

Chapter 24: Growth-Inducing Aspects of the Proposed Action

The term “growth-inducing aspects” generally refers to the potential for a proposed action to trigger additional development in areas outside of the project site (i.e., directly affected area) that would not experience such development without the proposed action. The 2012 *New York City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manual* indicates that an analysis of the growth-inducing aspects of a proposed action is appropriate when the action:

- Adds substantial new land use, new residents, or new employment that could induce additional development of a similar kind or of support uses, such as retail establishments to serve new residential uses; and/or
- Introduces or greatly expands infrastructure capacity.

As detailed in Chapter 1, “Project Description,” and Chapter 2, “Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy,” the purpose of the Proposed Action is to activate and enhance the Rezoning Area by permitting mixed-use development while preserving the area’s commercial base and existing built character. The Proposed Action would allow for carefully controlled residential development, including new affordable housing, while protecting and strengthening the neighborhood’s current commercial uses, and is expected to result in new development—including new construction, residential enlargements and/or conversion of existing buildings—on sites throughout the Rezoning Area.

There were two reasonable worst-case development scenarios (RWCDS) developed to assess the possible short- and long-term effects of the Proposed Action. RWCDS 1 identifies a net increase of up to 3,323 dwelling units (including 679 affordable housing units pursuant to the Inclusionary Housing Program); 99,086 gsf of retail use; 139,583 gsf of office use; 75,000 gsf of community facility (school) use; and 526 accessory parking spaces through the 2022 analysis year, as well as a net reduction of 739,170 gsf hotel use (approximately 1,126 hotel rooms); 382,010 gsf other commercial space (including loft and storage space); and 63 public parking spaces on 22 projected development and enlargement sites, as compared to the future without the Proposed Action (the No-Action condition).¹ There are also 17 potential development and enlargement sites on which growth could occur.² Additionally, since the issuance of the DEIS,

¹ Under RWCDS 2, it is assumed that two projected development sites would be developed with community facility uses with sleeping accommodations (i.e., dormitories) rather than residential buildings as projected in RWCDS 1. Thus, under RWCDS 2, a net increase of 2,977 dwelling units (including 598 affordable units); 254,896 gsf of dormitory use (approximately 773 dormitory beds); and 456 accessory parking spaces could result from the Proposed Action. The net increases and reductions associated with other uses would be the same as under RWCDS 1.

² As discussed in the Foreword of the FEIS, since the issuance of the DEIS, a developer has purchased Block 505, Lot 16 (Potential Enlargement Site 4) and intends to utilize the available development rights as part of the adjacent One SoHo Square project. A light and air easement has been provided to the existing building on Lot 16; therefore, an enlargement is not expected to occur there in the future. With this change, there are 16 potential development and enlargement sites on which growth could occur.

Hudson Square Rezoning FEIS

the Applicant has proposed a modification to the proposed zoning text amendment, pursuant to ULURP No. 120381(A)ZRM, which would eliminate the Subdistrict B regulations from the proposed Special District zoning text and in their place the general Special District bulk regulations would apply. This modification, which is analyzed in Chapter 21, "Alternatives" ("No Subdistrict B Alternative"), would increase the development potential within that area, as compared with that of the Proposed Action, resulting in an overall increase of 179 residential units (including 42 affordable units), 5,343 gsf of retail use, and 11 accessory parking spaces. The environmental consequences of the anticipated ~~this~~ growth in the district (with Subdistrict B) are the subject of this EIS; the Alternatives chapter identifies the environmental consequences associated with additional development associated with the "No Subdistrict B Alternative, and other Alternatives, where applicable.

It is anticipated that the consumer needs of the new residential and worker populations would largely be satisfied by the new neighborhood-scale ground-floor retail uses that are expected to be developed as a result of the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action is not expected to induce additional notable growth outside of the Rezoning Area. As described in Chapter 2, the neighborhoods surrounding the Rezoning Area consist of thriving mixed-use neighborhoods, and many new residential projects are anticipated or under construction. This residential growth is anticipated to occur independent of the Proposed Action, and the new uses introduced by the Proposed Action would not trigger additional residential development outside of the Rezoning Area. The infrastructure in the study area is sufficiently well-developed and the Proposed Action would not result in a substantial expansion to infrastructure capacity in the surrounding area. The relatively small increase in development potential that would result from the modification to the proposed zoning text amendment that would eliminate the Subdistrict B is not expected to induce additional notable growth outside of the Rezoning Area. *