

5

Open Space

The *2014 City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manual* defines open space as publicly accessible, publicly or privately-owned land that is available for leisure, play, or sport that serves to protect or enhance the natural environment. The CEQR guidelines indicate that an open space analysis should be conducted if an action would result in a direct effect, such as the physical loss or alteration of public open space, or an indirect effect, such as when a substantial new population could place added demand on an area's open spaces.

Introduction

The introduction of a CPC special permit for new hotels in M1 districts could result in shifting hotel development from M1 districts to other locations where they will continue to be permitted as-of-right, but would not otherwise change any rules regulating development in these locations. Thus, the possible effects of a shift in some hotel development from M1 districts in the future No-Action and With-Action conditions will be considered by means of a prototypical analysis. The open space assessment will be performed for each of the seven prototypical sites as defined and described in **Chapter 1, "Project Description"** to identify the possible effects of

shifting from one use (such as a residential or different commercial use) in the No-Action condition to a commercial hotel use in the With-Action condition.

The guidelines set forth in *the CEQR Technical Manual* stipulate a project can have either direct or indirect effects:

- › Direct effects may occur when the proposed action would encroach on, or cause a loss of, open space. Direct effects may also occur if the facilities within an open space would be so changed that the open space no longer serves the same user population. Limitation of public access and changes in the type and amount of public open space may also be considered direct effects. Other direct effects include the imposition of noise, air pollutant emissions, odors, or shadows on public open space that may alter its usability. Assessment of these effects is addressed in the relevant technical chapters of the manual and should be referenced for the open space analysis. It should be noted that direct effects may not always result in adverse effects to open space. Alterations and reprogramming of parks may be beneficial to some resources and may or may not have an adverse effect on others
- › Indirect effects may occur when the population generated by the proposed action overtaxes the capacity of existing open spaces so that their service to the future population of the affected area would be substantially or noticeably diminished.

Principal Conclusions

Analyses were conducted on the prototypical sites to assess open space as it pertains to the shift from non-hotel use (i.e., a residential or different commercial use) in the No-Action condition to commercial hotel use in the With-Action condition. None of the prototypical sites identified in the analysis framework warranted the need for detailed analysis.

Screening Analysis

The assessment below analyzes possible direct and indirect effects on open space resources.

Direct Effects

The proposed action would create a CPC special permit for hotels in M1 districts, excluding MX or paired M1/R districts, areas that are airport property or non-residential areas adjacent to airports and M1 districts with existing hotel special permit provisions. The proposed action would not result in any open space resources being physically displaced. However, due to the change in geographic distribution, the proposed action does have the potential to cause increased some noise or air pollutant emissions, odors, or shadows on public open space that could possibly affect its usefulness. To determine the likelihood of this potential, a review of land uses proximate to the prototypical sites was completed to analyze the type

of open space that might be affected. The analysis concluded that there were a wide variety of parks located within proximity to the prototypical sites, including community parks, playgrounds, natural areas, recreational fields, gardens and plazas.

Although the proposed action has the potential for some direct effects on open space, the potential for direct effects is extremely limited. As discussed in the **Chapter 7, "Shadows,"** the proposed action has a very limited potential to result in effects on the shadows cast by development on the prototypical sites in With-Action scenario. Additionally, as discussed in **Chapter 16, "Air Quality,"** and **Chapter 18, "Noise,"** development described in the With-Action scenario on the prototypical sites is not anticipated to result in direct effects on open space resources.

Indirect Effects

The proposed action is a generic action, and there are currently no known projected and/or potential development sites. To produce a reasonable analysis of likely effects of the proposed action, seven prototypical sites in seven areas have been established for analysis as described in **Chapter 1, "Project Description."** These prototypical sites were developed to represent the typical floor area ratio, sizes, locations, building envelopes, lot dimensions, M1 zoning districts and parking requirements of sites where hotels typically locate.

Since there are no specific development sites, the preliminary open space assessment first determined if any of the prototypical sites exceed any of the CEQR preliminary screening thresholds. None of the prototypes would induce residential development in either the With-Action or No-Action Condition. As shown below in **Table 5-1,** only one prototypical site (prototypical site 3) would exceed the 125-worker threshold for in an underserved area, and none of the sites exceed the 500-worker threshold for areas not in either an underserved or well-served area that would warrant analysis.

Table 5-1 Workers by Prototypical Site

Prototypical Site	Workers		
	No-Action Condition	With-Action Condition	Increment
1	8	34	+26
2	244	76	-167
3	85	283	+198
4	5	9	+4
5	2	58	+56
6	28	32	+4
7	3	63	+60

Prototypical site 3, located in Jamaica, is comprised of three separate hotels with a combined lot area of 37,645 SF and would generate 198 incremental workers; because this site is not in an underserved or well-served area and less than 500 additional employees would be generated, a detailed indirect open space analysis would not be warranted for this prototypical site. It should be noted that for very

large sites developed as hotels in underserved open spaces areas, a screening threshold of 125 incremental workers would warrant a detailed analysis. However, given open space study areas per the *CEQR Technical Manual* generally encompass a relatively large area across several census tracts within one-half mile of a project site (including many blocks and zoning districts) it is reasonable to assume that any area with demand for a future hotel that would otherwise be developed in an M1 district would be within generally the same open space study area; therefore, all other factors equal, the proposed actions would not generate additional hotel workers, but merely relocate workers within the same general open space study area. There would be no incremental workers within the open space study area. Consequently, the proposed action would not result in any possible indirect effects on open space, and no additional indirect open space analysis is warranted.

Conclusion

The proposed action does not have the potential to result in possible direct or indirect effects on open space resources.