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**Part I: GENERAL INFORMATION**

1. **Does the Action Exceed Any Type I Threshold in 6 NYCRR Part 617.4 or 43 RCNY §6-15(A) (Executive Order 91 of 1977, as amended)?**  
   - YES  
   - NO  

If “yes,” STOP and complete the FULL EAS FORM.

2. **Project Name**  805 Washington Avenue

3. **Reference Numbers**
   - CEQR REFERENCE NUMBER (to be assigned by lead agency) 18DCP050K
   - ULURP REFERENCE NUMBER (if applicable) N180139 ZCK, N180140 ZAK
   - BSA REFERENCE NUMBER (if applicable)
   - OTHER REFERENCE NUMBER(S) (if applicable) (e.g., legislative intro, CAPA)

4a. **Lead Agency Information**
   - NAME OF LEAD AGENCY  
     New York City Department of City Planning (DCP)
   - NAME OF LEAD AGENCY CONTACT PERSON  
     Robert Dobruskin, Director, EARD
   - ADDRESS  120 Broadway, 31st Floor

4b. **Applicant Information**
   - NAME OF APPLICANT  
     Happy Living Development
   - NAME OF APPLICANT’S REPRESENTATIVE OR CONTACT PERSON  
     Levi Balkany
   - ADDRESS  884 Eastern Parkway

5. **Project Description**

The Applicant, Happy Living Development, is seeking the following two actions in an effort to facilitate the development of a mixed-use commercial/residential building in the Prospect Heights neighborhood of Brooklyn:

1. A certification by the Chairperson of the City Planning Commission pursuant to Zoning Resolution ("ZR") Section 63-30 for a FRESH food store; and  
2. An authorization by the City Planning Commission pursuant to Section 63-22 to allow an increase in the maximum building height by 14 feet.

These actions (the "Proposed Actions") would facilitate the development of a nine-story (99') approximately 57,884 gross square foot (gsf) mixed-use building at 805 Washington Avenue in the Prospect Heights neighborhood of Brooklyn Community District (CD) 8 (the "Proposed Project"). The Proposed Project would include approximately 37 dwelling units (DUs), approximately 7,730 gsf of ground-level commercial space to be occupied by a FRESH food store, and approximately 19 accessory parking spaces. The Proposed Project is expected to be constructed, occupied, and fully operational by the end of 2020.

While the Applicant intends on developing the Proposed Project described above, a more conservative reasonable worst-case development scenario (RWCDS) will be analyzed in this Environmental Assessment Statement (EAS). The RWCDS would include the same amount of square footage as the Proposed Project, however, it includes a greater number of DUs and accessory parking spaces. The RWCDS for the Proposed Actions would comprise a nine-story (99-foot tall), approximately 57,884 gross square foot (gsf) mixed-use building including approximately 50 DUs, approximately 7,730 gsf of commercial space to be occupied by a FRESH food store, and approximately 25 accessory parking spaces.

**Project Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOROUGH</th>
<th>COMMUNITY DISTRICT(S)</th>
<th>STREET ADDRESS</th>
<th>ZIP CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>805 Washington Avenue</td>
<td>11238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 1180, Lot 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**6. Required Actions or Approvals** (check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Planning Commission:</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>UNIFORM LAND USE REVIEW PROCEDURE (ULURP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CITY MAP AMENDMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ZONING CERTIFICATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZONING MAP AMENDMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ZONING AUTHORIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ACQUISITION—REAL PROPERTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE SELECTION—PUBLIC FACILITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DISPOSITION—REAL PROPERTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSING PLAN &amp; PROJECT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OTHER, explain:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL PERMIT (if appropriate, specify type: modification; renewal; other)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Board of Standards and Appeals:**

| VARIANCE (use)            | YES | NO |
| VARIANCE (bulk)           |     |    |
| SPECIAL PERMIT (if appropriate, specify type: modification; renewal; other) | | |

**Department of Environmental Protection:**

| YES | NO | If “yes,” specify: |

**Other City Approvals Subject to CEQR** (check all that apply)

| LEGISLATION               | FUNDING OF CONSTRUCTION, specify: |
| RULEMAKING                | POLICY OR PLAN, specify:          |
| CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC FACILITIES | FUNDING OF PROGRAMS, specify: |
| 384(b)(4) APPROVAL        | PERMITS, specify:                |
| OTHER, explain:           |                                  |

**Other City Approvals Not Subject to CEQR** (check all that apply)

| PERMITS FROM DOT’S OFFICE OF CONSTRUCTION MITIGATION AND COORDINATION (OCMC) | LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION APPROVAL |
| OTHER, explain:                                                             |                                              |

**State or Federal Actions/Approvals/Funding:**

| YES | NO | If “yes,” specify: |

**7. Site Description:** The directly affected area consists of the project site and the area subject to any change in regulatory controls. Except where otherwise indicated, provide the following information with regard to the directly affected area.

**Graphics:** The following graphics must be attached and each box must be checked off before the EAS is complete. Each map must clearly depict the boundaries of the directly affected area or areas and indicate a 400-foot radius drawn from the outer boundaries of the project site. Maps may not exceed 11 x 17 inches in size and, for paper filings, must be folded to 8.5 x 11 inches.

| SITE LOCATION MAP | ZONING MAP | SANBORN OR OTHER LAND USE MAP |
| TAX MAP | FOR LARGE AREAS OR MULTIPLE SITES, A GIS SHAPE FILE THAT DEFINES THE PROJECT SITE(S) |
| PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE PROJECT SITE TAKEN WITHIN 6 MONTHS OF EAS SUBMISSION AND KEYED TO THE SITE LOCATION MAP |

**Physical Setting** (both developed and undeveloped areas)

| Total directly affected area (sq. ft.): 7,417 | Waterbody area (sq. ft.) and type: 0 |
| Roads, buildings, and other paved surfaces (sq. ft.): 7,417 | Other, describe (sq. ft.): N/A |

**8. Physical Dimensions and Scale of Project** (if the project affects multiple sites, provide the total development facilitated by the action)

| SIZE OF PROJECT TO BE DEVELOPED (gross square feet): 57,883 |
| NUMBER OF BUILDINGS: 1 | GROSS FLOOR AREA OF EACH BUILDING (sq. ft.): 57,884 |
| HEIGHT OF EACH BUILDING (ft.): 99 | NUMBER OF STORIES OF EACH BUILDING: 9 |

Does the proposed project involve changes in zoning on one or more sites? YES NO

If “yes,” specify: The total square feet owned or controlled by the applicant:

| The total square feet not owned or controlled by the applicant: |

Does the proposed project involve in-ground excavation or subsurface disturbance, including, but not limited to foundation work, pilings, utility lines, or grading? YES NO

If “yes,” indicate the estimated area and volume dimensions of subsurface permanent and temporary disturbance (if known):

| AREA OF TEMPORARY DISTURBANCE: 7,417 sq. ft. (width x length) | VOLUME OF DISTURBANCE: 148,340 cubic ft. (width x length x |
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1. View of project site (Block 1180, Lot 6) looking southeast along Washington Avenue.

2. Looking east down Lincoln Place from Washington Avenue. Project site is located to the right.

3. View of project site (Block 1180, Lot 6) looking southeast along Washington Avenue.
4. View of project site looking southeast from northwestern corner of Lincoln Place & Washington Avenue.

5. View of project site looking south across Lincoln Place.

6. View of project site looking north from northwestern corner of Washington Avenue & Eastern Parkway.
## Description of Proposed Uses

(please complete the following information as appropriate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Community Facility</th>
<th>Industrial/Manufacturing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong> (in gross sq. ft.)</td>
<td>50,154</td>
<td>7,730</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong> (e.g., retail, office, school)</td>
<td>50 units</td>
<td>FRESH food store</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does the proposed project increase the population of residents and/or on-site workers?  
[X] YES  
[ ] NO

If "yes," please specify:  
NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL RESIDENTS: 88  
NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL WORKERS: 25

Provide a brief explanation of how these numbers were determined:

The RWCDS for the Proposed Actions would result in 50 DUs and 7,730 gsf of commercial space; this would introduce approximately 119 residents based on the average household size (2.37) for Brooklyn CD 8, and approximately 25 workers based on estimates of one worker per 25 DUs and three workers per 1,000 sf of commercial space.

Does the proposed project create new open space?  
[X] YES  
[ ] NO

If "yes," specify size of project-created open space: sq. ft.

Has a No-Action scenario been defined for this project that differs from the existing condition?  
[X] YES  
[ ] NO

If "yes," see Chapter 2, “Establishing the Analysis Framework” and describe briefly:

In the absence of the Proposed Actions, the Applicant would proceed with the as-of-right development of an eight-story (85'), approximately 31,147 gsf mixed-use building containing 25 DUs, approximately 6,618 gsf of ground-level commercial space, and 13 accessory parking spaces.

### 9. Analysis Year

CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 2

ANTICIPATED BUILD YEAR (date the project would be completed and operational): 2020

ANTICIPATED PERIOD OF CONSTRUCTION IN MONTHS: up to 24 months

WOULD THE PROJECT BE IMPLEMENTED IN A SINGLE PHASE?  
[X] YES  
[ ] NO

IF MULTIPLE PHASES, HOW MANY?

BRIEFLY DESCRIBE PHASES AND CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE: Single phase with construction lasting up to 24 months

### 10. Predominant Land Use in the Vicinity of the Project

(check all that apply)

- [X] RESIDENTIAL
- [ ] MANUFACTURING
- [ ] COMMERCIAL
- [ ] PARK/FOREST/OPEN SPACE
- [X] OTHER, specify: Mixed-use commercial/residential
## Part II: TECHNICAL ANALYSIS

**INSTRUCTIONS:** For each of the analysis categories listed in this section, assess the proposed project’s impacts based on the thresholds and criteria presented in the CEQR Technical Manual. Check each box that applies.

- If the proposed project can be demonstrated not to meet or exceed the threshold, check the “no” box.
- If the proposed project will meet or exceed the threshold, or if this cannot be determined, check the “yes” box.
- For each “yes” response, provide additional analyses (and, if needed, attach supporting information) based on guidance in the CEQR Technical Manual to determine whether the potential for significant impacts exists. Please note that a “yes” answer does not mean that an EIS must be prepared—it means that more information may be required for the lead agency to make a determination of significance.
- The lead agency, upon reviewing Part II, may require an applicant to provide additional information to support the Short EAS Form. For example, if a question is answered “no,” an agency may request a short explanation for this response.

### 1. LAND USE, ZONING, AND PUBLIC POLICY: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Would the proposed project result in a change in land use different from surrounding land uses?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Would the proposed project result in a change in zoning different from surrounding zoning?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Is there the potential to affect an applicable public policy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) If “yes,” to (a), (b), and/or (c), complete a preliminary assessment and attach. see Attachment C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Is the project a large, publicly sponsored project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o If “yes,” complete a PlaNYC assessment and attach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Is any part of the directly affected area within the City’s Waterfront Revitalization Program boundaries?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o If “yes,” complete the Consistency Assessment Form.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Would the proposed project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Generate a net increase of 200 or more residential units?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Generate a net increase of 200,000 or more square feet of commercial space?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Directly displace more than 500 residents?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Directly displace more than 100 employees?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Affect conditions in a specific industry?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. COMMUNITY FACILITIES: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Direct Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Would the project directly eliminate, displace, or alter public or publicly funded community facilities such as educational facilities, libraries, hospitals and other health care facilities, day care centers, police stations, or fire stations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Indirect Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Child Care Centers: Would the project result in 20 or more eligible children under age 6, based on the number of low or low/moderate income residential units? (See Table 6-1 in Chapter 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Libraries: Would the project result in a 5 percent or more increase in the ratio of residential units to library branches? (See Table 6-1 in Chapter 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Public Schools: Would the project result in 50 or more elementary or middle school students, or 150 or more high school students based on number of residential units? (See Table 6-1 in Chapter 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Health Care Facilities and Fire/Police Protection: Would the project result in the introduction of a sizeable new neighborhood?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. OPEN SPACE: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Would the proposed project change or eliminate existing open space?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Is the project located within an under-served area in the Bronx, Brooklyn, Manhattan, Queens, or Staten Island?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o If “yes,” would the proposed project generate more than 50 additional residents or 125 additional employees?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Is the project located within a well-served area in the Bronx, Brooklyn, Manhattan, Queens, or Staten Island?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o If “yes,” would the proposed project generate more than 350 additional residents or 750 additional employees?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) If the project is located an area that is neither under-served nor well-served, would it generate more than 200 additional residents or 500 additional employees?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. **SHADOWS**: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 8

(a) Would the proposed project result in a net height increase of any structure of 50 feet or more? ☐ ☒

(b) Would the proposed project result in any increase in structure height and be located adjacent to or across the street from a sunlight-sensitive resource? ☐ ☒

6. **HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES**: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 9

(a) Does the proposed project site or an adjacent site contain any architectural and/or archaeological resource that is eligible for or has been designated (or is calendared for consideration) as a New York City Landmark, Interior Landmark or Scenic Landmark; that is listed or eligible for listing on the New York State or National Register of Historic Places; or that is within a designated or eligible New York City, New York State or National Register Historic District? (See the GIS System for Archaeology and National Register to confirm) ☐ ☒

(b) Would the proposed project involve construction resulting in in-ground disturbance to an area not previously excavated? ☐ ☒

(c) If “yes” to either of the above, list any identified architectural and/or archaeological resources and attach supporting information on whether the proposed project would potentially affect any architectural or archeological resources. See Attachment B

7. **URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES**: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 10

(a) Would the proposed project introduce a new building, a new building height, or result in any substantial physical alteration to the streetscape or public space in the vicinity of the proposed project that is not currently allowed by existing zoning? ☐ ☒

(b) Would the proposed project result in obstruction of publicly accessible views to visual resources not currently allowed by existing zoning? ☐ ☒

8. **NATURAL RESOURCES**: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 11

(a) Does the proposed project site or a site adjacent to the project contain natural resources as defined in Section 100 of Chapter 11? ☐ ☒

   ○ If “yes,” list the resources and attach supporting information on whether the proposed project would affect any of these resources.

   (b) Is any part of the directly affected area within the Jamaica Bay Watershed? ☐ ☒

   ○ If “yes,” complete the Jamaica Bay Watershed Form, and submit according to its instructions.

9. **HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 12

(a) Would the proposed project allow commercial or residential uses in an area that is currently, or was historically, a manufacturing area that involved hazardous materials? ☐ ☒

(b) Does the proposed project site have existing institutional controls (e.g., (E) designation or Restrictive Declaration) relating to hazardous materials that preclude the potential for significant adverse impacts? ☐ ☒

(c) Would the project require soil disturbance in a manufacturing area or any development on or near a manufacturing area or existing/historic facilities listed in Appendix 1 (including nonconforming uses)? ☐ ☒

(d) Would the project result in the development of a site where there is reason to suspect the presence of hazardous materials, contamination, illegal dumping or fill, or fill material of unknown origin? ☐ ☒

(e) Would the project result in development on or near a site that has or had underground and/or aboveground storage tanks (e.g., gas stations, oil storage facilities, heating oil storage)? ☐ ☒

(f) Would the project result in renovation of interior existing space on a site with the potential for compromised air quality; vapor intrusion from either on-site or off-site sources; or the presence of asbestos, PCBs, mercury or lead-based paint? ☐ ☒

(g) Would the project result in development on or near a site with potential hazardous materials issues such as government-listed voluntary cleanup/brownfield site, current or former power generation/transmission facilities, coal gasification or gas storage sites, railroad tracks or rights-of-way, or municipal incinerators? ☐ ☒

(h) Has a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment been performed for the site? ☐ ☒

   ○ If “yes,” were Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) identified? Briefly identify:

10. **WATER AND SEWER INFRASTRUCTURE**: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 13

(a) Would the project result in water demand of more than one million gallons per day? ☐ ☒

(b) If the proposed project located in a combined sewer area, would it result in at least 1,000 residential units or 250,000 square feet or more of commercial space in Manhattan, or at least 400 residential units or 150,000 square feet or more of commercial space in the Bronx, Brooklyn, Staten Island, or Queens? ☐ ☒

(c) If the proposed project located in a separately sewered area, would it result in the same or greater development than the amounts listed in Table 13-1 in Chapter 13? ☐ ☒

(d) Would the proposed project involve development on a site that is 5 acres or larger where the amount of impervious surface would increase? ☐ ☒

(e) If the project is located within the Jamaica Bay Watershed or in certain specific drainage areas, including Bronx River, Coney Island Creek, Flushing Bay and Creek, Gowanus Canal, Hutchinson River, Newtown Creek, or Westchester Creek, would it involve development on a site that is 1 acre or larger where the amount of impervious surface would increase? ☐ ☒
| (f) Would the proposed project be located in an area that is partially sewered or currently unsewered? | ✔ | ✗ |
| (g) Is the project proposing an industrial facility or activity that would contribute industrial discharges to a Wastewater Treatment Plant and/or generate contaminated stormwater in a separate storm sewer system? | ✗ | ✔ |
| (h) Would the project involve construction of a new stormwater outfall that requires federal and/or state permits? | ✗ | ✔ |

11. **SOLID WASTE AND SANITATION SERVICES**: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 14

(a) Using Table 14-1 in Chapter 14, the project’s projected operational solid waste generation is estimated to be (pounds per week): 6,913 pounds/week (With-Action total)

| (a) Would the proposed project have the potential to generate 100,000 pounds (50 tons) or more of solid waste per week? | ✗ | ✔ |

(b) Would the proposed project involve a reduction in capacity at a solid waste management facility used for refuse or recyclables generated within the City? | ✗ | ✔ |

12. **ENERGY**: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 15

(a) Using energy modeling or Table 15-1 in Chapter 15, the project’s projected energy use is estimated to be (annual BTUs): 7,224,555 BTU (With-Action total)

(b) Would the proposed project affect the transmission or generation of energy? | ✗ | ✔ |

13. **TRANSPORTATION**: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 16

(a) Would the proposed project exceed any threshold identified in Table 16-1 in Chapter 16? | ✗ | ✔ |

(b) If “yes,” conduct the screening analyses, attach appropriate back up data as needed for each stage and answer the following questions:

| o Would the proposed project result in 50 or more Passenger Car Equivalents (PCEs) per project peak hour? | ✗ | ✔ |

| If “yes,” would the proposed project result in 50 or more vehicle trips per project peak hour at any given intersection? **It should be noted that the lead agency may require further analysis of intersections of concern even when a project generates fewer than 50 vehicles in the peak hour. See Subsection 313 of Chapter 16 for more information.** | ✗ | ✔ |

| o Would the proposed project result in more than 200 subway/rail or bus trips per project peak hour? | ✗ | ✔ |

| If “yes,” would the proposed project result, per project peak hour, in 50 or more bus trips on a single line (in one direction) or 200 subway trips per station or line? | ✗ | ✔ |

| o Would the proposed project result in more than 200 pedestrian trips per project peak hour? | ✗ | ✔ |

| If “yes,” would the proposed project result in more than 200 pedestrian trips per project peak hour to any given pedestrian or transit element, crosswalk, subway stair, or bus stop? | ✗ | ✔ |

14. **AIR QUALITY**: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 17

(a) Mobile Sources: Would the proposed project result in the conditions outlined in Section 210 in Chapter 17? | ✗ | ✔ |

(b) Stationary Sources: Would the proposed project result in the conditions outlined in Section 220 in Chapter 17? | ✗ | ✔ |

| o If “yes,” would the proposed project exceed the thresholds in Figure 17-3, Stationary Source Screen Graph in Chapter 17? (Attach graph as needed) | ✗ | ✔ |

(c) Does the proposed project involve multiple buildings on the project site? | ✗ | ✔ |

(d) Does the proposed project require federal approvals, support, licensing, or permits subject to conformity requirements? | ✗ | ✔ |

(e) Does the proposed project site have existing institutional controls (e.g., (E) designation or Restrictive Declaration) relating to air quality that preclude the potential for significant adverse impacts? | ✗ | ✔ |

15. **GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 18

(a) Is the proposed project a city capital project or a power generation plant? | ✗ | ✔ |

(b) Would the proposed project fundamentally change the City’s solid waste management system? | ✗ | ✔ |

(c) If “yes” to any of the above, would the project require a GHG emissions assessment based on the guidance in Chapter 18? | ✗ | ✔ |

16. **NOISE**: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 19

(a) Would the proposed project generate or reroute vehicular traffic? | ✗ | ✔ |

(b) Would the proposed project introduce new or additional receptors (see Section 124 in Chapter 19) near heavily trafficked roadways, within one horizontal mile of an existing or proposed flight path, or within 1,500 feet of an existing or proposed rail line with a direct line of site to that rail line? | ✗ | ✔ |

(c) Would the proposed project cause a stationary noise source to operate within 1,500 feet of a receptor with a direct line of sight to that receptor or introduce receptors into an area with high ambient stationary noise? | ✗ | ✔ |

(d) Does the proposed project site have existing institutional controls (e.g., (E) designation or Restrictive Declaration) relating to noise that preclude the potential for significant adverse impacts? | ✗ | ✔ |

17. **PUBLIC HEALTH**: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 20
18. NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER: CEOR Technical Manual Chapter 21

(a) Based upon the analyses conducted, do any of the following technical areas require a detailed analysis: Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy; Socioeconomic Conditions; Open Space; Historic and Cultural Resources; Urban Design and Visual Resources; Shadows, Transportation; Noise?

(b) If “yes,” explain why an assessment of public health is or is not warranted based on the guidance in Chapter 20, “Public Health.” Attach a preliminary analysis, if necessary.

19. CONSTRUCTION: CEOR Technical Manual Chapter 22

(a) Would the project’s construction activities involve:
   - Construction activities lasting longer than two years?
   - Construction activities within a Central Business District or along an arterial highway or major thoroughfare?
   - Closing, narrowing, or otherwise impeding traffic, transit, or pedestrian elements (roadways, parking spaces, bicycle routes, sidewalks, crosswalks, corners, etc.)?
   - Construction of multiple buildings where there is a potential for on-site receptors on buildings completed before the final build-out?
   - The operation of several pieces of diesel equipment in a single location at peak construction?
   - Closure of a community facility or disruption in its services?
   - Activities within 400 feet of a historic or cultural resource?
   - Disturbance of a site containing or adjacent to a site containing natural resources?
   - Construction on multiple development sites in the same geographic area, such that there is the potential for several construction timelines to overlap or last for more than two years overall?

(b) If any boxes are checked “yes,” explain why a preliminary construction assessment is or is not warranted based on the guidance in Chapter 22, “Construction.” It should be noted that the nature and extent of any commitment to use the Best Available Technology for construction equipment or Best Management Practices for construction activities should be considered when making this determination.

See Attachment B

20. APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION

I swear or affirm under oath and subject to the penalties for perjury that the information provided in this Environmental Assessment Statement (EAS) is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief, based upon my personal knowledge and familiarity with the information described herein and after examination of the pertinent books and records and/or after inquiry of persons who have personal knowledge of such information or who have examined pertinent books and records.

Still under oath, I further swear or affirm that I make this statement in my capacity as the applicant or representative of the entity that seeks the permits, approvals, funding, or other governmental action(s) described in this EAS.

APPLICANT/REPRESENTATIVE NAME
Levi Balkany, Happy Living Development

DATE 11/9/2017

SIGNATURE

PLEASE NOTE THAT APPLICANTS MAY BE REQUIRED TO SUBSTANTIATE RESPONSES IN THIS FORM AT THE DISCRETION OF THE LEAD AGENCY SO THAT IT MAY SUPPORT ITS DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE.
**Part III: DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE (To Be Completed by Lead Agency)**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** In completing Part III, the lead agency should consult 6 NYCRR 617.7 and 43 RCNY § 6-06 (Executive Order 91 or 1977, as amended), which contain the State and City criteria for determining significance.

1. For each of the impact categories listed below, consider whether the project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment, taking into account its (a) location; (b) probability of occurring; (c) duration; (d) irreversibility; (e) geographic scope; and (f) magnitude.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT CATEGORY</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Adverse Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Conditions</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities and Services</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadows</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic and Cultural Resources</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Design/Visual Resources</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Sewer Infrastructure</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste and Sanitation Services</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Character</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Are there any aspects of the project relevant to the determination of whether the project may have a significant impact on the environment, such as combined or cumulative impacts, that were not fully covered by other responses and supporting materials?

   If there are such impacts, attach an explanation stating whether, as a result of them, the project may have a significant impact on the environment.

   ![ ]

3. Check determination to be issued by the lead agency:

   - **Positive Declaration:** If the lead agency has determined that the project may have a significant impact on the environment, and if a Conditional Negative Declaration is not appropriate, then the lead agency issues a **Positive Declaration** and prepares a draft Scope of Work for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

   - **Conditional Negative Declaration:** A **Conditional Negative Declaration (CND)** may be appropriate if there is a private applicant for an Unlisted action AND when conditions imposed by the lead agency will modify the proposed project so that no significant adverse environmental impacts would result. The CND is prepared as a separate document and is subject to the requirements of 6 NYCRR Part 617.

   - **Negative Declaration:** If the lead agency has determined that the project would not result in potentially significant adverse environmental impacts, then the lead agency issues a **Negative Declaration**. The **Negative Declaration** may be prepared as a separate document (see [template](#)) or using the embedded Negative Declaration on the next page.

**4. LEAD AGENCY’S CERTIFICATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director, Environmental Review and Assessment Division</td>
<td>Department of City Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert Dobruskin, AICP</td>
<td>11/9/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. INTRODUCTION

The Applicant, Happy Living Development, is seeking the following actions (the “Proposed Actions”) in an effort to facilitate the development of a mixed-use commercial/residential building in the Prospect Heights neighborhood of Brooklyn Community District (CD) 8:

1. A certification by the Chairperson of the City Planning Commission pursuant to Zoning Resolution (“ZR”) Section 63-30 for a FRESH Food store; and
2. An authorization by the City Planning Commission pursuant to Section 63-22 to allow an increase in the maximum building height by 14 feet.

The Proposed Actions would facilitate the development of a nine-story (99-foot tall), approximately 57,884 gross square foot (gsf) mixed-use building at 805 Washington Avenue (the "Proposed Project"). The Proposed Project would include approximately 37 dwelling units (DUs), approximately 7,730 gsf of commercial space to be occupied by a FRESH food store, and approximately 19 accessory parking spaces. The Proposed Project is expected to be constructed, occupied, and fully operational by the end of 2020. However, while the Applicant intends on developing the Proposed Project described above, a more conservative reasonable worst-case development scenario (RWCDS) will be analyzed in this Environmental Assessment Statement (EAS). The RWCDS would include the same amount of square footage as the Proposed Project, however, it includes a greater number of DUs and accessory parking spaces. The RWCDS for the Proposed Actions would comprise a nine-story (99-foot tall), approximately 57,884 gross square foot (gsf) mixed-use building including approximately 50 DUs, approximately 7,730 gsf of commercial space to be occupied by a FRESH food store, and approximately 25 accessory parking spaces.

II. EXISTING CONDITIONS

Development Site

The Development Site measures 7,417 square feet (sf) and is comprised of one tax lot: Brooklyn Block 1180, Lot 6 (see Figure A-1). The site, located in the northwestern corner of Block 1180, has approximately 130 feet of northern frontage along Lincoln Place and approximately 91 feet of western frontage along Washington Avenue. As shown in Figure A-2, the Development Site was formerly occupied by a vacant 5,400 sf commercial building, which the Applicant has recently demolished. Excavation activities are currently occurring at the Development Site and the pile work has been completed.

Surrounding Area

The area surrounding the Development Site is a dense urban setting consisting predominantly of multi-family residential and mixed commercial/residential uses, as well as several public facility/institutional uses (see Figure A-3). Multi-family residential buildings are located to the north, west, and east of the Development Site, while public facility/institutional uses are located to the south and east of the
1. View of project site (Block 1180, Lot 6) looking southeast along Washington Avenue.

2. Looking east down Lincoln Place from Washington Avenue. Project site is located to the right.

3. View of project site (Block 1180, Lot 6) looking southeast along Washington Avenue.
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Development Site. The Brooklyn Museum is located to the south of the Development Site, while two churches and a counseling center are located to the east of the Development Site. Additionally, Eastern Parkway and Dr. Ronald McNair Park are also located directly to the south of the Development Site. Commercial uses are concentrated to the north and south of the Development Site along Washington Avenue, which serves as the main commercial corridor in the surrounding area. In this area, commercial uses are typically local retail establishments located on the ground floors of mixed-use buildings.

The Development Site is well-served by mass transit and is located within close proximity to the Eastern Parkway–Brooklyn Museum station of the IRT number 2 and 3 subway lines. The BK45 bus runs east and west along St. Johns and Sterling Place and the BK48 bus runs north and south along Classon and Franklin Avenues.

Zoning

As shown in Figure A-4, the Development Site is located in a R7A zoning district. R7A zoning districts are widely mapped districts in built-up, medium-density areas of the City, including Prospect Park South and Ocean Parkway in Brooklyn, Jackson Heights in Queens, and Harlem and the East Village in Manhattan. R7A districts are subject to mandatory contextual Quality Housing regulations, which typically produce seven- and eight-story apartment buildings with high lot coverage that are set at or near the street line. Height regulations in R7A districts require a minimum base height of 40 feet and a maximum base height of 65 feet, after which a 10-foot setback is required on a wide street and a 15-foot setback is required on a narrow street. The maximum height limit is 80 feet. However, a building with a qualifying ground-floor commercial use is permitted a maximum base height of 75 feet and a maximum height of 85 feet. The residential FAR in R7A districts is 4.0 and the maximum community facility FAR is 4.0. Off-street parking is required for 50 percent of DUs (or 30 percent if zoning lot is 10,000 sf or less) and may be waived if 15 or fewer spaces are required.

A R8X zoning district is mapped to the west of the Development Site, directly across Washington Avenue. R8X contextual zoning districts are subject to Quality Housing bulk regulations, which permit a higher building height that typically produces 14- to 16-story apartment buildings that replicate the building envelope of older apartment buildings in the Prospect Heights and Park Slope neighborhoods that surround Grand Army Plaza in Brooklyn. Height regulations in R8X districts require a minimum base height of 60 feet and a maximum base height of 85 feet, after which a 10-foot setback is required on a wide street and a 15-foot setback is required on a narrow street. The maximum height limit is 150 feet. However, a building with a qualifying ground-floor commercial use is permitted a maximum base height of 95 feet and a maximum height of 155 feet. The residential FAR in R8X districts is 6.02 and the maximum community facility FAR is 6.02. Off-street parking is required for 40 percent of DUs and may be waived if the zoning lot is 10,000 sf or less, or 15 or fewer spaces are required.

Additionally, a C1-4 commercial overlay is mapped on the Development Site. C1-4 commercial overlays are mapped along streets that serve local retail needs, and are found extensively throughout the city’s medium-density areas. As this overlay is mapped in a R7A district, the maximum commercial FAR for the Development Site is 2.0.

III. THE PROPOSED ACTIONS

The Proposed Project requires two actions: A certification by the Chairperson of the City Planning
Commission pursuant to ZR Section 63-30 for a FRESH Food store; and an authorization by the City Planning Commission pursuant to Section 63-22 to allow an increase in the maximum building height by 14 feet.

Certification for a FRESH Food store

The Applicant is seeking a FRESH food store certification by the Chairperson of the City Planning Commission pursuant to Section 63-30 for a FRESH Food store. A developer seeking to utilize the zoning incentives of the FRESH Program must demonstrate that the primary business of the retail space is the sale of food products. Prior to obtaining a building permit, the proposed store must be certified as a FRESH food store by the CPC, verifying that the store meets the floor area requirements, that the space is legally committed to use as a FRESH food store, and that a grocer has agreed to operate a FRESH food store in the developed space.

The requirements for a FRESH food store are:

- At least 6,000 sf of the store's selling area must be used for a general line of food and other grocery products, such as dairy, canned and frozen foods, fresh fruits and vegetables, fresh and prepared meats, fish and poultry, and non-food products, all intended for home preparation, consumption, and use;
- At least 50 percent of the selling area must be used for the sale of a general line of food products;
- At least 30 percent of such selling area must be set aside for the sale of perishable goods, such as fresh produce, dairy and frozen foods (which may include fresh meats, poultry and fish), of which at least 500 sf must be used for the sale of fresh meat, fruits, and vegetables;
- And a percentage of the ground floor street wall of a FRESH food store must be glazed and transparent, contributing to a more active streetscape. All new security gates on the store front are required to be at least 75 percent transparent.

A mixed-use commercial/residential building would be permitted with one additional square foot of residential floor area for every square foot of a FRESH food store, up to a maximum of 20,000 sf.

Authorization to Modify Maximum Building Height

In seeking a FRESH food store certification from the Chairperson of the City Planning Commission pursuant to ZR Section 63-30, the Applicant is also seeking an increase in the maximum building height by 14 feet, from 85 to 99 feet. Pursuant to ZR Section 63-22, the City Planning Commission may authorize up to a 15 foot height increase in the maximum allowable building height, provided that the Commission finds that the height increase (a) is necessary to accommodate the FRESH food store; (b) will not adversely affect the scale and character of adjacent buildings; and (c) will not unduly obstruct light and air to adjacent properties.

IV. PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTIONS

The Proposed Actions are intended to facilitate a new mixed-use commercial/residential development on the Development Site. The Proposed Project is expected to introduce 37 DUs, approximately 7,730 gsf of commercial space to be occupied by a FRESH food store, and approximately 19 accessory parking spaces.
The vacant Development Site is currently underutilized and does not support any active uses. According to the Applicant, the Proposed Project would help address the need for a full-service supermarket in Prospect Heights, an area of the City currently designated as having a high supermarket need. In addition, the Development Site is suitable for residential development as it would be constructed in a predominantly residential area in close proximity to public transportation and existing public facilities/institutions.

V. ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK

As discussed above, the Development Site would be redeveloped as a result of the Proposed Actions in the future With-Action scenario. The incremental difference between the No-Action and With-Action scenarios is the basis of the impact category analyses of this Environmental Assessment Statement. To determine the No-Action and With-Action scenarios, standard methodologies have been used following the CEQR Technical Manual guidelines employing reasonable assumptions. These methodologies have been used to identify the amount and location of future development, as discussed below.

Future without the Proposed Actions (No-Action Condition)

In the 2020 No-Action condition, it is anticipated that the Applicant would pursue as-of-right development on the Development Site. Under the existing zoning regulations, it is possible to redevelop the Development Site with an eight-story (85-foot tall), approximately 31,147 gsf mixed-use commercial/residential building containing 25 DUs, approximately 6,618 gsf of commercial space, and 13 accessory parking spaces.

Future with the Proposed Actions (With-Action Condition)

In the 2020 With-Action condition, the FRESH food store certification and authorization to allow an increase in the maximum building height would both be approved. With the approved Proposed Actions, a nine-story (99-foot tall), approximately 57,884 gsf mixed-use commercial/residential development containing 37 DUs, approximately 7,730 gsf of commercial space to be occupied by a FRESH food store, and approximately 19 accessory parking spaces would be constructed on the Development Site (see Figure A-5). The accessory parking spaces would be provided in the cellar level of the building and would be accessed by a curb cut at the eastern end of the property along Lincoln Place. In addition to utilizing development rights via the FRESH bonus, the Proposed Project will utilize unused floor to area ratio (FAR) from the adjoining property at 201 Eastern Parkway (Block 1180, Lot 1), which is located on the same zoning lot. Lot 1 is not under the control of the Applicant and will remain under separate ownership. The existing six-story residential building on Lot 1 will remain in the With-Action condition.

While the Applicant intends on developing the Proposed Project described above, a more conservative reasonable worst-case development scenario (RWCDs) will be assumed for analysis purposes. While the Applicant-proposed number of dwelling units would have an average unit size of approximately 1,355 gsf per unit, which would result in 37 DUs, for conservative analysis purposes, the RWCDs assumes 1,000 gsf per unit. This would result in 50 DUs for RWCDs analysis purposes. Therefore, the RWCDs would comprise a nine-story (99-foot tall), approximately 57,884 gross square foot (gsf) mixed-use building including approximately 50 dwelling units (DUs), approximately 7,730 gsf of commercial space to be occupied by a FRESH food store, and approximately 25 accessory parking spaces.
As shown in Table A-1 below, the net increment for analysis would be 25 DUs, 1,112 gsf of commercial space, and 12 accessory parking spaces.

**TABLE A-1: Comparison of Existing, No-Action, and With-Action Conditions on Proposed Development Site**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Condition</th>
<th>No-Action Condition</th>
<th>With-Action Condition</th>
<th>Increment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAND USE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential</strong></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
<td>☑ NO</td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
<td>☑ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If “yes,” specify the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe type of residential structure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Multi-Family Mixed-Use</td>
<td>Multi-Family Mixed-Use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of dwelling units</td>
<td>0 DUs</td>
<td>25 DUs</td>
<td>50 DUs</td>
<td>+ 25 DUs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of low- to moderate-income units</td>
<td>0 DUs</td>
<td>0 DUs</td>
<td>0 DUs</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross floor area (sf)</td>
<td>0 sf</td>
<td>24,529 gsf</td>
<td>50,134 gsf</td>
<td>+25,605 gsf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial</strong></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
<td>☑ NO</td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
<td>☑ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If “yes,” specify the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of use</td>
<td>Retail uses</td>
<td>Retail uses</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross floor area (sf)</td>
<td>6,618 gsf</td>
<td>7,730 gsf</td>
<td>+ 1,112 gsf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manufacturing/Industrial</strong></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
<td>☑ NO</td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
<td>☑ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If “yes,” specify the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of use</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross floor area (sf)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open storage area (sf)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If any unenclosed activities, specify:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Facility</strong></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
<td>☑ NO</td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
<td>☑ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If “yes,” specify the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross floor area (sf)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vacant Land</strong></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
<td>☑ NO</td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
<td>☑ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If “yes,” describe:</td>
<td>Recently demolished buildings</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Land Uses</strong></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
<td>☑ NO</td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
<td>☑ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If “yes,” describe:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARKING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Garages</strong></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
<td>☑ NO</td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
<td>☑ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If “yes,” specify the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of public spaces</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of accessory spaces</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lots</strong></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
<td>☑ NO</td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
<td>☑ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If “yes,” specify the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of public spaces</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of accessory spaces</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZONING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning classification</td>
<td>R7A/C1-4</td>
<td>R7A/C1-4</td>
<td>R7A/C1-4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum amount of floor area that can be developed</td>
<td>Residential: 4.0</td>
<td>Residential: 4.0</td>
<td>Residential: 4.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial: 2.0</td>
<td>Commercial: 2.0</td>
<td>Commercial: 2.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Facility: 4.0</td>
<td>Community Facility: 4.0</td>
<td>Community Facility: 4.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### VI. REQUIRED APPROVALS

Implementation of the Proposed Actions requires the approval of the FRESH authorization which is subject to CEQR. The certification by the Chairperson of the City Planning Commission pursuant to ZR Section 63-30 for a FRESH Food store is not an action subject to CEQR. CEQR is a process by which City agencies review discretionary actions for the purpose of identifying the effects those actions may have on the environment. The CEQR process requires City agencies to assess, disclose, and mitigate to the greatest extent practicable the significant environmental consequences of their decisions to fund, directly undertake, or approve a proposed project. DCP is serving as lead agency for the CEQR review.
I. INTRODUCTION

This Environmental Assessment Statement (EAS) has been prepared in accordance with the guidelines and methodologies presented in the 2014 CEQR Technical Manual. For each technical area, thresholds are defined which, if met or exceeded, require that a detailed technical analysis be undertaken. Using these guidelines, preliminary screening assessments were conducted for the Proposed Actions to determine whether detailed analysis of any technical area may be appropriate. Part II of the EAS Form identifies those technical areas that warrant additional assessment. The technical areas that warranted a “Yes” answer in Part II of the EAS form were Land Use, Zoning, & Public Policy, Shadows, Historic and Cultural Resources, Urban Design & Visual Resources, Neighborhood Character, and Construction. As such, a supplemental screening assessment for each area is provided in this attachment. All remaining technical areas detailed in the CEQR Technical Manual were not deemed to require supplemental screening because they do not trigger initial CEQR thresholds and/or are unlikely to result in significant adverse impacts.

The supplemental screening assessment contained herein identified that a detailed analysis is required in Land Use, Zoning, & Public Policy, Urban Design & Visual Resources, and Noise. Table B-1 identifies for each CEQR technical area whether (a) the potential for impacts can be screened out based on the EAS Form, Part II, Technical Analyses; (b) the potential for impacts can be screened out based on a supplemental screening per the CEQR Technical Manual, (c) or whether a more detailed assessment is required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TECHNICAL AREA</th>
<th>SCREENED OUT PER EAS FORM</th>
<th>SCREENED OUT PER SUPPLEMENTAL SCREENING</th>
<th>DETAILED ANALYSIS REQUIRED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use, Zoning, &amp; Public Policy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Conditions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadows</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic &amp; Cultural Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Design &amp; Visual Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water &amp; Sewer Infrastructure</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste &amp; Sanitation Services</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Character</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As detailed in Attachment A, “Project Description,” the Proposed Actions include a certification by the Chairperson of the City Planning Commission pursuant to ZR Section 63-30 for a FRESH food store and an authorization by the City Planning Commission pursuant to Section 63-22 to allow an increase in the maximum building height by 14 feet. The Proposed Actions would facilitate the development of a nine-story (99-foot tall), approximately 57,884 gross square foot (gsf) mixed-use building at 805 Washington Avenue in the Prospect Heights neighborhood of Brooklyn Community District (CD) 8, introducing 37 dwelling units (DUs), approximately 7,730 gsf of commercial space to be occupied by a FRESH food store, and approximately 19 accessory parking spaces. The Development Site measures 7,417 square feet (sf) and is comprised of one tax lot: Brooklyn Block 1180, Lot 61 (see Figure B-1). The site, located in the northwestern corner of Block 1180, has approximately 130 feet of northern frontage along Lincoln Place and approximately 91 feet of western frontage along Washington Avenue.

While the Applicant intends on developing the Proposed Project described above, a more conservative reasonable worst-case development scenario (RWCDS) will be assumed for analysis purposes. While the Applicant-proposed number of dwelling units would have an average unit size of approximately 1,355 gsf per unit, which would result in 37 DUs, for conservative analysis purposes, the RWCDS assumes 1,000 gsf per unit. This would result in 50 DUs for RWCDS analysis purposes. Therefore, the RWCDS would comprise a nine-story (99-foot tall), approximately 57,884 gross square foot (gsf) mixed-use building including approximately 50 dwelling units (DUs), approximately 7,730 gsf of commercial space to be occupied by a FRESH food store, and approximately 25 accessory parking spaces.

This Proposed Project would, according to the Applicant, help address the need for a full-service supermarket in Prospect Heights, an area of the City currently designated as having a high supermarket need. In addition, the Development Site is suitable for residential development as it would be constructed in a predominantly residential area in close proximity to public transportation and existing public facilities/institutions. The Proposed Project is expected to be constructed, occupied, and fully operational by 2020.

The incremental changes between the No-Action and With-Action scenarios include the addition of 25 DUs and approximately 1,112 gsf of commercial space. These incremental differences are presented below in Table B-2 and serve as the basis for the impact category analyses of this Environmental Assessment Statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>No-Action Scenario</th>
<th>With-Action Scenario</th>
<th>Increment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Market-rate Housing</td>
<td>25 units</td>
<td>50 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Supermarket</td>
<td>6,618 gsf</td>
<td>7,730 gsf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>0 spaces</td>
<td>25 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population/Employment&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>No-Action Scenario</td>
<td>With-Action Scenario</td>
<td>Increment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>59 residents</td>
<td>119 residents</td>
<td>+60 residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td>21 workers</td>
<td>25 workers</td>
<td>+4 workers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
<sup>1</sup> Based on the average household size for Brooklyn CD 8 (2.50 persons per DU), as well as one worker per 25 DUs and three workers per 1,000 sf of commercial space.
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II. SUPPLEMENTAL SCREENING

LAND USE, ZONING, & PUBLIC POLICY

According to CEQR Technical Manual guidelines, a detailed analysis of land use and zoning is appropriate if a proposed action would result in a significant change in land use or would substantially affect regulations or policies governing land use. An assessment of zoning is typically performed in conjunction with a land use analysis when the action would change the zoning on the site or result in the loss of a particular use.

As the Proposed Actions include a zoning certification and authorization for a FRESH food store, a detailed analysis of land use, zoning, and public policy is provided in Attachment C, “Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy.” As discussed in Attachment C, no significant adverse impacts on land use, zoning, or public policy, as defined by the guidelines for determining impact significance set forth in the CEQR Technical Manual, are anticipated in the 2020 future with the Proposed Actions in the primary and secondary study areas. The Proposed Actions would not directly displace any land uses so as to adversely affect surrounding land uses, nor would it generate land uses that would be incompatible with land uses, zoning, or public policy in the secondary study area.

The Proposed Actions would not create land uses or structures that would be incompatible with the underlying zoning, nor would it cause a substantial number of existing structures to become nonconforming. The Proposed Actions would also not result in land uses that conflict with public policies applicable to the primary or secondary study areas. Therefore, the Proposed Actions are not anticipated to result in significant adverse impacts to land use, zoning, or public policies.

SHADOWS

A shadow assessment considers actions that result in new shadows long enough to reach publicly accessible open space resources or sunlight sensitive historic resources (expect 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 Project would have a maximum building height of approximately 99 feet (including rooftop mechanical equipment). As the No-Action condition would result in the development of an as-of-right, 85-foot tall building, the incremental height difference between the With-Action and No-Action conditions is 14 feet. Therefore, a detailed shadows analysis is not warranted.

HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

Historic and cultural 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 on the State and/or
National Register of Historic Places (S/NR); and National Historic Landmarks. An assessment of architectural and archaeological resources is usually needed for projects that are located adjacent to historic or landmark structures, or projects that require in-ground disturbance, unless such disturbance occurs in an area that has already been excavated.

The New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) was consulted regarding historic and cultural resources as they relate to the Proposed Project. As shown in a letter from LPC dated August 15, 2017, there are no historic architectural or archaeological resources associated with the Development Site (see Appendix A for letter).

Although not cited in the letter from LPC, two historic resources are present within 400-feet of the Development Site: Eastern Parkway, a designated national scenic landmark, and the Brooklyn Museum (Block 1183, Lot 26), a designated individual landmark. Eastern Parkway is a wide, multi-lane roadway which features a landscaped promenade for both cyclists and pedestrians and is approximately 120 feet south of the Development Site (see Figure B-1). The Brooklyn Museum was completed in 1894 and designated by LPC as an individual landmark in May 1966. The Museum is also listed on the State/National Register landmark registry. The Proposed Project was assessed to determine (a) whether there would be a physical change to any designated property as a result of the proposed project; (b) whether there would be a physical change to the setting of any designated resource, such as context or visual prominence as a result of the proposed project; and (c) if so, whether the change is likely to diminish the qualities of the resource that make it important.

**Direct (Physical) Impacts**

Historic resources can be directly impacted by physical destruction, demolition, damage, alteration, or neglect of all or part of a historic resource. For example, alterations, such as the addition of a new wing to a historic building or replacement of the resource’s entrance, could result in significant adverse impacts, depending on the design. Direct impacts also include changes to an architectural resource that cause it to become a different visual entity, such as a new location, design, materials, or architectural features.

It should be noted that privately owned properties that are NYCLs or in LPC-designated historic districts are protected under the New York City Landmarks Law, which requires LPC review and approval before any alteration or demolition can occur, regardless of whether the project is publicly or privately funded. Architectural resources that are listed on the S/NR or that have been found eligible for listing are given a measure of protection under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act from the impacts of projects sponsored, assisted, or approved by federal agencies. Although preservation is not mandated, federal agencies must attempt to avoid adverse impacts on such resources through a notice, review, and consultation process. Properties listed on the S/NR are similarly protected against impacts resulting from projects sponsored, assisted, or approved by State agencies under the State Historic Preservation Act. However, private owners of properties eligible for, or even listed on, the S/NR using private funds can alter or demolish their properties without such a review process.

As the Proposed Project is site-specific and not located directly adjacent to Eastern Parkway (approximately 120 feet away) or the Brooklyn Museum (approximately 436 feet away), it would therefore have no direct impacts on any LPC-designated, S/NR-eligible, or S/NR-listed historic resource.
**Indirect (Contextual) Impacts**

Contextual impacts may occur to architectural resources under certain conditions. According to the 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual*, possible impacts to architectural resources may include isolation of the property from, or alteration of, its setting or visual relationships with the streetscape. This includes changes to the resource's visual prominence so that it no longer conforms to the streetscape in terms of height, footprint, or setback; is no longer part of an open setting; or can no longer be seen as part of a significant view corridor.

The Proposed Project would replace a 1-story building that was formerly occupied commercial uses. The 1-story building has been demolished and excavation of the Development Site is currently underway. The Proposed Project would not adversely alter the setting or visual context of any historic resources in the area, nor would it eliminate or screen significant views of any historic resource (see Figures B-2 and B-3). While the proposed building would be slightly taller than the building proposed under the No-Action scenario, this would not be perceived as a substantial difference in surrounding pedestrian views. The proposed building would be built in an area characterized by a variety of building uses, shapes, and forms. Additionally, no incompatible visual, audible, or atmospheric elements would be introduced by the Proposed Project to any historic resource’s setting. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse impacts to distinguishing characteristics or to the visual context of Eastern Parkway and the Brooklyn Museum.

**Construction-Related Impacts**

Any new construction taking place within historic districts or adjacent to individual landmarks has the potential to cause damage to contributing buildings to those historic resources from ground-borne construction vibrations. As noted above, there are two historic resources located within 400 feet of the Development Site.

The New York City Building Code provides some measures of protection for all properties against accidental damage from adjacent construction by requiring that all buildings, lots, and service facilities adjacent to foundation and earthwork areas be protected and supported. Additional protective measures apply to LPC-designated Landmarks and S/NR-listed historic buildings located within 90 linear feet of a proposed construction site. For these structures, the NYC Department of Buildings (DOB)'s Technical Policy and Procedure Notice (TPPN) #10/88 applies. TPPN #10/88 supplements the standard building protections afforded by the Building Code by requiring, among other things, a monitoring program to reduce the likelihood of construction damage to adjacent LPC-designated or S/NR-listed resources (within 90 feet) and to detect at an early stage the beginnings of damage so that construction procedures can be changed.

Adjacent historic resources, as defined in the procedure notice, only include designated NYCLs, properties within NYCL historic districts, and listed S/NR properties that are within 90 feet of a lot under development or alteration. They do not include S/NR-eligible, NYCL-eligible, potential, or unidentified architectural resources. Construction period impacts on any designated historic resources would be minimized, and the historic structures would be protected, by ensuring that adjacent development projected as a result of the proposed project adheres to all applicable construction guidelines and follows the requirements laid out in TPPN #10/88. As the Development Site is located approximately 120 feet north of Eastern Parkway and 436 feet north of the Brooklyn Museum, construction damage to these resources are not anticipated. As such, no construction-related impacts on historic resources would be anticipated as a result of the Proposed Project.
Shadows

The Proposed Project would not result in shadows being cast on sunlight-sensitive features of historic resources within an approximate 400-foot radius of the Development Site. As such, no significant adverse shadows impacts to historic architectural resources are anticipated in the future with the Proposed Project.

URBAN DESIGN & VISUAL RESOURCES

An area’s urban design components and visual resources together define the look and character of the neighborhood. The urban design characteristics of the neighborhood encompass the various components of buildings and streets in the area, including 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 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 action 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.

As the Proposed Actions includes a zoning authorization that would change the permitted bulk allowed on the development site, a preliminary urban design analysis is required and is provided in Attachment D, “Urban Design and Visual Resources.” As discussed therein, the Proposed Project would replace a site currently vacant and being demolished, enlivening the streetscape and serving as an extension of the residential and community-oriented uses in the surrounding area. The Proposed Project would fill an existing void by replacing existing underutilized land with active pedestrian-oriented uses that would complement those found in the primary and secondary study areas. In addition, the Proposed Project would not alter views of study area visual resources. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts on urban design and visual resources.

AIR QUALITY

According to the guidelines provided in the 2014 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 2014 CEQR Technical Manual, an air quality assessment should be carried out for actions that can result in either significant adverse mobile source or stationary source air quality impacts. Per the EAS Form, further analysis of air quality mobile sources from action-generated vehicle trips has been screened out in accordance with 2014 CEQR Technical Manual assessment screening thresholds.
Stationary source impacts could occur with actions that create new stationary sources or pollutants, such as emission stacks for industrial plants, hospitals, or other large institutional uses, or a building’s boiler stacks used for heating/hot water, ventilation, and air conditioning (“HVAC”) systems, that can affect surrounding uses. Impacts from boiler emissions associated with a development are a function of fuel type, stack height, minimum distance of the stack on the source building to the closest building of similar or greater height, building use, and the square footage size of the source building. In addition, stationary source impacts can occur when new uses are added near existing or planned emissions stacks, or when new structures are added near such stacks and those structures change the dispersion of emissions from the stacks so that they affect surrounding uses.

A review of existing land uses near the proposed rezoning area via OASIS application and Google imaging did not find any existing “major” or large combustion sources, such as power plants, cogeneration facilities, etc., located within 1,000 feet of the proposed rezoning area were identified. As such, no analysis was warranted.

The Proposed Project would utilize mini-split systems for the residential units for heating and cooling and natural gas for commercial HVAC system. As such, a HVAC screening was conducted for the Proposed Project (see Figure B-4). The closest building of equal or greater height is a 15-story residential building located at 135 Eastern Parkway, approximately 350 feet away.

The CEQR Technical Manual Stationary Source Screen graph (Figure B-4–HVAC Screening) was used for the analysis assuming a 350-foot distance and using the 100-foot stack height curve, since the proposed building would be approximately 99’ in height (plus 3’ for the stack). As shown on the attached screen from the CEQR Technical Manual (Figure 17-8, as it is known in the Air Quality Appendix of the CEQR Technical Manual), the plotted point is below the curve and no stationary source impacts would be generated by the Proposed Project. Therefore, the potential for significant adverse impacts due to boiler stack emissions from the Proposed Project is unlikely, and a detailed analysis of stationary source impacts is not required.

NOISE

The Proposed Actions would result in additional residential floor area currently not permitted as-of-right on the Development Site. Consistent with the 2014 CEQR Technical Manual, existing noise levels should be measured and compared to the Noise Exposure Guidelines for these types of uses presented in Table 19-2 of the CEQR Technical Manual. As such, a noise analysis has been prepared and is provided in Attachment E, “Noise.” As discussed in detail Attachment E, the noise analysis determined that the development site would require an (E) designation that would specify the required noise attenuation measures for the western facade of the proposed building. As discussed in Attachment E, the Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse noise impacts.

The proposed development would not generate sufficient traffic to result in a significant noise impact (i.e., doubling of Noise PCEs). Therefore, consistent with the guidelines of the 2014 CEQR Technical Manual, an assessment of mobile noise impacts is not provided in this EAS.
NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

As the Proposed Actions required detailed analyses of Land Use, Zoning, & Public Policy and Urban Design & Visual Resources, a supplemental screening analysis is necessary to determine if a detailed neighborhood character analysis is warranted.

The Proposed Actions would not adversely affect any component of the surrounding area’s neighborhood character. The Proposed Actions would facilitate the redevelopment of an underbuilt lot into a productive residential and commercial development by 2020. The Proposed Actions are not expected to result in any significant adverse impacts to Land Use, Zoning, & Public Policy and Urban Design & Visual Resources. Therefore, the Proposed Actions and the resultant Proposed Project would not result in a significant adverse impact to neighborhood character.

CONSTRUCTION

Although temporary, construction impacts can include noticeable and disruptive effects from an action that is associated with construction or could induce construction. Determination of the significance of construction impacts and the need for mitigation is generally based on the duration and magnitude of the impacts. Construction impacts are usually important when construction activity could affect traffic conditions, archaeological resources, the integrity of historic resources, community noise patterns, and air quality conditions.

While short-term construction (less than 24 months) would occur on the Proposed Project within the same geographic area, the existing adjacent roadways and sidewalks would only be temporarily affected and construction of the Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse transportation impacts. Construction activity on the Project Site may also involve the operation of several pieces of diesel equipment or machinery during peak construction of the Proposed Project. However, through adherence to relevant guidelines and regulations including the New York City Noise Control Code and New York City Air Pollution Control Code, development facilitated by the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse construction-related noise or air quality impacts. Therefore, the Proposed Project is not expected to result in significant adverse construction-related impacts and no further analysis is warranted.
I. INTRODUCTION

This attachment examines the Proposed Actions’ compatibility and consistency with land use patterns in the surrounding area, ongoing development trends, and land use and zoning policies, as well as other public policies. This analysis has defined a study area within which the Proposed Actions would have the potential to affect land use or land use trends. Following guidance provided in the 2014 CEQR Technical Manual, this study area encompasses an approximate 400-foot radius surrounding the Development Site (Block 1180, Lot 6) in the Prospect Heights neighborhood of Brooklyn Community District (CD) 8. The land use study area boundary generally extends to lots fronting St. John’s Place to the north, lots fronting Eastern Parkway to the south, lots fronting Classon Avenue to the east, and lots fronting Lincoln Place to the west (refer to Figure C-1).

As described in Attachment A, “Project Description,” the Applicant is seeking the following two actions in an effort to facilitate the development of a mixed-use commercial/residential building at 805 Washington Avenue:

1. A certification by the Chairperson of the City Planning Commission pursuant to Zoning Resolution (“ZR”) Section 63-30 for a FRESH food store; and

2. An authorization by the City Planning Commission pursuant to Section 63-22 to allow an increase in the maximum building height by 14 feet.

As detailed in Attachment A, the Proposed Actions would facilitate the development of a nine-story (99’), approximately 57,844 gross square foot (gsf) mixed-use building. The Proposed Project would include 37 dwelling units (DUs), approximately 7,730 gsf of commercial space to be occupied by a FRESH food store, and approximately 19 accessory parking spaces. The Proposed Project is expected to be constructed, occupied, and fully operational by the end of 2020.

While the Applicant intends on developing the Proposed Project described above, a more conservative reasonable worst-case development scenario (RWCDS) will be assumed for analysis purposes. While the Applicant-proposed number of dwelling units would have an average unit size of approximately 1,355 gsf per unit, which would result in 37 DUs, for conservative analysis purposes, the RWCDS assumes 1,000 gsf per unit. This would result in 50 DUs for RWCDS analysis purposes. Therefore, the RWCDS would comprise a nine-story (99-foot tall), approximately 57,884 gross square foot (gsf) mixed-use building including approximately 50 dwelling units (DUs), approximately 7,730 gsf of commercial space to be occupied by a FRESH food store, and approximately 25 accessory parking spaces.

The application of CEQR screening thresholds and detailed analyses is based on the incremental development of the RWCDS for the Proposed Actions.
Figure C-1
Land Use Map

Legend

- 400-Foot Radius
- Development Site
- Development Rights Transfer Parcel
- One & Two Family Buildings
- Multi-Family Walkup Buildings
- Multi-Family Elevator Buildings
- Mixed Commercial/Residential Buildings
- Commercial/Office Buildings
- Industrial/Manufacturing
- Transportation/Utility
- Public Facilities & Institutions
- Open Space
- Parking Facilities
- Vacant Land
- All Others or No Data

Source: NYC
dCP 2016, DoITT
II. PRINCIPAL CONCLUSIONS

The assessment provided in this attachment concludes that the Proposed Actions would be compatible with and support land use, zoning, and public policies in the study area. No significant adverse impacts on land use, zoning, or public policy, as defined by the guidelines for determining impact significant set forth in the CEQR Technical Manual, are anticipated in the 2020 future with the Proposed Actions on both the primary and secondary study areas. The Proposed Actions would not directly displace any land uses so as to adversely affect surrounding land uses, nor would it generate land uses that would be incompatible with land uses, zoning, or public policy in the secondary study area. The Proposed Actions would not create land uses or structures that would be incompatible with the underlying zoning, nor would it cause a substantial number of existing structures to become nonconforming. The Proposed Actions would not result in land uses that conflict with public policies applicable to the primary or secondary study areas.

III. METHODOLOGY

Land use, zoning, and public policy are addressed and analyzed for two geographical areas for the Proposed Actions. For the purpose of this assessment, the primary study area encompasses the Development Site, which is located at the northeastern corner of Lincoln Place and Washington Avenue. The secondary study area encompasses areas that have the potential to experience indirect impacts as a result of the Proposed Actions. The secondary study area extends an approximate 400-foot radius from the boundary of the primary study area, which extends to lots fronting St. John’s Place to the north, Eastern Parkway and the Brooklyn Museum to the south, lots fronting Classon Avenue to the east, and lots fronting Lincoln Place to the west. Both the primary and secondary study areas have been established in accordance with CEQR Technical Manual guidelines and are presented in Figure C-1.

The analysis of land use, zoning, and public policy first provides a description of the existing land use, zoning, and public policy conditions in the study areas. Existing land uses in the primary and secondary study area were determined based on the 2016 New York City Primary Land Use Tax Lot Output (PLUTO) data files and July 2017 field visits. New York City Zoning and Land Use (ZoLa), New York City zoning maps, and the Zoning Resolution of the City of New York were consulted to describe existing zoning districts in the study areas. Relevant documented public policies recognized by the New York City Department of City Planning (DCP) and other City agencies were utilized to describe existing public policies pertaining to the primary and secondary study areas.

Next, the analysis projects land use, zoning, and public policy conditions in the 2020 build year without the Proposed Actions. This is the “No-Action” or “future without the Proposed Actions” condition, which is developed by identifying proposed developments and other relevant changes anticipated to occur in the primary and secondary study areas within this time frame. The No-Action condition describes the baseline conditions in the study areas against which the Proposed Actions’ incremental changes are measured. Finally, the analysis projects land use, zoning, and public policy conditions in 2020 with the completion of the Proposed Project. This is the “With-Action” or “future with the Proposed Actions” condition.
IV. PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT

Land Use & Zoning

A preliminary assessment, which includes a basic description of existing and future land uses and zoning, should be provided for all projects that would affect land use or would change the zoning on a site, regardless of the project’s anticipated effects. However, under CEQR Technical Manual guidelines, if a detailed assessment is required in the technical areas of socioeconomic conditions, neighborhood character, transportation, air quality, noise, infrastructure, or hazardous materials, a detailed land use assessment is appropriate. This EAS provides a detailed assessment of urban design and visual resources, so a detailed assessment of land use and zoning is warranted and provided in Section V below.

Public Policy

According to the CEQR Technical Manual, a project that would be located within areas governed by public policies controlling land use, or that has the potential to substantially affect land use regulation or policy controlling land use, requires an analysis of public policy. A preliminary assessment of public policy should identify and describe any public policies, including formal plans or published reports that pertain to the study areas. If the Proposed Actions could potentially alter or conflict with identified policies, a detailed assessment should be conducted; otherwise, no further analysis of public policy is necessary.

A number of adopted City policies are applicable to the primary and secondary study areas, including One New York: The Plan for a Strong and Just City and New York City Food Retail Expansion to Support Health Program (FRESH). There are no 197-a plans or designated in-place industrial parks governing the secondary study area, nor does the secondary study area fall within the coastal zone boundary. There are no additional applicable public policies within the study areas.

V. DETAILED ASSESSMENT

Existing Conditions

Development Site

Land Use

The Applicant-owned Development Site (Block 1180, Lot 6) encompasses approximately 7,417 sf of lot area in the Prospect Heights neighborhood of Brooklyn CD 8. The site is located in the northwestern corner of Block 1180 and has approximately 130 feet of northern frontage along Lincoln Place and approximately 91 feet of western frontage along Washington Avenue. The Development Site was formerly occupied by a vacant 5,400 sf 1-story commercial building, which the Applicant has recently demolished. Excavation activities are currently occurring at the Development Site and the pile work has been completed.
Zoning

The Development Site is located in an R7A zoning district, which is a widely mapped district in built-up, medium-density areas. The residential FAR in R7A districts is 4.0, and the maximum community facility FAR is 4.0. Commercial uses are not permitted as of right in R7A districts, however, there is a C1-4 commercial overlay mapped on the Development Site, which permits a maximum commercial FAR of 2.0. Off-street parking is required for 50 percent of DUs.

Public Policy

As indicated above, there are several public policies that apply to the Development Site. Each of the applicable public policies are described below.

One New York: The Plan for a Strong and Just City

In April 2015, Mayor Bill de Blasio released “One New York: The Plan for a Strong and Just City” (OneNYC), a comprehensive plan for a sustainable and resilient city for all New Yorkers that speaks to the profound social, economic, and environmental challenges facing the City of New York. OneNYC is the update to the sustainability plan for the City started under the Bloomberg administration, previously known as “PlaNYC 2030: A Greener, Greater New York.” Growth, sustainability, and resiliency remain at the core of OneNYC, but with the poverty rate remaining high and income inequality continuing to grow, the de Blasio administration added equity as a guiding principle throughout the plan. In addition to the focuses of population growth; aging infrastructure; and global climate change, OneNYC brings new attention to ensuring the voices of all New Yorkers are heard and to cooperating and coordinating with regional counterparts. Since the 2011 and 2013 updates of PlaNYC, the City has made considerable progress towards reaching original goals and completing initiatives. OneNYC includes updates on the progress towards the 2011 sustainability initiatives and 2013 resiliency initiatives and also sets additional goals and outlines new initiatives under the organization of four visions: growth, equity, resiliency, and sustainability.

Goals of the plan are to make New York City:

- A growing, thriving city by fostering industry expansion and cultivation, promoting job growth, creating and preserving affordable housing, supporting the development of vibrant neighborhoods, increasing investment in job training, expanding high-speed wireless networks, and investing in infrastructure.
- A just and equitable city by raising the minimum wage, expanding early childhood education, improving health outcomes, making streets safer, and improving access to government services.
- A sustainable city by reducing greenhouse gas emissions, diverting organics from landfills to attain zero waste, remediating contaminated land, and improving access to parks.
- A resilient city by making buildings more energy efficient, making infrastructure more adaptable and resilient, and strengthening coastal defenses.

---

1 May be increased up to 20 percent when utilizing the Inclusionary Housing Program bonus.
2 30 percent if zoning lot is 10,000 sf or less; waived if 15 or fewer spaces required.
The Proposed Actions would support OneNYC initiatives by constructing new multi-family housing, as well as commercial uses, on underbuilt land that is in close proximity to public transit, promoting transit use as well as walkability in the secondary study area. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not conflict with this public policy.

**New York City Food Retail Expansion to Support Health Program (FRESH)**

The FRESH program provides zoning and discretionary tax incentives to promote the establishment and retention of neighborhood grocery stores in communities throughout the five boroughs that lack full-line grocery stores. A developer seeking to utilize the zoning incentives of the FRESH Program must demonstrate that the primary business of the retail space is the sale of food products. Prior to obtaining a building permit, the proposed store must be certified as a FRESH food store by the CPC, verifying that the store meets the floor area requirements, that the space is legally committed to be utilized as a FRESH food store, and that a grocer has agreed to operate a FRESH food store in the developed space.

The requirements for a FRESH food store are:

- At least 6,000 sf of the store’s selling area must be used for a general line of food and other grocery products, such as dairy, canned and frozen foods, fresh fruits and vegetables, fresh and prepared meats, fish and poultry, and non-food products, all intended for home preparation, consumption and use;
- At least 50 percent of the selling area must be used for the sale of a general line of food products;
- At least 30 percent of such selling area must be set aside for the sale of perishable goods, such as fresh produce, dairy and frozen foods (which may include fresh meats, poultry and fish), of which at least 500 sf must be used for the sale of fresh meat, fruits and vegetables;
- And a percentage of the ground floor street wall of a FRESH food store must be glazed and transparent, contributing to a more active streetscape. All new security gates on the store front are required to be at least 75 percent transparent.

A mixed-use commercial/residential building would be permitted with one additional square foot of residential floor area for every square foot of a FRESH food store, up to a maximum of 20,000 sf. Both the primary and secondary study areas are located within a FRESH designated area. As the Proposed Actions would include a certified FRESH food store, the Proposed Actions would be consistent with this public policy.

**Secondary Study Area**

**Land Use**

The secondary study area for land use encompasses the area within approximately 400 feet of the Development Site. As shown in in **Figure C-1**, the secondary study area is generally bounded by lots fronting St. John’s Place to the north, lots fronting Eastern Parkway to the south, lots fronting Classon Avenue to the east, and lots fronting Lincoln Place to the west.

---

3 Includes tax lots which have 50 percent or more of their area within a 400-foot radius of the Development Site.
As shown in Table C-1 below, the secondary study area is predominantly comprised of residential and mixed-use commercial/residential buildings (approximately 72.1 and 26.8 percent of built gsf in the secondary study area, respectively), as well as several public facilities and institutions (approximately 1.1 percent of built gsf in the secondary study area). The secondary study area also contains several parcels of vacant land (approximately 6.0 percent of lot area sf). There are no commercial/office, industrial/manufacturing, transportation/utility, open space, and parking uses within the secondary study area.

Table C-1: Existing Land Uses with the Secondary Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Lot Area (sf)</th>
<th>% of Total Land Area</th>
<th>Built Area (gsf)</th>
<th>% of Total Built Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential One &amp; Two Family</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Multi-Family Walk-Up</td>
<td>82,550</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>213,044</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Multi-Family Elevator</td>
<td>125,954</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>369,677</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Total</td>
<td>202,504</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>582,721</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Residential &amp; Commercial</td>
<td>80,002</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>216,158</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial &amp; Office</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial &amp; Manufacturing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation &amp; Utility</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Facilities &amp; Institutions</td>
<td>8,299</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>8,911</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Facilities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>18,422</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>309,227</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>807,790</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Total lot areas and built areas included for all lots which have 50 percent or more of their area within a 400-foot radius of the Development Site (refer to Figure C-1).

As detailed in Table C-1, the predominantly residential secondary study area has a large amount of multi-family elevator buildings (approximately 45.8 percent of built gsf), which are primarily present in the northern (Block 1177 along St. John’s Place) and western (Block 1179 along Eastern Parkway) portions of the secondary study area (refer to Figure C-1). Other residential uses are predominantly smaller multi-family walk-up buildings dispersed throughout the secondary study area (refer to Figure C-1).

As shown in Table C-1, the secondary study area also contains a significant amount of mixed-use commercial/residential buildings (approximately 26.8 percent of built gsf), the majority of which are located along Washington Avenue, which serves as the main commercial corridor in the secondary study area. In these two-, three-, and four-story mixed-use buildings, commercial uses are typically local retail establishments located on the ground floors below residential uses.

Several public facilities and institutions (approximately 1.1 percent of built gsf and 2.7 percent of lot area sf) are also located within the secondary study area, and include one church and a community counseling center. The New Testament Church of God is located to the east of the Development Site at 836 Classon Avenue (Block 1177, Lot 38), and the Community Counseling and Mediation Center is located east of the Development Site at 810 Classon Avenue (Block 1177, Lot 31).
There are also four vacant lots located in the secondary study area, including the Development Site, which comprise six percent of the total lot area. These lots are all located along Washington Avenue and are in various stages of redevelopment. In the northern portion of the secondary study area, a five-story mixed-use commercial/residential building with eight DUs is being constructed at 816 Washington Avenue (Block 1176, Lot 90). At 856 Washington Avenue, directly west of the Development Site, a 14-story residential building with 26 DUs is being constructed (Block 1179, Lot 105). At 807 Washington Avenue, adjacent to the Development Site, a seven-story residential building with seven DUs is being constructed (Block 1180, Lot 5).

**Zoning**

Within the 400-foot study area, there has been one recent change to zoning. A majority of the eastern portion of the secondary study area, including a majority of lots on Blocks 1177 and 1180, was included in the Crown Heights West Rezoning. This rezoning was adopted in the fall of 2013 and incorporated several zoning changes to a large, 55-block area of western Crown Heights. As shown in Figure C-2, the area is predominantly mapped in a R7A zoning district, although a R8X zoning district is mapped in the western portion of the secondary study area along Eastern Parkway. A C1-4 commercial overlay is also mapped along Washington Avenue. A description of each zoning district within the secondary study area is provided in Table C-2 below.

**Table C-2: Existing Zoning with the Secondary Study Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Building Type</th>
<th>Permitted Use Groups</th>
<th>Maximum FAR (^1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>Medium-Density Residential</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>R: 3.0(^2) CF: 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7A</td>
<td>Medium-Density Apartment</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>R: 4.0 to 4.6(^2) CF: 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8X</td>
<td>Medium-Density Apartment</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>R: 6.02 CF: 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1-4 (overlay)</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Commercial and Residential Buildings; below residential uses</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>R &amp; CF: Same as underlying R district; C: 2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

\(^1\) R = residential; C = commercial; CF = community facility.

\(^2\) On a wide street outside of the Manhattan Core. Can be increased up to 20 percent when utilizing the Inclusionary Housing Program.

**Public Policy**

The public policies that apply to the Development Site also apply to the secondary study area. There are no additional public policies that apply to the secondary study area that do not apply to the Development Site.
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Future without the Proposed Actions (No-Action Condition)

Development Site

Land Use

In the future without the Proposed Actions, it is anticipated that the Applicant would pursue as-of-right development on the Development Site. Under the existing zoning regulations, it is possible to redevelop the Development Site with an eight-story (85-foot tall), approximately 31,147 gsf mixed-use commercial/residential building containing 25 DUs, approximately 6,618 gsf of commercial space, and 13 accessory parking spaces.

Zoning

The existing R7A/C1-4 zoning designation for the Development Site would remain in place in the 2020 No-Action condition.

Public Policy

No changes are anticipated to the existing public policies under the 2020 No-Action condition.

Secondary Study Area

Land Use

In the 2020 No-Action condition, it is assumed that land uses within the secondary study area would continue to be dominated by residential and mixed-use commercial/residential uses. However, three known development projects within the secondary study area are anticipated to be completed by the analysis year of 2020. These three development projects are described in Table C-3 and their locations are mapped in Figure C-3.

Zoning

There are no known or anticipated proposals to alter zoning in the secondary study area in the 2020 No-Action condition. As such, the existing zoning designations would remain in place.

Public Policy

No changes are anticipated to the existing public policies under the 2020 No-Action condition.

Table C-3: No-Action Developments Planned for Completion by 2020 within Secondary Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Total DU</th>
<th>Other Uses</th>
<th>Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>816 Washington Ave.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3,135 gsf of commercial</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>856 Washington Ave.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>807 Washington Ave.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>98</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future with the Proposed Actions (With-Action Condition)

Development Site

Land Use

In the future with the Proposed Actions, the Development Site would be redeveloped. As described in Attachment A, “Project Description,” the Proposed Actions would facilitate the construction of a nine-story (99’), approximately 57,844 gross square foot (gsf) mixed-use commercial/residential building. The proposed building would include 37 DUs (approximately 50,153 gsf of residential space), approximately 7,730 gsf of commercial space to be occupied by a FRESH food store, and 19 accessory parking spaces (approximately 13,174 gsf of parking area in the sub-cellar level.

While the Applicant intends on developing the Proposed Project described above, a more conservative reasonable worst-case development scenario (RWCDS) will be assumed for analysis purposes. While the Applicant-proposed number of dwelling units would have an average unit size of approximately 1,355 gsf per unit, which would result in 37 DUs, for conservative analysis purposes, the RWCDS assumes 1,000 gsf per unit. This would result in 50 DUs for RWCDS analysis purposes. Therefore, the RWCDS would comprise a nine-story (99-foot tall), approximately 57,884 gross square foot (gsf) mixed-use building including approximately 50 dwelling units (DUs), approximately 7,730 gsf of commercial space to be occupied by a FRESH food store, and approximately 25 accessory parking spaces.

The Proposed Project would be compatible with adjacent land uses, which feature a mix of residential buildings and mixed-use commercial/residential buildings. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse land use impacts on the Development Site.

Zoning

The existing R7A zoning designation for the Development Site would remain in place under the 2020 With-Action condition.

Public Policy

No significant adverse public policy impacts are expected to result from the Proposed Actions. The Proposed Actions would introduce a new FRESH food store onto the Development Site, which would be consistent with the goals of the New York City Food Retail Expansion to Support Health Program (FRESH).

Secondary Study Area

Land Use

The secondary study area would not undergo any changes as a result of the Proposed Actions, as the Proposed Actions would have no direct effect on land uses in the secondary study area. As noted above, the secondary study area is primarily comprised of residential and mixed-use commercial/residential uses. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not introduce a new land use that would be incompatible with
surrounding land uses, and no significant adverse land use impacts are expected in the secondary study area.

Zoning

There are no known or anticipated proposals to alter zoning in the secondary study area in the 2020 With-Action condition. As such, the existing zoning designations would remain in place.

Public Policy

No changes are anticipated to the existing public policies under the 2020 With-Action condition. Additionally, no new public policies are anticipated to be enacted within the secondary study area that would have consequences for the Proposed Project.
I. INTRODUCTION

The City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manual states that the urban design components and visual resources determine the “look” of a neighborhood—its physical appearance, including the street pattern, the size and shape of buildings, their arrangement on blocks, streetscape features, natural resources, and noteworthy views that may give an area a distinctive character. Pursuant to CEQR methodology, actions that would allow a project to potentially obstruct view corridors, compete with icons in the skyline, or make substantial alterations to the streetscape of a neighborhood by noticeably changing the scale of buildings may warrant a detailed urban design and visual resources analysis. The Proposed Actions include: (i) a certification by the Chairperson of the City Planning Commission pursuant to ZR Section 63-30 for a FRESH Food Store; and, (ii) an authorization by the City Planning Commission pursuant to Section 63-22 to allow an increase in the maximum building height by 14 feet. The Proposed Actions would result in a development that would differ from what is permitted as-of-right, and as such, an analysis of urban design and visual resources is appropriate.

As discussed in Attachment A, “Project Description,” the Applicant is proposing to redevelop the Development Site with a nine-story, approximately 57,884 gross square foot (gsf) mixed-use commercial/residential building at 805 Washington Avenue (the “Proposed Project”). The Proposed Project would include approximately 37 dwelling units (DUs) and approximately 7,730 gsf of commercial space to be occupied by a FRESH food store. The Proposed Project would also include approximately 19 accessory parking spaces which would be accessible via a curb cut on Lincoln Place. In addition to utilizing development rights via the FRESH bonus, the Proposed Project will utilize unused floor to area ratio (FAR) from the adjoining property at 201 Eastern Parkway (Block 1180, Lot 1), which is located on the same zoning lot. Lot 1 is not under the control of the Applicant and will remain under separate ownership. The existing six-story residential building on Lot 1 will remain in the With-Action condition.

While the Applicant intends on developing the Proposed Project described above, a more conservative reasonable worst-case development scenario (RWCDS) will be assumed for analysis purposes. While the Applicant-proposed number of dwelling units would have an average unit size of approximately 1,355 gsf per unit, which would result in 37 DUs, for conservative analysis purposes, the RWCDS assumes 1,000 gsf per unit. This would result in 50 DUs for RWCDS analysis purposes. Therefore, the RWCDS would comprise a nine-story (99-foot tall), approximately 57,884 gross square foot (gsf) mixed-use building including approximately 50 dwelling units (DUs), approximately 7,730 gsf of commercial space to be occupied by a FRESH food store, and approximately 25 accessory parking spaces.

In the future without the Proposed Actions (the No-Action scenario), it is anticipated that the Applicant would pursue as-of-right development on the Development Site. Under the existing zoning regulations, it is possible to redevelop the Development Site with an eight-story (85-foot tall), approximately 31,147 gsf mixed-use commercial/residential building containing 25 DUs, approximately 6,618 gsf of commercial space, and 13 accessory parking spaces. As the RWCDS would result in a larger development than the No-Action scenario, the RWCDS is analyzed for potential urban design and visual resources impacts for conservative analysis purposes.
This attachment considers the potential for the Proposed Actions to affect the urban design characteristics and visual resources of the Development Site and the surrounding secondary study area. As described in Attachment A, “Project Description,” the Development Site is comprised of one tax lot (Lot 6) on the northwestern corner of Brooklyn Block 1180 in the Prospect Heights neighborhood of Brooklyn Community District (CD) 8 (see Figures D-1 and D-2). The technical analysis presented below follows the guidelines of the CEQR Technical Manual and addresses each of the above-listed characteristics for existing conditions, the future without the Proposed Actions (the No-Action scenario), and the future with the Proposed Actions (the With-Action scenario) for a 2020 Build Year.

II. PRINCIPAL CONCLUSIONS

Urban Design

The proposed authorization to allow an increase in the maximum building height by 14 feet, which is necessary to accommodate the proposed FRESH food store, would allow a development that differs from what is permitted as-of-right. However, development facilitated by the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts on urban design as defined by the guidelines for determining impact significance set forth in the 2014 CEQR Technical Manual. In the future with the Proposed Actions, the visual appearance on the Development Site would not be noticeably different as compared to the No-Action condition and thus the pedestrian experience of the Development Site would not be noticeably altered. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not meet the CEQR Technical Manual threshold for a significant adverse urban design impact in that the Proposed Actions would not alter the arrangement, appearance, or functionality of the Development Site such that the alteration would negatively affect a pedestrian’s experience of the area.

Visual Resources

There are two visual resources that can be seen from the Development Site: Eastern Parkway, a designated national scenic landmark, and the Brooklyn Museum, a designated individual landmark, are located to the south of the Development Site. The Proposed Project under the With-Action scenario would not obstruct or eliminate any public views or affect any existing view corridors or views to these visual resources. As such, the Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse impacts to visual resources.

III. METHODOLOGY

In accordance with the CEQR Technical Manual, this analysis considers the effects of the Proposed Project on the following elements that collectively form an area’s urban design:

- **Street Pattern and Streetscape**—the arrangement and orientation of streets define location, flow of activity, and street views and create blocks on which buildings and open spaces are arranged. Other elements including sidewalks, plantings, street lights, curb cuts, and street furniture also contribute to an area’s streetscape.
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• **Buildings**—building size, shape, pedestrian and vehicular entrances, lot coverage, and orientation to the street are important urban design components that define the appearance of the built environment.

• **Open Space**—open space includes public and private areas that do not include structures, including parks and other landscaped areas, cemeteries, and parking lots.

• **Natural features**—natural features include vegetation and geologic and aquatic features that are natural to the area.

• **View Corridors and Visual Resources**—visual resources include significant natural or built features, including important view corridors, public parks, landmark structures or districts, or otherwise distinct buildings.

• **Wind**—Channelized wind pressure from between tall buildings and downwashed wind pressure from parallel tall buildings may cause winds that may jeopardize pedestrian safety.

In general, an assessment of urban design is needed when a project may have effects on one or more of the elements that contribute to the pedestrian experience, described above. As the Proposed Actions could result in physical changes to the Development Site beyond the bulk, form, and height currently permitted as-of-right, they have the potential to result in development that could alter the arrangement, appearance, and functionality of the built environment and, therefore, change the experience of a pedestrian in the project area. The following urban design analysis follows the guidelines of the **CEQR Technical Manual**.

Per criteria of Section 230 of the **CEQR Technical Manual**, a wind condition analysis is not warranted for the Proposed Actions. The Development Site is not located in a high wind location, such as directly along the waterfront, nor is it in a location where wind conditions from the waterfront are not attenuated by buildings or natural features.

**Study Area**

The urban design study area consists of both a primary study area, where the urban design effects of the Proposed Actions are direct, and a secondary study area (refer to Figures D-1 and D-2). For the purpose of this assessment, the primary study area consists of the Development Site. The secondary study area extends approximately 400-feet from the boundary of the Development Site and encompasses areas that have the potential to experience indirect impacts as a result of the Proposed Actions. It is generally bounded by St. John’s Place to the north, Eastern Parkway to the south, Classon Avenue to the east, and Lincoln Place to the west. Both the primary and secondary study areas have been established in accordance with **CEQR Technical Manual** guidelines.

The analysis of urban design and visual resources is based on July 2017 field visits, photography, and computer imaging of the Development Site and the surrounding 400-foot study area.

**IV. PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT**

Pursuant to CEQR, a preliminary assessment of urban design is appropriate when there is the potential for a pedestrian to observe from the street level a physical alteration beyond that allowed by existing zoning. CEQR further stipulates a detailed analysis is warranted for projects that would result in substantial alterations to the streetscape of the neighborhood by noticeably changing the scale of buildings. According to the **CEQR Technical Manual**, detailed analyses are generally appropriate for area-
wide rezonings that include an increase in permitted floor area or changes in height and setback requirements. The increased scale, in terms of bulk, form, and height, on the Development Site would be a notable change from the pedestrian’s perspective to the appearance and character of the site compared to the No-Action conditions. The visual appearance would be enhanced and thus the pedestrian experience of the Development Site would change; however, this change would not meet the CEQR Technical Manual threshold for a significant adverse urban design impact in that it would not alter the arrangement, appearance, or functionality of the Development Site such that the alteration would negatively affect a pedestrian’s experience of the area. As such, the Proposed Actions would not result in a substantial alteration to the streetscape of the neighborhood, and therefore, a preliminary analysis of urban design has been conducted and is provided below.

Existing Conditions

Primary Study Area (Development Site)

Urban Design

Buildings

The approximately 7,417 sf Development Site (Block 1180, Lot 6) has approximately 130 feet of northern frontage along Lincoln Place and approximately 91 feet of western frontage along Washington Avenue. As shown in Figure D-3, the Development Site is currently occupied by a vacant, single-story, approximately 5,400 sf commercial building, which the Applicant is in the process of demolishing.

Street Pattern and Streetscape

A typical street grid pattern exists in the immediate vicinity of the Development Site, and existing pedestrian and vehicular flows are moderate along both Washington Avenue and Lincoln Place. Washington Avenue, which carries two-way traffic, is classified as a ‘wide’ street with 80 feet in width. Lincoln Place, which carries one-way westbound traffic, is classified as a ‘narrow’ street with 70 feet in width. The Development Site adjoins the public sidewalks along both Washington Avenue and Lincoln Place. Streetscape elements are common and include standard street signs, cobra head lampposts, and street trees (see Figures D-3 and D-4).

Natural Features and Open Space

There are no natural features or open space resources located within the Development Site.

View Corridors and Visual Resources

There are no view corridors within the Development Site, however, two visual resources can be seen from the Development Site: Eastern Parkway, a designated scenic landmark, and the Brooklyn Museum, a designated individual landmark, are both located to the south of the Development Site.

Eastern Parkway

Designed by famed landscape architects Frederick Law Olmsted and Calvert Vaux, Eastern Parkway was completed in 1874 and designated by the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) as a
1. View of project site (Block 1180, Lot 6) looking southeast along Washington Avenue.

2. Looking east down Lincoln Place from Washington Avenue. Project site is located to the right.

3. View of project site (Block 1180, Lot 6) looking southeast along Washington Avenue.
4. View of project site looking southeast from northwestern corner of Lincoln Place & Washington Avenue.

5. View of project site looking south across Lincoln Place.

6. View of project site looking north from northwestern corner of Washington Avenue & Eastern Parkway.
scenic landmark in August 1978. The Parkway is also listed on the State/National Register landmark registry. According to the LPC’s designation report\(^1\), Eastern Parkway was conceived of as “a new kind of roadway incorporating central malls with trees, pleasure drives, walkways, and service roads in order to draw the character of Prospect Park with its attendant benefits through Brooklyn.” Eastern Parkway, the first of Olmsted’s urban parkways to be completed in the United States, is often credited for the enhancement of leisure and the provision of new parkland, as well as a facilitator of suburban growth in Brooklyn. In addition, Eastern Parkway is also credited for attracting cultural institutions, particularly the Brooklyn Museum, the Brooklyn Botanical Garden, and the Brooklyn Public Library, to the surrounding neighborhood.

**Brooklyn Museum**

Designed by the famed architecture firm McKim, Mead & White, the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences (now known as the Brooklyn Museum) was completed in 1894 and designated by the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) as an individual landmark in May 1966. The Museum is also listed on the State/National Register landmark registry. According to the LPC’s designation report\(^2\), the Museum serves as a prime example of the Eclectic Roman Style of architectural design. The 560,000-sf rectangular building consists of a central portion and two adjoining wings to the east and west; the central portion is topped by a circular drum with a low saucer-dome and a six-column portico, which forms the central feature of the front façade. The building’s façade features many architectural details, including 28 heroic-size sculptural figures that flank the cornice shelves of the eastern and western wings of the museum. Today, the Brooklyn Museum is the City’s second largest art museum\(^3\), serving as a critical cultural institution to the surrounding neighborhoods of Brooklyn and the entire City of New York.

**Secondary Study Area**

**Urban Design**

**Buildings**

Table C-1 in Attachment C, “Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy,” summarizes the existing generalized land uses within the 400-foot land use study area by land area and built square footage. Overall, as reflected in Table C-1 and in Figures D-5 through D-8, the secondary study area contains primarily medium density residential buildings and mixed commercial/residential buildings, as well as a small number of public facilities and institutions. Higher density multi-family residential development (five to 15 floors) is primarily present in the northern and western portions of the secondary study area, while lower density multi-family development (one to four floors) is present in the eastern portion of the secondary study area. Mixed-use commercial/residential development is concentrated along Washington Avenue, in the northern portion of the secondary study area, and features residential uses located above ground-level local retail uses. Two public facility and institutional uses, which include a church and a community counseling center, are both located in the eastern portion of the secondary study area. In addition, the Brooklyn Museum, a designated individual landmark, is a large public

---


\(^3\) [https://www.brooklynmuseum.org/about/faq/](https://www.brooklynmuseum.org/about/faq/) (Site accessed on August 29, 2017)
7. View of residential buildings in the study area looking northwest from Lincoln Place.

8. View of the mixed-use residential/commercial corridor in the study area looking north along Washington Avenue.
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11. View of mixed-use and residential buildings in the study area looking northeast along Classon Avenue.

12. View of residential buildings in the study area looking northwest along St. John’s Place.
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15. View of the mixed-use commercial/residential building adjacent to the Project Site looking southeast along Eastern Parkway.

17. View of Eastern Parkway looking west near the intersection of Eastern Parkway & Washington Avenue.

18. View of Eastern Parkway looking southeast near the intersection of Eastern Parkway & Washington Avenue.
facility/institution located to the south of the Development Site across Eastern Parkway, near the southern boundary of the secondary study area.

**Street Pattern and Streetscape**

The street pattern in the secondary study area is composed of rectilinear blocks within a street grid system. All streets within the secondary study area, apart from Washington Avenue and Eastern Parkway, are one-way streets. Eastern Parkway is a wide, major thoroughfare located in the southern portion of the study area. The Parkway, an LPC-designated and S/NR scenic landmark, runs east to west through Crown Heights and serves cyclists, pedestrians, and vehicular traffic. In addition, the number 2 and 3 subway lines (IRT) transect the secondary study area via Eastern Parkway.

**Natural Features and Open Space**

There are two open space resources located within the secondary study area: Eastern Parkway and Dr. Ronald McNair Park. As highlighted above, Eastern Parkway provides a promenade for both cyclists and pedestrians. In addition to the paved promenade, Eastern Parkway also features large trees and benches. Dr. Ronald McNair Park, located along the southern boundary of the study area, is a 1.36-acre park which features pedestrian walkways, benches, several statues and monuments, and landscaped areas.

**View Corridors and Visual Resources**

As highlighted above, Eastern Parkway and the Brooklyn Museum are two significant visual resources located in the secondary study area. Eastern Parkway provides users with vantage points to view the surrounding built environment of the secondary study area, including historic landmarks like the Brooklyn Museum, the Brooklyn Public Library, and Grand Army Plaza. The Brooklyn Museum, in particular its wide entrance plaza, also provides users with a vantage point to view the secondary study area and Eastern Parkway.

### V. FUTURE WITHOUT THE PROPOSED ACTIONS (NO-ACTION CONDITION)

**Primary Study Area (Development Site)**

In the future without the Proposed Actions, it is anticipated that the Applicant would pursue as-of-right development on the Development Site. Under the existing zoning regulations, it is possible to redevelop the Development Site with an eight-story (85-foot tall), approximately 31,147 gsf mixed-use commercial/residential building containing 25 DUs, approximately 6,618 gsf of commercial space, and 13 accessory parking spaces.

**Secondary Study Area**

There are three known projects that could be completed within 400 feet of the Development Site in the future without the Proposed Actions. A seven-story, seven DU residential building is under construction at 807 Washington Avenue, just south of the Development Site. A five-story, eight DU mixed-use building is under construction at 816 Washington Avenue, north of the Development Site. A 14-story, 26 DU residential building is under construction at 856 Washington Avenue, just west of the Development Site.
VI. FUTURE WITH THE PROPOSED ACTIONS (WITH-ACTION CONDITION)

This section describes the effects of the Proposed Actions on the urban design and visual resource conditions in the area by 2020 and evaluates the potential for the Proposed Actions to result in significant adverse impacts. As discussed above, because the With-Action condition would result in a larger development than the No-Action condition, the With-Action condition is analyzed for its potential to result in significant adverse urban design and visual resources impacts.

Primary Study Area (Development Site)

In the future with the Proposed Actions, the FRESH food store certification and authorization to allow an increase in the maximum building height would both be approved. With the approved Proposed Actions, a nine-story (99-foot tall), approximately 57,883 gsf mixed-use commercial/residential development containing 50 DUs, approximately 7,730 gsf of commercial space to be occupied by a FRESH food store, and approximately 25 accessory parking spaces would be constructed on the Development Site. The accessory parking spaces would be provided in the cellar level of the building and would be accessed by a curb cut at the eastern end of the property along Lincoln Place.

Urban Design

Buildings

The Applicant plans to redevelop the site with a 99-foot tall, mixed-use commercial/residential building. The residential component would consist of approximately 50,153 gsf, containing 50 DUs. In addition, 25 accessory parking spaces would be provided on-site, in the subcellar-level. As shown in Figure D-9, the proposed building would be designed to complement the built character of the surrounding area, which is comprised of predominantly higher-density, multi-family residential development.

Street Pattern and Streetscape

The Proposed Actions would not result in changes to the streetscape or the arrangement or orientation of streets surrounding the Development Site (refer to Figure D-9).

Natural Features and Open Space

As discussed above, there are no natural features or open space resources located within the Development Site.

Visual Resources and View Corridors

Although there are no visual resources or view corridors located within the Development Site, two visual resources, Eastern Parkway and the Brooklyn Museum, are located to the south of the Development Site. Portions of each of these visual resources are visible from the Development Site, and as such, Washington Avenue serves as a view corridor from which the Parkway and the Museum are publicly viewable.
Washington Avenue View Corridor: Views of Eastern Parkway and the Brooklyn Museum

Washington Avenue is a wide, two-way street that runs north-south to the west of the Development Site, with existing multi-story residential buildings to the west and to the east. Washington Avenue intersects with Eastern Parkway one block to the south of the Development Site, and the Brooklyn Museum is located at the southwestern corner of the intersection of Eastern Parkway and Washington Avenue. As shown in Figures D-10 and D-11, which illustrates the No-Action and With-Action views of the Development Site and the Washington Avenue view corridor, portions of both the Parkway and the Museum would be visible to the south. As illustrated, the proposed development in the With-Action scenario is 14-feet taller than the No-Action development. However, the proposed development would not block existing views of Eastern Parkway and the Brooklyn Museum along the Washington Avenue view corridor. Therefore, the visibility of the two visual resources near the Development Site would not be adversely impacted as a result of the Proposed Actions.

Assessment

As shown in Figures D-9 through D-11 which depict the proposed development under the With-Action scenario, the Proposed Actions would alter the urban design character of the Development Site. The proposed development would introduce an approximately 57,883 gsf, 99-foot tall building, the height and bulk of which would be larger than No-Action condition on the Development Site. The increased scale, both in terms of bulk and height (scale), would not be a significant change from the pedestrian’s perspective to the appearance and character of the Development Site compared to the No-Action conditions.

Compared to the future without the Proposed Actions, in the future with the Proposed Actions, the visual appearance would differ slightly and thus the pedestrian experience of the Development Site would not be noticeably altered. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not meet the CEQR Technical Manual threshold for a significant adverse urban design impact in that they would not alter the arrangement, appearance, or functionality of the Development Site such that the alteration would negatively affect a pedestrian’s experience of the area. In addition, although the Proposed Actions would result in a building that is slightly larger in scale than is allowed as-of-right, from a pedestrian’s perspective, the proposed development would not obstruct public views of Eastern Parkway or the Brooklyn Museum from the Development Site.

Secondary Study Area

Urban Design

Buildings

The mixed-use commercial/residential uses that would be developed under the With-Action scenario would be in keeping with existing land uses in the secondary study area, and would maintain the mixed-use character of Washington Avenue. In addition, there would be no change to building arrangement, bulk, use or type in the secondary study area as a result of the Proposed Actions. Within the secondary study area, there is a range of existing building density and heights (see Figures D-12 and D-13). Higher density multi-family buildings are located in the western portion of the secondary study area and along Eastern Parkway, while lower density residential and mixed-use commercial/residential buildings are located in the northern and eastern portions of the secondary study area.
CORNAR OF WASHINGTON AVE AND EASTERN PARKWAY - NO ACTION CONDITION

CORNAR OF WASHINGTON AVE AND EASTERN PARKWAY - WITH ACTION CONDITION

805 WASHINGTON AVENUE
BROOKLYN, NY 11238

- - - - PERMITTED BUILDING HEIGHT AS OF RIGHT
- - - - PROPOSED BUILDING HEIGHT
Street Pattern and Streetscape

The proposed With-Action development is expected to be consistent with the street pattern and streetscape found throughout the secondary study area.

Natural Features and Open Space

There are two open space resources located within the secondary study area: Eastern Parkway and Dr. Ronald McNair Park. Eastern Parkway provides a promenade for both cyclists and pedestrians and features large trees and benches. Dr. Ronald McNair Park, located along the southern boundary of the secondary study area, features pedestrian walkways, benches, several statues and monuments, and landscaped areas. The Proposed Actions would not have a significant adverse impact on these two public open space resources in the secondary study area.

Visual Resources and View Corridors

The Brooklyn Museum and Eastern Parkway are visual resources located in the secondary study area. Each of these visual resources provide users with vantage points to view the surrounding built environment. The western boundary of the Development Site is visible looking north from each of these visual resources, and as such, the view corridors from both the Parkway and the Museum are publicly viewable.

Northern Views from Eastern Parkway and the Brooklyn Museum

As described in the LPC’s designation report, the primary purpose behind the design of Eastern Parkway was to extend the open space benefits of Prospect Park, through a new form of parkland, east into Brooklyn. A secondary purpose was to further stimulate the suburban growth of eastern Brooklyn, particularly into neighborhoods which were expected to develop along the Parkway, to the north and south of its planned route. As shown in Figure D-10, which illustrates the No-Action and With-Action views of the Development Site looking north from Eastern Parkway and the Brooklyn Museum, both the No-Action development and the Proposed Project would be visible from these visual resources. As illustrated, the Proposed Project in the With-Action scenario would be taller than neighboring residential buildings. However, as shown in Figure D-13, the proposed development would not be the tallest building in the secondary study area; an existing 15-story residential building is located at 135 Eastern Parkway and a 14-story residential building is under construction at 856 Washington Avenue. Although the proposed development under the With-Action scenario would be visible from Eastern Parkway, no impacts to this visual resource are anticipated to occur, as the proposed development does not impair the ability of the Parkway to achieve its primary purpose as a major thoroughfare serving cyclists, pedestrians, and vehicular traffic. Similarly, the proposed development under the With-Action scenario would be visible from the Brooklyn Museum; however, no impacts to this visual resource are anticipated to occur, as the proposed development does not impair the architectural value of the Museum’s design, nor the Museum’s ability to provide its cultural benefits to the surrounding communities and to the City. Therefore, the visual resources in the secondary study area would not be adversely impacted as a result of the Proposed Actions.
Assessment

As shown in Figures D-9 through D-11, the Proposed Actions would not alter the urban design character of the secondary study area.

Compared to the future without the Proposed Actions, in the future with the Proposed Actions, the visual appearance would differ slightly and thus the pedestrian experience in the secondary study area would not be noticeably altered. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not meet the CEQR Technical Manual threshold for a significant adverse urban design impact in that they would not negatively affect a pedestrian’s experience of the area. Overall, the Proposed Actions are expected to improve urban design conditions within the secondary study area, and as such, the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact to urban design in the secondary study area. In addition, although the Proposed Actions would result in a building that is larger in scale than is allowed as-of-right, from a pedestrian’s perspective, the Proposed Project would not negatively impact the visual importance and prominence of Eastern Parkway and the Brooklyn Museum.
I. INTRODUCTION

This attachment assesses the potential for the Proposed Actions to result in significant adverse noise impacts. As described in Attachment A, “Project Description,” Happy Living Development (the “Applicant”) is seeking the following actions (the “Proposed Actions”) in an effort to facilitate the development of a mixed-use commercial/residential building in the Prospect Heights neighborhood of Brooklyn Community District (CD) 8:

1. A certification by the Chairperson of the City Planning Commission pursuant to Zoning Resolution (“ZR”) Section 63-30 for a FRESH Food store; and

2. An authorization by the City Planning Commission pursuant to Section 63-22 to allow an increase in the maximum building height by 14 feet.

The Proposed Actions would facilitate the development of a nine-story (99-foot tall), approximately 57,884 gross square foot (gsf) mixed-use building at 805 Washington Avenue (the "Proposed Project"). The Proposed Project would include approximately 37 dwelling units (DUs), approximately 7,730 gsf of commercial space to be occupied by a FRESH food store, and approximately 19 accessory parking spaces. The Proposed Project would be located on one tax lot (Block 1180, Lot 6) (the "Development Site"), which is bounded by Washington Avenue to the west and Lincoln Place to the north. The Development Site was occupied by a vacant 5,400 sf commercial building, which the Applicant has recently demolished.

While the Applicant intends on developing the Proposed Project described above, a more conservative reasonable worst-case development scenario (RWCDS) will be assumed for analysis purposes. While the Applicant-proposed number of dwelling units would have an average unit size of approximately 1,355 gsf per unit, which would result in 37 DUs, for conservative analysis purposes, the RWCDS assumes 1,000 gsf per unit. This would result in 50 DUs for RWCDS analysis purposes. Therefore, the RWCDS would comprise a nine-story (99-foot tall), approximately 57,884 gross square foot (gsf) mixed-use building including approximately 50 dwelling units (DUs), approximately 7,730 gsf of commercial space to be occupied by a FRESH food store, and approximately 25 accessory parking spaces.

The Proposed Project would generate vehicular traffic and change traffic patterns and volumes in the general vicinity of the proposed Development Site. As local vehicular traffic is a major source of ambient noise in the area, this could lead to changes in the ambient noise levels. According to the 2014 City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manual, if existing noise passenger car equivalent (PCE) values are increased by 100 percent or more due to a proposed action (which is equivalent to an increase of 3.0 dBA or more) a detailed analysis is generally warranted. Conversely, if existing noise PCE values are not increased by 100 percent or more it is likely that the proposed action would not cause a significant adverse vehicular noise impact, and therefore no further vehicular noise analysis is needed.

The noise analysis for the Proposed Actions was carried out in compliance with CEQR Technical Manual guidelines and consists of two parts:
• (1) A screening analysis to determine whether traffic generated by the proposed action would have the potential to result in significant noise impacts on existing sensitive receptors;

• (2) An analysis to determine the level of building attenuation necessary to ensure that the With-Action developments’ interior noise levels satisfy applicable interior noise criteria. This attachment does not include an analysis of mechanical equipment because such mechanical equipment would be designed to meet all applicable noise regulations and, therefore, would not result in adverse noise impacts.

II. PRINCIPAL CONCLUSIONS

In the future with the Proposed Actions, the predicted peak period L10 values at the receptor locations would range from a minimum of 68.8 dBA to a maximum of 74.4 dBA. When compared to the future without the Proposed Actions, the relative increases in noise levels are expected to be below 3.0 dBA at all analyzed receptor locations. Therefore, no significant adverse mobile source noise impacts due to action-generated vehicular traffic would occur.

To ensure acceptable interior noise levels for any future development at the proposed Development Site (Block 1180, Lot 6), the noise attenuation specifications would be mandated through the mapping of an (E) designation assigned to the tax lot that makes up this Development Site. The requirements of the (E) designation resulting from the noise analysis, outlined in Section VII of this attachment, state that the required noise attenuation ratings for residential and/or community facility uses would be 31 dBA on the western façade facing Washington Avenue. For all other facades, no additional noise attenuation measure above standard construction practices is required to achieve interior noise levels of 45 dBA or lower for residential uses. The minimum required composite window/wall attenuation for future commercial uses would be 5 dBA lower than that of residential uses. In addition, in order to maintain a closed-window condition, an alternate means of ventilation must also be provided.

With the implementation of the attenuation requirements pursuant to the (E) designation on the proposed development site (Lot 6), the Proposed Actions would provide sufficient attenuation to achieve the CEQR Technical Manual interior noise level guidelines. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse noise impacts related to building attenuation requirements.

III. NOISE FUNDAMENTALS

Noise is considered unwanted sound. Sound is a fluctuation in air pressure. Sound pressure levels are measured in units called “decibels” (dB). The particular character of the sound that we hear (a whistle compared with a French horn, for example) is determined by the speed, or “frequency,” at which the air pressure fluctuates or “oscillates.” Frequency defines the oscillation of sound pressure in terms of cycles per second (cps). One cycle per second is known as 1 Hertz (Hz). People can hear sound over a relatively limited range of frequencies, generally between 20 Hz and 20,000 Hz. Furthermore, the human ear does not perceive all frequencies equally well. High frequencies (e.g., a whistle) are more easily discernible and therefore more intrusive than many of the lower frequencies (e.g., the lower notes on the French horn).
A-Weighted Sound Level (dBA)

In order to establish a uniform noise measurement that simulates people’s perception of loudness and annoyance, the decibel measurement is weighted to account for those frequencies most audible to the human hearing range. This is known as the A-weighted sound level, or “dBA,” and it is the descriptor of noise levels most often used for community noise. As shown in Table E-1, the threshold of human hearing is defined as 0 dBA; very quiet conditions (as in a rural area at night, for example) are approximately 30-40 dBA; levels between 50 dBA and 70 dBA define the range of noise levels generated by normal daily activity; levels above 70 dBA would be considered noisy, and then loud, intrusive, and deafening, as the scale approaches 120 dBA.

### Table E-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sound Source</th>
<th>(dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Raid Siren at 50 feet</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Levels at Rock Concerts (Rear Seats)</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Platform by Passing Subway Train</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Sidewalk by Passing Heavy Truck or Bus</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Sidewalk by Typical Highway</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Sidewalk by Passing Automobiles with Mufflers</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Urban Area</td>
<td>60-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Suburban Area</td>
<td>50-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet Suburban Area at Night</td>
<td>40-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Rural Area at Night</td>
<td>30-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Whisper at 5 meters</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated Broadcast Studio</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiometric (Hearing Testing) Booth</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold of Hearing</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** A 10 dBA increase appears to double the loudness, and a 10 dBA decrease appears to halve the apparent loudness. 

Community Response to Changes in Noise Levels

Table E-2 shows the average ability of an individual to perceive changes in noise. It is important to note that the dBA scale is logarithmic, meaning that each increase of 10 dBA describes a doubling of perceived loudness. Thus, the noise on a platform with a passing subway train, at 100 dBA, is perceived as twice as loud as passing heavy trucks at 90 dBA. For most people to perceive an increase in noise, it must be at least 3 dBA. At 5 dBA, the change will be readily noticeable. These guidelines permit direct estimation of an individual's probable perception of changes in noise levels.

### Table E-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change (dBA)</th>
<th>Human Perception of Sound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>Barely perceptible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Readily noticeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A doubling or halving of the loudness of sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A dramatic change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Difference between a faintly audible sound and a very loud sound</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Noise Descriptors Used In Impact Assessment

Because the sound pressure level unit, dBA, describes a noise level at just one moment, and very few noises are constant, other ways of describing noise over extended periods have been developed. One way of describing fluctuating sound is to describe the fluctuating noise heard over a specific time period as if it had been a steady, unchanging sound. For this condition, a descriptor called the “equivalent sound level”, L\text{eq}, can be computed. L\text{eq} is the constant sound level that, in a given situation and time period (e.g., 1 hour, denoted by L\text{eq}[1]) conveys the same sound-energy as the actual time-varying sound.

Statistical sound level descriptors such as L1, L10, L50, L90, and Lx, are sometimes used to indicate noise levels that are exceeded 1, 10, 50, 90 and “x” percent of the time, respectively. Discrete event peak levels are given as L1 levels. L\text{eq} is used in the prediction of future noise levels, by adding the contributions from new sources of noise (i.e., increases in traffic volumes) to the existing levels and in relating annoyance to increases in noise levels.

The relationship between L\text{eq} and levels of exceedance is worth noting. Because L\text{eq} is defined in energy rather than straight numerical terms, it is not simply related to the levels of exceedance. If the noise fluctuates very little, L\text{eq} will approximate L50 or the median level. If the noise fluctuates broadly, the L\text{eq} will be approximately equal to the L10 value. If extreme fluctuations are present, the L\text{eq} will exceed L90 or the background level by 10 or more decibels. Thus the relationship between L\text{eq} and the levels of exceedance will depend on the character of the noise. In community noise measurements, it has been observed that the L\text{eq} is generally between L10 and L50. The relationship between L\text{eq} and exceedance levels has been used in this analysis to characterize the noise sources and to determine the nature and extent of their impact at both monitoring locations.

For the purposes of this analysis, the maximum 1-hour equivalent sound level (L\text{eq}) has been selected as the noise descriptor to be used in the noise impact evaluation. L\text{eq} is the noise descriptor used in the CEQR Technical Manual for noise impact evaluation, and is used to provide an indication of highest expected sound levels. L10 is the noise descriptor used in the CEQR Technical Manual for building attenuation.

The day-night sound level (L\text{dn}) is the noise description used in the HUD Noise guidebook that sets exterior noise standards for housing construction projects receiving federal funds. Similar to L\text{eq}, the L\text{dn} refers to a 24-hour average noise level with a 10 dBA penalty applied to noise levels during the hours between 10:00 PM and 7:00 AM to reflect the greater intrusiveness of noise experienced during these hours. Pursuant to the Federal Transit Authority (FTA) noise impact analysis methodology, the L\text{dn} is adopted to assess noise generated by trains. However, because the L\text{dn} descriptor tends to average out high hourly values over 24 hours, the CEQR Technical Manual recommends that the L\text{eq} descriptor be used for purposes of impact analysis.

Applicable Noise Codes and Impact Criteria

CEQR Technical Manual Noise Standards

The NYC Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) has set external noise exposure standards based on L10 noise levels. These standards are shown on the following page in Table E-3. Noise exposure is

---

TABLE E-3
Noise Exposure Guidelines for Use in City Environmental Impact Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receptor Type</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Acceptable General Exposure</th>
<th>Marginally Acceptable General Exposure</th>
<th>Marginally Unacceptable General Exposure</th>
<th>Clearly Unacceptable General Exposure</th>
<th>Airport Exposure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Outdoor area requiring serenity and quiet2</td>
<td></td>
<td>L10 ≤ 55 dBA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hospital, Nursing Home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55 &lt; L10 ≤ 65 dBA</td>
<td>65 &lt; L10 ≤ 80 dBA</td>
<td>L10 &gt; 80 dBA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Residence, residential hotel or motel</td>
<td>7 AM to 10 PM</td>
<td>L10 ≤ 65 dBA</td>
<td>65 &lt; L10 ≤ 70 dBA</td>
<td>70 &lt; L10 ≤ 80 dBA</td>
<td>L10 &gt; 80 dBA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 PM to 7 AM</td>
<td>L10 ≤ 55 dBA</td>
<td>55 &lt; L10 ≤ 70 dBA</td>
<td>70 &lt; L10 ≤ 80 dBA</td>
<td>L10 &gt; 80 dBA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. School, museum, library, court, house of worship, transient hotel or motel, public meeting room, auditorium, out-patient public health facility</td>
<td>Same as Residential Day (7 AM-10 PM)</td>
<td>Same as Residential Day (7 AM-10 PM)</td>
<td>Same as Residential Day (7 AM-10 PM)</td>
<td>Same as Residential Day (7 AM-10 PM)</td>
<td>Same as Residential Day (7 AM-10 PM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Commercial or office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Industrial, public areas only4</td>
<td>Note 4</td>
<td>Note 4</td>
<td>Note 4</td>
<td>Note 4</td>
<td>Note 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
(i) In addition, any new activity shall not increase the ambient noise level by 3 dBA or more;
1 Measurements and projections of noise exposures are to be made at appropriate heights above site boundaries as given by American National Standards Institute (ANSI) Standards; all values are for the worst hour in the time period.
2 Tracts of land where serenity and quiet are extraordinarily important and serve an important public need and where the preservation of these qualities is essential for the area to serve its intended purpose. Such areas could include amphitheaters, particular parks or portions of parks or open spaces dedicated or recognized by appropriate local officials for activities requiring special qualities of serenity and quiet. Examples are grounds for ambulatory hospital patients and patients and residents of sanitariums and old-age homes.
3 One may use the FAA-approved Ldn contours supplied by the Port Authority, or the noise contours may be computed from the federally approved INM Computer Model using flight data supplied by the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey.
4 External Noise Exposure standards for industrial areas of sounds produced by industrial operations other than operating motor vehicles or other transportation facilities are spelled out in the New York City Zoning Resolution, Sections 42-20 and 42-21. The referenced standards apply to M1, M2, and M3 manufacturing districts and to adjoining residence districts (performance standards are octave band standards).
Source: New York City Department of Environmental Protection (adopted policy 1983).

TABLE E-4
Required Attenuation Values to Achieve Acceptable Interior Noise Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noise level with Proposed Action</th>
<th>Marginally Unacceptable</th>
<th>Clearly Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70&lt;L10≤73</td>
<td>73&lt;L10≤76</td>
<td>76&lt;L10≤80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attenuation4</td>
<td>(I) 28 dBA</td>
<td>(II) 31 dBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *The above composite window/wall attenuation values are for residential dwellings. Commercial office spaces and meeting rooms would be 5 dBA less in each category. All the above categories require a closed window situation and hence an alternate means of ventilation.
* Required attenuation values increase by 1 dBA increments for L10 values greater than 80 dBA.
Source: NYC Department of Environmental Protection, CEQR Technical Manual
The CEQR Technical Manual defines attenuation requirements for buildings based on exterior noise level. Recommended noise attenuation values for building façades are designed to maintain interior noise levels of 45 dBA or lower for residential uses and 50 dBA or lower for commercial uses, and are determined based on exterior L10 noise levels. The standards shown are based on maintaining an interior noise level for the worst-case hour L10 of 45 dBA or lower. Attenuation requirements are shown in Table E-4.

IV. NOISE PREDICTION METHODOLOGY

Proportional Modeling

Proportional modeling was used to determine No-Action and With-Action noise levels at the receptor locations, which are discussed in more detail below. Proportional modeling is one of the techniques recommended in the CEQR Technical Manual for mobile source analysis. Using this technique, the prediction of future noise levels, where traffic is the dominant noise source, is based on a calculation using measured existing noise levels and predicted changes in traffic volumes to determine No-Action and With-Action noise levels. Vehicular traffic volumes, which are counted during the noise recording, are converted into Passenger Car Equivalent (PCE) values, for which one medium-duty truck (having a gross weight between 9,900 and 26,400 pounds) is assumed to generate the noise equivalent of 13 cars, and one heavy-duty truck (having a gross weight of more than 26,400 pounds) is assumed to generate the noise equivalent of 47 cars, and one bus (vehicles designed to carry more than nine passengers) is assumed to generate the noise equivalent of 18 cars. Future noise levels are calculated using the following equation:

\[ \text{FNA NL} = 10 \log \left( \frac{\text{NA PCE}}{\text{E PCE}} \right) + \text{E NL} \]

where:
- FNA NL = Future No-Action Noise Level
- NA PCE = No-Action PCEs
- E PCE = Existing PCEs
- E NL = Existing Noise Level

Sound levels are measured in decibels and therefore increase logarithmically with sound source strength. In this case, the sound source is traffic volumes measured in PCEs. For example, assume that traffic is the dominant noise source at a particular location. If the existing traffic volume on a street is 100 PCE and if the future traffic volume were increased by 50 PCE to a total of 150 PCE, the noise level would increase by 1.8 dBA. Similarly, if the future traffic were to increase by 100 PCE, or doubled to a total of 200 PCE, the noise level would increase by 3.0 dBA.

Analyses for the Proposed Actions were conducted for three typical time periods: the weekday AM peak hour (8 AM to 9 AM), the midday peak hour (12 PM to 1 PM), and the weekday PM peak hour (5 PM to 6 PM). These time periods are the hours when the maximum traffic generation is expected and, therefore, the hours when future conditions with the Proposed Actions are most likely to result in maximum noise impacts for the receptor locations.

For the purpose of this analysis, during the noise recording, vehicles were counted and classified. To calculate the No-Action PCE values, an annual background growth rate of 0.25 percent for 2017-2020 was applied to the existing PCE noise values based on counted vehicles\(^2\). In order to obtain the future With-Action noise PCE values to calculate the With-Action noise levels, a trip generation forecast was created.

---

\(^2\) Calculation according to Table 16-4 in the CEQR Technical Manual.
for the proposed incremental dwelling units (50 DUs) generated by the 2020 With-Action development, which is based on existing modal split data for the census tract within which the Proposed Project is located. The total incremental vehicles generated by the With-Action development per hour were estimated at 6 for the AM peak hour, 22 for the midday peak hour, and 9 for the PM peak hour. For conservative purposes, all of the action-generated trips were assigned to Lincoln Place and Washington Avenue, exclusive of one another.

V. EXISTING CONDITIONS

The proposed Development Site, located in the northwestern corner of Block 1180, measures 7,417 square feet (sf) and has approximately 130 feet of northern frontage along Lincoln Place and approximately 91 feet of western frontage along Washington Avenue. The Applicant-owned Development Site was occupied by a vacant 5,400 sf commercial building, which the Applicant has recently demolished.

The area surrounding the proposed Development Site consists primarily of multi-family residential and mixed commercial/residential uses, as well as several public facility/institutional uses. Multi-family residential uses generally include mid-rise, five- to 15-story buildings located along Washington Avenue, St. John’s Place, Lincoln Place, and Eastern Parkway. Mixed-use commercial/residential buildings are located along Washington Avenue, which serves as the main commercial corridor in the surrounding area. In this area, commercial uses are typically local retail establishments located on the ground floors of mixed-use, two- to four-story buildings. Two public facility and institutional uses, which include a church and a community counseling center, are both located along Classon Avenue, east of the Development Site. In addition, the Brooklyn Museum, a designated individual landmark, is a large public facility/institution located to the south of the Development Site across Eastern Parkway.

Selection of Noise Monitoring/Receptor Locations

In order to collect existing baseline volumes at the proposed Development Site, existing noise levels were measured at two locations. Receptor 1 was located on the southern side of Lincoln Place along the northern boundary of the proposed Development Site, to measure noise resulting from traffic along Lincoln Place. Receptor 2 was located on the eastern side of Washington Avenue along the proposed Development Site’s western frontage, to measure noise levels of the traffic along Washington Avenue. Measurements performed at these two receptor locations were conducted as part of the impact identification and building attenuation analyses. For reference, the noise monitoring receptor locations are identified in Figure E-1 and explained further below:

Receptor Location 1 – Future northern frontage of the proposed Development Site (Lincoln Place); approximate midpoint of frontage (approximately 65 feet east of Washington Avenue).

Receptor Location 2 – Future western frontage of the proposed Development Site (Washington Avenue); approximate midpoint of frontage (approximately 45 feet south of Lincoln Place).

---
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Noise Monitoring

At Receptor 1, as the main source of noise was local traffic, pursuant to CEQR guidelines, 20-minute measurements were performed to establish existing noise levels for three analysis time periods, including: weekday AM peak hour (8AM to 9AM), midday (MD) peak hour (12PM to 1PM), and weekday PM peak hour (5PM to 6PM). At Receptor 2, as the main source of noise was local traffic, pursuant to CEQR guidelines, 20-minute measurements of existing noise levels were performed during the same three analysis time periods as at Receptor 1. Noise monitoring at Receptors 1 and 2 was performed on Tuesday, September 26th, 2017. On September 26th, 2017, the weather was mostly cloudy with temperatures in the mid-70s and an average wind speed of 5 mph.

Equipment Used During Noise Monitoring

The instrumentation used for the measurements was a Brüel & Kjær Type 4189 ½-inch microphone connected to a Brüel & Kjær Model 2250 Type 1 (as defined by the American National Standards Institute) sound level meter. This assembly was mounted at a height of 6 feet above the ground surface on a tripod and at least 6 feet away from any sound-reflecting surfaces to avoid major interference with source sound levels being measured at the receptor locations along Lincoln Place and Washington Avenue. The meter was calibrated before and after readings with a Brüel & Kjær Type 4231 sound-level calibrator using the appropriate adaptor. Measurements at each location were made on the A-scale (dBA). The data were digitally recorded by the sound level meter and displayed at the end of the measurement period in units of dBA. Measured quantities included L_{eq}, L_{1}, L_{10}, L_{50}, and L_{90}. A windscreens was used during all sound measurements except for calibration. Traffic and aircraft flyover noise was captured; noise from other sources (e.g., emergency sirens etc.) was excluded from the measured noise levels. Weather conditions were noted to ensure a true reading as follows: wind speed under 12 mph; relative humidity under 90 percent; and temperature above 14°F and below 122°F (pursuant to ANSI Standard S1.13-2005).

Existing Noise Levels at Monitoring Locations

The noise monitoring results are shown in Table E-7 below. Automobile traffic and the operation of off-site construction equipment were dominant sources of noise at Receptor 1, located on the street level along Lincoln Place, and at Receptor 2, located on the street level along Washington Avenue. Overhead flights were moderate sources of noise at each of the receptors, as they are not continuous.

As shown in Table E-7, the highest overall L_{10} value (74.3 dBA) was measured in the AM peak period at Receptor 2. Pursuant to CEQR Technical Manual guidelines, this L_{10} value places Receptor 2 in the “Marginally Unacceptable” CEQR Noise Exposure category, as the noise levels exceed 70.0 dBA under existing conditions. The highest L_{10} for Receptor 1 was measured in the MD peak period (67.6 dBA), placing it in the Marginally Acceptable Noise Exposure category under the existing conditions.
### TABLE E-7
Existing Noise Levels (dBA) at Proposed Development Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Noise Receptor Location</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>( L_{\text{max}} )</th>
<th>( L_{\text{min}} )</th>
<th>( L_{\text{eq}} )</th>
<th>( L_1 )</th>
<th>( L_{10} )</th>
<th>( L_{50} )</th>
<th>( L_{90} )</th>
<th>CEQR Noise Exposure Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>South side of Lincoln Place; approximate midpoint of frontage; street level</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>Marginally Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>East side of Washington Avenue; approximate midpoint of frontage; street level</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>Marginally Unacceptable (II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Field measurements were performed by Philip Habib & Associates on September 26, 2017.

1 Refer to Figure E-1 for receptor locations.
2 AM = weekday AM peak hour; MD = weekday midday peak hour; PM = weekday PM peak hour
3 Highest \( L_{10} \) at each receptor is shown in **bold**.
4 Does not represent adjusted \( L_{10} \) noise level values based on FTA methodology and distance corrections.

### VI. THE FUTURE WITHOUT THE PROPOSED ACTIONS (NO-ACTION)

In the future without the Proposed Actions (the No-Action scenario), it is anticipated that the Applicant would pursue as-of-right development on the Development Site. Under the existing zoning regulations, it is possible to redevelop the Development Site with an eight-story (85-foot tall), approximately 31,147 gsf mixed-use commercial/residential building containing 25 DUs, approximately 6,618 gsf of commercial space, and 13 accessory parking spaces.

As there are no additional anticipated developments expected to generate a significant number of vehicle trips by 2020 within a 400-foot radius of the proposed Development Site, consistent with CEQR Technical Manual guidelines, estimates of peak hour noise levels for the No-Action condition were developed by applying an annual background growth rate of 0.25 percent from 2017 to 2020 to the existing traffic levels at Receptors 1 and 2 (refer to **Table E-8**).

In the future without the Proposed Actions, noise levels at the proposed Development Site would be similar to existing conditions, apart from a slight increase associated with increased traffic along Lincoln Place and Washington Avenue. As indicated in **Table E-8**, noise levels at both receptor locations would remain in their respective CEQR Noise Exposure categories; with noise levels at Receptor 1 remaining in the Marginally Acceptable category, and noise levels at Receptor 2 remaining in the Marginally Unacceptable category.
TABLE E-8
2020 No-Action Noise Levels (dBA) at the Proposed Development Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Existing PCEs</th>
<th>No-Action PCEs</th>
<th>No-Action Leq</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>No-Action L10</th>
<th>CEQR Noise Exposure Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>168.0</td>
<td>170.5</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>Marginally Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>174.0</td>
<td>176.6</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>1521.0</td>
<td>1543.9</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>Marginally Unacceptable (II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>1473.0</td>
<td>1495.2</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>1341.0</td>
<td>1361.2</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: All PCE and noise values are shown for a weekday. 
1 No-Action Leq = Existing Leq. 
2 Highest L10 at each receptor is shown in bold. 
3 Does not represent adjusted L10 noise level values based on FTA methodology and distance corrections.

VII. FUTURE WITH THE PROPOSED ACTIONS (WITH-ACTION CONDITION)

Following CEQR Technical Manual guidelines, noise levels in the future with the Proposed Actions were calculated for the weekday AM, MD, and PM peak periods in the 2020 analysis year. These calculations account for the additional traffic that would be added as a consequence of the Proposed Actions. As shown in Table E-9, the analysis indicates that the highest L10 noise levels at Receptor 1 will be 68.8 dBA, and it will remain in the Marginally Acceptable Noise Exposure category; the highest L10 noise levels at Receptor 2 will be 74.4 dBA and it will remain in the Marginally Unacceptable Noise Exposure category.

In the future with the Proposed Actions, noise levels at the proposed Development Site would be similar to No-Action conditions, apart from a slight increase associated with increased traffic along Lincoln Place. As indicated in Table E-9, noise levels at each receptor location would remain in their respective CEQR Noise Exposure categories; with noise levels at Receptor 1 remaining in the Marginally Acceptable category, and noise levels at Receptor 2 remaining in the Marginally Unacceptable category.

TABLE E-9
2020 With-Action Noise Levels (dBA) at Proposed Development Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>No-Action PCEs</th>
<th>With-Action PCEs</th>
<th>No-Action Leq</th>
<th>With-Action Leq</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>With-Action L10</th>
<th>CEQR Noise Exposure Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>170.5</td>
<td>176.5</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>Marginally Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>176.6</td>
<td>185.6</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>1543.9</td>
<td>1549.9</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>Marginally Unacceptable (II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>1495.2</td>
<td>1517.2</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>1361.2</td>
<td>1370.2</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: All PCE and noise values are shown for a weekday. 
1 With-Action Leq = No-Action Leq. 
2 Highest L10 at each receptor is shown in bold.

Comparing the future With-Action noise levels with No-Action noise levels, noise levels at Receptor 1 would experience increases ranging from 0.15 dBA to 1.14 dBA; and increases in noise levels at Receptor 2 would range from 0.02 dBA to 0.06 dBA. According to the CEQR Technical Manual, increases of these magnitudes would not be perceptible. As these increases are less than the CEQR impact criteria threshold
(3.0 dBA), the overall changes to noise levels at the proposed Development Site as a result of the Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse noise impacts.

However, given that Receptor 2 is anticipated to experience With-Action $L_{10}$ noise levels that exceed 70.0 dBA, a required composite window/wall attenuation rating must be determined for the proposed Development Site’s western frontage. These attenuation requirements will be determined for the residential and commercial uses of the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project would have to provide sufficient attenuation in order to achieve the CEQR Technical Manual interior noise level guidelines of 45 dBA or lower for residential uses and 50 dBA or lower for commercial uses.

VIII. WINDOW/ WALL ATTENUATION RATINGS

The attenuation of a composite structure is a function of the attenuation provided by each of its component parts and how much of the area is made up of each part. Typically, a building façade is composed of the wall, windows, and any vents or louvers for HVAC systems in various ratios of area. Since the proposed building would most likely be of masonry construction, which typically provides a high level of sound attenuation, the attenuation requirements for HUD or CEQR purposes apply primarily to the windows, but may also represent a composite window/wall attenuation value.

Composite window/wall attenuation can be described in terms of sound transmission class (STC), transmission loss (TL), and outdoor-indoor transmission class (OITC). Although these terms are sometimes used interchangeably, they are unique from each other. Transmission loss refers to how many decibels of sound a façade (wall) or façade accessory (window or door) can stop at a given frequency. The TL for a given construction material varies with the individual frequencies of the noise.

To simplify the noise attenuation properties of a wall, the STC rating was developed. It is a single number that describes the sound isolation performance of a given material for the range of test frequencies between 125 and 4,000 Hz. These frequencies sufficiently cover the range of human speech. Higher STC values reflect greater efficiencies to block airborne sound. HUD uses the STC when identifying the required sound attenuation for a façade.

The OITC is similar to the STC, except that it is weighted more towards the lower frequencies associated with aircraft, rail, and truck traffic. The OITC classification is defined by the American Society of Testing and Materials (ASTM E1332-90 (Reapproved 2003)) and provides a single-number rating that is used for designing a building façade including walls, doors, glazing, and combinations thereof. The OITC rating is designed to evaluate building elements by their ability to reduce the overall loudness of ground and air transportation noise. NYCDEP uses the OITC when identifying the required attenuation for a façade.

IX. ATTENUATION REQUIREMENTS

As shown earlier in Table E-4, the CEQR Technical Manual has set noise attenuation requirements for buildings based on $L_{10}$ noise levels. Recommended composite window/wall attenuation values for buildings are designed to maintain interior noise levels of 45 dBA or lower for residential and community facility uses and 50 dBA or lower for commercial uses, and are determined based on $L_{10}$ noise levels.

All facades that would experience an $L_{10}$ of 70.0 dBA or greater must provide an alternate means of ventilation (AMV) permitting a closed window condition during warm weather. This can be achieved by
installing double-glazed windows on a heavy frame for masonry structures or windows consisting of laminated glass, along with AMV such as central air conditioning, through-wall sleeve-fitted air conditioners, packaged terminal air conditioning (PTAC) units, trickle vents integrated into window frames, or other approved means. Where the required window/wall attenuation is above 40 dBA, special design features may be necessary that go beyond the normal double-glazed window and air conditioning. These may include specially designed windows (e.g., windows with small sizes, windows with air gaps, windows with thicker glazing, etc.) and additional building insulation.

As detailed above and presented in Table E-10, the maximum predicted $L_{10}$ noise level is expected to be 74.4 dBA along the proposed Development Site’s western frontage (Washington Avenue). Thus, as shown in Figure E-2, to ensure acceptable interior noise levels for the Proposed Project, a minimum of 31 dBA of attenuation is needed along the Proposed Project’s western façade. The noise attenuation specifications for the proposed Development Site would be mandated through an (E) designation.

(E) Designation

An (E) designation for noise provides a notice of the presence of an environmental requirement pertaining to high ambient noise levels on a particular tax lot. If an area is proposed to be rezoned, and the accompanying environmental analysis indicates that development on a property may be adversely affected by noise, then an (E) designation for window/wall attenuation and alternate means of ventilation may be placed on the property by the lead agency in order to address such issues in conjunction with any new development or new use of the property. For new developments, enlargements of existing buildings, or changes in use, the NYC Department of Buildings will not issue a building permit until the environmental requirements of the (E) designation are satisfied. The Office of Environmental Remediation (OER) administers the (E) Designation Environmental Review Program.

To avoid any potential impacts associated with noise on the Development Site (Block 1180, Lot 6), as part of the Proposed Action, an (E) designation for noise would be recorded against the property (E-456). The text for the (E) designation will be as follows:

In order to ensure an acceptable interior noise environment, future residential and/or community facility uses must provide 31.0 dBA of composite window/wall attenuation for future building facades along Washington Avenue in order to maintain an interior noise level of 45 dBA. The minimum composite window/wall attenuation for commercial uses would be 5 dBA less than that for residential and community facility uses. In order to maintain a closed-window condition, an alternate means of ventilation must also be provided.

Per the (E) designation requirements, in order to receive a Certificate of Occupancy from the NYC Department of Buildings (DOB) the Proposed Project must comply with these required composite window/wall attenuation values in order to maintain proper interior noise levels. With this institutional control in place, the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse noise impacts related to building attenuation and no further analysis is necessary.
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TABLE E-10
Attenuation Requirements (dBA) for Future Developments on the Proposed Development Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Façade¹</th>
<th>Corresponding Receptor</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Max. L₁₀ (dBA)</th>
<th>Required Attenuation²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Development Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Block 1180, Lot 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>N/A³</td>
<td>Facing Lincoln Place</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Facing Lot 5 (Block 1180)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Facing Lot 1 (Block 1180)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Facing Washington Avenue</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
¹ Refer to Figure E-2.
² Attenuation values are shown for residential uses; commercial uses would be 5 dBA less.
³ N/A = Not Applicable. Additional noise attenuation measure above standard construction practices is not required to achieve interior noise levels of 45 dBA or lower for residential/community facility uses.

X. OTHER NOISE CONCERNS

Mechanical Equipment

No detailed designs of the residential building’s mechanical systems (i.e., heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems) are available at this time. However, those systems would be designed to meet all applicable noise regulations and requirements, and would be designed to produce noise levels which would not result in any significant increases in ambient noise levels.

Aircraft Noise

An initial aircraft noise impact screening analysis would be warranted if the new receptor would be located within one mile of an existing flight path, or cause aircraft to fly through existing or new flight paths over or within one mile of a receptor. Since the proposed Development Site is not located within one mile of an existing flight path, no initial aircraft noise impact screening analysis is warranted.
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