

Chapter 5 : COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter assesses the Proposed Action's potential effect on the community facilities. Community facilities, as defined under CEQR, include public or publicly funded schools, hospitals, libraries, day care centers, and fire and police protection. Direct effects occur when a particular action physically alters or displaces a community facility while indirect effects result from increases in population which create additional demand on service delivery.

The Proposed Action would permit moderate increases to the allowable residential bulk in limited areas for inclusionary housing, affordable senior housing and long term care facilities, and small increases to the allowable residential bulk in limited areas for general residential uses. Therefore, community facilities assessment is warranted.

B. PRINCIPAL CONCLUSIONS

Direct Impacts

The Proposed Action would not result in direct impacts to community facilities. The Proposed Action would not result in physical alteration or displacement of any community facilities, therefore no direct effects to existing community facilities are expected as a result of the Proposed Action.

Indirect Impacts

The Proposed Action would not result in significant adverse indirect impacts on community facilities. Based on the CEQR Technical Manual screening methodology, detailed analysis of public schools, child care, health care centers, fire and police services are not warranted, although they are discussed qualitatively. As described below, the Proposed Action would not result in a significant adverse impacts on community facilities.

Public Schools

The Proposed Action would not result in significant adverse impacts to public schools. Projects that would add new residential units under the Proposed Action that would be designed exclusively for seniors or single adults (HPD supportive housing), which account for a substantial percentage of the incremental increase in dwelling units, need not assess public school impacts. While it is possible that borough-wide increases would exceed the thresholds outlined in Table 6-1 of the *CEQR Technical Manual*, any potential impact is not expected to be significant, as the Proposed Action is not expected to generate substantial new non-senior units at a local level.

Libraries

The Proposed Action would not result in significant adverse impacts to libraries. Based on the increments demonstrated in the prototypical analyses, the population is not expected to increase by more than five percent in any catchment area, and therefore, no detailed analysis is warranted.

Child Care Services

The Proposed Action would not result in significant adverse impacts to child care services. According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a significant adverse child care impact may result, warranting consideration of mitigation, if a Proposed Action would increase the study area's utilization rate by at least five percentage points and the resulting utilization rate would be 100 percent or more. Projects that would add residential units designed exclusively for seniors or single adults (HPD supportive housing), which account for a substantial percentage of the incremental increase in dwelling units, need not assess child care impacts. While it is possible that borough-wide increases would

exceed the thresholds outlined in Table 6-1 of the *CEQR Technical Manual*, any potential impact is not expected to be significant, as the Proposed Action is not expected to generate substantial new non-senior units at a local level.

Police, Fire, and Health Care Services

The Proposed Action would not result in significant adverse impacts to police, fire, and health care services. The *CEQR Technical Manual* recommends a detailed analysis of indirect impacts on police, fire, and health care services in cases where a Proposed Action would create a sizeable new neighborhood where none existed before. The affected areas are zoning districts citywide where residential and community facilities are permitted today, and would continue to be under the Proposed Action. They are neighborhoods already served by existing police, fire, and health care services. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not create a neighborhood where none existed before, and a detailed analysis of indirect effects on these community facilities is not warranted.

C. METHODOLOGY

Because the proposal is a citywide action that would impact a variety of areas, this analysis addresses community facilities by examining prototypical cases, as described in Chapter 2, Analytical Framework. Accordingly, the analysis presented in this chapter is not site-specific, but instead, to the extent practicable, considers the types of developments that could occur as a result of the Proposed Action. In addition, the analysis addresses the range of conditions under which the Proposed Action would take place, so that the full range of impacts can be identified.

These prototypes have been developed and are described in detail in Chapter 2H. Eighteen of the 27 prototypes illustrating the effects of the proposal demonstrate a potential increase to the number of dwelling units or beds facilitated by the Proposed Action.

- Prototype 6: R7D District, Affordable Independent Residences for Seniors, 100' x 100' interior lot on narrow street (24 additional units)
- Prototype 7: R7X District, Affordable Independent Residences for Seniors, 100' x 100' interior lot on narrow street (32 additional units)
- Prototype 8: R7-2 District, Affordable Independent Residences for Seniors, 200' x 100' corner lot on wide and narrow streets (29/39 additional units)
- Prototype 9: R7A District, Long-term Care Facility, 100' x 100' interior lot on narrow street (34 additional beds)
- Prototype 10: R7A District, second building, 200' x 200' through lot on wide and narrow streets (32 additional units)
- Prototype 11: R7A District, Affordable Independent Residences for Seniors, 200' x 200' through lot on wide and narrow streets (99 additional units)
- Prototype 14: C6-4A district (R10A equivalent commercial district), Inclusionary Housing, 100'x100' interior lot on narrow street (8 additional units)
- Prototype 15: R10A District, Inclusionary Housing, 40' x 100' interior lot on wide street (30 additional units)
- Prototype 16: R10 District, Inclusionary Housing utilizing increased density allowance, 100' x 100' corner lot on wide and narrow streets (24 additional units)
- Prototype 18: R8A District, Inclusionary Housing, 100' x 85' shallow interior lot on wide street (3 additional units)
- Prototype 19: R8A, Inclusionary Housing, 100' x 170' shallow through lot on wide and narrow streets (8 additional units)
- Prototype 20: R8 District, Affordable Independent Residences for Seniors, 200' x 100' corner lot on wide and narrow streets (81 additional units)
- Prototype 22: R8 District, Affordable Independent Residences for Seniors, 200' x 100' interior lot on narrow street (44 additional units)
- Prototype 23: R10A District, Long-term Care Facility, 100' x 100' interior lot on Wide Street (54 additional beds)
- Prototype 24: R4 District, Affordable Independent Residences for Seniors, 150' x 100' interior lot on narrow street, outside the Transit Zone (12 additional units)

- Prototype 25: R5 District, Affordable Independent Residences for Seniors, 150' x 100' interior lot on narrow street (5 additional units)
- Prototype 26: R5 District, Long-term Care Facility and Affordable Independent Residences for Seniors, 200'x200' corner lot on wide and narrow streets, outside of Transit Zone (50 units)
- Prototype 27: R4, Affordable Independent Residences for Seniors, 200'x200' steeply-sloping corner lot on wide and narrow streets, outside the Transit Zone (51 additional units)

These prototypical cases are examples of individual developments and potential increase in density at a given site. At the citywide level, geographic analysis of the location of historic development suggest that new units tend to be widely scattered and not clustered in a given area, as show in Appendix A.

The Proposed Action is not expected to induce development where it would not otherwise occur in the No Action scenario, with the exception of the proposal to allow redevelopment of previously required parking for Affordable Independent Residences for Seniors within the Transit Zone, modeled in Prototypes 11 and 22, and, to a more limited degree, with the reduction in required minimum distance between buildings, modeled in Prototype 10.

The Proposed Action to allow as-of-right infill development on existing parking lots has the highest likelihood of generating an incremental increase in new units that exceeds CEQR thresholds for Community Facility and other density-related impacts. For each of the other components of the Proposed Action, the incremental increase in dwelling units facilitated as a result of the Proposed Action falls well below any CEQR thresholds. Significant clustering of development would have to occur in order to exceed thresholds that require analysis and such clustering is unlikely to occur given the dearth of development sites in the affected zoning districts.

Units created as a result of the Proposed Action would likely house a population that is expected to reside in New York City, regardless of the level of housing production. In the future without the Proposed Action, there would be more overcrowding, illegal units, and homelessness, but not fewer people or fewer school children. Moreover, as demonstrated in the prototypes, the development-inducing components of the proposal are unlikely to exceed thresholds at any individual site. Nevertheless, given the possibility that increased housing supply may lead to a small but unquantifiable incremental increase in population, the potential for impacts cannot be ruled out.

Based on the CEQR Technical Manual thresholds and the increments demonstrated for the prototypical development sites, the Proposed Action would not, trigger an analysis of hospitals, libraries, fire and police services, as none exceed the thresholds for detailed analysis or introduce a sizeable new neighborhood. Further, the highest estimated increases are for Affordable Independent Residences for Seniors, 90% of which are inhabited by households where the head of household is 65 years in age or older. Affordable senior housing densities differ from that of other housing in the high frequency of single occupancies and the absence of families with children; thus the population in a building for the elderly is less than it is in an identical building tenanted by a mixed-age group and rarely houses school-aged or a working population.

The potential for a clustering of effects as a result of the Proposed Action is also considered, to rule out the potential that multiple developments with small incremental increases in the number of dwelling units might occur within a study area, resulting in a new population that exceeds the thresholds outlined in the CEQR Technical Manual.

The objective of a community facilities and services analysis is to assess the potential of a Proposed Action to affect the provision of services provided by the public or publicly funded facilities referenced above. As set forth below, the Proposed Action would not result in significant adverse impacts to community facilities and services.

D. PRELIMINARY SCREENING

The purpose of the preliminary screening is to determine where a community facilities assessment is required. As recommended by the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a community facilities assessment is warranted if a project has the potential to result in either direct or indirect effects on community facilities. If a project would physically alter a community facility, whether by displacement of the facility or other physical change, this "direct" effect triggers the need to assess the service delivery of the facility and the potential effect that the physical change may have on that service delivery. New population added to an area as a result of an action would use existing services, which may

result in potential “indirect” effects on service delivery. Depending on the size, income characteristics, and age distribution of the new population, there may be effects on public schools or child care centers.

Direct Effects

The Proposed Action would not result in direct impacts to community facilities. The Proposed Action would not displace or otherwise directly affect any public schools, libraries, child care centers, health care facilities, or police and fire protection services facilities. Therefore, an analysis of direct effects is not warranted.

Indirect Effects

The *CEQR Technical Manual* includes thresholds that provide guidance in making an initial determination of whether a detailed analysis is necessary to determine potential impacts. Table 6-1 lists those *CEQR Technical Manual* thresholds for each community facility analysis area. If a proposal exceeds the threshold for a specific facility, a more detailed analysis is warranted. A preliminary screening analysis was conducted to determine if the Proposed Action would exceed established *CEQR Technical Manual* thresholds warranting further analysis.

Table 6-1 in the *CEQR Technical Manual* defines thresholds for detailed analysis as 50 or more elementary/middle school students (Public Schools) 20 or more children eligible for group child care and Head Start centers, more than 5% increase in ratio of residential units to library branches, or the introduction of a sizeable new neighborhood (Police/Fire Services and Health Care Facilities). Based on that screening, the Proposed Action does not warrant a detailed analysis on the indirect effects on public schools, publicly funded child care centers, libraries, health care facilities and police and fire service. However, for conservative analysis a qualitative discussion has been provided below.

E. INDIRECT EFFECTS ON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

This analysis assesses the potential effects of the Proposed Action on public elementary, intermediate, and high schools. According to the guidelines presented in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, CEQR analyzes potential impacts only on public schools operated by the DOE¹⁷; private and parochial schools within the study area are not included in the analysis of schools presented in this chapter.

The demand for community facilities and services is directly related to the type and size of the new population generated by development resulting from the Proposed Action. As outlined in Chapter 1, “Project Description,” the projected number of new units created as a result of the Proposed Action cannot be reasonably measured. The effects of the proposal are expected to be widespread and dispersed across the affected zoning districts in all five boroughs, and any incremental increase in residential units would be largely associated with Affordable Independent Residences for Seniors under the provision that would allow them to expand over existing parking. Nevertheless, as explained throughout this document, some small incremental increase in general residential units is expected to be facilitated by the Proposed Action. Although there are relatively few development sites remaining in any one neighborhood, and although the Proposed Action is generally not expected to induce development where it would not otherwise occur in the future without the Proposed Action, the potential for development that exceeds the CEQR threshold for a significant adverse impact on public schools cannot be immediately ruled out.

Following the methodologies in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the study area for the analysis of elementary and intermediate schools is the community school district’s “sub-district” (“region,” or “school planning zone”) in which the project is located. As high school students may attend any high school in the City if they meet the admissions criteria, and high schools compete to attract students on the basis of specialized programs and overall reputation,

¹⁷ Pursuant to CEQR guidelines, the schools analysis does not consider charter schools.

high school capacity assessments are not performed for small, localized study areas. The *CEQR Technical Manual* states that the borough in which a project is located should serve as the study area for high school analyses.

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a significant adverse impact may occur if a Proposed Action would result in: (1) a utilization rate of the elementary and/or intermediate schools that is equal to or greater than 100 percent in the future With-Action condition; and (2) an increase of five percent or more in the collective utilization rate between the No-Action and With-Action conditions.

Existing Conditions

[Elementary Schools, Intermediate Schools, High Schools](#)

There are approximately 2600 public schools across the city. School capacity varies widely.

Future without the Proposed Action

[Elementary Schools, Intermediate Schools, High Schools](#)

This proposal is only one piece of a comprehensive initiative to develop more housing citywide, and financial commitments have been made to ensure the infrastructure and service upgrades necessary to support an increase in housing units, both with and without this Proposed Action. Absent the Proposed Action, the number of school aged children is expected to increase citywide, as population continues to increase and as housing is developed under a series of initiatives designed to accommodate the growing population. As a result of the substantial increases in funding for services citywide, the school aged children expected as a result of the housing developed outside of this proposal are expected to be accommodated in the neighborhoods where the increases may otherwise be expected to have a significant adverse impact on public schools. The Department of Education, through its 5 year capital plan, forecasts future school needs based on projected future school enrollment and the housing pipeline. As the city's population grows, DOE would monitor school enrollment, forecast future needs, and allocate the available resources accordingly.

Future with the Proposed Action

[Elementary Schools, Intermediate Schools, High Schools](#)

While the Proposed Action would modify the bulk envelopes for many residential zoning districts, it would not alter the development rights for non-senior residential development. In most cases, the Proposed Action would enable the construction of a building that better fits is permitted floor area, providing more appropriate floor to ceiling heights and better street wall articulation. In a few cases, however, the Proposed Action would enable the full build-out of a development over what would have been feasible under the No-Action scenario, thereby resulting in a slight incremental increase of residential units and, thus, school-age children. The specific location of these developments is not possible to determine, but are expected to be widespread and dispersed across the city in recognition of the overall dearth of development sites large enough to generate an incremental increase that exceeds *CEQR Technical Manual* thresholds.

This Proposed Action is only one piece of a comprehensive initiative to develop more housing citywide, and financial commitments have been made to ensure the infrastructure and service upgrades necessary to support an increase in housing units, both with and without this Proposed Action. As a result of the substantial increases in funding for services citywide, the school aged children expected as a result of this Proposed Action are expected to be accommodated in the neighborhoods where the increases may otherwise be expected to have a significant adverse impact on public schools. The changes in development occurring as a result of the Proposed Action are not expected to alter significantly the distribution of future school enrollment, for reasons mentioned above. The Department of Education, through its 5 year capital plan, forecasts future school needs based on projected future school enrollment and the housing pipeline. As the city's population grows, DOE would monitor school enrollment, forecast future needs, and allocate the available resources accordingly.

F. INDIRECT EFFECTS ON PUBLICLY FUNDED CHILD CARE CENTERS

ACS provides subsidized child care in center-based group child care, family-based child care, informal child care, and Head Start programs. Publicly financed child care services are available for income-eligible children up through the age of 12. The CEQR analysis focuses on services for children under age six, as eligible children aged six through 12 are expected to be in school for most of the day.

Families eligible for subsidized child care must meet financial and social eligibility criteria established by ACS. In general, children in families that have incomes at or below 200 percent of the federal poverty level, depending on family size, are financially eligible, although in some cases eligibility can go up to 275 percent. The family must also have an approved “reason for care,” such as involvement in a child welfare case or participation in a “welfare-to-work” program. Head Start is a federally funded child care program that provides children with half-day and full-day early childhood education; program eligibility is limited to families with incomes at 130 percent or less than the federal poverty level.

The City’s affordable housing market is pegged to the Area Median Income (AMI), rather than the federal poverty level. Since family incomes at or below 200 percent of the federal poverty level fall under 80 percent of AMI, for the purposes of CEQR analysis, the number of housing units expected to be subsidized and targeted for incomes of 80 percent AMI or below is used as a proxy for eligibility. This provides a conservative assessment of demand, since eligibility for subsidized child care is not defined strictly by income, but also takes into account family size and other reasons for care (e.g., low-income parent(s) in school; low-income parent(s) training for work; or low-income parent(s) who is/are ill or disabled).

Since there are no locational requirements for enrollment in child care centers, and some parents or guardians choose a child care center close to their place of employment rather than their residence, the service area of these facilities can be quite large and are not subject to strict delineation on a map. According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, if a project would result in demand for slots greater than the remaining slots for child care centers and if that demand would constitute an increase of five percentage points or more in the collective capacity of child care centers serving the study area, a significant adverse impact may result.

Existing Conditions

There are over 500 publicly funded child care centers across the city in the affected districts. While family-based child care facilities and informal care arrangements provide additional slots in the study area, these slots are not included in the quantitative analysis.

The Future without the Proposed Action

This proposal is only one piece of a comprehensive initiative to develop more housing citywide, and financial commitments have been made to ensure the infrastructure and service upgrades necessary to support an increase in housing units, both with and without this Proposed Action. Absent the Proposed Action, the number of children enrolled in publicly funded child care centers is expected to increase citywide, as population continues to increase and as affordable housing is developed under a series of initiatives designed to accommodate the growing population. As a result of the substantial increases in funding for services citywide, the young children expected as a result of the housing developed outside of this proposal are expected to be accommodated in the neighborhoods where the increases may otherwise be expected to have a significant adverse impact on publicly funded child care facilities. The ACS conducts needs assessments to inform their plans for the provision of affordable childcare. As the city’s population grows, ACS would monitor the need for affordable childcare.

The Future with the Proposed Action

While the Proposed Action would modify the bulk envelopes for many residential zoning districts, it would not be altering the development rights for non-senior residential development. In most cases, this action would enable the

construction of a building that better fits is permitted floor area, providing more appropriate floor to ceiling heights and better street wall articulation. In a few cases, however, the Proposed Action would enable the full build-out of a development over what would have been feasible under the No-Action scenario, thereby resulting in a slight incremental increase of affordable residential units and, thus, young children. The specific location of these developments is impossible to determine, but are expected to be widespread and dispersed across the city in recognition of the overall dearth of development sites large enough to generate an incremental increase that exceeds *CEQR Technical Manual* thresholds.

This proposal is only one piece of a comprehensive initiative to develop more housing citywide, and financial commitments have been made to ensure the infrastructure and service upgrades necessary to support an increase in housing units, both with and without this Proposed Action. As a result of the substantial increases in funding for services citywide, the increase in young children in families eligible for subsidized child care as a result of this Proposed Action are expected to be accommodated in the neighborhoods where the increases may otherwise be expected to have a significant adverse impact on publicly funded child care facilities. The changes in development occurring as a result of the Proposed Action are not expected to alter significantly the distribution of future school enrollment, for reasons mentioned above. Nevertheless, the ACS conducts needs assessments to inform their plans for the provision of affordable childcare and, as the city's population grows, ACS would monitor the need for affordable childcare.