

APPENDIX B: CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS OF THE DISCRETIONARY ACTIONS CREATED UNDER THE PROPOSED ACTION

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this analysis is to consider the potential for significant, adverse impacts that could result from future utilization of the proposed BSA Special Permits, CPC Special Permit and CPC Authorization. The analyses rely on prototypical scenarios that are representative of the types of developments that are expected to seek the proposed discretionary actions. The potential effects of these discretionary actions are analyzed conceptually in this appendix.

~~Because it is not possible to predict whether the discretionary actions would be pursued on any one site in the future, and each action would require its own ULURP approvals, any time a discretionary action is applied for it would be subject to its own environmental review to ensure an accurate analysis of the future conditions and development in the area. However, it should be noted that the discretionary actions are not anticipated to be widely used.~~

~~The conclusions of the conceptual analyses find that, should any future application be submitted for the use of the use of the discretionary actions, there are several impact areas that may experience similar or slightly different environmental effects as compared to the proposed action, such as historic resources, shadows, hazardous materials, or, less likely, noise. The potential impacts would be site specific and in the absence of specific applications, difficult to predict.~~

The conceptual analysis of the proposed discretionary actions concludes that future applications that may utilize the proposed discretionary actions have the potential to result in the same significant adverse impacts as the proposed action, specifically historic resources, shadows, hazardous materials, and noise. Because the potential for significant adverse impacts is dependent on site-specific conditions, it is difficult to predict the potential for impacts in the absence of specific applications.

It is not possible to predict whether discretionary actions would be pursued on any one site in the future, and each action would require its own ULURP approvals. Any time a discretionary action is applied for it would be subject to its own environmental review.

Provided below are conceptual analysis of the potential impacts that could result from future utilization of the proposed BSA Special Permit for Quality Housing to account for unforeseen site circumstances (ZR Section 73-623), BSA Special Permit for the reduction of existing parking spaces for income-restricted housing units in the transit zone (ZR Section 74-434), BSA Special Permit for the reduction of existing parking spaces for Affordable Independent Residences for Seniors outside the transit zone (ZR Section 74-435), BSA Special Permit for the reduction of parking spaces to facilitate affordable housing within the Transit Zone (ZR Section 73-433), CPC Special Permit for the reduction or waiver of parking requirements for accessory group parking facilities within a Large-Scale Residential Development or a Large-Scale General Development (ZR Section 74-532), CPC Special permit to allow Long Term Care and certain community facilities in R1 and R2 districts (ZR Section 74-901), CPC Authorization to allow a Continuing Care Retirement Community on a lot greater than 10 acres in R1 and R2 Districts (ZR Section 22-42).

The following prototypical sites were determined to be representative of the types of sites that would be expected to apply under the Proposed Action. Prototypical sites are numbered and grouped for environmental analysis purposes where appropriate.

Conceptual Analysis for BSA Special Permit for Quality Housing to account for unforeseen site circumstances

As described in Chapter 1, Project Description sites with significant, but not unique, constraints such as topography or irregular lot configurations, may not qualify for a BSA variance. The BSA variance findings require applicants to

demonstrate uniqueness, which is difficult to demonstrate when site constraints are not limited to a single lot in the vicinity. Lots in these cases are required to comply with existing regulations and thus are often unable to be developed to their fully permitted floor area, or are only able to be developed in a costly or inefficient manner.

The following prototypical Site 1, represents a likely instance where the BSA Special Permit could be sought to redevelop a site with significant, but not unique, constraints. Given the frequency of the lot conditions modelled for this prototype, this example is representative of the types of projects that are expected to utilize the special permit.

Site 1: An applicant is seeking to build a 4.0 FAR mixed residential and commercial development in Brooklyn Community Board 3 within a C4-4L zoning district (R7A equivalent) within the Transit Zone. A diagonal street cuts across the street grid, resulting in several blocks of irregularly shaped lots, including the development site. The developer seeks a BSA Special Permit for relief from certain bulk regulations due to its irregularly shaped site, since it cannot prove uniqueness in the context of several nearby lots with the same condition.

Site 1 is a 4,950 square foot vacant lot, triangularly shaped by with 80 feet of direct street frontage with one 90 degree angle and two 45 degree angles. The lot is adjacent to a developed lot that is nearly symmetrical, and the situation of triangular lots and other irregularly shaped lots is repeated along the avenue, which cuts diagonally through the otherwise regular street grid.

The maximum lot coverage requirement for an interior lot in this district is 65 percent, and, given the triangular configuration of the lot, it is difficult to develop a functional building with no more than 65 percent lot coverage. The property owner is seeking to develop a building with a 3330 sq. ft. footprint, resulting in 67 percent lot coverage with a triangular rear yard. This additional building depth would enable the building to provide residential units with a double-loaded corridor, and an elevator core. The proposed development would be 65 feet tall, or 6 stories, with no setback in order to maintain the floor plan without providing a setback. The development would contain retail on the ground floor utilizing the 15 foot ceiling heights.

In order to meet the findings, the applicant must demonstrate that there are physical conditions that create practical difficulties in complying with the bulk regulations for a Quality Housing building, that the practical difficulties have not been created by the owner or by a predecessor in title, that the proposed modifications would not unduly obstruct light and air to the adjoining properties or street, that the proposed scale and placement of the development relates harmoniously with the surrounding buildings, and that the requested modification is the least amount necessary.

For purposes of this conceptual analysis it is assumed hypothetically that the applicant meets the findings of the BSA Special Permit.

Should any future application be submitted for the use of the Special Permit, there are several impact areas that may experience different effects as compared to the proposed action, such as historic resources, hazardous materials, and shadows. These potential impacts would be site specific and are difficult to predict with any certainty. Absent the ability to identify specific sites and development proposals to which the new Special Permit would apply, a conservative assumption is that there would be a modest increase in the overall amount of development throughout the city as a result of the new provisions.

As described, the Special Permit could result in a different building envelope and height as compared to what would be expected as of right. The change has the potential to affect urban design and neighborhood character by facilitating the development of buildings that are better integrated into their surroundings, and by facilitating more efficient construction and a more rational allocation of permitted floor area.

It is expected that the use of the proposed BSA Special Permit is likely to result in a modest increase in the number of buildings that are able to develop to their full permitted FAR, but is not expected to result in widespread changes to the overall amount, type, or location of development. Most sites with conditions that make development difficult would still be redeveloped in the future, but would be unable to utilize construction best practices to design optimal buildings. The new findings proposed with the Special Permit would result in a more logical and rational design of buildings, taking into consideration factors such as topography and lot shape.

Future applications could have site specific effects, including shadows, historic resources, hazardous materials, and noise, to the same extent as under the Proposed Action without any overall change in the nature or extent of the impacts. These site specific impacts are considered further below:

SHADOWS

A shadow assessment considers actions that result in new shadows long enough to reach a publicly accessible open space or historic resource (except within an hour and a half of sunrise or sunset). For actions resulting in structures less than 50 feet high, a shadow assessment is generally not necessary unless the site is adjacent to a park, historic resource, or important natural feature (if the features that make the structure significant depend on sunlight). According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, some open spaces contain facilities that are not sunlight sensitive, and do not require a shadow analysis including paved areas (such as handball or basketball courts) and areas without vegetation.

The proposed BSA Special Permit for Quality Housing could facilitate development that would cast sufficient shadows to impact sun-sensitive resources. Absent specific development proposals, it is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the BSA Special Permits. The BSA Special Permit's approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse shadows impacts, including those related to a net increase in building height and/or bulk, resulting from use of the BSA Special Permit. In some instances, the development induced by the BSA Special Permits would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review.

HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

Historic resources are defined as districts, buildings, structures, sites and objects of historical, aesthetic, cultural and archaeological importance. This includes properties that have been designated or are under consideration as New York City Landmarks or Scenic Landmarks or are eligible for such designation; properties within New York City Historic Districts; properties listed or formally determined eligible for the State and/or National Register of Historic Places; and National Historic Landmarks. According to the *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines, a study area defined by a radius of 400 feet from the boundaries of the project site is typically adequate to assess potential impacts on historic/architectural resources.

The proposed BSA Special Permit for Quality Housing could facilitate development that would affect historic and cultural resources. Absent specific development proposals, it is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the BSA Special Permits. The BSA Special Permit's approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse impacts to historic resources, including those related to the exterior appearances or context of architectural resources or new ground disturbance in archeological sensitive areas, resulting from use of the BSA Special Permits. In some instances, the development that requires the BSA Special Permits would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

A hazardous material is any substance that poses a threat to human health or the environment. Substances that can be of concern include, but are not limited to, heavy metals, volatile and semi volatile organic compounds, methane, polychlorinated biphenyls and hazardous wastes (defined as substances that are chemically reactive, ignitable, corrosive, or toxic). According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the potential for significant impacts from hazardous materials can occur when: a) hazardous materials exist on a site, and b) an action would increase pathways to their exposure; or c) an action would introduce new activities or processes using hazardous materials.

In addition, in connection to previous rezoning actions, (E) designations have been placed related to Hazardous Materials in many parts of the directly affect area.

The proposed BSA Special Permit for Quality Housing could facilitate development that would have the potential to disturb existing hazardous materials and/or increase pathways to their exposure. Absent specific development proposals, it is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the BSA Special Permits. The BSA Special Permit's approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific

to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse impacts due to hazardous materials, including those related to new ground disturbance, resulting from use of the BSA Special Permits. In some instances, the development induced by the BSA Special Permits would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review.

NOISE

The purpose of a noise analysis is to determine both (1) a Proposed Action's potential effects on sensitive noise receptors, including the effects on the level of noise inside residential, commercial, and institutional facilities (if applicable) and (2) the effects of ambient noise levels on new sensitive uses introduced by the Proposed Action. The principal types of noise sources affecting the New York City environment are mobile sources (primarily motor vehicles), stationary sources (typically machinery or mechanical equipment associated with manufacturing operations or building heating, ventilating and air conditioning systems) and construction noise.

The proposed BSA Special Permit for Quality Housing could facilitate development that would introduce noise sources to sensitive receptors. Absent specific development proposals, it is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the BSA Special Permits. The BSA Special Permits approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse noise impacts, including those related to new noise sources and/or sensitive receptors such as residential uses, resulting from use of the BSA Special Permits. In some instances, the development that requires the BSA Special Permits would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review.

CONCLUSION

Future applications could have site specific effects, including shadows, historic resources, hazardous materials, and noise, to the same extent as under the Proposed Action without any overall change in the nature or extent of the impacts. These potential impacts would be site specific and are difficult to predict with any certainty. Absent the ability to identify specific sites and development proposals to which the new Special Permit would apply, a conservative assumption is that there would be a modest increase in the overall amount of development throughout the city as a result of the new provisions.

As described, the Special Permit could result in a different building envelope and height as compared to what would be expected as of right. The change has the potential to effect urban design and neighborhood character by facilitating the development of buildings that are better integrated into their surroundings, and by facilitating more efficient construction and a more rational allocation of permitted floor area.

Conceptual Analyses for BSA Special Permits for the reduction of existing parking spaces

BSA Special Permit for the reduction of existing parking spaces for income-restricted housing units within the Transit Zone

Currently in zoning, low-income housing units are subject to off-street parking requirements that do not match with car ownership rates. The Proposed Action would remove the parking requirement for new low-income units within the Transit Zone, and proposes a provision for a discretionary action that would allow for the reduction or elimination of previously required parking for low-income units, within the Transit Zone.

The following prototypical Site 2 is an instance where the BSA Special Permit could be sought to redevelop parking spaces that were required for low-income residential units prior to the date of adoption of the proposed text amendment.

Site 2: Affordable housing development in Manhattan Community Board 11 within an R7-2 zoning district in the Transit Zone. The development has 1600 existing low-income housing units with 315 enclosed accessory parking spaces, and is seeking to convert 150 of its existing parking spaces into an expanded laundry center, community room and childcare center for the development's residents.

Site 2, developed in 1974 with 1600 units for low-income households retains two existing below-grade parking garages. One garage has 150 parking spaces, the other has 165 spaces. Two hundred and forty spaces were required at the time of development pursuant to the 15% parking requirement per ZR Section 25-25 Column C for an R7-2 district. The property owner is seeking to redevelop the smaller parking garage into a roughly 45,000 square feet of laundry facility, community gathering space, and a childcare center for building residents. Since this development is in the Transit Zone, under the Proposed Action, there would be no parking requirement for new low-income housing units; however, any parking spaces required at the time of building development could only be eliminated by discretionary action. Because the property owner is seeking to reduce the current parking from 315 to 165 spaces - 75 fewer spaces than required under pre-adoption zoning - the property owner applies for the BSA Special Permit to allow for the reduction of previously required parking for low-income units within the Transit Zone.

In this scenario, the operators of the housing development seek the BSA Special Permit to reduce the parking requirement to 165 spaces. Combined utilization among residents with cars in the two on-site garages is roughly 50 percent, with some car-owning households choosing to park on-street nearby rather than pay the \$100 monthly parking fee for an off-street space. The 1600 low-income households have a car ownership rate of 12 percent, significantly lower than at the time the development was built in the 1970s. The development is approximately ½ mile from the subway, with regular and select bus service operating along a nearby avenue every 5 minutes on weekdays.

In order to meet the findings of the BSA Special Permit, the applicant must demonstrate that the existing parking would facilitate an improved site plan; would not cause traffic congestion; and would not have undue adverse effects on residents, businesses or community facilities in the surrounding area.

Future applications could have site specific effects, including shadows, historic resources, hazardous materials, and noise, to the same extent as under the Proposed Action without any overall change in the nature or extent of the impacts.

Future applications can also be expected to add population to a neighborhood when existing parking spaces are redeveloped for housing. Therefore, in addition to shadows, historic resources, hazardous materials, and noise, the following density-related impact categories are assessed for the purposes of analyzing the proposed BSA Special Permits: Socioeconomics, Open Space, Urban Design and Visual Resources, Transportation, Air Quality and Neighborhood Character

These impacts are analyzed in the following section, as part of a combined analysis for the BSA Special Permit for the reduction of existing parking spaces for income-restricted housing, and the BSA Special Permit for the reduction of existing parking spaces for Affordable Independent Residences for Seniors, below.

BSA Special Permit for the reduction of existing parking spaces for Affordable Independent Residences for Seniors, outside of the Transit Zone

The Proposed Action would include a provision for a discretionary action that would allow for the reduction or elimination of previously required parking for “non-profit residences for the elderly” outside of the Transit Zone, depending on the zoning district. In multifamily zoning districts, where parking would be required for 10 percent of units in a new development, previously required parking could be reduced to 10 percent by BSA Special Permit. Because it is not possible to predict whether such action would be pursued on any specific site in the future, the RWCDs does not include specific development sites that would achieve the reduction of existing parking. Instead, a conceptual analysis is provided to generically assess the potential environmental impacts that could result from the reduction of, and development on, previously required parking for senior housing pursuant to the Special Permits.

The following prototypical Site 3 is an instance where the BSA Special Permit could be sought to develop in the future over parking space that exist as a result of the parking requirement prior to 2015.

Site 3: Affordable independent residence for seniors development in an R6 zoning district in Bronx Community Board 9, outside of the Transit Zone. The development has 145 existing HUD-assisted non-profit residences for the elderly with 33 accessory parking spaces in surface parking lot, and plans to build an additional 113 units.

Site 3, developed in 1978 with 145 units of non-profit residences for the elderly residential units retains an existing parking ratio of 22.5 percent, or 33 spaces, as required by zoning in an R6 district. Only four of the current households

in the development have a car and parks on-site. Under the proposal, there would be a 10 percent accessory parking requirement for new senior housing developments, and the BSA Special Permit for the reduction of the number of required existing parking spaces would be available.

In this scenario, the operators of the existing 145-unit housing development propose to build a new 12-story structure on the lot, adding 113 units of Affordable Independent Residences for Seniors. Combined, the resulting development would have a new total of 258 units. The developers seek the BSA Special Permit to eliminate 7 previously required parking spaces, reducing the existing parking to 26 spaces and resulting in an overall parking ratio of 10 percent, as required for new developments.

The development currently has an active shuttle bus service available to transport residents and staff to the public transportation and shopping. Service would be expanded to accommodate the increase in demand.

In order to meet the findings of the BSA Special Permit, the applicant must demonstrate that the existing parking facility was underutilized by the residents for whom it was built, and that such reduction would not have undue adverse effects on residents, businesses or community facilities in the surrounding area.

Future applications can also be expected to add population to a neighborhood when existing parking spaces are redeveloped for housing. Therefore, in addition to shadows, historic resources, hazardous materials, and noise, the following density-related impact categories are assessed for the purposes of analyzing the proposed BSA Special Permits: Socioeconomics, Open Space, Urban Design and Visual Resources, Transportation, Air Quality and Neighborhood Character.

SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS

The socioeconomic character of an area is comprised of the area's population, housing and economic activity. A preliminary assessment pursuant to the *CEQR Technical Manual* identifies whether a proposed project may adversely affect the socioeconomic character of the area by directly or indirectly changing any of these elements. The Proposed Action, as detailed in Attachment A, "Project Description" would maintain the existing land use and the underlying zoning, and the Proposed Action would have a widespread and dispersed effect on the type, location, or amount of development throughout the city.

Pursuant to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the preliminary assessment of socioeconomic conditions focuses on whether the proposed project could:

- generate a net increase of 200 or more residential units;
- generate a net increase of 200,000 or more square feet of commercial space;
- directly displace more than 500 residents;
- directly displace more than 100 employees; or
- affect conditions in a specific industry.

The Proposed BSA Special Permits could facilitate development that would generate a net increase of 200 or more residential units, or a net increase of 200,000 or more square feet of commercial space. Owing to the numerous constraints in addition to zoning that influence development of any given project, is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the BSA Special Permits. Approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse socioeconomic impacts, including those related to a net increase in residential units or commercial square footage, resulting from use of the Special Permits. In some instances, the development that requires the Special Permits would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review. The environmental assessment of any induced development would identify any impacts and mitigation measures, consistent with SEQRA requirements.

Even with the City's commitment to develop more affordable and affordable senior housing, funding and the lack of available development sites would remain as significant obstacles to the development of additional housing units in the future with the Proposed Action. Moreover, even with the discretionary elimination of previously required parking, the redevelopment of existing parking lots requires HUD and HPD approval. As conditions of the original

regulatory agreement, mortgage provisions, and other restrictions, the property owners are required to seek HUD and HPD approval to modify a partial change in use on the site, in order to expand into an existing parking lot. Therefore, although some expansion and the creation of additional units is expected in the future with the Proposed Action, it is difficult to predict how many existing sites would be expected to construct additional housing in the foreseeable future.

OPEN SPACE

Open space is defined as publicly or privately owned land that is publicly accessible and has been designated for leisure, play or sport, or conservation land set aside for protection and/or enhancement of the natural environment. An open space assessment may be necessary if a Proposed Action could potentially have a direct or indirect effect on open space resources in the project area. A direct impact would “encroach on, or cause a loss of, open space,” affect the facilities within an open space so that the open space no longer serves the same user population, or limit public access to an open space. Other direct affects include the imposition of noise, air pollutant emissions, odors, or shadows on public open space that may alter its usability. Use of the BSA Special Permits would not directly affect any existing public open space or recreational resources in the area.

An indirect effect may occur when the population generated by a Proposed Action would be sufficient to noticeably diminish the ability of an area’s open space to serve the existing or future population. According to the guidelines established in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, an action that would add fewer than 200 residents or 500 employees, or a similar number of other users to an area is typically not considered to have indirect effects on open space.

The proposed BSA Special Permits for a reduction of the required number of existing parking spaces could facilitate development that would indirectly affect open space. Absent specific development proposals, it is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the BSA Special Permits. A Special Permit’s approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse impacts to open space resources, including those related to a net increase in residential or non-residential population, resulting from use of the BSA Special Permits. In some instances, the development that requires the BSA Special Permits would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review.

SHADOWS

A shadow assessment considers actions that result in new shadows long enough to reach a publicly accessible open space or historic resource (except within an hour and a half of sunrise or sunset). For actions resulting in structures less than 50 feet high, a shadow assessment is generally not necessary unless the site is adjacent to a park, historic resource, or important natural feature (if the features that make the structure significant depend on sunlight). According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, some open spaces contain facilities that are not sunlight sensitive, and do not require a shadow analysis including paved areas (such as handball or basketball courts) and areas without vegetation.

The proposed BSA Special Permits for a reduction of the required number of existing parking spaces could facilitate development that would cast sufficient shadows to impact sun-sensitive resources. Absent specific development proposals, it is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the BSA Special Permits. The BSA Special Permit’s approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse shadows impacts, including those related to a net increase in building height and/or bulk, resulting from use of the BSA Special Permits. In some instances, developments requiring the BSA Special Permit would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review.

HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

Historic resources are defined as districts, buildings, structures, sites and objects of historical, aesthetic, cultural and archaeological importance. This includes properties that have been designated or are under consideration as New York City Landmarks or Scenic Landmarks or are eligible for such designation; properties within New York City Historic Districts; properties listed or formally determined eligible for the State and/or National Register of Historic Places; and National Historic Landmarks. According to the *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines, a study area defined

by a radius of 400 feet from the boundaries of the project site is typically adequate to assess potential impacts on historic/architectural resources.

The proposed BSA Special Permits for a reduction of the required number of existing parking spaces could facilitate development that would affect historic and cultural resources. Absent specific development proposals, it is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the BSA Special Permits. The BSA Special Permit's approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse impacts to historic resources, including those related to the exterior appearances or context of architectural resources or new ground disturbance in archeological sensitive areas, resulting from use of the BSA Special Permits. In some instances, the development requiring the BSA Special Permits would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review.

URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES

An area's urban components and visual resources together define the look and character of the neighborhood. The urban design characteristics of a neighborhood encompass the various components of buildings and streets in the area. These include building bulk, use and type; building arrangement; block form and street pattern; streetscape elements; street hierarchy; and natural features. An area's visual resources are its unique or important public view corridors, vistas, or natural or built features. For the CEQR analysis purposes, this includes only views from public and publicly accessible locations and does not include private residences or places of business.

An analysis of urban design and visual resources is appropriate if a Proposed Project would a) result in buildings that have substantially different height, bulk, form, setbacks, size, scale, use or arrangement than exists in an area; b) change block form, demap an active street or map a new street, or affect the street hierarchy, street wall, curb cuts, pedestrian activity or streetscape elements; or c) would result in above-ground development in an area that includes significant visual resources.

The proposed BSA Special Permits for a reduction of the required number of existing parking spaces could facilitate development that would affect the pedestrian perspective of an area's urban design and visual resources. Absent specific development proposals, it is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the BSA Special Permits. The BSA Special Permit's approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse urban design and visual resources impacts, including those related to building form, streetscape, and/or views as experienced by pedestrians, resulting from use of the BSA Special Permits. In some instances, developments that require the BSA Special Permits would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

A hazardous material is any substance that poses a threat to human health or the environment. Substances that can be of concern include, but are not limited to, heavy metals, volatile and semi volatile organic compounds, methane, polychlorinated biphenyls and hazardous wastes (defined as substances that are chemically reactive, ignitable, corrosive, or toxic). According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the potential for significant impacts from hazardous materials can occur when: a) hazardous materials exist on a site, and b) an action would increase pathways to their exposure; or c) an action would introduce new activities or processes using hazardous materials.

In addition, in connection to previous rezoning actions, (E) designations have been placed related to Hazardous Materials in many parts of the city.

The proposed BSA Special Permits for a reduction of the required number of existing parking spaces could facilitate development that would have the potential to disturb existing hazardous materials and/or increase pathways to their exposure. It is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the BSA Special Permits. The BSA Special Permit's approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse impacts due to hazardous materials, including those related to new ground disturbance, resulting from use of the BSA Special

Permits. In some instances, the development induced by the BSA Special Permits would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review.

TRANSPORTATION

The objective of the transportation analysis is to determine whether a Proposed Action may have a potential significant impact on traffic operations and mobility, public transportation facilities and services, pedestrian elements and flow, safety of all roadway users (pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicles), on-and off-street parking or goods movement.

The *CEQR Technical Manual* identifies minimum development densities that have the potential to result in significant adverse impacts to traffic conditions and therefore require a detailed traffic analysis. As shown in Table 16-1 of the *CEQR Technical Manual*, actions with a single or multiple land uses which may result in fewer than 50 peak hour vehicle trips are generally unlikely to cause significant adverse impacts.

According to the general thresholds used by the MTA New York City Transit (NYCT) specified in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, detailed transit analysis is not required if a Proposed Action would result in less than 200 peak hour rail or bus transit riders at a particular facility. In addition, a detailed pedestrian analysis is not required if a Proposed Action would result in less than 200 peak hour pedestrian trips.

The proposed BSA Special Permits for a reduction of the required number of existing parking spaces could facilitate development that would generate an increase of 50 peak hour vehicle trips, 200 peak hour rail or bus transit riders, and/or 200 peak hour pedestrian trips. It is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the BSA Special Permits.

Nevertheless, even with the current administration's commitment to develop more affordable and affordable senior housing, funding and the lack of available development sites would remain as significant obstacles to the development of additional housing units in the future with the Proposed Action. Moreover, even with the discretionary elimination of previously required parking, the redevelopment of existing parking lots requires HUD and HPD approval. As conditions of the original regulatory agreement, mortgage provisions, and other restrictions, the property owners are required to seek HUD and HPD approval to modify a partial change in use on the site, in order to expand into an existing parking lot. Therefore, although some expansion and the creation of additional units is expected in the future with the Proposed Action, it is difficult to predict how many existing sites would be expected to construct additional housing in the foreseeable future.

The BSA Special Permits approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse transportation impacts, including those related to an increase in residential units or commercial square footage, resulting from use of the BSA Special Permits. Under the proposed new BSA Special Permits, the BSA may allow a reduction of off-street parking spaces only if such a reduction would facilitate an improved site plan, would not cause traffic congestion, and would not have undue adverse effects on residents, businesses or community facilities in the surrounding area. The environmental review conducted in support of such a reduction would also have to consider the development that would be facilitated by such a reduction. If the environmental review finds a potential for adverse impacts that could, individually or in combination, be considered significant, the BSA would have the authority to prescribe the necessary mitigation to offset and/or minimize those adverse effects including those that would address impacts that contribute to serious traffic congestion or would unduly inhibit vehicular and pedestrian movement.

In some instances, the development that requires the BSA Special Permits would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review.

AIR QUALITY

According to the guidelines provided in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, air quality analyses are conducted in order to assess the effect of an action on ambient air quality (i.e., the quality of the surrounding air), or effects on the project because of ambient air quality. Air quality can be affected by "mobile sources," pollutants produced by motor vehicles, and by pollutants produced by fixed facilities, i.e., "stationary sources." As per the *CEQR Technical Manual*, an air quality assessment should be carried out for actions that can result in either significant mobile source or stationary source air quality impacts.

The proposed BSA Special Permits for a reduction of the required number of existing parking spaces could facilitate development that would substantively increase the number of motor vehicles and/or introduce fixed emission sources to sensitive receptors. It is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the BSA Special Permits. The BSA Special Permits approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse impacts to ambient air quality, including those related to motor vehicles and/or new or existing stationary sources, resulting from use of the BSA Special Permits. In some instances, the development that requires the BSA Special Permits would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review.

NOISE

The purpose of a noise analysis is to determine both (1) a Proposed Action's potential effects on sensitive noise receptors, including the effects on the level of noise inside residential, commercial, and institutional facilities (if applicable) and (2) the effects of ambient noise levels on new sensitive uses introduced by the Proposed Action. The principal types of noise sources affecting the New York City environment are mobile sources (primarily motor vehicles), stationary sources (typically machinery or mechanical equipment associated with manufacturing operations or building heating, ventilating and air conditioning systems) and construction noise.

The proposed BSA Special Permits for a reduction of the required number of existing parking spaces could facilitate development that would introduce noise sources to sensitive receptors. It is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the BSA Special Permits. The BSA Special Permits approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse noise impacts, including those related to new noise sources and/or sensitive receptors such as residential uses, resulting from use of the BSA Special Permits. In some instances, the development that requires the BSA Special Permits would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review.

NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

Neighborhood character is an amalgam of various elements that give neighborhoods their distinct "personality." According to the CEQR Technical Manual, a preliminary assessment may be appropriate if a project has the potential to result in any significant adverse impacts on any of the following impact categories: land use, zoning, and public policy; socioeconomic conditions; open space; historic and cultural resources; urban design and visual resources; shadows; transportation; or noise.

The proposed BSA Special Permits for a reduction of the required number of existing parking spaces could facilitate development that would affect neighborhood character. It is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the BSA Special Permits. Generally, the effect on neighborhood character is expected to be a positive one as a result of the proposed discretionary actions, by facilitating the development of development that improves the pedestrian experience and increases the number of residential units and other uses.

The BSA Special Permits approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse impacts to neighborhood character resulting from use of the BSA Special Permits. Under the proposed new BSA Special Permits, the BSA may allow a reduction of off-street parking spaces only if such a reduction would facilitate an improved site plan, would not cause traffic congestion, and would not have undue adverse effects on residents, businesses or community facilities in the surrounding area. This allows the BSA, when appropriate, to prescribe appropriate conditions and safeguards to minimize adverse effects on the character of the surrounding area.

In some instances, the development induced by the BSA Special Permits would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review.

CONCLUSION

Under the proposed new BSA Special Permits, the BSA may allow a reduction of off-street parking spaces only if such a reduction would not have undue adverse effects on residents, businesses or community facilities in the surrounding area. This allows the BSA, when appropriate, to prescribe appropriate conditions and safeguards to

minimize adverse effects on the character of the surrounding area. As a result, it is not expected that a reduction in parking allowed under the BSA Special Permits is itself going to result in any significant adverse impacts.

Use of the BSA Special Permits may induce new development, the location, nature and size of which cannot be predicted. This development could result in a potential for significant adverse impacts. Any induced development would be considered in the environmental review of an individual BSA Special Permits application, and impacts and mitigations would be identified therein.

Conceptual Analysis for the BSA Special Permit for the reduction of parking spaces to facilitate affordable housing, within the Transit Zone

The Proposed Action would include a provision for a BSA Special Permit that would allow for the reduction or elimination of required parking for market-rate units in a new development where at least 20 percent of the dwelling units are for low-income households within the Transit Zone. Because it is not possible to predict whether an authorization would be pursued on any specific site in the future, the RWCDs does not include specific development sites that would achieve the reduction or elimination of existing parking. Instead, a conceptual analysis is provided to generically assess the potential environmental impacts that could result from the reduction of required parking for market-rate units as part of a development that includes low-income units.

The following prototypical Site 4 is an instance where the Special Permit could be sought to reduce the parking requirement for market-rate units that are developed as part of a mixed-income development.

Site 4: A new mixed-income development on a 35,800 square foot lot in an R6A zoning district in Brooklyn Community Board 1, within the Transit Zone. The development is proposing to include 210 dwelling units, 105 of which would be affordable, 105 of which would be market rate. There would be no parking requirement for the affordable units, but parking would be required for 50 percent of the market rate units, resulting in 53 parking spaces.

Site 4 is seeking a BSA Special Permit to reduce the amount of required parking to 20 percent for the market-rate units developed as part of a mixed-income rental development. The development is planned to include 210 total dwelling units, half of which would be have rental restrictions based on income and half of which would be market-rate rentals. Because the development is occurring within the Transit Zone, no parking would be required for the 105 affordable units under the Proposed Action. However, absent the proposed discretionary action to reduce the amount of parking required for the market-rate units, 53 parking spaces would be required for the market rate units, assuming the development was built pursuant to Quality Housing regulations.

A very conservative cost estimate for the construction of structured parking assumes \$20,000 per space, resulting in a cost of \$1,060,000 to develop the 53 spaces below grade. Mixed-income developments rely substantially on public subsidy to fund the overall project. In order to finance the parking construction, property owners are often forced to charge upwards of \$300 per parking space on a monthly basis. Based on car ownership rates among residents of new renter-occupied market-rate housing the surrounding neighborhood, and given the availability of on-street parking and improvements in public transportation through the offering of year-round ferry service from India Street in Brooklyn CB1, only 21% percent of market-rate households in this development are expected to own cars. This amounts to approximately 22 cars associated with the market-rate units in the development. As a result of these factors, rates necessary to recoup the cost of parking construction are unlikely to be achieved in this neighborhood, making it difficult for the developer to obtain necessary financing for the project.

Under the Proposed Action, a BSA Special Permit would be available to waive or reduce required parking for market rate units if such a reduction would facilitate the development of a mixed-income building. To meet the findings, the developer must demonstrate that the reduction from 50 percent to 20 percent would facilitate the development by improving its financial feasibility; would not cause traffic congestion; and would not have undue adverse effects on residents, businesses or community facilities in the surrounding area, as applicable.

The developer is able to demonstrate that the waiver would improve the project's financial feasibility by eliminating the need to excavate below grade to provide the parking spaces, and that the few households within the

development that would be expected to own cars would be able to find parking on-street without undue adverse impacts.

Prototypes 2 and 3 analyzed situations where the reduction in parking for affordable housing resulting in the parking required for market-rate housing falling below the waiver threshold, effectively eliminating the market-rate parking requirement as of right. As a result of those analyses, no density related impacts could be expected. Future applications could have site specific effects, including shadows, historic resources, hazardous materials, and noise, to the same extent as under the Proposed Action without any overall change in the nature or extent of the impacts. Nevertheless, these impacts are analyzed below:

SHADOWS

A shadow assessment considers actions that result in new shadows long enough to reach a publicly accessible open space or historic resource (except within an hour and a half of sunrise or sunset). For actions resulting in structures less than 50 feet high, a shadow assessment is generally not necessary unless the site is adjacent to a park, historic resource, or important natural feature (if the features that make the structure significant depend on sunlight). According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, some open spaces contain facilities that are not sunlight sensitive, and do not require a shadow analysis including paved areas (such as handball or basketball courts) and areas without vegetation.

The proposed BSA Special Permit that would allow for the reduction or elimination of required parking to facilitate affordable housing could enable development that would cast sufficient shadows to impact sun-sensitive resources. It is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the BSA Special Permit. The BSA Special Permit's approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse shadows impacts, including those related to a net increase in building height and/or bulk, resulting from use of the BSA Special Permit. In some instances, the development induced by the BSA Special Permit would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review.

HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

Historic resources are defined as districts, buildings, structures, sites and objects of historical, aesthetic, cultural and archaeological importance. This includes properties that have been designated or are under consideration as New York City Landmarks or Scenic Landmarks or are eligible for such designation; properties within New York City Historic Districts; properties listed or formally determined eligible for the State and/or National Register of Historic Places; and National Historic Landmarks. According to the *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines, a study area defined by a radius of 400 feet from the boundaries of the project site is typically adequate to assess potential impacts on historic/architectural resources.

The proposed BSA Special Permit that would allow for the reduction or elimination of required parking to facilitate affordable housing could facilitate development that would affect historic and cultural resources. It is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the BSA Special Permit. The BSA Special Permit's approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse impacts to historic resources, including those related to the exterior appearances or context of architectural resources or new ground disturbance in archeological sensitive areas, resulting from use of the BSA Special Permit. In some instances, the development that requires the BSA Special Permit would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

A hazardous material is any substance that poses a threat to human health or the environment. Substances that can be of concern include, but are not limited to, heavy metals, volatile and semi volatile organic compounds, methane, polychlorinated biphenyls and hazardous wastes (defined as substances that are chemically reactive, ignitable, corrosive, or toxic). According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the potential for significant impacts from hazardous materials can occur when: a) hazardous materials exist on a site, and b) an action would increase pathways to their exposure; or c) an action would introduce new activities or processes using hazardous materials.

In addition, in connection to previous rezoning actions, (E) designations have been placed related to Hazardous Materials throughout the city.

The proposed BSA Special Permit that would allow for the reduction or elimination of required parking to facilitate affordable housing could enable development that would have the potential to disturb existing hazardous materials and/or increase pathways to their exposure. It is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the BSA Special Permit. The BSA Special Permit's approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse impacts due to hazardous materials, including those related to new ground disturbance, resulting from use of the BSA Special Permit. In some instances, the development induced by the BSA Special Permit would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review.

NOISE

The purpose of a noise analysis is to determine both (1) a Proposed Action's potential effects on sensitive noise receptors, including the effects on the level of noise inside residential, commercial, and institutional facilities (if applicable) and (2) the effects of ambient noise levels on new sensitive uses introduced by the Proposed Action. The principal types of noise sources affecting the New York City environment are mobile sources (primarily motor vehicles), stationary sources (typically machinery or mechanical equipment associated with manufacturing operations or building heating, ventilating and air conditioning systems) and construction noise.

The proposed BSA Special Permit that would allow for the reduction or elimination of required parking to facilitate affordable housing could enable development that would introduce noise sources to sensitive receptors. It is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the BSA Special Permit. The BSA Special Permit approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse noise impacts, including those related to new noise sources and/or sensitive receptors such as residential uses, resulting from use of the BSA Special Permit. In some instances, the development that requires the BSA Special Permit would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review.

Conceptual Analysis for the CPC Special Permit for the reduction or waiver of parking requirements for accessory group parking facilities within a Large-Scale Residential Development or a Large-Scale General Development

The Proposed Action would create a City Planning Commission Special Permit under Section 74-532 that would allow group parking facilities in large scale residential, community facility, or general developments, in conjunction with a bulk modification, to reduce or waive the number of required accessory residential parking spaces, including any spaces previously required for an existing building.

In order to meet the findings, the development would need to be within the Transit Zone, and demonstrate that the reduction of parking spaces would facilitate the development of affordable housing units, that auto ownership patterns for the development's residents are minimal, that the reduction of parking spaces would not have undue adverse impacts, and that the reduction would result in a better site plan.

Because it is not possible to predict whether a CPC Special Permit would be pursued on any specific site in the future, the RWCDs does not include specific Large Scale developments that would achieve the reduction of required parking. The following prototypical Site 5 is an instance where the Special Permit could be sought to reduce the parking requirement for market-rate units that are developed as part of a mixed-income development.

Site 5: Affordable housing development within a Large Scale Development in Bronx Community Board 6 within an R7-2 zoning district within the Transit Zone. The development has 1533 existing low-income housing units with 300 enclosed accessory parking spaces, and is seeking to replace the existing parking with additional housing units.

Site 5, developed in 1981 with 1533 units of low-income residential units retains an existing parking garage with 300 enclosed spaces, 233 of which were required pursuant to a 15% parking requirement per Column C for an R7-2 district. The property owner is seeking to redevelop the parking garage into a new mixed-use building, with 291

dwelling units, and roughly 8,000 sq. ft. each of retail and community facility use. Since this development is in the Transit Zone, under the Proposed Action, there would be no parking requirement for new low-income housing units, and the BSA Special Permit for the reduction or elimination of previously required parking spaces for low-income households would be available. However, since the City Planning Commission could not approve a large-scale general development that does not comply with zoning, the applicant proposes to utilize the parking waiver that is available through the General Large-Scale Development special permit.

In this scenario, the operators of the housing development seek the CPC Special Permit to develop 291 new low-income units, increasing the total size of the development to 1844 units. Under the Proposed Action, the new dwelling units would have no parking requirement, but discretionary approval is required for the elimination of previously required spaces.

The parking garage on the site was originally designed for up to 300 parking spaces, but the garage was never fully opened because its lower level was deemed unsafe immediately after it was built in 1980. The facility was closed completely in 2012 due to structural and personal safety issues; the 50 cars registered to the site were able to find parking nearby, on street or in another facility belonging to the large-scale development.

In order to meet the findings of the CPC Special Permit, the applicant must demonstrate that the reduction in parking would facilitate the development of affordable housing units, that the anticipated automobile ownership patterns for residents of are minimal and that such a reduction is warranted, that the reduction would not have undue adverse impacts on residents, businesses or community facilities in the surrounding area, and that the reduction of spaces would result in a better site plan with better quality open areas.

As demonstrated in Chapter 2, Analytical Framework, the reduction or elimination of off-street parking is unlikely to have density-related effects, but, since future applications can also be expected to add population to a neighborhood when existing parking spaces are redeveloped for housing, the following density-related impact categories are assessed for the purposes of analyzing the proposed BSA Special Permits: Socioeconomics, Open Space, Urban Design and Visual Resources, Transportation, Air Quality and Neighborhood Character.

Future applications could also have site specific effects, including shadows, historic resources, hazardous materials, and noise, to the same extent as under the Proposed Action without any overall change in the nature or extent of the impacts.

SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS

The socioeconomic character of an area is comprised of the area's population, housing and economic activity. A preliminary assessment pursuant to the *CEQR Technical Manual* identifies whether a proposed project may adversely affect the socioeconomic character of the area by directly or indirectly changing any of these elements. The Proposed Action, as detailed in Attachment A, "Project Description" would maintain the existing land use and the underlying zoning, and the Proposed Action would have a widespread and dispersed effect on the type, location, or amount of development throughout the city.

Pursuant to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the preliminary assessment of socioeconomic conditions focuses on whether the proposed project could:

- generate a net increase of 200 or more residential units;
- generate a net increase of 200,000 or more square feet of commercial space;
- directly displace more than 500 residents;
- directly displace more than 100 employees; or
- affect conditions in a specific industry.

The Proposed CPC Special Permit could facilitate development that would generate a net increase of 200 or more residential units, or a net increase of 200,000 or more square feet of commercial space. It is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the CPC Special Permit. Approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse socioeconomic impacts, including those related to a net increase in residential

units or commercial square footage, resulting from use of the Special Permits. In some instances, the development that requires the Special Permits would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review. The environmental assessment of any induced development would identify any impacts and mitigation measures, consistent with SEQRA requirements.

OPEN SPACE

Open space is defined as publicly or privately owned land that is publicly accessible and has been designated for leisure, play or sport, or conservation land set aside for protection and/or enhancement of the natural environment. An open space assessment may be necessary if a Proposed Action could potentially have a direct or indirect effect on open space resources in the project area. A direct impact would “encroach on, or cause a loss of, open space,” affect the facilities within an open space so that the open space no longer serves the same user population, or limit public access to an open space. Other direct affects include the imposition of noise, air pollutant emissions, odors, or shadows on public open space that may alter its usability. Use of the CPC Special Permit would not directly affect any existing public open space or recreational resources in the area.

An indirect effect may occur when the population generated by a Proposed Action would be sufficient to noticeably diminish the ability of an area’s open space to serve the existing or future population. According to the guidelines established in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, an action that would add fewer than 200 residents or 500 employees, or a similar number of other users to an area is typically not considered to have indirect effects on open space.

The proposed CPC Special Permit for a reduction of the required number of existing parking spaces could facilitate development that would indirectly affect open space. It is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the CPC Special Permit. A Special Permit’s approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse impacts to open space resources, including those related to a net increase in residential or non-residential population, resulting from use of the CPC Special Permit. In some instances, the development that requires the CPC Special Permit would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review.

SHADOWS

A shadow assessment considers actions that result in new shadows long enough to reach a publicly accessible open space or historic resource (except within an hour and a half of sunrise or sunset). For actions resulting in structures less than 50 feet high, a shadow assessment is generally not necessary unless the site is adjacent to a park, historic resource, or important natural feature (if the features that make the structure significant depend on sunlight). According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, some open spaces contain facilities that are not sunlight sensitive, and do not require a shadow analysis including paved areas (such as handball or basketball courts) and areas without vegetation.

The proposed CPC Special Permit for a reduction of the required number of existing parking spaces could facilitate development that would cast sufficient shadows to impact sun-sensitive resources. It is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the CPC Special Permit. The CPC Special Permit’s approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse shadows impacts, including those related to a net increase in building height and/or bulk, resulting from use of the CPC Special Permit. In some instances, the development induced by the CPC Special Permit would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review.

HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

Historic resources are defined as districts, buildings, structures, sites and objects of historical, aesthetic, cultural and archaeological importance. This includes properties that have been designated or are under consideration as New York City Landmarks or Scenic Landmarks or are eligible for such designation; properties within New York City Historic Districts; properties listed or formally determined eligible for the State and/or National Register of Historic Places; and National Historic Landmarks. According to the *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines, a study area defined

by a radius of 400 feet from the boundaries of the project site is typically adequate to assess potential impacts on historic/architectural resources.

The proposed CPC Special Permit for a reduction of the required number of existing parking spaces could facilitate development that would affect historic and cultural resources. It is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the CPC Special Permit. The CPC Special Permit's approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse impacts to historic resources, including those related to the exterior appearances or context of architectural resources or new ground disturbance in archeological sensitive areas, resulting from use of the CPC Special Permit. In some instances, the development that requires the CPC Special Permit would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review.

URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES

An area's urban components and visual resources together define the look and character of the neighborhood. The urban design characteristics of a neighborhood encompass the various components of buildings and streets in the area. These include building bulk, use and type; building arrangement; block form and street pattern; streetscape elements; street hierarchy; and natural features. An area's visual resources are its unique or important public view corridors, vistas, or natural or built features. For the CEQR analysis purposes, this includes only views from public and publicly accessible locations and does not include private residences or places of business.

An analysis of urban design and visual resources is appropriate if a Proposed Project would a) result in buildings that have substantially different height, bulk, form, setbacks, size, scale, use or arrangement than exists in an area; b) change block form, demap an active street or map a new street, or affect the street hierarchy, street wall, curb cuts, pedestrian activity or streetscape elements; or c) would result in above-ground development in an area that includes significant visual resources.

The proposed CPC Special Permit for a reduction of the required number of existing parking spaces could facilitate development that would affect the pedestrian perspective of an area's urban design and visual resources. It is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the CPC Special Permit. The CPC Special Permit's approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse urban design and visual resources impacts, including those related to building form, streetscape, and/or views as experienced by pedestrians, resulting from use of the CPC Special Permit. In some instances, the development that requires the CPC Special Permit would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review.

TRANSPORTATION

The objective of the transportation analysis is to determine whether a Proposed Action may have a potential significant impact on traffic operations and mobility, public transportation facilities and services, pedestrian elements and flow, safety of all roadway users (pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicles), on-and off-street parking or goods movement.

The *CEQR Technical Manual* identifies minimum development densities that have the potential to result in significant adverse impacts to traffic conditions and therefore require a detailed traffic analysis. As shown in Table 16-1 of the *CEQR Technical Manual*, actions with a single or multiple land uses which may result in fewer than 50 peak hour vehicle trips are generally unlikely to cause significant adverse impacts.

According to the general thresholds used by the MTA New York City Transit (NYCT) specified in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, detailed transit analysis is not required if a Proposed Action would result in less than 200 peak hour rail or bus transit riders at a particular facility. In addition, a detailed pedestrian analysis is not required if a Proposed Action would result in less than 200 peak hour pedestrian trips.

The proposed CPC Special Permit for a reduction of the required number of existing parking spaces could facilitate development that would generate an increase of 50 peak hour vehicle trips, 200 peak hour rail or bus transit riders, and/or 200 peak hour pedestrian trips. It is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the CPC Special Permit.

Nevertheless, even with the City's commitment to develop more affordable and affordable senior housing, funding and the lack of available development sites would remain as significant obstacles to the development of additional housing units in the future with the Proposed Action.

The CPC Special Permit approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse transportation impacts, including those related to an increase in residential units or commercial square footage, resulting from use of the CPC Special Permit. Under the proposed new CPC Special Permit, the CPC may allow a reduction of off-street parking spaces only if such a reduction would facilitate the development of income-restricted housing units, where the anticipated automobile patterns for residents are minimal, where the reduction would not have undue adverse impacts on the residents, businesses or community facilities in the surrounding area, and where the reduction would result in a better site plan with better quality open spaces. The environmental review conducted in support of such a reduction would also have to consider the development that would be facilitated by such a reduction. If the environmental review finds a potential for adverse impacts that could, individually or in combination, be considered significant, the CPC would have the authority to prescribe the necessary mitigation to offset and/or minimize those adverse effects including those that would address impacts that contribute to serious traffic congestion or would unduly inhibit vehicular and pedestrian movement.

In some instances, development that requires the CPC Special Permit would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review.

AIR QUALITY

According to the guidelines provided in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, air quality analyses are conducted in order to assess the effect of an action on ambient air quality (i.e., the quality of the surrounding air), or effects on the project because of ambient air quality. Air quality can be affected by "mobile sources," pollutants produced by motor vehicles, and by pollutants produced by fixed facilities, i.e., "stationary sources." As per the *CEQR Technical Manual*, an air quality assessment should be carried out for actions that can result in either significant mobile source or stationary source air quality impacts.

The proposed CPC Special Permit for a reduction of the required number of existing parking spaces could facilitate development that would substantively increase the number of motor vehicles and/or introduce fixed emission sources to sensitive receptors. It is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the CPC Special Permit. The CPC Special Permit approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse impacts to ambient air quality, including those related to motor vehicles and/or new or existing stationary sources, resulting from use of the CPC Special Permit. In some instances, the development that requires the CPC Special Permit would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review.

NOISE

The purpose of a noise analysis is to determine both (1) a Proposed Action's potential effects on sensitive noise receptors, including the effects on the level of noise inside residential, commercial, and institutional facilities (if applicable) and (2) the effects of ambient noise levels on new sensitive uses introduced by the Proposed Action. The principal types of noise sources affecting the New York City environment are mobile sources (primarily motor vehicles), stationary sources (typically machinery or mechanical equipment associated with manufacturing operations or building heating, ventilating and air conditioning systems) and construction noise.

The proposed CPC Special Permit for a reduction of the required number of existing parking spaces could facilitate development that would introduce noise sources to sensitive receptors. It is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the CPC Special Permit. The CPC Special Permit approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse noise impacts, including those related to new noise sources and/or sensitive receptors such as residential uses, resulting from use of the CPC Special Permit. In some instances, the development that requires the CPC Special Permit would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review.

NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

Neighborhood character is an amalgam of various elements that give neighborhoods their distinct “personality.” According to the CEQR Technical Manual, a preliminary assessment may be appropriate if a project has the potential to result in any significant adverse impacts on any of the following impact categories: land use, zoning, and public policy; socioeconomic conditions; open space; historic and cultural resources; urban design and visual resources; shadows; transportation; or noise.

The proposed CPC Special Permit for a reduction of the required number of existing parking spaces could facilitate development that would affect neighborhood character. It is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the CPC Special Permit. Generally, the effect on neighborhood character is expected to be a positive one as a result of the proposed discretionary actions, by facilitating the development of development that improves the pedestrian experience and increases the number of residential units and other uses.

The CPC Special Permit approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse impacts to neighborhood character resulting from use of the CPC Special Permit. Under the proposed new CPC Special Permit, the CPC may allow a reduction of off-street parking spaces only if such a reduction would facilitate the development of income-restricted housing units, where the anticipated automobile patterns for residents are minimal, where the reduction would not have undue adverse impacts on the residents, businesses or community facilities in the surrounding area, and where the reduction would result in a better site plan with better quality open spaces. This allows the CPC, when appropriate, to prescribe appropriate conditions and safeguards to minimize adverse effects on the character of the surrounding area.

In some instances, the development induced by the CPC Special Permit would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review.

CONCLUSION

Under the proposed new CPC Special Permit, the CPC may allow a reduction of off-street parking spaces only if such a reduction would facilitate the development of income-restricted housing units, where the anticipated automobile patterns for residents are minimal, where the reduction would not have undue adverse impacts on the residents, businesses or community facilities in the surrounding area, and where the reduction would result in a better site plan with better quality open spaces. This allows the CPC, when appropriate, to prescribe appropriate conditions and safeguards to minimize adverse effects on the character of the surrounding area. As a result, it is not expected that a reduction in parking allowed under the CPC Special Permit is itself going to result in any significant adverse impacts.

Use of the CPC Special Permit may induce new development, the location, nature and size of which cannot be predicted. This development could result in a potential for significant adverse impacts. Any induced development would be considered in the environmental review of an individual CPC Special Permit application, and impacts and mitigations would be identified therein.

Conceptual Analysis for the CPC Special permit to allow Long Term Care and certain community facilities in R1 and R2 districts

Under the Proposed Action, Long Term Care Facilities in R1 and R2 districts become subject to discretionary review regardless of the relative concentration of nursing home beds in the community district. Under current zoning, nursing homes in any zoning district would be required to obtain a special permit for the use if located in a community district with a relative concentration of nursing home beds.

The Proposed Action would not change the allowable floor area for Long Term Care Facilities in R1 and R2 districts, as per Section 24-111, but would create a single special permit to allow the Long Term Care Facilities use in R1 and R2 districts, and another special permit to allow such facilities to apply for the higher Section 24-11 floor area, (this is not a change from existing zoning).

Because it is not possible to predict whether a CPC Special Permit would be pursued on any specific site in the future, the RWCDs does not include specific development sites that would obtain the Special Permit for Long Term Care Facilities in the affected districts. The following prototypical Site 6 is an instance where the Special Permit could be sought to develop such a facility in an R1 or R2 district.

Site 6: Long Term Care Facility on a 70,000 sq. ft. corner lot in Queens Community District 13 within an R2 zoning district. The applicant seeks to build a 55-bed assisted living facility with 0.44 FAR, with a two-story 31,000 sq. ft. building.

The owner of Site 6 is seeking to develop a 55-bed assisted living facility on a 70,000 square foot lot. Since this proposed use is in an R2 zoning district, it would be required to apply for a Special Permit under proposed Section 74-901 and adhere to the bulk regulations of the underlying residential district.

In the future without the Proposed Action, this development would be permitted as of right. In the future with the Proposed Action, the operators of the proposed development seek the CPC Special Permit to develop 55 beds in a facility with roughly 12,100 square feet of sleeping area, and 19,000 square feet of area dedicated for shared meals, amenities, and medical services on site, as required by the state license. In order to meet the open space ratio requirements, the building is required to build on two floors, providing a ground floor dedicated to community space, and a second floor with sleeping accommodations and 3,400 sq. ft. of common area. Five parking spaces would be required and thus eligible to waive, but the applicant plans to provide 15 spaces, to accommodate staff needs and shuttles provided to the residents.

In order to meet the findings of the CPC Special Permit, the applicant would need to demonstrate that such use is compatible with the character or the future use or development of the surrounding area, and that the streets providing access to such use are adequate to handle the traffic generated by the use.

Based on the above analysis, it is expected that the use of the proposed CPC Special Permit is likely to result in a modest decrease in the development of buildings that might have occurred as-of-right in the future without the Proposed Action. Very few of these facilities are developed in R1 and R2 districts today, and the proposed CPC Special Permit is unlikely to be utilized. No significant adverse effects of the Proposed Action to allow them only by Special Permit are expected, however, a future application would need to review each impact area that may experience different effects as compared to the Proposed Action.

Conceptual Analysis for the CPC Authorization to allow a ~~Continuing Care Retirement Community~~ Long-Term Care Facility on a lot greater than 10 acres in R1 and R2 Districts

The proposal includes revisions to Section 22-42 that would replace the existing certification with a City Planning Authorization for ~~continuing care retirement communities (a subset of Long Term Care Facilities)~~ in R1 and R2 districts on a zoning lot that is greater than 10 acres.

Because it is not possible to predict whether an Authorization would be pursued on any specific site in the future, the RWCDs does not include specific development sites that would seek to site a ~~continuing care retirement community~~ Long-Term Care Facility in the affected districts. Instead, a conceptual analysis of the following Prototypical Site 7 is provided to generically assess the potential environmental impacts that could result from such development.

Site 7: Continuing Care Retirement Community on a 40 acre lot in Staten Island Community District 3 within an R1 zoning district. The applicant seeks to build a facility with 700 nursing home beds, 100 assisted living units, and 440 independent living units.

Under the Proposed Action, an applicant seeks to develop a Continuing Care Retirement Community comprised of two separate buildings on a 40 acre lot, for 1240 total residents. The CCRC model includes a mix of independent living units, assisted living units, and nursing home beds, allowing residents to transition through the facility as their care needs change.

In order to meet the findings of the Authorization, the applicant must demonstrate that the design is consistent with neighborhood character and that an adequate buffer exists from nearby residences.

The surrounding neighborhood within the R1 district is primarily comprised of single-family homes. However, there is another large medical facility on 12 acres adjacent to the development site. The proposed development is designed for only 15 percent lot coverage, leaving substantial open space between the proposed six-story buildings and the lot boundaries. The development proposed 680 parking spaces, half of which would be structured below grade, and half surface parking, to accommodate residents, visitors and staff.

While the proposed action would add population to a neighborhood by allowing independent living units in R1 and R2 districts, where they would not be permitted in the Future Without the Proposed Action. However, by virtue of the required site size, the independent living uses may be buffered from other single family homes off the zoning lot. Conceptually, the main impact of the independent living units compared with the assisted living and nursing home beds is that the independent living residents are more likely to own cars. However, the large site size allows for a combination of parking options and the discretionary action findings would address any traffic impacts. Nevertheless, as described below, density-related impacts are analyzed as part of this analysis.

Future applications could have site specific effects, including shadows, historic resources, hazardous materials, and noise, to the same extent as under the Proposed Action without any overall change in the nature or extent of the impacts.

Future applications can also be expected to add population to a neighborhood when existing parking spaces are redeveloped for housing. Therefore, in addition to shadows, historic resources, hazardous materials, and noise, the following density-related impact categories are assessed for the purposes of analyzing the proposed CPC Authorization: Socioeconomics, Open Space, Urban Design and Visual Resources, Transportation, Air Quality and Neighborhood Character

SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS

The socioeconomic character of an area is comprised of the area's population, housing and economic activity. A preliminary assessment pursuant to the *CEQR Technical Manual* identifies whether a proposed project may adversely affect the socioeconomic character of the area by directly or indirectly changing any of these elements. The Proposed Action, as detailed in Attachment A, "Project Description" would maintain the existing land use and the underlying zoning, and the Proposed Action would have a widespread and dispersed effect on the type, location, or amount of development throughout the city.

Pursuant to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the preliminary assessment of socioeconomic conditions focuses on whether the proposed project could:

- generate a net increase of 200 or more residential units;
- generate a net increase of 200,000 or more square feet of commercial space;
- directly displace more than 500 residents;
- directly displace more than 100 employees; or
- affect conditions in a specific industry.

The Proposed CPC Authorization could facilitate development that would generate a net increase of 200 or more residential units, or a net increase of 200,000 or more square feet of commercial space. The CPC Authorization may permit a net increase of 200 or more residential units. Approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse socioeconomic impacts, including those related to a net increase in residential units or commercial square footage, resulting from use of the Authorization. In some instances, the development that requires the Authorizations would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review. The environmental assessment of any induced development would identify any impacts and mitigation measures, consistent with SEQRA requirements.

OPEN SPACE

Open space is defined as publicly or privately owned land that is publicly accessible and has been designated for leisure, play or sport, or conservation land set aside for protection and/or enhancement of the natural environment. An open space assessment may be necessary if a Proposed Action could potentially have a direct or indirect effect

on open space resources in the project area. A direct impact would “encroach on, or cause a loss of, open space,” affect the facilities within an open space so that the open space no longer serves the same user population, or limit public access to an open space. Other direct affects include the imposition of noise, air pollutant emissions, odors, or shadows on public open space that may alter its usability. Use of the CPC Authorization would not directly affect any existing public open space or recreational resources in the area.

An indirect effect may occur when the population generated by a Proposed Action would be sufficient to noticeably diminish the ability of an area’s open space to serve the existing or future population. According to the guidelines established in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, an action that would add fewer than 200 residents or 500 employees, or a similar number of other users to an area is typically not considered to have indirect effects on open space.

The proposed CPC Authorization could facilitate development that would indirectly affect open space. It is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the CPC Authorization. The Authorization’s approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse impacts to open space resources, including those related to a net increase in residential or non-residential population, resulting from use of the CPC Authorization. In some instances, the development that requires the CPC Authorization would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review.

SHADOWS

A shadow assessment considers actions that result in new shadows long enough to reach a publicly accessible open space or historic resource (except within an hour and a half of sunrise or sunset). For actions resulting in structures less than 50 feet high, a shadow assessment is generally not necessary unless the site is adjacent to a park, historic resource, or important natural feature (if the features that make the structure significant depend on sunlight). According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, some open spaces contain facilities that are not sunlight sensitive, and do not require a shadow analysis including paved areas (such as handball or basketball courts) and areas without vegetation.

The proposed CPC Authorization to allow a CCRC Long-Term Care Facility in an R1 or R2 district on a lot greater than 10 acres could facilitate development that would cast sufficient shadows to impact sun-sensitive resources. It is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the CPC Authorization. The CPC Authorization’s approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse shadows impacts, including those related to a net increase in building height and/or bulk, resulting from use of the CPC Authorization. In some instances, the development induced by the CPC Authorization would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review.

HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

Historic resources are defined as districts, buildings, structures, sites and objects of historical, aesthetic, cultural and archaeological importance. This includes properties that have been designated or are under consideration as New York City Landmarks or Scenic Landmarks or are eligible for such designation; properties within New York City Historic Districts; properties listed or formally determined eligible for the State and/or National Register of Historic Places; and National Historic Landmarks. According to the *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines, a study area defined by a radius of 400 feet from the boundaries of the project site is typically adequate to assess potential impacts on historic/architectural resources.

The proposed CPC Authorization could facilitate development that would affect historic and cultural resources. It is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the CPC Authorization. The CPC Authorization’s approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse impacts to historic resources, including those related to the exterior appearances or context of architectural resources or new ground disturbance in archeological sensitive areas, resulting from use of the CPC Authorization. In some instances, the development that requires the CPC Authorization would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review.

URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES

An area's urban components and visual resources together define the look and character of the neighborhood. The urban design characteristics of a neighborhood encompass the various components of buildings and streets in the area. These include building bulk, use and type; building arrangement; block form and street pattern; streetscape elements; street hierarchy; and natural features. An area's visual resources are its unique or important public view corridors, vistas, or natural or built features. For the CEQR analysis purposes, this includes only views from public and publicly accessible locations and does not include private residences or places of business.

An analysis of urban design and visual resources is appropriate if a Proposed Project would a) result in buildings that have substantially different height, bulk, form, setbacks, size, scale, use or arrangement than exists in an area; b) change block form, demap an active street or map a new street, or affect the street hierarchy, street wall, curb cuts, pedestrian activity or streetscape elements; or c) would result in above-ground development in an area that includes significant visual resources.

The proposed CPC Authorization could facilitate development that would affect the pedestrian perspective of an area's urban design and visual resources. It is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the CPC Authorization within the existing R1 and R2 districts across the city. The requirement that the lot be at least 10 acres and within a single-family district makes it likely that the existing urban design and visual resources of the neighborhood are characterized by a low density building fabric lacking streetwall continuity. The requirement that no building approved shall be closer than 200 feet from the nearest residence ensures that the low-density scale of the neighborhood would not be significantly and adversely affected by the Proposed Action.

The CPC Authorization's approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse urban design and visual resources impacts, including those related to building form, streetscape, and/or views as experienced by pedestrians, resulting from use of the CPC Authorization. In some instances, the development that requires the CPC Authorization would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

A hazardous material is any substance that poses a threat to human health or the environment. Substances that can be of concern include, but are not limited to, heavy metals, volatile and semi volatile organic compounds, methane, polychlorinated biphenyls and hazardous wastes (defined as substances that are chemically reactive, ignitable, corrosive, or toxic). According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the potential for significant impacts from hazardous materials can occur when: a) hazardous materials exist on a site, and b) an action would increase pathways to their exposure; or c) an action would introduce new activities or processes using hazardous materials.

In addition, in connection to previous rezoning actions, (E) designations have been placed related to Hazardous Materials in many parts of the directly affected area.

In general, R1 and R2 districts are not as likely to have hazardous materials issues as other zoning districts. Nevertheless, the proposed CPC Authorization could facilitate development that would have the potential to disturb existing hazardous materials and/or increase pathways to their exposure. It is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the CPC Authorization. The CPC Authorization's approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse impacts due to hazardous materials, including those related to new ground disturbance, resulting from use of the CPC Authorization. In some instances, the development induced by the CPC Authorization would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review.

TRANSPORTATION

The objective of the transportation analysis is to determine whether a Proposed Action may have a potential significant impact on traffic operations and mobility, public transportation facilities and services, pedestrian elements and flow, safety of all roadway users (pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicles), on-and off-street parking or goods movement.

The *CEQR Technical Manual* identifies minimum development densities that have the potential to result in significant adverse impacts to traffic conditions and therefore require a detailed traffic analysis. As shown in Table 16-1 of the *CEQR Technical Manual*, actions with a single or multiple land uses which may result in fewer than 50 peak hour vehicle trips are generally unlikely to cause significant adverse impacts.

According to the general thresholds used by the MTA New York City Transit (NYCT) specified in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, detailed transit analysis is not required if a Proposed Action would result in less than 200 peak hour rail or bus transit riders at a particular facility. In addition, a detailed pedestrian analysis is not required if a Proposed Action would result in less than 200 peak hour pedestrian trips.

The proposed CPC Authorization could facilitate development that would generate an increase of 50 peak hour vehicle trips, 200 peak hour rail or bus transit riders, and/or 200 peak hour pedestrian trips. It is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the CPC Authorization.

The definition of a CCRC requires that the development consist of one or more buildings (on adjacent or contiguous zoning lots or zoning lots that would be contiguous but for their separation by a street) where 50 percent of the total units and beds included in any CCRC, nursing home, and assisted living facility uses on the same lot (or contiguous lots) are allocated for exclusive nursing home or assisted living facility uses. Residents of nursing homes and assisted living facilities have limited physical mobility, and are thus very unlikely to own cars. As a result, only the 50 percent or fewer beds or units developed as part of a CCRC may be allocated towards independent living, whose residents have car ownership rates that more closely resemble those of the general population.

The CPC Authorization approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse transportation impacts, including those related to an increase in residential units or commercial square footage, resulting from use of the CPC Authorization. Under the proposed new CPC Authorization, the CPC may allow a reduction of off-street parking spaces only if such a reduction would facilitate the development of income-restricted housing units, where the anticipated automobile patterns for residents are minimal, where the reduction would not have undue adverse impacts on the residents, businesses or community facilities in the surrounding area, and where the reduction would result in a better site plan with better quality open spaces. The environmental review conducted in support of such a reduction would also have to consider the development that would be facilitated by such a reduction. If the environmental review finds a potential for adverse impacts that could, individually or in combination, be considered significant, the CPC would have the authority to prescribe the necessary mitigation to offset and/or minimize those adverse effects including those that would address impacts that contribute to serious traffic congestion or would unduly inhibit vehicular and pedestrian movement.

In some instances, the development that requires the CPC Authorization would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review.

AIR QUALITY

According to the guidelines provided in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, air quality analyses are conducted in order to assess the effect of an action on ambient air quality (i.e., the quality of the surrounding air), or effects on the project because of ambient air quality. Air quality can be affected by “mobile sources,” pollutants produced by motor vehicles, and by pollutants produced by fixed facilities, i.e., “stationary sources.” As per the *CEQR Technical Manual*, an air quality assessment should be carried out for actions that can result in either significant mobile source or stationary source air quality impacts.

The proposed CPC Authorization could facilitate development that would substantively increase the number of motor vehicles and/or introduce fixed emission sources to sensitive receptors. It is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the CPC Authorization. The CPC Authorization approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse impacts to ambient air quality, including those related to motor vehicles and/or new or existing stationary sources, resulting from use of the CPC Authorization. In some instances, the development that requires the CPC Authorization would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review.

NOISE

The purpose of a noise analysis is to determine both (1) a Proposed Action's potential effects on sensitive noise receptors, including the effects on the level of noise inside residential, commercial, and institutional facilities (if applicable) and (2) the effects of ambient noise levels on new sensitive uses introduced by the Proposed Action. The principal types of noise sources affecting the New York City environment are mobile sources (primarily motor vehicles), stationary sources (typically machinery or mechanical equipment associated with manufacturing operations or building heating, ventilating and air conditioning systems) and construction noise.

The proposed CPC Authorization could facilitate development that would introduce noise sources to sensitive receptors. It is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the CPC Authorization. The CPC Authorization approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse noise impacts, including those related to new noise sources and/or sensitive receptors such as residential uses, resulting from use of the CPC Authorization. In some instances, the development that requires the CPC Authorization would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review.

NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

Neighborhood character is an amalgam of various elements that give neighborhoods their distinct "personality." According to the CEQR Technical Manual, a preliminary assessment may be appropriate if a project has the potential to result in any significant adverse impacts on any of the following impact categories: land use, zoning, and public policy; socioeconomic conditions; open space; historic and cultural resources; urban design and visual resources; shadows; transportation; or noise.

The proposed CPC Authorization could facilitate development that would affect neighborhood character. It is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the CPC Authorization. Generally, the effect on neighborhood character is expected to be a positive one as a result of the proposed discretionary actions, by facilitating the development of development that improves the pedestrian experience and increases the number of residential units and other uses.

The CPC Authorization approval requires the completion of its own environmental review, specific to the proposed development. That review would consider the possibility of any significant adverse impacts to neighborhood character resulting from use of the CPC Authorization.

It is not possible to predict the size, nature and location of development that could be induced by the CPC Authorization within the existing R1 and R2 districts across the city. The requirement that the lot be at least 10 acres and within a single-family district makes it likely that the existing urban design and visual resources of the neighborhood are characterized by a low density building fabric lacking streetwall continuity. The requirement that no building approved shall be closer than 200 feet from the nearest residence ensures that the low-density scale of the neighborhood would not be significantly and adversely affected by the Proposed Action.

Moreover, under the proposed new CPC Authorization, the CPC may authorize such development only if the applicant can demonstrate that the proposed facility, including the scale and placement of buildings, would not impair the essential character of the surrounding area; and that an adequate buffer exists between the proposed facility and nearby residences. In order to make such a finding, the CPC may consider proposed building access, orientation and landscaping. This allows the CPC, when appropriate, to prescribe appropriate conditions and safeguards to minimize adverse effects on the character of the surrounding area.

In some instances, the development induced by the CPC Authorization would be subject to other discretionary approvals also subject to environmental review.

CONCLUSION

Under the proposed new CPC Authorization, the CPC may allow the development of a ~~continuing care retirement community~~ Long-Term Care Facility on a large lot in an R1 or R2 district only when they can find that the proposed facility, including the scale and placement of the buildings, would not impair the essential character of the surrounding area, and when an adequate buffer exists between the proposed facility and nearby residences. This

allows the CPC, when appropriate, to prescribe appropriate conditions and safeguards to minimize adverse effects on the character of the surrounding area. As a result, it is not expected that development allowed under the CPC Authorization would result in any significant adverse impacts.

Use of the CPC Authorization may induce new development, the location, nature and size of which cannot be predicted. This development could result in a potential for significant adverse impacts. Any induced development would be considered in the environmental review of an individual CPC Authorization application, and impacts and mitigations would be identified therein.