

17 Noise

Introduction

This chapter examines the potential for the Proposed Actions to result in significant, adverse noise impacts. Noise in an urban area comes from many sources. Some of these sources are activities essential to the health, safety, and welfare of a city's inhabitants, such as noise from emergency vehicle sirens, sanitation trucks, and construction and maintenance equipment. Other sources, such as train and traffic noise, are essential by-products of maintaining the viability of a city as a place to live and do business. With respect to noise, the goal of CEQR is to determine both (1) a proposed project's potential effects on sensitive noise receptors, and (2) the effects of ambient noise levels on new sensitive uses introduced by the proposed project.

The Proposed Actions include zoning text and map amendments that would establish regulations that create a hierarchy of natural resource preservation rules based on the proximity of a private property to the most ecologically sensitive areas. The Proposed Actions would create a consistent framework and clear development standards, resulting in better and more predictable outcomes in terms of both development and natural resources preservation.

Given their broad applicability, it is difficult to predict the sites where the Proposed Actions would facilitate development. Additionally, the proposed zoning text and map amendments are not expected to induce development or cause a significant change in the overall amount, type, or location of development. However, because the land use actions necessary to facilitate development on a site (i.e., certifications, authorizations, and special permits) may be changed or eliminated by the proposed regulations, the Proposed Actions could increase the proportion of development sites proceeding as-of-right.

Therefore, a noise screening assessment was performed following the 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines to determine the potential for adverse impacts with respect to noise. The assessment is based on a comparison of the development of the four prototypical analysis sites

under the No Action scenario with the With Action scenario, as described in **Chapter 1**, *Project Description*.

Principal Conclusions

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant, adverse impacts related to noise from the operation of any potential development. The Proposed Actions would not introduce new sensitive receptors closer to existing stationary noise sources. In accordance with the methodology outlined in the 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual*, a screening analysis was conducted on the four prototypical analysis sites to assess the potential of the Proposed Actions to result in significant, adverse impacts related to noise. Increased traffic volumes, which would be the primary mobile noise source under the Proposed Actions, could be generated at some of the prototypical analysis sites under the With Action scenario. However, the screening analysis found that none of the prototypical analysis sites would generate traffic increases of 100 percent or more, which is equivalent to an increase of 3 A-weighted decibels (dBA) or more. As such, per guidance under the 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual*, the Proposed Actions would not significantly affect noise, and a detailed analysis is not warranted. Stationary sources of noise resulting from development under the Proposed Actions would operate in compliance with the NYC Noise Code, and as such, a detailed analysis is not warranted.

Methodology

As per the *CEQR Technical Manual*, an initial impact screening was prepared to consider whether the Proposed Actions would: (1) generate any mobile or stationary sources of noise, e.g., induce large volumes of traffic or develop facilities with high operational noise levels; and/or (2) be located in an area with existing high ambient noise levels, which typically include projects near highly trafficked thoroughfares, airports, rail, or other loud activities.

- For mobile sources, the development densities of each prototypical analysis site were compared to the threshold for mobile source noise analysis in Zone 5.
- For development in an area with existing high ambient levels, the induced development associated with the Proposed Actions was analyzed to determine whether it would induce development where none would have occurred absent the Proposed Actions (i.e., in areas with high existing noise levels).
- For stationary sources, the Proposed Actions were analyzed to determine whether they would result in (1) placement of HVAC

equipment that would generate substantial noise, or (2) placement of sensitive uses proximate to existing equipment.

Screening Analysis

Mobile Sources

Vehicular Noise

Based on the preliminary screening analysis below, no additional detailed analysis is warranted. None of the prototypical analysis sites would exceed the trip generation thresholds listed for Zone 5²⁰ in Table 16-1 Minimum Development Densities Potentially Requiring Transportation Analysis in the 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual*, as shown below in **Table 17-1** and discussed in **Chapter 14, Transportation**; therefore, no additional detailed analysis is warranted.

Table 17-1. SNAD Preliminary Screening Analysis

Prototypical Analysis Site	No Action	With Action	Increment Increase	CEQR Technical Manual Threshold (Zone 5)	Level I Screening Warranted?
Residential (Dwelling Units)					
1	1	1	0	100	No
2	1	1	0	100	No
3	0	1	1	100	No
4	1	1	0	100	No

*** This table has been modified for the FEIS.**

Other Mobile Source Noise

The Proposed Actions would not generate aircraft or train noise. The proposed zoning text and map amendments are not expected to induce development or cause a significant change in the overall amount, type, or location of development. As such, the Proposed Actions would not result in increased placement of sensitive receptors near these mobile sources, and no further analysis is warranted.

Stationary Sources

Rooftop mechanical equipment, including air conditioning compressors, for any potential development would be enclosed and would comply with New York City Noise Code requirements, which would limit noise levels generated by such equipment to 65 dBA during the daytime (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.) and 55 dBA during the nighttime (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.).

²⁰ According to the 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual*, in Zone 5, residential developments under 100 dwelling units are not expected to generate sufficient traffic to warrant a noise analysis.

Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant, adverse stationary source noise impacts, and no additional analysis is warranted.

Conclusion

The Proposed Actions would not directly result in increased development. However, as stated above, significant increases in traffic and other mobile noise sources are not expected as a result of the Proposed Actions. The preliminary screening analysis found that the prototypical analysis sites would not generate traffic increases of 100 percent or more, which is equivalent to an increase of 3 dBA or more. In addition, the Proposed Actions would not result in increased placement of sensitive receptors near trains, airports, or other mobile source generators. Rooftop mechanical equipment for any potential development would be enclosed and would comply with New York City Noise Code requirements.

Therefore, there would be no significant, adverse impacts related to noise, and no additional analysis is warranted.