM 5:00 AM	155	0	155	176	0	176	331	266	(65)
5:00 AM 6:00 AM	155	0	155	176	0	176	331	266	(65)
6:00 AM 7:00 AM	155	0	155	176	0	176	331	266	(65)
7:00 AM 8:00 AM	133	0	133	150	0	150	283	266	(17)
8:00 AM 9:00 AM	94	0	94	106	0	106	200	266	66
9:00 AM 10:00 AM	62	0	62	70	0	70	131	266	135
10:00 AM 11:00 AM	42	0	42	48	0	48	91	266	175
11:00 AM 12:00 PM	38	0	38	44	0	44	82	266	184
12:00 PM 1:00 PM	38	0	38	44	0	44	82	266	184
1:00 PM 2:00 PM	40	0	40	45	0	45	85	266	181
2:00 PM 3:00 PM	45	0	45	51	0	51	96	266	170
3:00 PM 4:00 PM	47	0	47	53	0	53	101	266	165
4:00 PM 5:00 PM	61	0	61	69	0	69	130	266	136
5:00 PM 6:00 PM	77	0	77	88	0	88	165	266	101
6:00 PM 7:00 PM	101	0	101	115	0	115	216	266	50
7:00 PM 8:00 PM	114	0	114	129	0	129	244	266	22
8:00 PM 9:00 PM	127	0	127	144	0	144	271	266	(5)
9:00 PM 10:00 PM	137	0	137	155	0	155	292	266	(26)
10:00 PM 11:00 PM	149	0	149	168	0	168	317	266	(51)
11:00 PM 12:00 AM	155	0	155	176	0	176	331	266	(65)
1 The Droposed Actions would	ı d provide	266 on	cito nark	ing chac	0.0				•

<sup>1.</sup> The Proposed Actions would provide 266 on-site parking spaces.

<sup>2.</sup> Overnight parking demand estimated based on a vehicle ownership rate of 53% for renter occupied units per U.S. Census Data.

Table 7: Modified Actions Project-Generated Hourly Parking Accumulation – Saturday

		Proje	cted Site	1-A	Projected Site 1-B					
								Total		
Time period		Res	Retail	Total	Res	Retail	Total	Demand	Supply (1)	Shortfall
Overnight (2)		155	0	155	176	0	176	331	266	(65)
12:00 AM	 1:00 AM	155	0	155	176	0	176	331	266	(65)
1:00 AM	 2:00 AM	155	0	155	176	0	176	331	266	(65)
2:00 AM	 3:00 AM	155	0	155	176	0	176	331	266	(65)
3:00 AM	 4:00 AM	155	0	155	176	0	176	331	266	(65)
4:00 AM	 5:00 AM	155	0	155	176	0	176	331	266	(65)
5:00 AM	 6:00 AM	155	0	155	176	0	176	331	266	(65)
6:00 AM	 7:00 AM	155	0	155	176	0	176	331	266	(65)
7:00 AM	 8:00 AM	128	0	128	146	0	146	274	266	(8)
8:00 AM	 9:00 AM	73	0	73	83	0	83	156	266	110
9:00 AM	 10:00 AM	36	0	36	41	0	41	77	266	189
10:00 AM	 11:00 AM	15	0	15	17	0	17	32	266	234
11:00 AM	 12:00 PM	9	0	9	11	0	11	20	266	246
12:00 PM	 1:00 PM	11	0	11	12	0	12	23	266	243
1:00 PM	 2:00 PM	11	0	11	12	0	12	23	266	243
2:00 PM	 3:00 PM	24	0	24	27	0	27	50	266	216
3:00 PM	 4:00 PM	24	0	24	27	0	27	51	266	215
4:00 PM	 5:00 PM	27	0	27	31	0	31	58	266	208
5:00 PM	 6:00 PM	72	0	72	82	0	82	154	266	112
6:00 PM	 7:00 PM	96	0	96	109	0	109	206	266	60
7:00 PM	 8:00 PM	115	0	115	130	0	130	245	266	21
8:00 PM	 9:00 PM	127	0	127	144	0	144	272	266	(6)
9:00 PM	 10:00 PM	137	0	137	156	0	156	293	266	(27)
10:00 PM	 11:00 PM	149	0	149	169	0	169	318	266	(52)
11:00 PM	 12:00 AM	155	0	155	176	0	176	331	266	(65)

<sup>1.</sup> The Proposed Actions would provide 266 on-site parking spaces.

Table 8: With-Action Condition Off-Street Public Parking Utilization within %-mile

		Week		Satu	ırday	
	AM	MD	PM	Overnight	MD	Overnight
2025 No-Action Public Parking Supply Total	2,558	2,558	2,558	2,558	2,558	2,558
2025 No-Action Public Parking Demand (Excluding AOR Project)	1,735	2,090	1,772	1,470	1,805	1,513
2025 No-Action Public Parking Utilization (Excluding AOR Project)	68%	82%	69%	57%	71%	59%
2025 No-Action Public Parking Supply	2,558	2,558	2,558	2,558	2,558	2,558
New Proposed Actions Public Parking Supply Total	0	0	0	0	0	0
2025 With-Action Public Parking Supply Total	2,558	2,558	2,558	2,558	2,558	2,558
2025 Proposed Actions Parking Demand	200	82	165	331	23	331
2025 Proposed Actions Parking Demand Accommodated by Public Parking	0	0	0	65	0	65
2025 With-Action Public Parking Demand Total	1,735	2,090	1,772	1,536	1,805	1,578
2025 With-Action Public Parking Utilization	68%	82%	69%	60%	71%	62%
2025 With-Action Available Spaces	823	468	786	1,022	753	980

With the parking demand generated by the Modified Project, the off-site public parking facilities would operate at 68, 82, 69, 60, 71, and 62 percent utilization, with 823, 468, 786, 1,022, 753, and 980 available parking spaces during the weekday morning, weekday midday, weekday evening, weekday overnight, Saturday midday and Saturday overnight time periods, respectively. Accordingly, like the Proposed Actions, the parking demand generated by the Modified Project would not result in a parking shortfall in the study area.

<sup>2.</sup> Overnight parking demand estimated based on a vehicle ownership rate of 53% for renter occupied units per U.S. Census Data.

#### Vehicular and Pedestrian Safety

The FEIS presented crash data for the study area intersections. As shown in Table 5-27 of the FEIS, no intersections were identified as high-crash locations. Therefore, the Modified Actions would not adversely affect the vehicle and pedestrian safety conditions in the study area.

#### **Transportation Conclusion**

In terms of traffic operations, the incremental vehicle trips generated by the Modified Project would be lower as compared to the Proposed Actions during all four peak hours. In addition, the net incremental trips at the study area intersections would be lower with the Modified Project compared to the Proposed Actions. Therefore, as compared to the Proposed Actions analyzed in the FEIS, the Modified Project would not result in new significant adverse traffic impacts. The Modified Project would enable mitigation of significant adverse impacts at the intersection of Bay Street and Victory Boulevard during two peak hours where the FEIS found the Proposed Actions would result in an unmitigated significant adverse impact. Compared to the Proposed Actions, the Modified Project would require fewer changes to signal timing to mitigate the significant adverse impact at the intersection of Richmond Terrace and Jersey Street.

Transit and pedestrian trips generated by the Modified Project would be lower in comparison to the FEIS Program in all four peak hours. Accordingly, like the Proposed Actions, the Modified Project would not result in significant adverse transit or pedestrian impacts. In terms of vehicular and pedestrian safety, none of the study area's intersections are high-crash locations. Like the Proposed Actions, the Modified Project would not result in significant adverse safety impacts.

The projected parking demand from the Modified Project during the weekday morning, weekday midday, weekday evening, weekday overnight, Saturday midday and Saturday overnight periods would be partially accommodated by the public parking facilities within ¼-mile of the Project Site. Therefore, like the Proposed Actions, the Modified Project would not result in a parking shortfall in the study area.

#### Air Quality

#### **Existing-On-Project Stationary Sources**

The FEIS found that there would not be a significant adverse air quality impact from nearby existing emissions sources. No industrial emissions sources of concern were identified within 400 feet of the CPC-Approved Rezoning Area that warranted detailed air quality analysis. Similarly, the FEIS found that no large or major emissions sources within 1,000 feet of the development sites.

Like the Proposed Actions, the Modified Project would not be within 400 feet of an industrial emission source that warrants detailed air quality analysis, and would be beyond 1,000 feet of any large or major source. Accordingly, the Modified Project would not result in a significant adverse impact from existing stationary emissions sources.

#### **Project-Generated Stationary Sources**

The FEIS found that the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse air quality impacts with an E-Designation specifying the stack location and fuel type for heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) and hot water systems. Specifically, the E-Designation associated with the Proposed Actions would require:




- The emissions stack from Building 1 to be located at the highest tier at least 301 feet above grade;
- Building 2 to use natural gas as a fuel source with the emissions stack located at the highest tier at least 273 feet above grade;
- Building 3 to use natural gas as a fuel source with the emissions stack located at the highest tier at least 160 feet above grade; and
- The emissions stack from Building 4 (on Projected Development Site 2) to be located at the highest tier at least 208 feet above grade.


The Modified Project would reconfigure building heights and have the potential to modify the air quality conditions from building-specific emissions and from the cumulative emissions from the three buildings that would result from the Modified Project. The Applicant intends to use electric-powered heating and cooling systems in the proposed buildings, which would significantly reduce the project-generated emissions of concern at Projected Development Site 1 relative to heating and cooling systems powered by fuel oil #2 or natural gas. However, to account for worst-case conditions, nomograph screenings were completed for the Modified Project.

#### Building 1

Because Building 1's emissions stack would be at 195 feet above grade and below the elevation of the sensitive receptors at the Castleton Park Apartments South Tower, an HVAC screening was warranted. Building 1 would contain 257,554 gsf of non-parking floor area (the parking area would not be served by the building's HVAC system). The bulkhead would be at least 127 feet from the nearest façade of the Castleton Park Apartments; because Building Code requires the emissions stack be at least 5 feet from the roof edge, the emissions stack on Building 1 will be at least 132 feet from the Castleton Park Apartments South Tower. The HVAC screenings for Building 1 are provided in Figure 3.

Figure 3: HVAC and Hot Water Emissions from Building 1





#### Building 2

Building 2 would have a bulkhead height of approximately 125 feet in the Modified Project, and an emissions release point of approximately 128 feet. The nearest receptor of similar or greater height to the building's bulkhead would be Building 3 at a minimum distance of 60 feet. When incorporating the 5-foot setback from the roof edge that is required by Building Code, Building 2's emissions stack would be at least 65 feet from Building 3. Building 2 would contain 121,587 gsf of floor area that would be served by the building's HVAC and hot water systems. Building 2's nomographs for both natural gas and fuel oil #2 are shown in Figure 4.




Figure 4: HVAC and Hot Water Emissions from Building 2

The nomograph shows that Building 2 would fail the screening with the use of fuel oil #2 if the emissions stack is located within 125 feet of a building of similar or greater height, or within 85 feet if natural gas is used. Because of the configuration of the proposed buildings and the location of Building 2's bulkhead, it may not be possible to site the emissions stack more than 125 feet from a receptor of similar or greater height. Portions of Building 2's bulkhead would be at least 85 feet from a receptor of similar or greater height and 5 feet from the bulkhead's edge. Accordingly, an E-Designation would be warranted specifying that the emissions stack on Building 2 be located at the highest tier at least 128 feet above grade and at least 85 feet from a receptor of similar or greater height.

#### **Building 3**

Building 3 would have a bulkhead height of approximately 152 feet in the Modified Project, and an emissions release point of approximately 155 feet. The nearest receptor of similar or greater height to the building's bulkhead would be the Castleton Park Apartments North Tower at a minimum distance of 180 feet, or 185 feet including the required 5-foot setback from the bulkhead's roof edge. Building 3 would contain 171,814 gsf of floor area that would be served by the building's HVAC and hot water systems. Building 3's nomographs for both natural gas and fuel oil #2 are shown in Figure 5.



The nomographs show that Building 3 would pass the screening with the use of either fuel oil #2 or natural gas if the emissions stack is located at the highest tier at least 155 feet above grade. Accordingly, and E-Designation would be warranted for Building 3 specifying that the emissions stack must be located at the highest tier.




Figure 5: HVAC and Hot Water Emissions from Building 3

#### **Cumulative Emissions**

In the Modified Project, Buildings 2 and 3 would be of similar height and have the potential to result in cumulative emissions at nearby receptors of similar or greater height. Combined, Buildings 2 and 3 would contain 293,401 of floor area that would be served by the buildings' HVAC and hot water systems. The nearest receptor of similar or greater height to either Building 2 or 3 would be Building 1 at a minimum distance of 60 feet from Building 2; however, as currently contemplated, Building 2's bulkhead would be at least 90 feet from Building 1 at the emissions height. The nomograph showing the cumulative emissions from Buildings 2 and 3 on Building 1 are shown in Figure 6.

The nomograph of cumulative emissions from natural gas-powered systems in Buildings 2 and 3 show that the emissions stack on Building 2 must be sited at least 127 feet from Building 1 at the emissions height. Accordingly, an E-Designation is warranted for Building 2 specifying that the emissions stack be located at the highest tier and at least 127 feet from Building 1. Because Building 2 also warrants an E-Designation specifying the stack must be at the highest tier and at least 85 feet from Building 3, to account for cumulative emissions, an E-Designation is warranted specifying that:

- HVAC and hot water systems must use natural gas as a fuel source;
- the emissions stack on Building 2 must be located at the highest tier; and
- the emissions stack be located at least 85 feet from Building 3 and at least 127 feet from Building 1.




Figure 6: HVAC and Hot Water Cumulative Emissions from Buildings 2 and 3

#### E-Designation for Stationary Sources

To preclude the potential for project-on-project or project-on-existing air quality impacts from stationary sources, an E-Designation for air quality would be assigned to Projected Development Site 1 (Block 13, Lots 82, 92, and 100) for air quality with adoption of the Modified Actions. By placing this E-Designation, the potential for a significant adverse air quality impact from the Proposed Actions would be avoided. The requirements of E-Designation associated with the Modified Actions would be as follows:

#### **Projected Development Site 1**

Building 1 (Block 13, Lot 100): Any new residential and/or commercial development on the above-referenced properties must ensure that the heating, ventilating and air conditioning systems and the hot water system (HVAC) stack is located at the highest tier and at least 195 feet above grade to avoid any potential significant adverse air quality impacts.

Building 2 (Block 13, Lot 92): Any new residential and/or commercial development on the above-referenced properties must use natural gas as the type of fuel for the heating, ventilating and air conditioning systems and the hot water system (HVAC) and ensure that the HVAC stack is located at the highest tier and at least 128 feet above grade, and at least 127 feet from Building 1 and 85 feet from Building 3 to avoid any potential significant adverse air quality impacts.

Building 3 (Block 13, Lot 82): Any new residential and/or commercial development on the above-referenced properties must use natural gas as the type of fuel for heating, ventilating and air conditioning systems and the hot water system (HVAC), and ensure that the HVAC stack is located at the highest tier and at least 155 feet above grade to avoid any potential significant adverse air quality impacts.



#### **Mobile Sources**

The FEIS found that the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts from mobile source emissions.

The Modified Project would result in fewer project-generated trips than the Proposed Actions, and the volume of trips at most intersections would decrease relative to the Proposed Actions. The Modified Project may result in a nominal number of additional peak-hour vehicle trips at select intersections, however, the intersections where these nominal number of additional trips would occur would operate at acceptable levels and would not have the potential or result in new significant adverse air quality impacts from mobile sources. Accordingly, like the Proposed Actions, the Modified Project would not result in significant adverse air quality impacts from mobile source emissions.

#### Noise

The FEIS found that the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse noise impact. The Project Area is proximate to the Richmond County Bank Ballpark, mechanical equipment on the roof of the Castleton Park Apartments parking garage, and other ambient noise sources in the area such as traffic along Richmond Terrace and Stuyvesant Place. The Proposed Actions are not projected to increase mobile source noise levels by more than 2.9 dBA. The proposed E-Designation would require the developer to coordinate with the NYC Mayor's Office of Environmental Remediation to incorporate the minimum noise attenuation that would be mapped upon adoption of the Proposed Actions. The design of and specification for building mechanical systems, such as HVAC, would meet all applicable noise regulations (i.e., Subchapter 5, §24-227 of the New York City Noise Control Code and the New York City Department of Buildings Mechanical Code), ensuring that the equipment does not result in any significant increase in ambient noise levels.

Like the Proposed Actions, the Modified Project would be required to comply with the applicable noise regulations, including an E-Designation specifying attenuation at certain façades. Mechanical equipment would be sited wholly within the building footprint analyzed in the FEIS. The Modified Project would result in fewer passenger-car-equivalent (PCE) trips than the Proposed Actions, and therefore would result in fewer mobile source noise emissions. Because the FEIS found that the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse noise impact, the Modified Project — with fewer PCEs and code-compliant mechanical equipment — would result in less noise and similarly would not result in a significant adverse noise impact.

#### **Public Health**

The FEIS concluded the Proposed Actions would not result in unmitigated significant adverse impacts in any of the technical areas related to public health (hazardous materials, water quality, air quality, and noise) and would not have the potential to result in significant adverse public health impacts.

The Modified Project similarly would not result in any new or different significant adverse impacts related to hazardous materials, water quality, air quality, or noise, as described in the relevant sections above. Therefore, like the Proposed Actions, the Modified Project would not result in a significant adverse public health impact.

#### Construction

The FEIS found that construction resulting the Proposed Actions on Projected Development Sites 1 and 2 would not have the potential to result in significant adverse impacts to open space, historic and cultural resources,



hazardous materials, or air quality, but would have the potential to result in significant adverse construction traffic and noise impacts.

The Modified Project would remove Projected Development Site 2 from the Rezoning Area, and this site would not be developed with the Modified Actions. The Modified Project would result in smaller buildings on Projected Development Site 1 compared to the Proposed Actions. While the smaller buildings of the Modified Project would be constructed in a timelier manner relative to the Proposed Actions, the construction activities in the "demolition, excavation, and foundation" stage would be similar to the Proposed Actions. Compared to the Proposed Actions, construction generated by the Modified Project during the "superstructure" and "envelope and façade" stages would be slightly reduced in duration and scale because the Modified Project would entail the development of smaller and shorter buildings. The "Interior Fit-Out" stage of Buildings 1 and 2 would be decreased in duration by approximately one month, and this stage would be expanded by approximately one month in Building 3, which would have 25,794 gsf of more floor area in the Modified Project than the Proposed Actions. Because the "demolition, excavation, and foundation," "superstructure," and "envelope and façade" stages would have the greatest potential to result in adverse effects, construction generated by the Modified Project would have slightly reduced construction-related effects on the surroundings than the Proposed Actions.

#### **Traffic**

The FEIS concluded that the peak construction traffic would occur in construction quarter 7, when approximately 462 workers would be arriving daily at Projected Development Site 1.

With the floor area reduction resulting from the Modified Project relative to the Proposed Actions, the peak construction traffic may be shifted to construction quarter 6. However, the Modified Project is anticipated to result in a similar number of construction-generated traffic trips during the peak AM and PM construction periods and during the surrounding network's peak hours. Accordingly, like the Proposed Actions, the Modified Project would result in significant adverse traffic impacts during construction. These impacts would not be greater than the impacts identified in the FEIS (and may be slightly reduced) because the Modified Project may result in a reduction of workers during the peak construction period and a reduction in overall construction activities.

#### Air Quality

The FEIS concluded that construction-generated air quality effects would not result in a significant adverse construction impact. Measures would be taken by the Applicant to reduce pollutant emissions during construction in accordance with all applicable laws, regulations, and building codes. These include dust suppression measures, idling restrictions, and the use of ultra-low sulfur diesel (ULSD). In addition to the required laws and regulations, an emissions reduction program, including the use of best available tailpipe (BAT) reduction technologies and the use of newer equipment would be implemented.

In the Modified Project, the Applicant would commit to the same emissions reduction measures as the Proposed Actions. Projected Development Site 2 would also be removed from the Rezoning Area and would not be redeveloped with the Modified Actions. Compared to the Proposed Actions, the Modified Project would result in less floor area and less construction. Therefore, the Modified Project would result in fewer construction-generated air emissions of concern and would similarly not result in a significant adverse construction air quality impact.



#### **Noise**

The FEIS found that construction generated by the Proposed Actions would have the potential to exceed either the *CEQR Technical Manual* construction noise screening threshold for an extended period of time or the CEQR construction noise impact criteria at receptors surrounding the proposed construction work areas. The Applicant would commit to using auger drills in lieu of pile drivers, constructing a 15-foot-tall construction fence in certain locations, using ventilation fans that do not exceed an L<sub>max</sub> noise level of 59-dBA at 50 feet, and using generators that have a capacity of less than 25 kilovolt amps (KVA). During worst-case conditions, construction from the Proposed Actions would result in increased maximum quarterly noise levels exceeding the 15-dBA threshold over 12 months at 11 locations and exceeding the 20-dBA threshold over three months at 9 locations in worst-case conditions. Project-generated construction would also exceed the CEQR screening threshold of 3-dBA over 24 months at up to 11 locations. Noise levels would be greatest during construction quarters 3, 4, and 5. The construction noise generated by the Proposed Actions is not projected to exceed 85 dBAs at any sensitive receptor.

In the Modified Project, the Applicant would commit to the same noise reduction and pathway measures as disclosed in the FEIS. The Modified Project would contain less floor area, would require less time to complete construction, and would not generate construction on Projected Development Site 2. The overall construction duration at Projected Development Site 1 would be slightly reduced by approximately one month during the "Interior Fit-out" stage of Buildings 1 and 2, and increased by approximately one month during Building 3's "Interior Fit-Out" stage. As disclosed in the FEIS, the "Interior Fit-Out" stage would have significantly reduced project-generated construction noise relative to other construction stages. Notwithstanding, the Modified Project would result in similar noise effects as the Proposed Actions because noise generated during the peak construction times would be similar to the Proposed Actions, with the peak construction noise likely occurring during construction quarters 3, 4, and 5. Similar to the Proposed Actions, the Modified Project has the potential to result in significant adverse construction noise impacts, although these construction noise impacts would occur at a reduced scale compared to the Proposed Actions.

#### E. CONCLUSION

This Technical Memorandum examined whether the Modified Project would result in any new or different significant adverse environmental impacts not already identified in the FEIS and concludes that no new or greater impacts would result with the Modified Project.

Like the Proposed Actions, the Modified Project would not result in significant adverse impacts in the CEQR areas of: land use, zoning, and public policy; socioeconomic conditions; community facilities and services; shadows; historic and cultural resources; urban design and visual resources; natural resources; hazardous materials; water and sewer infrastructure; solid waste and sanitation services; energy; air quality; greenhouse gas emissions and climate change; noise; public health; and neighborhood character.

The Modified Project would result in similar or reduced impacts in the areas of open space (indirect effects to active open space for residents), transportation (traffic), and construction (traffic and noise). Therefore, the same or similar mitigations and commitments discussed in the FEIS would be required for the Modified Project. Like the Proposed Actions, the Modified Project would also result in similar unmitigated significant adverse impacts in transportation (traffic) and construction (traffic and noise).

Overall, the Modified Project would not result in any new or greater significant adverse impacts that were not disclosed in the River North (formerly Liberty Towers) FEIS.





River North (Liberty Towers) Technical Memo Modified Project Drawings Prepared by FXCollaborative



# **RIVER NORTH**

STATEN ISLAND BLOCK 13 LOTS 82, 92, 100 & PART OF LOT 8 (TENTATIVE LOT 95) PROPOSED MIXED-USE BUILDINGS 24 STUYVESANT PLACE, 170 RICHMOND TERRACE, 180 RICHMOND TERRACE STATEN ISLAND, NY

SPECIAL PERMIT FILING - CITY COUNCIL REVISIONS OCTOBER 25, 2021

## INDEX OF DRAWINGS

Z-000	COVER SHEET	Z-300	BUILDING ELEVATIONS
Z-001	SITE SURVEY	Z-301	BUILDING ELEVATIONS
Z-002	ZONING ANALYSIS		
Z-003	ZONING ANALYSIS	Z-400	NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER DIAGRAMS
Z-004	ZONING SITE PLAN		
		Z-500	PUBLIC OPEN SPACE PLAN
Z-101	GROUND FLOOR PLAN	Z-501	MATERIAL PLAN, SEATING AND LIGHTING
Z-102	PARKING PLAN	Z-502	PLANTING AND GRADING PLAN
		Z-503	PLAZA DETAILS
Z-110	WAIVER PLAN	Z-504	PUBLIC OPEN SPACE SECTIONS
		Z-505	PUBLIC OPEN SPACE SECTIONS
Z-200	WAIVER SECTIONS	Z-506	PUBLIC OPEN SPACE SECTIONS
Z-201	WAIVER SECTIONS	Z-507	ONSITE FITNESS PUBLIC OPEN SPACE PLAN
Z-202	WAIVER SECTIONS	Z-508	ONSITE FITNESS MATERIAL, SEATING AND LIGHTING PLANS
Z-203	WAIVER SECTIONS	Z-509	ONSITE FITNESS PLANTING AND GRADING PLAN
		Z-510	ONSITE FITNESS DETAILS
		Z-511	ONSITE FITNESS SECTIONS


RIVER NORTH
STATEN ISLAND BLOCK 13 LOTS 82, 92, 100 & PART
OF LOT 8 (TENTATIVE LOT 95)
PROPOSED MIXED-USE BUILDINGS
24 STUYVESANT PLACE, 170 RICHMOND TERRACE,
180 RICHMOND TERRACE
STATEN ISLAND, NY

### **f**xcollaborative

STARR WHITEHOUSE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS AND PLANNERS PLLC
80 Broad Street, Sulle 1700 | New York, NY 10004 | 212 487 3272 | starrefrilehouse com

Z-000 COVER SHEET

NOTE: PLACE HOLDER. NEW SURVEY INCLUDING PORTION OF LOT 13 AS PART OF ZONING LOT TO BE PROVIDED



RIVER NORTH

STATEN ISLAND BLOCK 13 LOTS 82, 92, 100 & PART OF LOT 8 (TENTATIVE LOT 95)

PROPOSED MIXED-USE BUILDINGS 24 STUYVESANT PLACE, 170 RICHMOND TERRACE, 180 RICHMOND TERRACE STATEN ISLAND, NY

SPECIAL PERMIT DRAWING SET

### **fx**collaborative

FXCollaborative Architects LLP | 22 West 19th Street | New York, NY 10011 | 212 627 1700 | fxcollaborative.co

STARR WHITEHOUSE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS AND PLANNERS PLLC

80 Broad Street, Suite 1700 | New York, NY 10004 | 212 487 3272 | stamwhitehouse.co

03 SPECIAL PERMIT FILING - CITY COUNCIL REVISIONS 02 SPECIAL PERMIT FILING - CPC REVISIONS 01 SPECIAL PERMIT FILING 10/25/2021 08/27/2021 04/01/2021 DATE

Z-001 SITE SURVEY

\_\_\_\_

Out.

RETAIL-														
INLIAIL	BLDG	1			BLDG 2			BLDG	3			TOTA	NL.	
D & DIVING	ZSF	DEV.	ENCLOSED			DEV.			DEV.	<b>ENCLOSED</b>			DEV.	ENCLOSED
PARKI	235	UNITS	PARKING	GSF	ZSF	UNITS	GSF	ZSF	UNITS	PARKING	GSF	ZSF	UNITS	PARKING
.,251	222,076	293	-	119,683	103,419	295	164,292	154,434	204	-	525,226	479,929	792	-
TOTAL,697	9,115	-	-	1,904	1,714		7,522	7,071	-	-	19,123	17,899	-	-
,851	-	-	100	-			25,912	-	-	166	54,763	-	-	266
A/OTE 1,799	231,191			121,587	105,132		197,726	161,505			599,112	497,829		

NOTE: eliminary and are subject to change. GSF includes below gram area. Parking is anticipated to be attended with stackers bus is subject to change.

# AREA TOTALSSUMMARY

- Zoning Map Amendments
- 8 Zoning map amendment to rezone an area bounded by Nicholas Street, Richmond Terrace, Stuyvesant Place, Hamilton Avenue and a line running parallel to Richmond Terrace and Stuyvesant Place at a depth of 185 feet from an R6/ C2-2 (HS) zoning district to an R7-3/C2-4 (SG) zoning district.
- Zoning map amendment to rezone the block bounded by Richmond Terrace, Stuyvesant Place and Hamilton Avenue from an R6/C2-2 zoning district to an R6/C2-4 (SG) zoning district.
   Zoning Text Amendments
- Article (Residence District Regulations) of the New York City Zoning Resolution ("Zoning Resolution" or "Zr") to allow an R7-3 district and the optional Quality Housing Program within the SSGD;
- are 3-300.

  A Article XII, Chapter 8 (Special St. George District) regulations to include the Proposed Area within the Upland Subdistrict, establish bulk and other regulations for the R7-3 district within the SSQD, and establish a new special permit to modify bulk and mandatory improvements within the R7-3 district; and
- Appendix F (Inclusionary Housing Designated Areas and Mandatory Inclusionary Housing Areas) to include Proposed R7-3/C2-4 (SG) district as a mandatory inclusionary housing area.
- 3. Zoning Special Permit pursuant to proposed ZR Section 128-62
- ${\tt N}$  . To permit a waiver to the Maximum Base Height (ZR 128-33) and the Maximum Building Height (ZR 128-34);
- To permit an encroachment into the required rear yard (ZR Section 23-47); and
- 8 To permit a waiver to planting requirements (ZR Section 128-42) to allow the proposed publicly accessible open space with landscaping and paving to be located between the street wall of the building and the street line.

/	PROPOSED	<b>ZONING</b>	ACTIONS

Borough	Staten Islan
Zoning Lot	Block 13 Lots 82, 92, 100 & portion of lot
Addresses	24 Stuyvesant Plac
	170 Richmond Terrac
	178 Richmond Terras
Zoning Lot Area	97,009.3
Street Widening	1,659.6
Total Lot Area	98,669.0
Community District	Staten Island Community District
Zoning District	R7-3 / C2-4 / SG / MI
Zoning Map	21

March   1981	ITEM	ZR	PERMITTED / REQUIRED	PROPOSED	CCMPLIANCE	COMPLIANC: NOTES
Months   M	Uses	22-00		Use Group 2 - Residential		
March   1967	10363				165	
March   Marc						***
March   Marc	Floor Area	126.21			Vee	
March   Marc						subject to clarige:
Page   1922   Section					163	
Part   Continue		128-21	Maximum FAR 6.00 592,014.00	Total Proposed Floor Area:** 5.05 497,829	Yes	
Part   Continue					No.	
March   Marc		23-22	development units		Yes	
Montable   March   M				Washian hamoer of anits persuant to Els is 750		
March   Marc						
March   Marc						
March   Marc		128-22	Maximum residential corner lot coverage: 103%		Yes	
Mode		128-22	Maximum residential interior lot coverage: 73%		Yes	
March   1924   1925						
Page						
Part						
19.53   19.50   19.5						
March		33-26				
Part		23-471 / 33-26;		Rearyard waiver required for building 1.	No*	
Markation   Mark						requirement pursuant to 128-62
Part						
Part	Haight &	128.20	All huildings shall comply with Quality Housing haight & sathack regulations		Vec	
20.20   20.2	Setback	110 30	pursuant to 23-664(c)		103	
Part   Community   Part   Pa	Regulations		All heights shall be measure from the base plane	See pase plane calculations	Yes	
Part   Community   Part   Pa		128-32	Street wall location regulations do not apply to developments in R7-3 withing			
23-24   23-25   23-2			the Special Saint George Dstrict			
20-24   10-25   10-2	1					
25.23   Pagainet have for exect statuks   37   Pagainet flower for extentions   38   16   16   16   16   16   16   16   1	1	I				
Page	1				V	*Special Remit to wait halabs and
Pagual American State   18-2						
Proposed Name Server Services   Proposed Services Services   Proposed Services Services   Proposed Servi	1	22.33	regards white street settings. 10			
Proposed Business   Prop	1					
Reputation   Rep				100000000000000000000000000000000000000		
Proposed Bases register.  Proposed Bases reg						
Page						
Projuct Building larger						L
Proposed furnisher of Montes   11   Proposed furnisher of Montes   12   Proposed furnisher (Montes Description   Prop						"Special Permit to waive height, setback & maximum rumber of stories requirements
Proposed Works From Section 1   Proposed Works From Section						pursuant tc 128-62
Building   1   Proposed Bases regist   13.3 of Proposed Bases   Propose						
Record   R				Taries minister	103	
Proceed Business register   Proceded Business register   Proceded Business register   Proceded Business register   Proceed Business register   Proceded Business register				Building 3		
Proceed Basic People 1922   1923   1923   1924   19						
Procured Building Feligies   13.2.8   The Content of Statistics   13   Procured Wide Stores Lettack   13   Procured Statistics   Procured Wide Stores Lettack   Procured						
Proposed Window Francher of Stories   13   Proposed Window Extends Feature   Proposed Window Extends   Proposed Wi						
Proposed Wide Street Settlinia   Various More 1   Proposed Set Garge District   Proposed Wide Street Settlinia   Various More 1   Various Various Mor						requirements pursuantto 120 02
Provided Name   13-42 apply to all bidge within The Special SS George District Regulations which seeks 1.0° from instructed but meed not be settable from the Special SS George District Regulations which the Special SS George District But with the Special SS George District Regulations which the Special SS George of the building 1 Buildhead Coursege 22% 31.25 Min Provided State Special Regulation Pr						
Distance from the section of the settled 20 from traversal but need not be settled. See from the settled 10 from traversal but need to be settled. See from the settled 10 flowers, rate and mechanical but hosels mixed to 20% is coverage 20% is 5.6 % flowers. 15.8 % for the settled 10 flowers. The settled 10 flowers 10 flowers 10 flowers 10 flowers. 15.8 % flowers 10 flowers 10 flowers. 15.8 % flowers 10 flowers 10 flowers. 15.8 % flowe						
The contract of the contract o		128-31	Provisions of 33-42 apply to all bldgs within The Special St George District	Lot Coverage Streetwall Setback		*Special Permit to waive maximum
Distance  Eleventer State of mechanism declarated builbeads limited to 2015 tot coverage of the billing and state of billing and state	Regulations					
Soliding						pursuant to 128-62
Distance Between Buildings Wall to wall 47 Wolfout to wall 57 Wolfout to wall salings shall not cloudly parking in my story that congiles wall 57 Wolfout to wall salings shall not cloudly parking in my story that congiles wall 57 Wolfout to wall salings shall not cloudly parking in my story that congiles wall 57 Wolfout to wall salings shall not cloudly parking in my story that congiles wall 57 Wolfout mamber of proposed garking spaces 7 Wolfout mamber of bloods parking in my story that congiles wall 57 Wolfout mamber of proposed garking spaces 7 Wolfout mamber of bloods parking in my story that congiles wall 57 Wolfout mamber of bloods parking in my story that congiles wall 57 Wolfout mamber of bloods parking in my story that congiles wall 57 Wolfout mamber of bloods parking in my story that congiles wall 57 Wolfout mamber of bloods parking in my story that congiles wall 57 Wolfout mamber of bloods parking in my story that congiles wall 57 Wolfout mamber of bloods parking in my story that congiles wall 5				Building 3 Bulkhead Lot Coverage 20% 16.5' Min	Yes	
Mode of the wall   47   Mode to wall   47   Mode to wall   49   Mode to wall   49   Mode to wall   49   Mode to Wildow to Wi			Dullullig			
Buildings    Workstor to will 1.5		23-711	Minimum Distance Between Buildings	Projosed Minimum Distance Between Buildings		
Proposed Parking Spaces 2.3 40 min wait towall 70  Proced Regulations  Regulations  22.5.21  Regulations  Reg						
Parking & 128-5189 / 25-33 Required Marlet Rate Residential Parking Spaces 219 50% of development units (48 Market his Lunks x 50% - 219 Parking Spaces) (48 Market his Lunks x 50% - 219 Parking Spaces) (48 Market his Lunks x 50% - 219 Parking Spaces) (48 Market his Lunks x 50% - 219 Parking Spaces) (48 Market his Lunks x 50% - 219 Parking Spaces) (48 Market his Lunks x 50% - 219 Parking Spaces) (48 Market his Lunks x 50% - 219 Parking Spaces) (48 Market his Lunks x 50% - 219 Parking Spaces) (48 Market his Lunks x 50% - 219 Parking Spaces) (48 Market his Lunks x 50% - 210 Parking Spaces) (48 Market his Lunks x 50% - 210 Parking Spaces) (48 Market his Lunks x 50% - 210 Parking Spaces) (48 Market his Lunks x 50% - 210 Market his Lunks	bullulligs			Distince between Bldg 2 & 3 40' min wall towall	Yes	
Solid of development units   Solid of So			Window to Window 60'			
GRAM Marker River Levilles x 90% - 212 Periods Spaces   28   Proposed Parking Spaces for Affordable Residential D.J. 28   Yes	Parking &	128-51(b) / 25-23	Required Market Rate Residential Parking Spaces 219	Projosed Market Rate Residential Parking Spaces 219	Yes	
25-221   Required Microfiable Residential Partinis Spaces.   28   Proposed Parking Spaces for Affordable Residential DJ   28   Yes						
136 of development unitswhich are below 90% ANI (138 Affordable Units x 156 x 28 Parking Spaces) Required parking for retail(U.G. 6A) 18 Induser stelling area in the cellular per 12-00 definition of floor area 1 space per even y 1,000 st of U.G. 6A (12/89 56 y f 1,200 = 17.89) Test an interior of required larking Spaces 265 275 276 For area of buildings and not include parking in any story that complies with 128-54 278-54 278-54 278-55 380 be grade parking mats comply with the complies with 37-35. Required number of residual beloyed spaces 313 350 of develorment units (16) Development Units 36-312.5 Stoyled Spaces) (16) Development Units 36-312.5 Stoyled Spaces) (16) Development Units 36-312.5 Stoyled Spaces) (1780 SP x 1,000 SF = 1.29) Test anumber of broyled spaces (1780 SP x 1,000 SF = 1.29) Test anumber of broyled spaces (1780 SP x 1,000 SF = 1.29) Test anumber of prognosed pirking spaces 20 Yes All ower graded but the compliance with 118-54 with 128-54 218-54 218-54 218-55 218-56 Stoyled Spaces 219-56 Stoyled Spaces 210 Stoyled Spaces 211 Space per 11,000 SP Stoyled Spaces 212-57 212-58 218-59 Stoyled Spaces 215-58 218-59 Stoyled Spaces 216-59 Stoyled Spaces 217-59 Stoyled Spaces 218-59 Stoyled Spaces 219-59 Stoyled Spaces 220 Stoyled Spaces 230 Stoyled Spaces 24-59 Stoyled Spaces 250 Stoyled Spaces 260 Yes 27-60 All ower graded but the Extra Grade Spaces 27-70 Spaces Spaces 28-10 Spaces Spaces 29-70 Spaces Spaces 20 Spaces Space	Regulations	25.254		0	V	
Section   188 Affordable Units x 15% = 28 Parking Spaces    Proposed Parking for Retail (UG 6A)   19   Yes	1	27-231		28 28 control of the	res	
Required parking for retail (UG 6A)   18   Proposed Parking for Retail (UG 6A)   19   Yes			(188 Affordable Units x 15% = 28 Parking Spaces)			
1,5   Space per every 1,000 5 of 10 GA	1	36-21	Required parking for retail(UG 6A) 18	Proposed Parking for Retail (UG 6A) 19	Yes	
Total number of proposed parking spaces   765						
Total number of required larking spaces 755  Floor area of buildings shall not include parking in any story that compiles with 128-54  128-54  All above grade parking shall be in compliance with 128-54  All above grade parking shall be in compliance with 128-54  All above grade parking shall be in compliance with 128-54  All above grade parking shall be in compliance with 128-54  All above grade parking shall be in compliance with 128-54  All above grade parking shall be in compliance with 128-54  All above grade parking shall be in compliance with 128-54  All above grade parking shall be in compliance with 128-54  All above grade parking shall be in compliance with 128-54  All above grade parking shall be in compliance with 128-54  All above grade parking shall be in compliance with 128-54  All above grade parking shall be in compliance with 128-54  All above grade parking shall be in compliance with 128-54  All above grade parking shall be in compliance with 128-54  All above grade parking shall be in compliance with 128-54  All above grade parking shall be in compliance with 128-54  All above grade parking shall be in compliance with the Parking Warp  For possed estables be screened in accordance with the Parking Warp  For possed estables be screened in accordance with the Parking Warp  For possed estables be screened in accordance with the Parking Warp  For possed estables be screened in accordance with the Parking Warp  For possed estables be screened in accordance with the Parking Warp  For possed estables be screened in accordance with the Parking Warp  For possed estables be screened in accordance with the Parking Warp  For possed estables be screened in accordance with the Parking Warp  For possed estables be screened in accordance with the Parking Warp  For possed estables be screened in accordance with the Parking Warp  For possed estables be screened in accordance with the Parking Marking  For administration of the Sarking Marking Marking Marking Marking Marking Marking Marking Marking Marking Marki						
with 128-54  All above goals parking mist comply with the screening requirements 37-911 and shall be located within a facility that complies with 37-35.  Required number of bresidential bicycle spaces 213 Side of develonment units x10% = 122.5 Bicycle Spaces) Required number of bicycle spaces 213 Foreigned number of bicycle spaces 215 Total number of proposed bicycle spaces 2 1 space per 10,000 5F 1(17.899 5F 1/10,000 5F = 1.79) Total number of bicycle spaces 315 Total number of proposed bicycle spaces 2 1 space per 10,000 5F 1(17.899 5F 1/10,000 5F = 1.79) Total number of bicycle spaces 315 No loading Provided. Proposed retail (U5 6A) less thin 25,000 5F.  Mandaory Improvements  2-4-1  1.5 treet tree pr 25 of street frontage Himprovements Proposed retail bicycle spaces 2 Total number of proposed bicycle spaces 3 No loading Provided. Proposed retail (U5 6A) less thin 25,000 5F.  All tees will be planted adjacent to zoning lot on at alternate sitely selected by the NYCDepartment of Parks and Recreation  Yes	1			Total number of proposed parking spaces 266	Yes	
with 128-54  All above goals parking mist comply with the screening requirements 37-911 and shall be located within a facility that complies with 37-35.  Required number of bresidential bicycle spaces 213 Side of develonment units x10% = 122.5 Bicycle Spaces) Required number of bicycle spaces 213 Foreigned number of bicycle spaces 215 Total number of proposed bicycle spaces 2 1 space per 10,000 5F 1(17.899 5F 1/10,000 5F = 1.79) Total number of bicycle spaces 315 Total number of proposed bicycle spaces 2 1 space per 10,000 5F 1(17.899 5F 1/10,000 5F = 1.79) Total number of bicycle spaces 315 No loading Provided. Proposed retail (U5 6A) less thin 25,000 5F.  Mandaory Improvements  2-4-1  1.5 treet tree pr 25 of street frontage Himprovements Proposed retail bicycle spaces 2 Total number of proposed bicycle spaces 3 No loading Provided. Proposed retail (U5 6A) less thin 25,000 5F.  All tees will be planted adjacent to zoning lot on at alternate sitely selected by the NYCDepartment of Parks and Recreation  Yes		128-52	Floor area of buildings shall not include parking in any story that complies	All above grade parking shall be in compliance with 128-54	Yes	
Required number of residential bicycle spaces 313 Proposed residential bicycle spaces 313 Ves Soft of development units x 50% = 312.5 Bicycle Spaces) Required number of bicycle spaces for retail (UG 6A) 2 1 space per 10,000 SP 107,899 SP 13,000 SP - 179) Total number of bicycle spaces 315 Nequired Loading for UG 6A Retail Neme required for less that 25,000 SP No loading Provided. Proposed retail (UG 6A) less thin 25,000 SI Ves No loading Provided. Proposed Provided Proposed bicycle spaces 315 No loading Provided. Proposed retail (UG 6A) less thin 25,000 SI.  Mandaory Interview of Provided Proposed Provided Provided Proposed Provided Provided Proposed Provided Provided Proposed Provided Proposed Provided Proposed Provided Proposed Provided Proposed Provided Proposed Provided Provided Proposed Provided Proposed Provided P	1		with 128-54			
Required number of residential bicycle spaces 313 Proposed residential bicycle spaces 313 Ves Soft of development units x 50% = 312.5 Bicycle Spaces) Required number of bicycle spaces for retail (UG 6A) 2 1 space per 10,000 SP 107,899 SP 13,000 SP - 179) Total number of bicycle spaces 315 Nequired Loading for UG 6A Retail Neme required for less that 25,000 SP No loading Provided. Proposed retail (UG 6A) less thin 25,000 SI Ves No loading Provided. Proposed Provided Proposed bicycle spaces 315 No loading Provided. Proposed retail (UG 6A) less thin 25,000 SI.  Mandaory Interview of Provided Proposed Provided Provided Proposed Provided Provided Proposed Provided Provided Proposed Provided Proposed Provided Proposed Provided Proposed Provided Proposed Provided Proposed Provided Provided Proposed Provided Proposed Provided P		128-54	All above grade parking mist comply with the screening requirements 37-921 and shall be located within a facility that complies with 27-25	Ground floor parking will be imited to entrances and exits of the parking facility and parking above grade shall be screened in accordance with the Parking Mark	Yes	
Solid of development units (05 Se Developmen	1					
(625 Development Units x50% = 312.5 Bitycke Spaces)	1			Proposed residential bicycle spaces 313	Yes	
Required number of bicycle spaces for retail (UG 6A) 2 1 1592 per p1 (1000 SF 1) 1700 per p1 (1000 SF						
Comparison of the Comparison of the Service of th	1			Proposed retail bicycle spaces 2	Yes	
Total number of biocycle spaces 315 Required Loading for UG 6A Retail None required for less that 25,000 SF  Mandaony 26-41 1. Street tree per 25 of street formage is 322-65: 123.66 / 25 = 5 Shywesan Flex Frontage; 132.66:						
Required Loading for UG 68. Retail No loading Provided. Proposed retail (US 6A) less than 25,000 51.  Yes  Mandsory Improvements Limition Averuse Frontage is 323.66 / 25 - 5 Subveants Place Frontage is 637: 305 / 25 - 13 Street Trees Richmond Terrace Frontage is 637: 305 / 25 - 13 Street Trees Richmond Terrace Frontage is 637: 305 / 25 - 13 Street Trees Richmond Terrace Frontage is 607: 400 / 25 - 16 Street Trees Richmond Terrace Frontage is 607: 400 / 25 - 16 Street Trees Richmond Terrace Frontage is 607: 400 / 25 - 16 Street Trees Richmond Terrace Frontage is 607: 400 / 25 - 16 Street Trees Richmond Terrace Frontage is 607: 400 / 25 - 16 Street Trees Richmond Terrace Frontage is 607: 400 / 25 - 16 Street Trees Richmond Terrace Frontage is 607: 400 / 25 - 16 Street Trees Richmond Terrace Frontage is 607: 400 / 25 - 16 Street Trees Richmond Terrace Frontage is 607: 400 / 25 - 16 Street Trees Richmond Terrace Frontage is 607: 400 / 25 - 16 Street Trees Richmond Terrace Frontage is 607: 400 / 25 - 16 Street Trees Richmond Terrace Frontage is 607: 400 / 25 - 16 Street Trees Richmond Terrace Frontage is 607: 400 / 25 - 16 Street Trees Richmond Terrace Richmond Terr				Total number of proposed bicycle spaces 315	Yes	
Mandarory Improvements  2-6-1  1 Street tree per 25' of street frontage Humbrowers  128-12  128-12  Cloud commercial or community facility uses must comply with 37-34 Transparenty Requirement Transparent Transp	1				l .	
Improvements   Humition Averue Frontage is \$12.66; 132.66; 125.65   25.5			None required for less than 25,000 SF		, es	
Improvements   Humition Averue Frontage is \$12.66; 132.66; 125.65   25.5	Mandeone	26.41	1 Street tree nor 25' of street frontage	All trees will be planted adjacent to zoning lot or at alternate sitebly colored by the	Yor	*Special Permit to waite planting ar-
Supvessor Rise Frontage's 309': 309', 25 = 13 Street Trees Richmond Terrace Frontage's 309': 309', 25 = 13 Street Trees Richmond Terrace Frontage's 400': 400', 25 = 16 Street Trees Ground commercial or community facility uses must comply with 37-34 Transparent represents also coupy at least 50 percent of the surface area of such ground floor level street well between a height of 2" and 12", or the height of the ground floor ceillen, whichever from the adjoining sidewilk. Transparent represents hallow the hight of the ground floor ceillen, whichever from the surface area of such ground floor result use facades will provide 50% transparency between 30" above adjoining sidewilk to height of ceiling  128-41  The combined width of the sidewalk within the street and sidewalk within the street wall of buildings 1. 28-8-20 to sidewalk within the street wall of buildings 1. 28-8-20 to sidewalk to height it sidewalk to height it sidewalk within the street w		20 41		NYCDepartment of Parks and Recreation	res	mandatory improvements pursuant to
Richmond Terrace Frontage is 400°, 400 / 25 - 16 Street Trees  Glound commercial or community facility uses must comply with 37-34 Transparency Requirements  Transparency Requirements  Transparency materials shall occupy at least 50 percent of the surface area of such ground flyor level server wall between a height of 2" and 2", or the height of the ground floor zelling, whithever is higher, as measured from the adjoining sidewalk. Transparent materials syndishes than 30"  The combined width of this sidewalk within the street and the sidewalk wideling sidewalk. Transparent materials provided to satisfy such 50 percent requirements shall not begin higher than 30"  The combined width of this sidewalk within the street and the sidewalk wideling sidewalk. Transparent materials provided to satisfy such 50 percent requirements shall not begin higher than 30"  Stupe-sand Street  12 Min.  Stupe-sand Street  12 Min.  Richmond Terrace  12 Min.  Richmond Terrace  12 Min.  Pairliton Ave  Stupe-sand Street  12 Min.  Pisring area beween street line of portions of Biolidings 1, 2 & ground level except planting not required in front of building and or garage  provided in accordance with 128-42 to permit new public open space.	1		Stuyvesant Place Frontageis 305': 305 / 25 = 13 Street Trees			128-62 to permit new public open space
228-12 Giound commercial or community facility uses must comply with 37-34 Transparency Requiremens Tamsparency Between 30" above Tadding sidewalk. Transparency Detween 30" above Tadding sidewalk to height of ceiling Tadding sidewalk to height	1					
Transparent place in a billion of the surface area of such ground filter for the surface area of such ground filter for the ground surface area of such ground filter for the ground filter filter for the ground filter filter filter filter filter filter filter filter for the ground filter fil		128-12	Ground commercial or community facility uses must comply with 37-34		Yes	ounding 4.
such ground filton fevel street wolf between a height of 2" and 12", or the height of the gound floor ceiling, withinews height of the the gound floor ceiling, withinews height of the things of the sidewalk that he street and the sidewalk that he street and the sidewalk within the street and the sidewalk within the street and the sidewalk within the property must equal 12", minimum.  128-42  Area of zoning lot between the street line and street wall shall be planted at ground level except planting not required in front of building and or garage and provided in accordance with 128-42 to permit new public open space. See	1		Transparency Requiremens			
height of the ground floor zelling, whithever is higher, as measured from the adjoining sidewalk. Transpert materials provided to astisfy such 50 percest requirement shall not begin higher than 30"  128-41 The combined width of the sidewalk within the street and the sidewalk widering with the property must sequal 12; minimum.  Also a familiary of the sidewalk within the street and the sidewalk with	1					
acjoining sidewalk. Transprent materials provided to satisfy such 50 percest requirement shall not begin higher than 30"  128-41 The combined width of the sidewalk whin the street and the sidewalk widening with not properly must equal 12', minimum.  Stupesant Street 12' Min.  Richmond Terrace 12' Min.  Richmond Terrace 12' Min.  Plarting area between street wall and and street line of portions if Buildings I, 2. & No*  ground level except planting not required in front of building and or garage 3 ground seven street wall and and street line of portions if Buildings I, 2. & No*	1		height of the ground floor :eiling, whichever is higher, as measured from the			
128-41 The combined width of the sidewalk within the street and the sidewalk widening within the property must equal 12', minimum.  128-42 Area of zoning lot between the street in and street wall shall be planted at ground level except planting not required in front of building and or garage and provided in accordance with 128-42 to permit new public open space. See			adjoining sidewalk. Transpirent materials provided to satisfy such 50 percent			
widening within the property must equal 12', minimum.  Stuyesant Street 12' Min. Richmond Terrace 12' Min. Richmond Terrace 12' Min. Plarting area between street wall and and street line of portions if Buildings 1, 2 & No* ground level except planting not required in front of building and or garage and provided in accordance with 128-42 to permit new public open space. See	1		requirement shall not begin higher than 30"			
widening within the property must equal 12', minimum.  Stuyesant Street 12' Min. Richmond Terrace 12' Min. Richmond Terrace 12' Min. Plarting area between street wall and and street line of portions if Buildings 1, 2 & No* ground level except planting not required in front of building and or garage and provided in accordance with 128-42 to permit new public open space. See	1	128-41	The combined width of the sidewalk within the street and the sidewalk	Hamilton Ave	Yes	
Richmond Terrace  12* Min.  128-42  Area of zoning lot betweer the street line and street wall shall be planted at ground level except plantils; not required in front of building and or garage  3 provided in accordance with 128-42 to permit new public open space. See	1	100-41			res	
128-42 Area of zoning lot betweer the street line and street wall shall be planted at ground level except planting not required in front of building and or garage 3 not provided in accordance with 128-42 to permit new public open space. See						
ground level except planting not required in front of building and or garage 3 not provided in accordance with 128-42 to permit new public open space. See	1	128-42	Area of zoning lot betweer the street line and street wall shall be planted at	Planting area between street wall and and street line of portions of Buildings 1, 2 &	No*	
entrances waiter plan.			ground level except planting not required in front of building and or garage	3 not provided in accordance with 128-42 to permit new public open space. See		
			entrances	waiver plan.	<u></u>	

# 1 ZONING CALCULATIONS

#### RIVERNORTH

STATEN ISLAND BLOCK 13 LOTS 82, 92, 100 & PART OF LOT 8 (TENTATIVELOT 95)

PROPOSED MIXED-USE BUILDINGS 24 STUYVESANT PLACE, 170 RICHMOND TERPACE, 180 RICHMOND TERPACE STATEN ISLAND, NY

SPECIAL PERMIT DRAWING SET


## fxcollaborative


## STARRWHITEHOUSE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS AND PLANNERS PLLC


80 Broad Street, Suite 1700 | New York, NY 10004 | 212 487 3272 | starrwhitehouse.com

03 SPECIAL PERMIT FILING - CITY COUNCIL REVISIONS 02 SPECIAL PERMIT FILING - CPC REVISIONS 01 SPECIAL PERMIT FILING 10/25/2021 08/27/2021 04/01/2021 Z-002 ZONING ANALYSIS

© 2021 FXCollaborative Architects LLP | All Rights Reserved







			Avg. Base Plane	Lot Co	werage	Weighted Base Plane
BUILDING 1 HAMILTON AVE STREET LINE (CORNER LOT)	66'+66'+67'+68'+67'+65'+65'		66.29			
STUYVESANT STREET LINE (CORNER LOT)	55'+54'+53'+52'+51'+51'+50'+49' 8		51.88			
AVERAGE	66.50 + 52.67 2	- :	59.08	3,637	17%	9.87
HAMILTON AVE STREET LINE (INTERIOR LOT)	66'+65'+66'		65.67	1,148	5%	3.46
STUYVESANT STREET LINE (INTERIOR LOT)	49'+48'+48'+48'+48'+46'+46'+46'+44'+ 44'+42'+42'+42' 14		45.36	11,366	52%	23.69
BEYOND 100' FROM STREET LINE	67'+69'+71'+72'+74'+77'+78'+78'+78'+ 79'+79'+79'+79'+79'+90'+81'+78'+77'+ 74'+69'+66'	-	75.43	5,609	26%	19.44
			TOTAL	21,760	100%	56.47

			Avg. Base Plane	Lot Co	werage	Weighted Base Plan
BUILDING 1 RICHMOND (BLDG 2) STREET LINE	41'+41'+41'+40'+40'+39'+39'+38'+ 38'+38'+39'+39'+40'+40'+41'+41'+42'+ 42' 19		40.00	8,192	68%	27.23
BEYOND 100' FROM STREET LINE	60'+63'+68'+72'+74'+69'+68'+70'+70'+ 70'+70'+70'+67'+65'+62'+61'+58'+54' 18	-	66.17	3,845	32%	21.14
			TOTAL	12,037	100%	48.36
BUILDING 3 RICHMOND (BLDG 3) STREET LINE	42'+42'+41'+41'+41'+40'+40'+39'+ 39'+39'+38'+38'+37'+37'+37'+36'+ 36'+36'+36'	-	38.55	8,192	99%	37.98
BEYOND 100' FROM STREET LINE	59'+60'+61'+61' 4		60.25	121	1%	0.88

1) BASE PLANE CALCULATIONS

RIVER NORTH

STATEN ISLAND BLOCK 13 LOTS 82, 92, 100 & PART OF LOT 8 (TENTATIVE LOT 95)

PROPOSED MIXED-USE BUILDINGS 24 STUYVESANT PLACE, 170 RICHMOND TERRACE, 180 RICHMOND TERRACE STATEN ISLAND, NY


SPECIAL PERMIT DRAWING SET


## fxcollaborative


EVCollaboration Architecte LLD | 22 West 19th Street | New York NV 10011 | 212 627 1700 | forollaboration of


STARR WHITEHOUSE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS AND PLANNERS PLLC


80 Broad Street, Suite 1700 | New York, NY 10004 | 212 487 3272 | starrwhitehouse.com



































TOTAL AREA OF PUBLIC SPACE	7900 SF
ENTRANCE WIDTHS	ENTRANCE 1: MIN 14'-0"
	ENTRANCE 2: MIN 12'-0"
	ENTRANCE 3: MIN 9'-0"

### SIGNAGE:

FOUR (4) ENTRANCE PLAQUES: ONE (1) LOCATED ON HAMILTON AVENUE AND THREE (3) LOCATED ON STUYVESANT PLACE

ONE (1) INFORMATION PLAQUE LOCATED ON THE BUILDING

### RIVER NORTH

STATEN ISLAND BLOCK 13 LOTS 82, 92, 100 & PART OF LOT 8 (TENTATIVE LOT 95)

PROPOSED MIXED-USE BUILDINGS 24 STUYVESANT PLACE, 170 RICHMOND TERRACE, 180 RICHMOND TERRACE STATEN ISLAND, NY

SPECIAL PERMIT DRAWING SET


# **f**xcollaborative


FXCollaborative Architects LLP | 22 West 19th Street | New York, NY 10011 | 212 627 1700 | fxcollaborative.c

STARR WHITEHOUSE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS AND PLANNERS PLLC

30 Broad Street, Suite 1700 | New York, NY 10004 | 212 487 3272 | starrwhitehouse.com

SPECIAL PERMIT FILING - CITY COUNCIL REVISIONS SPECIAL PERMIT FILING - CPC REVISIONS SPECIAL PERMIT FILING





TOTAL AREA OF PUBLIC SPACE	7900 SF
ENTRANCE WIDTHS	ENTRANCE 1: MIN 14'-0"
	ENTRANCE 2: MIN 12'-0"
	ENTRANCE 3: MIN 9'-0"

#### SIGNAGE:

FOUR (4) ENTRANCE PLAQUES: ONE (1) LOCATED ON HAMILTON AVENUE AND THREE (3) LOCATED ON STUYVESANT PLACE

ONE (1) INFORMATION PLAQUE LOCATED ON THE BUILDING

	MINIMUM AMOUNT OF SEATING AND BREAKDOWN	LF WITH BACK: 52'
		LF BACK-LESS: 44'
		LF MOVEABLE SEATING: 18' (3 TABLES WITH 4 SEATS EA.
		LF TOTAL: 114'

- THE DEPTH OF SEATING IS 18-20 INCHES, THE HEIGHT ABOVE THE PAVEMENT OF SEATING IS 16-18 INCHES.
- FOR BACKLESS SEATING ON PLANTER LEDGE, THE DEPTH OF LEDGE IS AT LEAST 22 INCHES.
- AT LEAST 50 PERCENT OF THE LINER FEET OF FIXED SEATING HAVE BACKS AT LEAST 14 INCHES HIGH.
- ALL SEATS BACK ARE RECLINED FROM VERTICAL BETWEEN 10 TO 15 DEGREES.

### LIGHTING:

- LOCATIONS AND TYPES OF LIGHTING ELEMENTS ARE FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY AND SUBJECT TO CHANGE.
- ALL PAVED SURFACES SHOULD BE ILLUMINATED FOR MIN. 1 FOOT-CANDLE DURING HOURS OF OPERATION.

PLANTINGS / VEGETATION | MAJOR TREES: 3

MINOR TREES: 17

GROUND COVER / PERENNIAL: 2927.5 SF

ALL EXISTING CONTEXT BUILDINGS FOOTPRINT AND HEIGHT PER NYC PLUTO DATABASE.

PLANTING LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE AND SUBJECT TO CHANGE.

THE OPEN SPACE DESIGN SHALL SUBSTANTIALLY COMPLY WITH THE PARAMETERS SHOWN IN TABLE ON SHEET  $Z\!-\!501$ .

SPECIAL PERMIT FILING - CITY COUNCIL R SPECIAL PERMIT FILING - CPC REVISIONS SPECIAL PERMIT FILING

CUTS. INFORMATION REGARDING THE SURROUNDING PROPERTIES IS FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY, AND MAY NOT BE EXACT. THE ARCHITECT BEARS NO RESPONSIBILITY FOR INEXACT INFORMATION ON SURROUNDING PROPERTIES.

Z-501

MATERIAL PLAN, SEATING AND LIGHTING

**GENERAL NOTES** 

ELEVATIONS REFERENCED TO NORTH AMERICAN VERTICAL DATUM OF 1988 (NAVD88) WHICH IS 1.095 FEET ABOVE NATIONAL GEODETIC SURVEY DATUM AT SANDY HOOK, NJ.

- BUILDINGS SHOWN WITHIN ZONING ENVELOPES ARE FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE.
- ADDITIONAL ENTRANCES FOR GROUND FLOOR RETAIL, COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SECONDARY ENTRY AND EGRESS PERMITTED.

APPLICANT'S STAMP AND SEAL CORRESPOND TO THE INFORMATION REGARDING THE DEVELOPMENT SITE, ZONING LOT, AND RELATED CURB

đ STOP SIGN FIRE HYDRANT

LEGEND

GRAPHIC APPLICABLE TO ALI

NON-DIMENSIONED ELEMENTS

- · · - ZONING LOT LINE — · · · — TAX LOT LINE PUBLIC ACCESSIBLE OPEN SPACE

- - ZONING SETBACK LINE \_\_\_ ILLUSTRATIVE BUILDING LINE STREET LAMP EXISTING CATCH BASIN

BENCH WITH BACK · · · LIGHTS ON PLANTERS ----- LIGHTED AREA

BACKLESS BENCH

· LIGHTS ON BUILDING

PROPOSED STREET TREE

PLAZA INFORMATION PLAQUE PLAZA ENTRY PLAQUE

ROOFTOP TERRACES & LANDSCAPE ARE FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE.

THE ZONING ENVELOPE REPRESENTS THE MAXIMUM DEVELOPMENT BULK, EXCLUDING PERMITTED OBSTRUCTIONS, EXCEPT WHERE OBSTRUCTIONS WAIVER IS ALSO REQUESTED.

STATEN ISLAND BLOCK 13 LOTS 82, 92, 100 & PART OF LOT 8 (TENTATIVE LOT 95)


PROPOSED MIXED-USE BUILDINGS 24 STUYYESANT PLACE, 170 RICHMOND TERRACE, 180 RICHMOND TERRACE STATEN ISLAND, NY

SPECIAL PERMIT DRAWING SET

RIVER NORTH

**fx**collaborative

STARR WHITEHOUSE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS AND PLANNERS PLLC






1 ENTRY PLAQUE

### NOTE:

INFORMATION ON THIS PLAQUE IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE. OWNER AND MAINTENANCE PERSONNEL SUBJECT TO CHANGE. FINAL DETERMINATION OF EMAIL AND PHONE # ARE TO BE COORDINATED WITH THE OWNER.



2 INFORMATION PLAQUE

RIVER NORTH

STATEN ISLAND BLOCK 13 LOTS 82, 92, 100 & PART OF LOT 8 (TENTATIVE LOT 95)

PROPOSED MIXED-USE BUILDINGS 24 STUYVESANT PLACE, 170 RICHMOND TERRACE, 180 RICHMOND TERRACE STATEN ISLAND, NY

SPECIAL PERMIT DRAWING SET

# **f**xcollaborative

FXCollaborative Architects LLP | 22 West 19th Street | New York, NY 10011 | 212 627 1700 | fxcollaborative.com

STARR WHITEHOUSE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS AND PLANNERS PLLC

80 Broad Street, Suite 1700 | New York, NY 10004 | 212 487 3272 | starrwhitehouse.c

03 SPECIAL PERMIT FILING - CITY COUNCIL REVISION.
02 SPECIAL PERMIT FILING - CPC REVISIONS
01 SPECIAL PERMIT FILING

04/01/202

Z-503

PLAZA DETAILS

FLAZA DL

Seal:

GENERAL NOTES

- I. ELEVATIONS REFERENCED TO NORTH AMERICAN VERTICAL DATUM OF 1988 (NAVD88) WHICH IS 1.095 FEET ABOVE NATIONAL GEODETIC SURVEY DATUM AT SANDY HOOK, NJ.
- BUILDINGS SHOWN WITHIN ZONING ENVELOPES ARE FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE.
- ROOFTOP TERRACES & LANDSCAPE ARE FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE.
- THE ZONING ENVELOPE REPRESENTS THE MAXIMUM DEVELOPMENT BULK, EXCLUDING PERMITTED OBSTRUCTIONS, EXCEPT WHERE OBSTRUCTIONS WAIVER IS ALSO REQUESTED.
- 5. ADDITIONAL ENTRANCES FOR GROUND FLOOR RETAIL, COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SECONDARY ENTRY AND EGRESS PERMITTED.
- APPLICANT'S STAMP AND SEAL CORRESPOND TO THE INFORMATION REGARDING THE DEVELOPMENT SITE, ZONING LOT, AND RELATED CURB

D.


9. THE OPEN SPACE DESIGN SHALL SUBSTANTIALLY COMPLY WITH THE PARAMETERS SHOWN IN TABLE ON SHEET Z-501.


CUTS. INFORMATION REGARDING THE SURROUNDING PROPERTIES IS FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY, AND MAY NOT BE EXACT. THE ARCHITECT BEARS NO RESPONSIBILITY FOR INEXACT INFORMATION ON SURROUNDING PROPERTIES.


ALL EXISTING CONTEXT BUILDINGS FOOTPRINT AND HEIGHT PER NYC PLUTO DATABASE.


PLANTING LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE AND SUBJECT TO CHANGE.


© 2021 FXCollaborative Architects LLP | All Rights Reserv











TOTAL AREA OF PUBLIC SPACE MINIMUM OF 5700 SF ENTRANCE: MIN 10'-9" **ENTRANCE WIDTHS** SIGNAGE:

ONE (1) ENTRANCE PLAQUE LOCATED ON RICHMOND TERRACE ONE (1) INFORMATION PLAQUE LOCATED ON WALKING LOOP

## GENERAL NOTES

- ELEVATIONS REFERENCED TO NORTH AMERICAN VERTICAL DATUM OF 1988 (NAVD88) WHICH IS 1.095 FEET ABOVE NATIONAL GEODETIC SURVEY DATUM AT SANDY HOOK, NJ.
- 2. BUILDINGS SHOWN WITHIN ZONING ENVELOPES ARE FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE.
- 3. ROOFTOP TERRACES & LANDSCAPE ARE FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE.
- 4. THE ZONING ENVELOPE REPRESENTS THE MAXIMUM DEVELOPMENT BULK, EXCLUDING PERMITTED OBSTRUCTIONS, EXCEPT WHERE OBSTRUCTIONS WAIVER IS ALSO REQUESTED.
- ADDITIONAL ENTRANCES FOR GROUND FLOOR RETAIL, COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SECONDARY ENTRY AND EGRESS PERMITTED.
- 6. APPLICANT'S STAMP AND SEAL CORRESPOND TO THE INFORMATION REGARDING THE DEVELOPMENT SITE, ZONING LOT, AND RELATED CURBINFORMATION REGARDING THE SUPROUNDING PROPERTIES IS FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY, AND MAY NOT BE EXACT. THE ARCHITECT BEARS NO RESPONSIBILITY FOR INEXACT INFORMATION ON SURROUNDING PROPERTIES.
- 7. ALL EXISTING CONTEXT BUILDINGS FOOTPRINT AND HEIGHT PER NYC PLUTO DATABASE.
- 8. PLANTING LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE AND SUBJECT TO CHANGE.
- 9. THE OPEN SPACE DESIGN SHALL SUBSTANTIALLY COMPLY WITH THE PARAMETERS SHOWN IN TABLE ON SHEET Z-508.

RIVER NORTH

SPECIAL PERMIT DRAWING SET

STATEN ISLAND BLOCK 13 LOTS 82, 92, 100 & PART OF LOT 8 (TENTATIVE LOT 95) PROPOSED MIXED-USE BUILDINGS 24 STUYVESANT PLACE, 170 RICHMOND TERRACE, 180 RICHMOND TERRACE STATEN ISLAND, NY

**f**xcollaborative

STARR WHITEHOUSE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS AND PLANNERS PLLC

10/25/2021 08/27/2021 04/01/2021

Z-507 ACTIVE PUBLIC OPEN SPACE PLAN

 $-\cdots$  TAX LOT LINE RETAIL ACCESS POINT PUBLIC ACCESSIBLE OPEN SPACE PROPOSED BUILDING FOOTPRINT CIP CONCRETE 12" WIDE RETAINING WALL BUILDING ENTRANCE POINTS SHOWN FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY GRAPHIC APPLICABLE TO ALL NON-DIMENSIONED ELEMENTS - - ZONING SETBACK LINE PLAZA INFORMATION PLAQUE \_\_ ILLUSTRATIVE BUILDING LINE CIP CONCRETE CURB 6" WIDE PLAZA ENTRANCE CIP CONCRETE PAVEMENT STREET LAMP PLAZA ENTRY PLAQUE EXISTING CATCH BASIN STREET LAMP SAFETY SURFACE PAVEMENT PROPOSED STREET TREE M STOP SIGN TABLE AND CHAIRS

- · · - ZONING LOT LINE

FIRE HYDRANT

RESIDENTIAL ACCESS POINT


LEGEND


BENCH WITH BACK ----- FENCE EXISTING BUILDING FOOTPRINT ----- RAILING, 42" HT.

GROUND COVER / PERENNIALS ARTIFICIAL TURF LAWN MAJOR TREE

CONCRETE TILES PAVEMENT

MINOR TREE





2 KEY PLAN

TOTAL AREA OF PUBLIC SPACE MINIMUM OF 5700 SF ENTRANCE: MIN 10'-9" **ENTRANCE WIDTHS** 

#### SIGNAGE:

ONE (1) ENTRANCE PLAQUE LOCATED ON RICHMOND TERRACE ONE (1) INFO PLAQUE LOCATED ON WALKING LOOP

MINIMUM AMOUNT OF SEATING LF WITH BACK: 24' (5 BENCHES) AND BREAKDOWN LF BACK-LESS: 44' (SEAT WALL) LF TOTAL: 68'

#### SEATING:

- THE DEPTH OF STANDARD SEATING IS 18-20 INCHES, THE DEPTH OF SEATING STEPS IS 36", THE HEIGHT ABOVE THE PAVEMENT OF SEATING IS 16-18 INCHES.
- AT LEAST 50 PERCENT OF THE LINER FEET OF FIXED SEATING HAVE BACKS AT LEAST 14 INCHES HIGH.
- ALL SEATS BACK ARE RECLINED FROM VERTICAL BETWEEN 10 TO 15 DEGREES.

ARTIFICIAL TURF: 934 SF ACTIVE RECREATION SAFETY SURFACE: 1120 SF WALKING PATH: 155 LF

### LIGHTING:

- LOCATIONS AND TYPES OF LIGHTING ELEMENTS ARE FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY AND SUBJECT TO CHANGE.
- ALL PAVED SURFACES SHOULD BE ILLUMINATED FOR MIN. 1 FOOT-CANDLE DURING HOURS OF OPERATION

PLANTINGS / VEGETATION | MAJOR TREES: 1 MINOR TREES: 6 MINOR TREES MULTISTEM: 13 SHRUBS: 81 GROUND COVER / PERENNIAL: 2340 SF

ACTIVE PUBLIC OPEN SPACE Z-508 MATERIAL, SEATING AND LIGHTING PLAN

RIVER NORTH

180 RICHMOND TERRACE STATEN ISLAND, NY

SPECIAL PERMIT DRAWING SET

STATEN ISLAND BLOCK 13 LOTS 82, 92, 100 & PART OF LOT 8 (TENTATIVE LOT 95) PROPOSED MIXED-USE BUILDINGS 24 STUYVESANT PLACE, 170 RICHMOND TERRACE,

**f**xcollaborative

STARR WHITEHOUSE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS AND PLANNERS PLLC

NON-DIMENSIONED ELEMENTS

LEGEND

GRAPHIC APPLICABLE TO ALI

. . — ZONING LOT LINE

— · · · — TAX LOT LINE PUBLIC ACCESSIBLE OPEN SPACE - - ZONING SETBACK LINE ILLUSTRATIVE BUILDING LINE

STREET LAMP EXISTING CATCH BASIN đ STOP SIGN FIRE HYDRANT

---- LIGHTED AREA PROPOSED STREET TREE PLAZA ENTRY PLAQUE

TABLE AND CHAIRS

BENCH WITH BACK . . . LIGHTS ON RETAINING WALL · LIGHTS ON BUILDING

----- RAILING, 42" HT. CIP CONCRETE 12" WIDE RETAINING WALL CIP CONCRETE CURB 6" WIDE CIP CONCRETE PAVEMENT

SAFETY SURFACE PAVEMENT



ARTIFICIAL TURF

ELEVATIONS REFERENCED TO NORTH AMERICAN VERTICAL DATUM OF 1988 (NAVD88) WHICH IS 1.095 FEET ABOVE NATIONAL GEODETIC SURVEY DATUM AT SANDY HOOK, NJ.

GENERAL NOTES


BUILDINGS SHOWN WITHIN ZONING ENVELOPES ARE FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE.

ROOFTOP TERRACES & LANDSCAPE ARE FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE. THE ZONING ENVELOPE REPRESENTS THE MAXIMUM DEVELOPMENT BULK, 9. EXCLUDING PERMITTED OBSTRUCTIONS, EXCEPT WHERE OBSTRUCTIONS WAIVER IS ALSO REQUESTED.

ADDITIONAL ENTRANCES FOR GROUND FLOOR RETAIL, COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SECONDARY ENTRY AND EGRESS PERMITTED. APPLICANT'S STAMP AND SEAL CORRESPOND TO THE INFORMATION REGARDING THE DEVELOPMENT SITE, ZONING LOT, AND RELATED CURB

CUTS. INFORMATION REGARDING THE SURROUNDING PROPERTIES IS FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY, AND MAY NOT BE EXACT. THE ARCHITECT BEARS NO RESPONSIBILITY FOR INEXACT INFORMATION ON SURROUNDING PROPERTIES. ALL EXISTING CONTEXT BUILDINGS FOOTPRINT AND HEIGHT PER NYC PLUTO DATABASE.

PLANTING LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE AND SUBJECT TO CHANGE. THE OPEN SPACE DESIGN SHALL SUBSTANTIALLY COMPLY WITH THE PARAMETERS SHOWN IN TABLE ON SHEET  $Z\!-\!508$ .





### NOTE:

INFORMATION ON THIS PLAQUE IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE. OWNER AND MAINTENANCE PERSONNEL SUBJECT TO CHANGE. FINAL DETERMINATION OF EMAIL AND PHONE # ARE TO BE COORDINATED WITH THE OWNER.



RIVER NORTH

STATEN ISLAND BLOCK 13 LOTS 82, 92, 100 & PART OF LOT 8 (TENTATIVE LOT 95)

PROPOSED MIXED-USE BUILDINGS 24 STUYVESANT PLACE, 170 RICHMOND TERRACE, 180 RICHMOND TERRACE STATEN ISLAND, NY

SPECIAL PERMIT DRAWING SET

# **f**xcollaborative

STARR WHITEHOUSE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS AND PLANNERS PLLC

SPECIAL PERMIT FILING - CITY COUNCIL REVISIONS SPECIAL PERMIT FILING - CPC REVISIONS SPECIAL PERMIT FILING

ACTIVE PUBLIC OPEN Z-510 ACTIVE PUBLIC O

GENERAL NOTES

- ELEVATIONS REFERENCED TO NORTH AMERICAN VERTICAL DATUM OF 1988 (NAVD88) WHICH IS 1.095 FEET ABOVE NATIONAL GEODETIC SURVEY DATUM AT SANDY HOOK, NJ.
- BUILDINGS SHOWN WITHIN ZONING ENVELOPES ARE FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE.
- ROOFTOP TERRACES & LANDSCAPE ARE FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE.
- THE ZONING ENVELOPE REPRESENTS THE MAXIMUM DEVELOPMENT BULK, EXCLUDING PERMITTED OBSTRUCTIONS, EXCEPT WHERE OBSTRUCTIONS WAIVER IS ALSO REQUESTED.
- ADDITIONAL ENTRANCES FOR GROUND FLOOR RETAIL, COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SECONDARY ENTRY AND EGRESS PERMITTED.
- APPLICANT'S STAMP AND SEAL CORRESPOND TO THE INFORMATION REGARDING THE DEVELOPMENT SITE, ZONING LOT, AND RELATED CURB
- CUTS. INFORMATION REGARDING THE SURROUNDING PROPERTIES IS FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY, AND MAY NOT BE EXACT. THE ARCHITECT BEARS NO RESPONSIBILITY FOR INEXACT INFORMATION ON SURROUNDING PROPERTIES.
- ALL EXISTING CONTEXT BUILDINGS FOOTPRINT AND HEIGHT PER NYC PLUTO DATABASE.
- PLANTING LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE AND SUBJECT TO CHANGE.
- THE OPEN SPACE DESIGN SHALL SUBSTANTIALLY COMPLY WITH THE PARAMETERS SHOWN IN TABLE ON SHEET Z-508.

