



DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
CITY OF NEW YORK

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND REVIEW DIVISION

Marisa Lago, *Director*
Department of City Planning

October 20, 2017

**NOTICE OF COMPLETION OF
THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

Self-storage Text Amendment

Project Identification

CEQR No. 17DCP119Y
ULURP Nos. N 170425 ZRY, N 170425(A) ZRY
SEQRA Classification: Type I

Lead Agency

City Planning Commission
120 Broadway, 31st Floor
New York, New York 10271

Contact Person

Robert Dobruskin, Director (212) 720-3423
Environmental Assessment and Review Division
New York City Department of City Planning

Pursuant to City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR), Mayoral Executive Order No. 91 of 1977, CEQR Rules of Procedure of 1991 and the regulations of Article 8 of the State Environmental Conservation Law, State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) as found in 6 NYCRR Part 617, a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) has been prepared for the action described below. Copies of the FEIS are available for public inspection at the office of the undersigned. The proposal involves actions by the City Planning Commission and Council of the City of New York pursuant to Uniform Land Use Review Procedures (ULURP). A public hearing on the FEIS was held on August 23, 2017, in conjunction with the City Planning Commission's citywide public hearing pursuant to ULURP. The public hearing also considered a modification to the Proposed Action (ULURP No. N 170425(A) ZRY). Written comments on the DEIS were requested and were received and considered by the Lead Agency until September 5, 2017. The FEIS incorporates responses to the public comments received on the DEIS and additional analysis conducted subsequent to the completion of the DEIS.

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Department of City Planning proposes a citywide zoning text amendment to establish a Special Permit under the jurisdiction of the City Planning Commission (CPC) for all new self-storage development in the proposed "Designated Areas." The proposed Designated Areas, all located in Manufacturing (M) districts, would largely coincide with Industrial Business Zones and would be established as text maps. A Special Permit is a discretionary action by the City Planning Commission that may modify use regulations if certain conditions specified in the Zoning Resolution are met.

Self-storage Text Amendment

CEQR No. 17DCP119Y

Page 2

Self-storage typically occupies large sites near Designated Truck Routes, which could provide potential siting opportunities for future industrial, more job-intensive businesses. The primary intent of this proposal is to establish a framework to conduct a case-by-case, site-specific review to ensure that the development of self-storage facilities does not occur on sites that should remain available to more job-intensive industrial uses. Additionally, a case-by-case framework would allow self-storage facilities to locate in Designated Areas in M districts on sites where self-storage facilities are found to be appropriate. The measure would significantly advance the City's economic development objectives for Industrial Business Zones by preserving adequate sites for industrial businesses. However, numerous factors influence the kind of uses that are developed in any given area, and it is understood that the Proposed Action alone will not in itself induce industrial development, which are already permitted as-of-right in M districts. This action solely aims to improve future siting opportunities for industrial businesses in NYC.

The proposed Designated Areas (the areas that would be directly affected by the proposed text amendment) in M districts are New York City's most active industrial areas, encompassing 10,254 acres and portions of 27 Community Districts across Brooklyn, Queens, Staten Island and the Bronx. All of the proposed Designated Areas are zoned for M1, M2 and M3 with FARs of 1, 2 or 5, respectively. Within the proposed Designated Areas, there are 65 self-storage facilities, representing about one quarter of all self-storage facilities in NYC.

It is expected that the likely effects of the proposed text would be to affect the amount and location of future self-storage facilities. Specifically, the proposed text amendment may result in a slight decrease in the number of self-storage facilities that would be developed in the foreseeable future, decreasing the projected amount from 86 to 81 in the foreseeable future. For the purposes of this analysis, the foreseeable future is defined as a ten-year period resulting in an analysis year of 2027.

Based on past and current development trends, it is projected that in the future without the proposed text amendment, there would be a total of 86 self-storage facilities developed in NYC. Of these 86 facilities, 20 are projected to be located within the areas proposed to be Designated Areas and 66 would be developed in M and C8 districts outside of the Designated Areas, where these uses are currently permitted. In the future with the proposed text amendment, there are projected to be 81 self-storage facilities, with 11 facilities located within the areas proposed to be Designated Areas and 70 facilities proposed to be developed in M and C8 districts. In total, there could be five fewer self-storage facilities overall by 2027, with nine fewer in Designated Areas, and four more in M and C8 districts outside of the Designated Areas.

Since the issuance of the DEIS, DCP has prepared and filed an amended zoning text application that expands upon the Mixed Use Alternative presented in the DEIS. The amended application, filed as ULURP application N 170425 (A) ZRY consists of modifications to the Proposed Action that would allow self-storage facilities as of right in Designated Areas in Manufacturing Districts by providing more job intensive industrial uses on the site. The amended application was analyzed in a technical memorandum issued on August 7, 2017, and is further analyzed as the A-text Alternative in the FEIS.

II. BACKGROUND

INDUSTRIAL BUSINESS ZONES

In November 2015, Mayor de Blasio announced a 10-point Industrial Action Plan (NYC Office of the Mayor, 2015), which aims to: strengthen NYC's most active industrial areas, invest in industrial and manufacturing businesses, and advance industrial-sector training and workforce development opportunities for New Yorkers. The Plan's proposals include zoning changes, infrastructure investments and loans and grants for mission-driven developers. The Industrial Action Plan specifically mentions Industrial Business Zones (IBZs), which are subsets of the City's manufacturing zones. These IBZs aim to support employment growth, industrial innovation, and the provision of industrial services, which allow New York City to function and prosper.

The present City administration has recognized the importance of the industrial sector for New York City, which employs 524,000 people (NYSDOL QCEW 2016(P)). Industrial businesses provide essential services such as building construction and maintenance; food and beverage distribution; bus, taxi and air transportation; freight management; waste disposal; and recycling services. These industrial businesses typically generate truck traffic, noise, odors, emissions, require relatively large sites and may be incompatible with residential and high density commercial or community facility development. For these reasons, such businesses and uses are typically only permitted in Manufacturing districts and C8 districts, most of which do not permit new residences.

A manufacturing district, designated by the letter M (M1-1, M2-2, for example), is a zoning district in which industrial and manufacturing uses, most commercial uses and some community facility uses are permitted. Industrial uses are subject to a range of performance standards. Performance standards are minimum requirements or maximum allowable limits on noise, vibration, smoke, odor and other effects of industrial uses listed in Use Groups 17 and 18 in the NYC Zoning Resolution. New residential development is typically not allowed, except in some districts with special designations.

A C8 district is a type of commercial zone that does not allow residential uses and is often mapped along automotive corridors. Similar to M1 districts, C8 districts allow industrial and manufacturing uses, most commercial uses and some community facility uses.

Not all M or C8 districts are characterized by the same amount or type of industrial and business activity. The previous administration under Mayor Bloomberg identified certain M districts as the most active industrial areas, designating those as Industrial Business Zones, while rezoning others to allow for some residential development. Established in 2006, Industrial Business Zones (IBZs) function as key industrial areas that accommodate and encourage a range of industrial jobs and activities (NYC Office of the Mayor, 2005). IBZs contain only M districts, but do not comprise all of NYC's M districts. Industrial and manufacturing businesses in IBZs are served by City-selected nonprofit organizations and may be eligible for tax incentives, financing tools and workforce development programs. While, up to this point, no specific land use regulations have been tied to IBZs, the Bloomberg administration committed not to rezone these areas to permit residential use; this commitment was re-affirmed within Mayor de Blasio's 10-Point Industrial Action Plan.

SELF-STORAGE

Self-storage, also known as mini-storage, is a business model in which space, often within a warehouse, is rented to individuals under a lease or rental agreement, usually on a month-to-month basis, specifically for the purpose of storing personal property. In no case may a self-storage unit be used for residential purposes. The tenant, a household or a business, has sole access to the storage unit, which could be a room, a container or a locker. A typical self-storage facility in NYC is a multi-story building, converted from a prior industrial use, containing several hundred or thousand storage rooms of about 5 – 10 x 10 feet, separated by interior metal partition panels and often accessed by roll-up doors. While conversions still account for the majority of existing self-storage facilities in NYC, they are becoming less popular, with the majority of newly opening self-storage facilities being purpose-built.

Unlike a warehouse operator or a moving business, who becomes a bailee of the entrusted goods, self-storage operators do not enter a bailment relationship. “A bailment is the relationship established when someone (the bailor) entrusts his property temporarily to someone else (the bailee) without intending to give up title.” (Mayer et al., 2012). In other words, a bailment is, “the rightful possession of goods by one who is not the owner.” *Zuppa v. Hertz*, 268 A.2d 364 (N.J. 1970). Accordingly, a self-storage operator’s liability for the stored goods is limited by the signing of a rental lease agreement and the establishment of a landlord and tenant relationship with the customer. The self-storage operator, not owning keys to locks on leased units, is not able to access those. In order to further ensure limited liability, self-storage operators will not themselves offer moving services or handle any of the stored goods, but rather recommend the hiring of third parties, who are equipped with adequate insurances packages and licenses to provide such services. Only when a tenant fails to pay the rent, and in accordance with NY State Lien law, may a self-storage operator enter a storage unit and take possession of the stored property.

New York City has been described as ‘the best storage market in the world’ (Morris, 2016): The city is large and very densely populated. Residents tend to live in small apartments, which often cannot accommodate all of their belongings. Furthermore, partially due to the high rate of renter versus owner-occupied households, there are many households moving in, out and around the city. Finally, many New Yorkers have high incomes, affording them the option of renting a self-storage on a monthly basis. The successful self-storage market in NYC is also reflected in the numbers: For the second quarter of 2015, the average asking rent was an annual \$36 per square foot for a climate controlled 10x10 foot unit in New York City, as compared to a national average of \$19 per square foot, according to REIS, a commercial real estate data analytics firm. Both nationally and in New York City, the asking rent per square foot is projected to increase steadily over the next five years, although asking rent growth rates are expected to decelerate (REIS, 2015).

PROJECT AREA DESIGNATED AREAS IN M DISTRICTS

Since IBZ boundaries were created for a tax program, and do not exist in the NYC Zoning Resolution, zoning maps needed to be created for the Proposed Action. Accordingly, the Department of City Planning analyzed the existing IBZ boundaries on a case-by-case basis, and in very limited cases, rationalized them to ensure that the proposed boundaries would be consistent with zoning practices. The resulting rationalized boundaries are referred to as Designated Areas in Manufacturing districts.

Overview of Nomenclatures

IBZs or Industrial Business Zones: Manufacturing-zoned areas in NYC, which were designated under the Bloomberg Administration. The boundaries define eligibility for tax incentives and do not exist in the NYC Zoning Resolution. IBZ boundaries are based on tax lots and do not follow the mapping conventions of the Zoning Resolution. Not all M districts are IBZs.

Designated Area in Manufacturing districts: Manufacturing-zoned areas, where the application of a CPC Special Permit for self-storage is proposed. These areas largely mirror current IBZ boundaries, but adhere to the mapping conventions of the Zoning Resolution, and will be incorporated into the Zoning Resolution as text maps.

Furthermore, other than the few above-explained individual tax lots or blocks, the John F. Kennedy and La Guardia airport areas have been excluded from the proposed Designated Areas in M districts. These airport areas are not subject to the City's Zoning Resolution and play a unique economic role in New York City, providing essential airport services. The proposed boundaries will be incorporated into the New York City Zoning Resolution as text maps.

III. PURPOSE AND NEED

The present City administration has recognized the importance of the industrial sector for New York City – a sector, which employs 524,000 people. Industrial businesses provide essential services such as building construction and maintenance; food and beverage distribution; bus, taxi and air transportation; freight management; and waste disposal and recycling services. Industrial Business Zones (IBZ) represent the most active industrial areas in New York City, which recent data shows have gained industrial employment since 2010.

Industrial businesses often need specialized space, geographically separated from potentially conflicting uses. In general, these businesses may generate truck traffic, noise, odors or emissions, and consequentially, prefer to locate away from residential, commercial, or community facility developments. These businesses also require relatively large sites and prefer to occupy ground floor space, for loading/unloading and the operation of heavy machinery. Since New York City is dense, and contains a narrow, historic transportation grid, the number of lots that are large and appropriate for truck-intensive uses are limited. Compounding this scarcity is that these lots are in limited supply and high demand. For the above reasons, Industrial Business Zones have been the objective of several economic development policies and are the City's target areas for the realization of economic development goals supporting a range of industrial and other employment-generating business activities and industrial innovation. The announced 10-point Industrial Action Plan builds on existing economic development policies for IBZs, which include Industrial Service Provider contracts, tax incentives and the pledge not to rezone IBZs for residential uses.

Self-storage development detracts from the City's economic development objectives for IBZs for several reasons. Firstly, it is a low job-generating use that primarily serves household rather than business needs. Self-storage facilities typically only store goods, without handling or taking custody for such goods, and even a very large facility may employ only a handful of workers. In NYC, self-storage facilities employ an average of five workers. Other types of warehouses, commercial storage spaces and moving companies provide not only storage but other essential services, such as moving, distribution, logistics and/or supply chain management services. Since these other warehouse generally offer other services, they also tend to hire a greater number of employees. Employment data from the Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages, collected by the New York State Department of Labor, supports this. According to 2015 3rd quarter QCEW data, there were 386 Warehousing and Storage (NAICS code: 4931) and Used Household and Office Goods Moving (NAICS code: 48421) firms in New York City. On average, each firm employed 17.8 workers, more than 3.5 times the amount of self-storage.

Self-storage also utilizes land that may be utilized by industrial uses. Recent new construction of self-storage facilities in M districts (30 facilities) were built on lots with an average size of 49,500 square feet; and conversions in M districts (42 facilities) present an average built area of 111,000 square feet. Lots and buildings of such sizes provide important siting opportunities for many industrial businesses, which tend to require sites large enough to accommodate horizontal operations, off-street loading and vehicle fleet parking.

Moreover, they are in limited supply in New York City: throughout DCP's studies of industrial areas, interviewed industrial businesses explained that they were finding it difficult to maintain operations in New York City in general, amongst other reasons due to the challenge of expansion and finding appropriate sites, in a context of low industrial vacancy. These statements are supported by an analysis of DOF Detailed Annual Sales data between 2010 and 2016, which reveals dramatic increases in prices for large industrial lots in M districts outside Manhattan. Furthermore, the volume of transactions for such properties has grown significantly, which is another indicator for increased market activity and a potential lack of future siting opportunities for industrial businesses.

Additionally, self-storage facilities typically site along arterial highways and designated truck routes. Sixty-five self-storage facilities have been developed in proposed Designated Areas in M districts: all sixty-five are within a half-mile of a Designated Truck Route, and over 75 percent are within 500 feet of a Designated Truck Route. These are crucial locations for truck-dependent businesses in the wholesale, freight and logistics, construction and other industries. Self-storage facilities have also been developed on sites near transit, which could be ideal for businesses with more employees, who depend on reliable public transportation options to access their work site.

Considering all of the above, self-storage stands out as a low-density employment use when compared to other storage and warehousing businesses, which furthermore tends to occupy large sites along designated truck routes, in a context where such large sites are becoming increasingly scarce. Almost one quarter of new construction permits issued for large sites in Designated Areas in M Districts are for self-storage developments: An analysis of new building permits issued by the Department of Buildings between 2010 and the end of 2016 for new constructions on sites larger than 20,000 SF in Designated Areas in M Districts shows that a total of 44 new building permits were issued, of which ten, or 23 percent, were self-storage facilities.

Given the City's numerous measures to support industrial businesses in IBZs and the fact that industrial employment has been growing in IBZs since 2010, the use of such sites for self-storage detracts from the City's economic development objectives.

IV. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

PROPOSED REGULATORY MECHANISM

The Department of City Planning proposes a citywide zoning text amendment to introduce a Special Permit under the jurisdiction of the City Planning Commission for all new self-storage development in proposed Designated Areas in M districts. A Special Permit is a discretionary action by the City Planning Commission, subject to the public review process (ULURP), which may modify use regulations if certain conditions specified in the Zoning Resolution are met. The public review process includes Community Board, Borough President and City Planning Commission review. The City Council may elect to review a Special Permit application and Mayoral review is also optional. By introducing a Special Permit, the Department of City Planning proposes to establish a framework to conduct a case-by-case, site-specific review to ensure that the development of self-storage facilities does not occur on sites that should remain available to industrial, more job-intensive uses. Additionally, a case-by-case framework would allow self-storage facilities to locate in Designated Areas in M districts on sites where self-storage facilities are found to be appropriate.

Currently, self-storage facilities are classified in zoning as Use Group 16D, either as warehouses or moving and storage offices, and are permitted as-of right in all M districts and C8 districts. With the enactment of this proposal, self-storage will remain in Use Group 16D, but will be specifically defined in the Zoning Resolution. The currently proposed definition is as follows:

Self-service storage facility

A "self-service storage facility" is a moving or storage office use or a warehouse use listed in Use Group 16D, for the purpose of storing personal property, and where such:

- (a) facility is partitioned into individual, securely subdivided space for lease; or
- (b) facility consists of enclosed or unenclosed floor space which is subdivided by secured bins, boxes, containers, pods or other mobile or stationary storage devices; and
- (c) floor spaces or storage devices are less than 300 square feet in area and are to be leased or rented to persons or businesses to access, store or remove property on a self-service basis.

A CPC Special Permit would be required for the defined use in proposed Designated Areas in M districts, which cover a portion of M districts and represent the City's target areas for the realization of economic development objectives.

The findings of the proposed Special Permit will require the City Planning Commission to evaluate whether a lot or building would be optimal for conforming, modern-day industrial uses, based on a set of criteria. In making its determination, the Commission considers such factors as:

- the size and configuration of the lot and its suitability for an industrial use;
- the accessibility of the lot to an arterial highway, or a designated truck route and the ability of streets providing access to the lot to handle generated traffic;
- the proximity of the lot to transit, which could serve employees;
- in the case of an existing building: its suitability for an industrial use, by considering the design and layout of loading docks, interior column spacing, floor-to-floor height and other relevant physical characteristics;
- the need to undertake environmental remediation work on the lot;
- recent development trends and levels of investment in the surrounding area for industrial uses within the last five years; and
- the potential for conflict between potential industrial uses on the lot and existing uses in the surrounding area.

Existing self-storage facilities could continue to operate as legal non-conforming uses. Extensions and enlargements of such grandfathered self-storage facilities would be permitted within the original zoning lot and the reconstruction of a grandfathered self-storage facility to the previously existing FAR, should it be damaged or destroyed, would be permitted.

INTENDED EFFECTS OF THE ACTION

By introducing a Special Permit for the development of self-storage in proposed Designated Areas in M districts, the Department of City Planning proposes to establish a framework to conduct a case-by-case, site-specific review to ensure that the development of self-storage facilities does not occur on sites that should remain available to more job-intensive industrial uses. Additionally, a case-by-case framework would allow self-storage facilities to locate in Designated Areas in M districts on sites where self-storage facilities are found to be appropriate.

The availability of future siting opportunities for industrial businesses in IBZs is a key component of the City's Industrial Action Plan. In order to advance the City's economic development objectives for Industrial Business Zones, the City aims to ensure that the kind of sites that have in the past often been occupied by self-storage facilities, which are typically large, adjacent to a Designated Truck Route and are in limited supply in NYC, remain available to industrial businesses. The Proposed Action is expected to result in the greater availability of sites in Designated Areas in Manufacturing districts, either for existing businesses to remain, or for potential development of more job-intensive industrial businesses, which provide essential industrial services, offer a greater number of jobs to New Yorkers and support the infrastructure of NYC.

Zoning framework: Future with and without the Action

	As-of-right	by Special Permit:
Future no-action	C8 and M districts	-
Future with-action	C8 districts and M districts that are not Designated Areas	Designated Areas in M districts

V. ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK

PROTOTYPICAL ANALYSIS

Reasonable Worst Case Development Scenario (RWCDS)

In order to assess the possible effects of the Proposed Actions, a RWCDS was developed for both the current (No Action Condition) and proposed zoning (With-Action Condition) conditions for a 10-year period (analysis year 2027). The incremental difference between the No Action and With Action Conditions will serve as the basis for the impact analyses of the EIS. A 10-year period typically represents the amount of time developers would act on the proposed action for an area-wide rezoning not associated with a specific development.

To determine that With Action and No Action Conditions, the RWCDS provides a projection – based on recent characteristics and geographic distribution patterns of new self-storage development and industry trends – of the number of new self-storage developments that can reasonably be expected by the 2027 Build Year in both the No Action and With Action Condition. It then considers the potential shift in self-storage development from Designated Areas to M and C8 district outside Designated Areas where new self-storage development would continue to be allowed as-of-right.

Project Area

Proposed Designated Areas in Manufacturing Districts

By subjecting the development of self-storage to a CPC Special Permit, the Proposed Action aims to improve future siting opportunities for industrial businesses in NYC, in a context where industrial uses are growing and are already permitted as-of-right in M districts. However, it is understood that the Proposed Action alone will not directly induce industrial development in the Designated Areas in M Districts: numerous factors influence the kind of uses that are developed in any given area, which remain beyond the scope of the Proposed Action, and which the Department of City Planning has no control over. Although the Proposed Action is a restriction and would in itself not induce development in the Designated Areas in M Districts, the occurrence of development on sites can never be excluded.

Sites that may have become self-storage facilities in the No-Action Condition, in the With-Action Condition may be developed for another use instead. Alternatively, an existing use may be more likely to remain in a location that would be redeveloped with self-storage in the No-Action.

This DEIS considers the type and location of new development and the placement or retention of businesses, by means of representative examples. This approach was the most appropriate given the myriad of potential scenarios, which exist in Designated Areas in M-Districts in the With-Action Condition. No technical analysis is planned for these representative examples as there is a high level of uncertainty surrounding any potential development in the With-Action condition, which would render any analysis of projected uses and their impacts meaningless. It is reasonable for the Department of City Planning to point to representative examples; however, conducting detailed technical analyses would be highly speculative.

This DEIS also analyzes the potential impact of self-storage development in Designated Areas in M Districts, which would be subject to a CPC Special Permit in the With-Action Condition, by means of a Conceptual Analysis. The conceptual analysis considers the potential impacts of self-storage development in the future No-Action and Future With-Action Condition, which will be based on existing trends and reasonable projections for the future.

M and C8 Districts Outside of Designated Areas

Per CEQR guidelines, since the Proposed Action has broad applicability, it is difficult to predict the universe of sites where development would be affected by the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action is therefore analyzed in this DEIS as a, “generic action.” Given the numerous possibilities for future development of self-storage facilities in M and C8 districts outside of Designated Areas which cover areas in all boroughs of New York City, a detailed, quantitative analysis of these potential developments and their environmental impacts in a site-specific manner would be very speculative. As such, this is a generic, city-wide action and the potential impacts of self-storage development in the future No-Action and future With-Action Condition will be analyzed by means of a prototypical analysis, which will be based on existing trends and reasonable projections for the future.

These reasonable projections regard the type of locations self-storage developers have typically sought out: larger sites near transit and highways, enjoying a high degree of visibility, in relatively densely populated areas.

Existing Conditions

In early 2017, there were approximately 240 self-storage facilities in New York City. The borough of Brooklyn had the most self-storage facilities, followed by Queens and the Bronx. The majority of self-storage facilities are in M districts, since M districts are more widely mapped than C8 districts – the only other zoning districts where self-storage is currently allowed as-of-right. A number of self-storage facilities also exist outside of M or C8 districts, but these facilities are non-conforming uses. Overall, about one quarter of all self-storage facilities are located in the proposed Designated Areas in M districts, meaning that the majority of facilities have been developed outside NYC’s most active industrial areas.

In written statements submitted to DCP, the New York Self-Storage Association (NYSSA) has stated that New York City is underserved in terms of self-storage. According to the NYSSA, the national

average square footage of self-storage amounts to 7.5 square feet per person, but self-storage amounts only to two square feet per person in NYC. Developers of self-storage have seen an increasing demand, which they attribute to the city's small apartments and growing population. In the most recent years, it appears that the share of facilities being developed in proposed Designated Areas in M districts is growing: approximately 50 percent of the new facilities were located in Designated Areas. However, this trend is not clearly discernible, since the pre-construction pipeline does not follow such a pattern. As of mid-January 2017, there were 9 self-storage facilities in the pre-construction process.

Four of the facilities in the pre-construction process will be built in Queens, and four in the Bronx. Two of the nine self-storage developments in the pre-construction process are to be developed in proposed Designated Areas in M districts, which reflects the last decade's average rate (25 percent), but is a lower share than in the last few years. Due to the inconclusive data, it is not possible to predict whether in the future without the proposed action, self-storage development would increasingly occur in the proposed Designated Areas in M districts, or whether the geographic development patterns would remain similar to those in the past.

Future No-Action Condition

Development patterns in the self-storage industry are anticipated to continue, with ongoing growth for the self-storage industry in NYC and the city remaining undersupplied with this type of facility compared with the national average. The demand for self-storage is expected to continue to grow, based also on the fact that the population and the number of businesses in NYC is growing.

It is not possible to project with certainty the number and location of self-storage facilities that will be developed in the No-Action condition within the proposed Designated Areas in M districts or in M and C8 districts outside of Designated Areas. However, in order to complete a thorough environmental analysis that enables the Department of City Planning to understand the potential impacts of the Proposed Action, a reasonable and conservative framework has been developed. This framework is based on self-storage development trends of the last ten years, which have been relatively constant.

Over the last decade, an average of 7.7 new self-storage facilities were built annually. This does not include approximately seven percent of existing self-storage facilities (N=17), because the build year of those facilities could not adequately be determined. For analytic purposes, it is assumed that these seventeen facilities were completed within the last two decades. Accordingly, 0.85 (17 facilities/20 years = 0.85 facilities per year) self-storage facilities were added to the yearly average in order to account for these seventeen self-storage facilities. Adding 0.85 to the 7.7 yearly self-storage facilities, the total of new self-storage facilities per year over the last decade would amount to an average of 8.5.

Number of self-storage facilities projected Citywide by the Build Year (No-Action)

based on the continuation of the rate of self-storage development in the last ten years (2007 – 2016), amounting to 8.5 new self-storage development per year

Citywide projection

9 self-storage facilities in pre-construction (next 1 year)

+

8.5 new facilities per year x 9 years

$9 + (9 \times 8.5) \approx 86$

Citywide, Self-storage No-Action

For the purpose of environmental analysis, DCP estimates that within the next year, the nine self-storage developments that are currently in the pre-construction process will be completed. For the remaining nine years until the Build Year, beyond the pre-construction pipeline, it is assumed that the last decade's rate of self-storage development will continue. As explained above, the rate of self-storage development in NYC in the last decade averaged about 8.5 new self-storage facilities per year. Projecting this rate of self-storage development into the future is reasonable and conservative, since the self-storage industry expanded significantly in New York City in the last decade, and is expected to continue to grow, and thus maintain a similar development trend until the Build Year. Accordingly, an additional 8.5 self-storage facilities per year are expected to be built until the Build Year. This amounts to a total of approximately eighty-six projected new self-storage facilities citywide by the time of the Build Year.

Although approximately eighty-six new facilities are anticipated, the location of these facilities will most likely not be evenly distributed across the boroughs. Given that only one of the self-storage developments in the pre-construction phase is located in Manhattan, and none are in Staten Island, and that these boroughs' real estate market conditions tend to result in other types of development, it is expected that the large majority of the projected self-storage facilities would site in the Bronx, Brooklyn, and Queens. More specifically, over the last decade (2007 – 2016), about one quarter of self-storage development has occurred in proposed Designated Areas in M districts and the other three quarters has for the most part taken place in M and C8 districts outside of Designated Areas.

Proposed Designated Areas in Manufacturing Districts

The number of self-storage developments within proposed Designated Areas in Manufacturing districts amounts to an average of about two self-storage facilities per year between 2007 and 2016, representing approximately one quarter of all self-storage development. In the most recent years, it appears that the share of facilities being developed in proposed Designated Areas in M districts is growing, but the pre-construction pipeline does not follow this pattern and so the data remains

inconclusive. For analytic purposes, it is assumed that the last decade's trends will continue until the Build Year, meaning that the number of self-storage facilities that could be expected in proposed Designated Areas in M districts until the Build Year would amount to approximately 20. This includes also the two self-storage facilities, which are in the pre-construction phase.

The number of new self-storage facilities projected by the time of the Build Year amounts to eighty-six. This is a conservative estimate for the purpose of this analysis, and a generous assessment of the amount of self-storage development that may occur over the next decades, since it is based on the last decade's rate of self-storage development – a decade, which marked a significant expansion period for the self-storage industry.

M and C8 districts Outside of Designated Areas

Over the last decade, the majority of self-storage development has occurred in M and C8 districts outside of Designated Areas. However, considering that population and employment are growing in New York City, these areas – typically less industrial in character, often closer to transit and residencies, tending to consist of smaller lots – may gain an increasing share of development in commercial, community facility and other uses. It is possible that self-storage would decrease in competitiveness compared to other uses in these areas, and may increasingly occur in the proposed Designated Areas in M districts. In that sense, the ratio of self-storage facilities built in proposed Designated Areas in M districts versus other areas could change, with proposed Designated Areas in M districts absorbing an increasingly larger share of self-storage development. Because data regarding whether such a trend already exists is inconclusive (see Existing Conditions), it is assumed that the future share of new facilities siting in Designated areas in M districts will resemble the patterns of the last decade. Understanding that the total number of projected self-storage facilities amounts to 8.5 per year in the No-Action Condition, and past rates of self-storage development place about three quarter of these facilities in M and C8 districts outside of Designated Areas, approximately 6.5 self-storage facilities would be developed on a yearly basis in M and C8 districts outside of Designated Areas.

Number of self-storage facilities projected by the Build Year (No-Action) by Location

Based on the continuation of the rate of self-storage development in the last ten years (2007 – 2016), amounting to 8.5 new self-storage development per year on a citywide basis: one quarter in Designated Areas, and three-quarters in M and C8 districts outside of Designated Areas.

Proposed Designated Areas in M districts	Citywide, excl. proposed Designated Areas
---	--

2 self-storage facilities in pre-construction (next 1 year); and	7 self-storage facilities in pre-construction (next 1 year); and
--	--

2 new facilities per year x 9 years 2 + (9 x 2)	6.5 new facilities per year x 9 years 7 + (9 x 6.5)
---	---

2 new facilities per year x 9 years 2 + (9 x 2)	6.5 new facilities per year x 9 years 7 + (9 x 6.5)
---	---

≈20	≈ 66
------------	-------------

≈20	≈ 66
------------	-------------

Detailed, Self-storage No-Action

Future With-Action Condition

The Proposed Action introduces a discretionary approval process by CPC Special Permit for self-storage development within proposed Designated Areas in M districts. CPC Special Permits present a disincentive to the development of self-storage development facilities, since obtaining the Special Permit can add significant time, costs and uncertainty to a project. Accordingly, it is reasonable to assume that a CPC Special Permit would have the effect of slowing the rate at which self-storage is developed in the proposed Designated M districts and increasing the rate at which it is developed in the areas that remain as-of-right.

Overall, by 2027, the Proposed Action may lead to a somewhat reduced number of additional self-storage facilities in New York City; some self-storage projects that may have occurred in the No-Action Condition may never get realized. Because the directly affected area covers a considerable amount of the area where self-storage is permitted as-of-right today (49 percent), it can be expected that the Proposed Action would to a certain extent, reduce the number of sites available to developers of self-storage, who may seek opportunities in neighboring municipalities. However, considering the importance of the New York City market for the self-storage industry, it is generally expected that the industry will continue to seek siting opportunities in New York City, despite the Proposed Action. For instance, self-storage development that would have located in the Designated Areas in Manufacturing districts may seek siting opportunities in M and C8 districts in New York City, where the Special Permit is not proposed.

As in the No-Action Condition, it is not possible to project with certainty the number and location of self-storage facilities that will be developed until the Build Year in the With-Action condition.

Nevertheless, for the purposes of environmental review, a reasonable and conservative framework has been developed, which is based on past self-storage development trends and other plausible, well-explained assumptions. This framework allows for an analytical analysis, but is not intended to capture the character or totality of future self-storage development, which is to a large extent unknown.

The number of self-storage facilities that would not be built in New York City due to the Proposed Action cannot be determined with precision. Since demand for self-storage is very strong and the industry is highly lucrative, it is expected that the industry will continue to seek and find siting opportunities in New York City, despite the Proposed Action. DCP also expects that increased demand for self-storage may lead to redevelopment of what today would be considered suboptimal sites, as we see with many other highly profitable developments, such as residential.

The Proposed Action would apply to 49 percent of the land area where self-storage is currently permitted as-of-right, and where on average one quarter of self-storage development has occurred. Accordingly, the Proposed Action does not include the areas, where the majority of self-storage development has occurred, and zoning districts permitting self-storage development as-of-right would remain in nearly all Community Districts in New York City. Furthermore, in some instances, developers will likely apply and receive a Special Permit to develop facilities in proposed Designated Areas in M districts. Considering all of these factors, it is expected that the Proposed Action will not as much affect the total number of new self-storage developments in NYC, as it will affect the location of those new facilities within the city boundaries. While this assumption is well-founded and thoroughly explained in this chapter, the future cannot be projected with certainty. However, for the purpose of this analysis, it is projected that the Proposed Action would result in the change of location of one new self-storage facility per every two years beyond city boundaries. This implies that under the With-Action Condition, the number of projected new self-storage facilities would amount to 8 per year until the Build Year on a citywide basis, as compared to the 8.5 per year under the No-Action Condition.

The Proposed Action is not expected to alter any self-storage developments that are currently in the pre-construction phase. Operating under the assumption that the building permits would be issued before the date of enactment of this proposed text amendment, the nine projects that are currently in the pre-construction phase are anticipated to be completed. This assumption is reasonable, since developers need to obtain only a building permit and complete foundations, if constructing a new building, in order to comply with the vesting terms and receive permission to finish the project. Any project that is currently already in the pre-construction process is likely to be completed, and is not expected to be affected by the Proposed Action.

Number of self-storage facilities projected by the Build Year (With-Action), Citywide

Based on the continuation of the rate of self-storage development in the last ten years (2007 – 2016), and including a net reduction of one facility per two years due to the Proposed Action.

Citywide projection

9 self-storage facilities in pre-construction (next 1 year)

+

8 new facilities per year x 9 years

$9 + (9 \times 8) \approx 81$

Citywide, Self-storage With-Action

Overall, the Proposed Action would likely lead to slightly fewer self-storage facilities in NYC by the Build Year. This implies that the Proposed Action would slightly constrain supply and could potentially diminish the self-storage industry's ability to satisfy market demand, which in return would lead to a modest increase in the price of self-storage units. The extent to which this would occur, and the prices at which self-storage units would be leased, are difficult to estimate. However, it is plausible to assume that the slight increase in self-storage rates due to the Proposed Action would help the operating side of the self-storage industry, and also increase the value of pre-existing grandfathered self-storage facilities, while the development side would experience a small number of lost opportunities and slightly diminished revenues.

The potential modest rate increases for self-storage may affect certain households' and small businesses' ability to rent self-storage units or their ability to pay for such units, if demand stays strong. Households and businesses alike may have to travel further to access units in the desired price range or rent smaller units, resulting in some inconvenience. Furthermore, there may also be a certain shift in customer demand. Businesses may increasingly lease warehousing space, instead of self-storage units, and the on-demand storage model may become prominent. This alternative business model in the household storage market is gaining popularity. A shift in customer preferences, away from self-storage and toward on-demand storage, would reduce the demand for self-storage and consequently also the number of self-storage facilities developed in the future. Furthermore, if demand for personal storage continues to grow, more residential developments may include accessory private storage within buildings, providing more opportunities for storage closer to residences.

Regarding the distribution of self-storage facilities within New York City's five boroughs, DCP expects that the majority of the self-storage facilities would site in the Bronx, Brooklyn, and Queens. However, the Proposed Action is expected to have a certain effect on the siting locations city wide, since a Special Permit would be required in proposed Designated Areas in M districts.

Proposed Designated Areas in Manufacturing Districts

DCP projects less self-storage development in Designated Areas in Manufacturing districts under the With-Action Condition than the No-Action Condition. The introduction of a new discretionary approval process is likely to present a disincentive to the development of self-storage since some self-storage developers may be reluctant to undergo a discretionary review process. Yet, demand for self-storage is not close to being saturated, according to the New York Self Storage Association and is highly lucrative. Accordingly, it is plausible to assume that the Special Permit discretionary review process would not deter all self-storage developers, and that a certain number of Special Permits may be applied for.

Under the With-Action Condition, the number of self-storage facilities developed in Designated Areas in Manufacturing districts under the CPC Special Permit framework cannot be precisely determined. For the purpose of this analysis, past application trends of a Special Permit similar to the Proposed Action – the CPC Special Permit for large retail establishments, outlined in Section 74-922 of the NYC Zoning Resolution – were used as a reference. In the ten-year timeframe between 2007 and the end of 2016, ten Special Permit applications were completed, or an average of one CPC Special Permit per year. Using recent application patterns for the 74-922 CPC Special Permit, DCP projects that there would be one application per year for the CPC Special Permit for self-storage. The Proposed Action is not expected to alter any self-storage developments that are currently in the pre-construction phase. Operating under the reasonable assumption that the building permits would be issued before the date of enactment of this proposed text amendment, the two developments that are currently in the pre-construction phase in proposed Designated Areas in M districts would presumably be completed. Accordingly, under the With-Action Condition, assuming all pre-construction projects are realized and one CPC Special Permit is applied for and granted on a yearly basis (amounting to a total of nine Special Permits), a total of eleven new self-storage facilities would be built in the proposed Designated Areas in M districts until the Build Year.

M and C8 districts Outside of Designated Areas

Over the next ten years, the projected number of new self-storage facilities is eight facilities per year on a citywide basis. This is because demand for self-storage is expected to follow the patterns of the last decade and will remain high. As explained above, it is expected that one self-storage facility per year will be built in a Designated Area in M districts. All other self-storage facilities would be developed in M and C8 districts outside of Designated Areas, which are the only areas where self-storage development could still occur as-of-right. It is expected that self-storage developers would increasingly seek development opportunities in M and C8 districts outside of Designated Areas. Due to the Proposed Action and the still increasing demand for self-storage, sites that today would be considered suboptimal sites may be redeveloped, as can be seen with many other highly profitable developments, such as residential.

Since the Proposed Action is not expected to alter any self-storage developments that are currently in at least the pre-construction phase, the seven self-storage facilities, which are in the pre-construction phase in the M and C8 districts outside of Designated Areas, would assumedly not be affected by the Proposed Action and be completed.

As a result, under the With-Action Condition, seventy self-storage facilities would be added to M and C8 districts outside of Designated Areas on a citywide basis by the time of the Build Year. This

represents an increase of four new self-storage facilities in the M and C8 districts outside Designated Areas in M-districts by the time of the Build Year, compared to the sixty-six additional facilities projected in the No-Action Condition.

Number of self-storage facilities projected by the Build Year (With-Action) by Location

based on the continuation of the rate of self-storage development in the last ten years (2007 – 2016), including a net reduction of one facility per two years due to the Proposed Action, and assuming 1 Special Permit per year for development in Designated Areas.

Proposed Designated Areas in M districts

Citywide, excl. Designated Areas

2 self-storage facilities in pre-construction (next 1 year); and

7 self-storage facilities in pre-construction (next 1 year); and

1 Special Permit x 9 years

7 new facilities per year x 9

2 + (9 x 1)

years 7 + (9 x 7)

≈11

≈ 70

Detailed. Self-storage With-Action

The modest increase in self-storage development could occur anywhere in New York City where self-storage development would still be permitted as-of-right. It cannot be exactly determined where the additional four new self-storage facilities, projected on a citywide basis by the time of the Build Year, would be developed. However, it is clear that any such additional self-storage development would be relatively diffused; the potentially affected M and C8 districts are widely dispersed in the NYC and there are many sites where such development could potentially take place in these areas. It is anticipated that a majority of the self-storage developments that would change location would site in M and C8 districts that adjoin Designated Areas in Manufacturing districts, which already have several self-storage facilities. Here, existing market conditions already demonstrate demand for self-storage development. As such, DCP would expect the modest increase in self-storage development to take place in M and C8 districts within about a two-mile radius of proposed Designated Areas in M districts that have already experienced a greater amount of self-storage development. Examples of such places include: Long Island City, Jamaica, Port Morris, Flatlands/Fairfield, Zerega and Southwest Brooklyn. The Designated Areas in the M districts in portions of those neighborhoods all have five or more self-storage facilities. As a result of the Proposed Action, the M and C8 districts within about a two-mile radius to these Designated Areas in Manufacturing districts would be expected to experience a minor increase in self-storage development. The boroughs of Brooklyn, Queens and Bronx each have two of these proposed Designated Areas in M districts, meaning that the areas, where such a modest increase could be projected, are relatively evenly distributed in the City.

These M and C8 districts near Designated Areas in Manufacturing districts are typically large and contain numerous potential sites where such additional self-storage facilities could be placed.

Therefore it cannot be predicted with certainty where such a self-storage facility would be built. Self-storage does not only site on large existing lots, but it is also typical for assemblages to occur before the construction of such a facility.

When comparing the No-Action to the With-Action Condition, this represents a decrease in nine facilities in proposed Designated Areas in M districts, and an increase in four facilities in the M and C8 districts outside Designated Areas in M-districts by the time of the Build Year.

No-Action and With-Action Condition Comparison			
Number of self-storage facilities projected by the Build Year			
	Proposed Designated Areas in M districts	Citywide, excl. Designated Areas	Total Citywide
No-Action Condition	≈20	≈ 66	≈86
With-Action Condition	≈11	≈ 70	≈81

Comparison of No-Action and With-Action

Overall, the With-Action Condition is expected to achieve the Purpose and Need of the Proposed Action. The detailed and site-specific review process for new self-storage developments in Designated Areas in Manufacturing districts would help to better ensure the availability of desirable sites for more job-intensive industrial uses by ensuring that self-storage would only get built on sites that are not optimal for such industrial businesses. Ensuring the availability of large industrial lots as future industrial business locations, in a context where such businesses are growing and are already experiencing difficulties to operate and expand their NYC base, is a crucial component of the Industrial Action Plan. Importantly, the 10-point Industrial Action Plan is accompanied by a series of economic development measures targeting IBZs, which are oriented towards enabling industrial businesses to remain and grow in Industrial Business Zones, which are largely coincident with proposed Designated M Areas.

Overall, the Proposed Action would likely lead to slightly fewer self-storage facilities in NYC by the Build Year. This implies that the Proposed Action would slightly constrain supply and could potentially diminish the self-storage industry’s ability to satisfy market demand, which in return would lead to a modest increase in the price of self-storage units.

No-Action and With-Action Condition Compared

The No-Action Condition forecasted that eighty-six new self-storage facilities would be developed in New York City by the time of the Build Year: twenty in the proposed Designated Areas in M districts, and sixty-six in the M and C8 districts outside of Designated Areas. This number took into consideration the pre-construction pipeline, and projected an average of 8.5 new facilities per year

beyond the pipeline. This estimate is deemed to be conservative for the purpose of this analysis and a generous assessment of the amount of self-storage development that may occur over the next decade.

The With-Action Condition projected a total of eighty-one new self-storage facilities on a citywide basis, leading to five fewer facilities by the time of the Build Year compared to the No-Action Condition. Eleven new self-storage facilities would be built in proposed Designated Areas in M districts, and seventy self-storage facilities would be added to M and C8 districts outside of Designated Areas on a citywide basis by the time of the Build Year. When comparing the No-Action to the With-Action Condition, this represents a decrease in nine facilities in proposed Designated Areas in M districts, and an increase in four facilities in the M and C8 districts outside Designated Areas in M-districts by the time of the Build Year.

Overall, the With-Action Condition is expected to achieve the Purpose and Need of the Proposed Action, as outlined in Attachment A. The detailed and site-specific review process for new self-storage developments in Designated Areas in Manufacturing districts would help to better ensure the availability of desirable sites for more job-intensive industrial uses by ensuring that self-storage would only get built on sites that are not optimal for such industrial businesses. Ensuring the availability of large industrial lots as future industrial business locations, in a context where such businesses are growing and are already experiencing difficulties to operate and expand their NYC base, is a crucial component of the Industrial Action Plan. Importantly, the 10-point Industrial Action Plan is accompanied by a series of economic development measures targeting IBZs, which are oriented towards enabling industrial businesses to remain and grow in Industrial Business Zones, which are largely coincident with proposed Designated M Areas.

REPRESENTATIVE EXAMPLES

This DEIS considers the type and location of new development and the placement or retention of businesses, by means of representative examples. This approach was the most appropriate given the myriad of potential scenarios, which exist in Designated Areas in M-Districts in the With-Action Condition. No technical analysis is planned for these representative examples as there is a high level of uncertainty surrounding any potential development in the With-Action condition, which would render any analysis of projected uses and their impacts meaningless. It is reasonable for the Department of City Planning to point to representative examples; however, conducting detailed technical analyses would be highly speculative.

VI. PRINCIPAL CONCLUSIONS

LAND USE, ZONING AND PUBLIC POLICY

No significant adverse impacts on land use, zoning, or public policy are anticipated. The Proposed Action would not adversely affect surrounding land uses, nor would the Proposed Action generate land uses that would be incompatible with existing zoning and land uses. Furthermore, the Proposed Action would not result in development that conflicts with adopted public policies.

SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS

The Proposed Action is not expected to result in direct or indirect residential or business displacement. However, the Proposed Action would result in significant adverse business impacts in the self-storage industry.

Direct and Indirect Residential Displacement

The Proposed Action is a restriction on the as-of-right development of self-storage facilities within Designated Areas in M districts, which – by definition – do not permit residencies. Residential displacement is accordingly not a potential impact of the Proposed Action.

Direct and Indirect Business and Institutional Displacement

The Proposed Action will continue to allow existing self-storage facilities to operate, and even expand within the zoning lot as of date of enactment of the Proposed Action. Although the Proposed Action could to a certain extent limit the self-storage industry's ability to meet future demand, which could entail rising rental costs for self-storage users, of which some are businesses, the Proposed Action is, overall, expected to continue to substantially support needs of businesses, in comparison to the No-Action Condition. As such, the Proposed Action does not have the potential to cause direct or indirect business displacement.

Adverse Effects on Specific Industries

Generally, it can be expected that the Proposed Action would effectively reduce the number of sites available to developers of self-storage that meet these developers' market-based selection criteria. Overall, the Proposed Action reduces the amount of land viable for self-storage development in 27 Community Districts. In sixteen Community Districts, it reduces the amount of viable land by more than 50 percent. In two Community Districts, the Proposed Action reduces the amount of land viable for self-storage development by more than 80 percent: this is in Community District 2 of the Bronx and Community District 2 of Staten Island. However, residual acreage in Community District 2 of the Bronx would still be 30 acres, and 183 acres in the case of Community District 2 of Staten Island.

As expressed in statements made by representatives of the self-storage industry, it is possible that more viable sites for self-storage development remain within the Designated Areas in M districts than in other M and C8 districts. This implies that the Proposed Action would slightly constrain supply and could potentially diminish the self-storage industry's ability to satisfy market demand. The extent to which this would occur, and the prices at which self-storage units would be leased, cannot be estimated with certainty.

In both oral and written statements submitted to DCP, representatives of the self-storage industry have stated that their industry would be negatively affected by the Proposed Action. Furthermore, New York City already is the most undersupplied major metropolitan market nationwide, according to a report from CBRE (2016). The report estimates that there are 3.5 square feet of self-storage per person in NYC, whereas between 5 and 7 sq. ft. per person are seen as the amount of self-storage a balanced market would provide. Given that the Proposed Action could potentially diminish the self-storage industry's ability to satisfy market demand, the consideration that the supply of self-storage

in NYC is already lower than in other major metropolitan markets in the US intensifies the potential for a significant adverse impact on the self-storage industry.

It is not possible to quantitatively estimate the impact of the Proposed Action on the self-storage industry, due to uncertainty in development trends until the Build Year. Yet, based on available information and statements from the industry, it cannot be excluded that the proposed CPC Special Permit could hamper the self-storage industry's ability to grow in New York City. As such, it is determined that the Proposed Action has the potential to significantly affect business conditions in the self-storage industry.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

The Proposed Action would not directly or indirectly impact any community facilities. In terms of direct effects, the Proposed Action would not physically alter a community facility, whether by displacement of the facility or by other physical change. In terms of indirect displacement, the Proposed Action is also not anticipated to have any indirect effects, as this project would not generate residential development. Thus, the Proposed Action would not result in significant adverse impacts to community facilities and services, and no further analysis is necessary.

OPEN SPACE

The Proposed Action would not result in any direct or indirect significant adverse impacts related to open space.

Direct Effects

The Proposed Action would not result in any open space resources being physically displaced. However, due to the change in geographic distribution, the Proposed Action does have the potential to cause increased noise or air pollutant emissions, odors, or shadows on public open space that could possibly affect its usefulness. Although the Proposed Action has the potential for direct effects on open space, the potential for direct effects is extremely limited.

Indirect Effects

The Proposed Action is a "Generic Action," and there are no known potential and/or projected development sites at this time. To produce a reasonable analysis of likely effects of the Proposed Action, four representative development prototypes have been established for analysis. Since there are no specific development sites, the preliminary open space assessment first determined if any of the four prototypes exceed any of the CEQR preliminary screening thresholds. None of the prototypes would induce residential development in either the With-Action or No-Action Condition.

SHADOWS

While it is not possible to rule out the potential for adverse shadow impacts, the potential for such impacts is unlikely. The Proposed Action would result in only four more self-storage facilities in M and C8 districts outside of the Designated Areas. In order for there to be an adverse impact, one of these four facilities would need to locate adjacent to, or across the street from, a sunlight-sensitive

resources, and the facility would need to be situated in such a way as to cause impacts on this sunlight-sensitive resource. The potential for this, while possible, is unlikely.

HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

Archaeological Resources

The Proposed Action has the potential to result in significant adverse impacts to archaeological resources as it may result in deeper in-ground disturbance. While the potential impacts of the provisions are expected to be limited and unlikely, it is not possible to conclude where and to what extent additional in-ground disturbance might occur. As such, the possibility of significant impacts on archaeological resources cannot be eliminated. These potential impacts would be unmitigated.

Architectural Resources

The Proposed Action is not expected to induce development. In total, it is anticipated to result in five fewer self-storage facilities overall by 2027, with nine fewer in Designated Areas, and four more in M and C8 districts outside of Designated Areas. Privately owned properties that are NYCLs or in New York City Historic Districts would continue to be protected under the New York City Landmarks Law that requires LPC review and approval before any alteration or demolition can occur. However, impacts to eligible historical resources that are not protected by local, state or national designations may be affected by the Proposed Action. Such impacts are unlikely, however, given that the Proposed Action is expected to shift the location of four new facilities citywide. Not only would one of these four facilities need to be located in close proximity to an architectural resource, but it would need to be situated or constructed in such a way to adversely affect the resource. The likelihood of the combination of these factors is limited.

URBAN DESIGN

The Proposed Action has the potential to change the geographic distribution of self-storage facilities, resulting in 9 fewer self-storage facilities within Designated Areas and four additional facilities in C8 and M districts outside of Designated Areas. The Proposed Action could introduce four new facilities to C8 and M districts in Non-Designated Areas. The buildings would have a compatible height, zoning calculation, and floor area calculation to other buildings in Non-Designated Areas. It should be noted, however, that self-storage facilities tend to be brightly colored as part of their branding. Although color isn't specifically mentioned in the CEQR Technical Manual, the Manual does mention facades noting, "the public realm extends to building facades and rooftops, offering more opportunity to enrich the visual character of an area." Although not all facilities are brightly colored, since a large number are brightly colored, and this would have the potential to change the pedestrian's experience, it is noted in the analysis.

Overall, the Proposed Action is anticipated to have minimum effects on the pedestrian's experience. The proposal is anticipated to result in four additional facilities in C8 and M districts outside of Designated Areas citywide. These facilities are largely compatible with the surrounding context. Additionally, just because some of the facilities are colorful, does not mean it would necessarily result in a negative pedestrian experience; some people may find the colorful facilities attractive and find they enliven the surrounding area. Thus, overall, the Proposed Action is unlikely to disturb the vitality, the walkability or the visual character of that area and no further assessment is necessary.

NATURAL RESOURCES

The Proposed Action would not result in significant adverse impacts to natural resources. In accordance with the methodology outlined in the CEQR Technical Manual, a screening analysis was conducted to assess the potential of the Proposed Action to affect natural resources. The analysis concluded that, although the Proposed Action is anticipated to shift development to locations outside of the Designated Areas, the Proposed Action itself would not induce development on sites where natural resources exist and where development would not have otherwise been possible. The Proposed Action would not eliminate and/or change the existing State or local protections.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The Proposed Action has the potential to result in significant adverse hazardous materials impacts. In accordance with the methodology outlined in the CEQR Technical Manual, a hazardous materials assessment was conducted. The assessment concluded that the Proposed Action would likely result in additional in-ground disturbance that could occur on sites where hazardous materials exist. The extent of this potential impact is expected to be limited, however. The Proposed Action itself is not expected to induce development on sites where development would not have otherwise been possible thereby limiting the potential for additional in-ground disturbance. It is also not anticipated to increase building footprints. It could, however, result in deeper excavation compared to the No Action scenario as the building heights under the With Action condition are anticipated to be slightly taller. Given the land uses in the area, and their associated potential for hazardous materials, this would result in the potential for significant adverse hazardous materials impacts. These potential impacts would be unmitigated.

WATER AND SEWER INFRASTRUCTURE

The Proposed Action would not result in significant adverse impacts on water and sewer infrastructure. In accordance with the CEQR Technical Manual, a screening analysis was conducted. Since the Proposed Action is a “generic action,” and there are no specific development sites, to produce a reasonable analysis of likely effect of the Proposed Action, four representative development prototypes have been identified and used for analysis, as described in Chapter 2 of the FEIS, “Analytical Framework.”

Water Supply

The Proposed Action would not result in significant adverse impacts on water supply. The screening analysis concluded that the effects of the Proposed Action would not be great enough to warrant a preliminary analysis of water supply, and therefore would not result in significant adverse impacts to water supply.

Wastewater and Stormwater Conveyance and Treatment

The Proposed Action would not result in significant adverse impacts on wastewater and stormwater conveyance and treatment. The preliminary assessment shows that the incremental development that may occur at any one prototypical development site would fall below the CEQR thresholds, and therefore would not result in significant adverse impacts to water supply.

SOLID WASTE AND SANITATION

The Proposed Action would not result in any significant adverse impacts to solid waste and sanitation services. In accordance with the methodology outlined in the CEQR Technical Manual, a screening analysis was conducted to assess the potential of the Proposed Action to affect demand for solid waste and sanitation services.

The Proposed Action is a “generic action,” and there are no known potential or projected development sites and, due to its broad applicability, it is difficult to predict the sites where development would be facilitated by the Proposed Action. To produce a reasonable analysis of likely effect of the Proposed Action, four representative development prototypes have been identified. The Proposed Action is not anticipated to induce development, but there was a difference in the development of the No-Action compared to the With-Action Condition. None of the four prototypes analyzed would result in a net increase of more than 50 tons of solid waste per week. As such, the Proposed Action would not result in any significant adverse impacts to solid waste and sanitation services and a detailed analysis is not warranted.

ENERGY

The Proposed Action would not result in a significant adverse impact on energy systems. In accordance with the CEQR Technical Manual, a screening analysis of the potential for the Proposed Action to affect demand for energy has been provided based on prototypical development sites. The screening analysis concluded that the incremental development that may occur at any one prototypical development would not be significant enough to affect energy systems.

TRANSPORTATION

The analyses presented below conclude that the Proposed Action would not result in significant adverse impacts on the transportation network. Of the four prototypes that have been developed to represent the likely effects of the Proposed Action outside of Designated Areas, Prototype 2 is the largest and contains a total of 167,000 gross square feet of floor area. Based on the analyses, Prototype 2 is projected to generate vehicle, pedestrian, and transit trip levels that are below the screening thresholds that could cause significant transportation impacts, as defined by the 2014 CEQR Technical Manual. It is noted that this analysis does not “take credit” for a potential No-Action development, such as an as-of-right industrial use that may have occupied the project site absent the Proposed Action, resulting in conservative analysis. Therefore, none of the other Prototypes would exceed the screening thresholds, and there is no potential for the Proposed Action to create significant adverse transportation impacts.

AIR QUALITY

Mobile Sources

The Proposed Action would not result in significant adverse air quality impacts due to mobile sources. Based on the traffic screening criteria provided in CEQR Technical Manual, the Proposed Action would not exceed the thresholds for requiring a mobile source air quality analysis, and therefore, no further analysis is warranted.

Stationary Sources

The Proposed Action would not result in any significant adverse air quality impacts due to stationary sources. Based on the prototypical analysis, two of four prototypes require detailed analysis and two of four prototypes require screening analysis. The prototypical analysis showed that there would be no potential for significant adverse air quality impacts from fossil fuel-fired heat and hot water systems associated with any prototype.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND CLIMATE CHANGE

The Proposed Action would be consistent with the City's Greenhouse Gas (GHG) and climate change goals. Since the Proposed Action would not facilitate development greater than 350,000 square feet on a single development site or involve other energy intense projects, per CEQR guidelines, there would be no significant adverse GHG emissions or climate change impacts as a result of the Proposed Action.

NOISE

The Proposed Action would not result in significant adverse noise impacts due to operations of any potential development. The Proposed Action has the potential to introduce new source receptors near existing sensitive receptors. However, based on the performance standards set forth by the zoning resolution Section 42-214, self-storage facilities are required to emit a maximum noise level reduced by 6 decibels below the maximum permitted sound pressure level listed in the table below. With the noise level criteria in place, the Proposed Action would not result in significant adverse noise impacts and further analysis is not warranted.

NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

The Proposed Action would not result in significant adverse impacts on neighborhood character. A screening analysis of neighborhood character concluded the Proposed Action would not result in significant adverse impacts on the following technical areas that comprise the elements that make up neighborhood character: land use, open space, historic and cultural resources (architecture), urban design and visual resources, shadows, transportation and noise. While the Proposed Action would result in significant adverse impacts with respect to socioeconomic conditions, the effects would not raise the potential to significantly impact neighborhood character.

PUBLIC HEALTH

The Proposed Action would not result in significant adverse impacts on public health. As described in preceding chapters of this Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the Proposed Action would not result in significant adverse impacts in air quality, water quality, or noise. The Proposed Action would potentially result in significant adverse impacts on hazardous materials; therefore, a screening analysis was conducted. The screening analysis concluded that, while the Proposed Action has the potential result of unmitigated adverse impacts in hazardous materials due to potential for additional in-ground disturbance, the potential for these impacts to occur is expected to be limited and would not significantly affect public health. Therefore, no further analysis is warranted.

CONSTRUCTION

The Proposed Action would not result in significant adverse construction impacts. Based on CEQR Technical Manual guidelines, where the duration of construction is expected to be short-term (less than two years) detailed construction assessment is not warranted. Based on the screening analysis, the Proposed Action is not expected to result in any development where the duration of construction would be over two years.

MITIGATION

The Proposed Action would result in potential significant adverse impacts with respect to socioeconomic conditions (adverse effects on specific industries), historic and cultural resources (archaeological), and hazardous materials. No practicable mitigation measures were identified to reduce or eliminate historic and cultural resources or hazardous materials impacts. As discussed in Chapter 23 of the FEIS, “Alternatives,” alternatives were developed which would partially mitigate the socioeconomic conditions impact.

ALTERNATIVES

Alternatives selected for consideration in an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) are those that are feasible and have the potential to reduce, eliminate, or avoid any adverse impacts of a proposed action while meeting some or all of the goals and objectives of the action. The Proposed Action is intended to ensure that self-storage development does not utilize locations that may otherwise be used by a more job-intensive industrial use. This will be achieved by verifying that proposed self-storage facilities only take place only on sites that are suboptimal for industrial businesses and would prove unlikely for future industrial business locations.

The FEIS considered four alternatives to the Proposed Action:

- A No Action Alternative, which is mandated by CEQR and the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), and is intended to provide the lead and involved agencies with an assessment of the expected environmental impacts of no action on their part.
- A Smaller Sites Exemption Alternative, which considers allowing self-storage facilities as-of-right on zoning lots of 20,000 sq. ft. or less.
- The Mixed Use Alternative in the DEIS has been revised and expanded upon in response to comments on the DEIS and is presented as the A-text Alternative in the FEIS. The A-text Alternative considers modifications to the Proposed Action which would allow self-storage uses in Designated Areas above the ground floor, provided that 20,000 square feet of ground-floor space is set aside for more job-intensive industrial uses. DCP has prepared and filed an amended zoning text application (ULURP No. N 170425 (A) ZRY) that addresses issues raised after issuance of the DEIS. This amended application is assessed as the A-text Alternative in the FEIS.
- A new alternative was added to the FEIS (“Modified A-text Alternative”) that considers potential modifications to the proposed amended zoning text application (ULURP No. N 170425 (A) ZRY), which would allow new self-storage uses as-of-right in Designated Areas in M districts, provided that on large lots, floor space amounting to at least 50 percent of the lot area is set aside for more job-intensive industrial uses.

No-Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative examines future conditions within the Project Area, but assumes the absence of the Proposed Actions (i.e., none of the discretionary approvals proposed as part of the Proposed Actions would be adopted). Under the No Action Alternative, existing zoning would remain in the area affected by the Proposed Actions and new storage could continue to locate as-of-right within Designated Areas in M Districts.

Under the Proposed Action, by the build year, it is anticipated 11 new self-storage facilities would be built in Designated Areas and 71 new self-storage would be developed in in M and C8 districts outside Designated Areas. Under the No-Action Alternative, 20 new self-storage facilities would be located in Designated Areas and 66 would be located in C8 and M districts outside Designated Areas. In addition, under the No-Action Alternative, approximately 9,600 acres of land would be available and viable for as-of-right self-storage development, compared with approximately 4,900 acres under the Proposed Action.

Although the No-Action Alternative would potentially eliminate impact related to adverse effects on the self-storage industry, hazardous materials and archaeology, this alternative would not meet the Proposed Action's objective of maintaining suitable sites for more job-intensive industrial uses and encouraging higher job densities in the city's strongest industrial areas.

Smaller Sites Alternative

Another possible alternative is to continue to allow new self-storage development as-of-right on smaller sites. For the purposes of this analysis, a small site is defined as having a lot area of 20,000 sq. ft. or less, which is significantly smaller than the median lot size of 40,000 sq. ft. of recent self-storage development within Designated Areas.

Under the Proposed Action, by the build year, it is anticipated 11 new self-storage facilities would be built in Designated Areas and 71 new self-storage would be developed in in M and C8 districts outside Designated Areas. Under the Smaller Sites Alternative, it is assumed that the number of new self-storage facilities developed in Designated Areas would be higher since an as-of-right option for self-storage development would remain, but somewhat less than the 20 additional facilities expected in the No-Action Alternative since some self-storage facilities may choose not to build on smaller, less optimal development sites. Some additional development may also shift to more optimal sites in M and C8 districts outside of Designated Areas, but, as in the Proposed Action, this would be expected to be a very small number of sites.

An analysis of land use and employment trends on potential redevelopment sites on lots smaller than 20,000 sq. ft. indicates that these sites are actively used by a diverse range of businesses, the majority of which remain industrial in character. As described below, although parking and vacant sites are often considered prime sites for redevelopment, these sites also support significant employment, an indication that many largely unimproved sites remain in active use by businesses for vehicle parking and storage of materials.

Overall, given the above-described trends, it is evident that smaller sites also serve as an important siting opportunity for industrial companies. Therefore, an alternative that would continue to allow as-of-right construction of self-storage on smaller sites (the Smaller Sites Alternative) would not be

fully consistent with the Proposed Action's purpose and need to maintain and maximize siting opportunities for more job-intensive industrial sectors.

In addition, because most recent self-storage development occurs on lots larger than 20,000 sq. ft. the Smaller Sites Alternative would not provide a full range of siting opportunities for self-storage and thus would only partially mitigate significant adverse impacts on the self-storage industry. Since some additional development may still shift to more optimal development sites outside Designated Areas, the Small Sites Alternative would not mitigate the potential for significant adverse impacts related to archaeology and hazardous materials.

A-text Alternative

The A-text Alternative considers modifications to the Proposed Action that would allow new self-storage uses in Designated Areas as-of-right, provided that at least 20,000 square feet of ground floor space is set aside for more job-intensive industrial uses. Since the issuance of the DEIS, DCP has prepared and filed an amended zoning text application that expands upon the Mixed Use Alternative presented in the DEIS. The amended application, filed as ULURP application N 170425 (A) ZRY, consists of modifications to the Proposed Action to permit self-storage facilities as-of-right in Designated Areas in M districts, provided that a minimum specified amount of ground-floor space is set aside for more job-intensive industrial uses. The industrial ground floor requirement could be modified or waived by applying for a City Planning Commission Special Permit. The allowance would be limited to self-storage developments including ground floor industrial uses of no less than 20,000 square feet, where the industrial ground floor space would be limited to occupancy by use groups 11A, 16A, 16B, 16D (excluding self-storage), 17 and 18; art studios in UG 9A; and/or photographic or motion picture production studios, radio or television studios in UG 10A. The analysis assumes separate off-street loading docks and entrances for the self-storage and ground floor industrial uses. The changes proposed under the A-text Alternative are in response to views expressed during the public review process, and would reduce the potential for significant adverse impacts on the self-storage industry, while still supporting the Proposed Action's goal of maintaining adequate future siting opportunities for more job-intensive industrial uses in the Designated Areas.

Under the Proposed Action, by the build year, it is anticipated 11 new self-storage facilities would be built in Designated Areas and 70 new self-storage would be developed in in M and C8 districts outside Designated Areas. Under the A-text Alternative, it is expected that by the Build Year, up to 20 sites in Designated M Areas would be redeveloped with mixed industrial and self-storage developments, but the continued requirements for a Special Permit for new self-storage development that does not meet the standards described above could result in somewhat fewer sites than would be expected in the No-Action Alternative. Some additional development may also shift to more optimal sites in M and C8 districts outside of Designated Areas, but, as in the Proposed Action, this would be expected to be a very small number of sites.

Based on conclusions of a mixed-use feasibility analysis in the Alternatives chapter, the type of industrial tenants most compatible for such space would be smaller scale, less truck-dependent manufacturing uses. Therefore, land use conditions in the future with the A-text Alternative are likely to include more new space for manufacturing uses, but potentially fewer sites available to larger scale construction, wholesale and transportation businesses.

Although the A-text Alternative would not maintain as much flexibility in siting opportunities for larger industrial businesses as the Proposed Action, it could create new space for smaller scale industrial and light manufacturing businesses, and would therefore partly meet the purpose and need of the Proposed Action. Additionally, by providing additional siting opportunities for self-storage, this alternative would partially mitigate the significant adverse impacts of the Proposed Action on the self-storage industry. Since some additional development may still shift to more optimal development sites outside Designated Areas, the A-text Alternative would not mitigate the potential for significant adverse impacts related to archaeology and hazardous materials.

Modified A-text Alternative

The Modified A-Text Alternative considers potential modifications for consideration by the City Planning Commission that would modify the amended zoning text application (ULURP application N 170425 (A) ZRY). In response to comments received on the DEIS, a Modified A-text Alternative was developed to increase the feasibility of mixed-use self-storage and industrial development, with the objective of addressing public comment and further reducing significant adverse business impacts on the self-storage industry. The Modified A-text Alternative would allow for some flexibility in the placement of the required industrial space and considers rules that are appropriate to lots of all sizes. The Modified A-text Alternative would permit self-storage development as-of-right on large lots, considered as lots larger than or equal to 25,000 SF, provided that an industrial floor space component equivalent to 50 percent of the lot area is provided. On small lots, considered as lots smaller than 25,000 square feet, floor space equivalent to 50 percent of the lot area may be provided in the form of large self-storage units, defined as units equal to or larger than 100 square feet, because units of these sizes are typically rented by businesses.

The Modified A-text Alternative furthermore changes the findings of the Special Permit, basing them on financial hardship. Accordingly, a BSA Special Permit could modify, reduce or waive the industrial space requirement.

This as-of-right framework is less restrictive and presents less of a disincentive to the development of self-storage development facilities than the Proposed Action. It also provides more options for the siting of self-storage facilities compared to the A-text Alternative, because it offers provisions for the siting of self-storage facilities on small sites and includes provisions that make the locational requirements associated with the industrial space more flexible. Accordingly, it is expected that the Modified A-Text Alternative would reduce, but not fully mitigate, the Proposed Action's potential for a significant adverse environmental impacts on Socioeconomic Conditions related to the self-storage industry. Since some additional development may still shift to more optimal development sites outside Designated Areas, the Modified A-text Alternative would not mitigate the potential for significant adverse impacts related to archaeology and hazardous materials.

CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS

The FEIS includes a conceptual analysis to assess potential environmental impacts that could result if a Special Permit is obtained to build a self-storage facility within the Designated Areas in M Districts. Approval of such a special permit would be subject to discretionary approval and any environmental impacts associated with such action would be assessed and disclosed pursuant to a separate project-specific, environmental review. However, to disclose the possible environmental impacts of such a self-storage facility, analyses were conducted on a conceptual and generic basis

and are discussed in the following chapters. The prototypes are used to illustrate the consequences of a CPC Special Permit being granted are examples, which DCP believes would meet the findings of the proposed Special Permit. If a site would not meet the findings, the application would not receive the Special Permit and the facility would not be built.

The With-Action for the Proposed Action includes nine self-storage facilities in Designated Areas in M Districts that would be built by applying for the proposed CPC Special Permit. This conceptual analysis cannot attempt to analyze every possible scenario under which a CPC Special Permit could be granted, since too many variations and possibilities exist, but presents prototypes, by means of which the technical analyses may be conducted. These prototypes will be plausible cases for future Special Permit applications, but may not exhaust the entire universe of future possibilities for self-storage development via the CPC Special Permit in Designated Areas in M Districts.

Since the Proposed Action is a restriction, and a self-storage facility would be allowed as-of-right in the Future-No-Action Condition, the Special Permit application in the With-Action Condition effectively presents a subset of the possible as-of-right developments under the No-Action Condition. Consequentially, the range of possibility are like those that guided the selection of prototypes in the Analysis Framework.

Two prototypes were developed for the conceptual analysis for CEQR analysis purposes. These prototypes were based existing trends and reasonable projections for the future. These reasonable projections regard the type of locations self-storage developers have typically sought out: larger sites near transit and highways, enjoying a high degree of visibility, in relatively densely populated areas.

UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

The Proposed Action would result in potential significant adverse impacts with respect to socioeconomics conditions, historic resources, and hazardous materials. No practicable mitigation measures were identified to reduce or eliminate historic resources or hazardous materials impacts. As presented in the “Alternatives” Chapter, alternatives were presented that would partially mitigate socioeconomic conditions impacts. Therefore, the Proposed Action would result in the potential for unavoidable adverse impacts with respect to socioeconomic conditions, historic resources, and hazardous materials.

GROWTH-INDUCING ASPECTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTIONS

The Proposed Action is not anticipated to directly induce development and consequentially, would not add substantial new land use, new residents or new employment that could induce additional development. Likewise, the Proposed Action would not introduce or greatly expand infrastructure capacity.

IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES

The Proposed Action is a “generic action” and there are no specific development sites at this time. The Proposed Action itself is not expected to induce development, however, it may result in different geographic distribution of self-storage facilities. The Proposed Action also constitutes an irreversible and irretrievable commitment of potential development sites as a land resource, as it thereby renders land use for other purposes infeasible.

Robert Dobruskin

Robert Dobruskin, AICP, Director
Environmental Assessment and Review Division
New York City Department of City Planning

cc: Marisa Lago, Chair
City Planning Commissioners
All Borough Presidents
All Borough Boards
All Community Boards
Raju Mann, City Council
Hilary Semel, OEC
Terrell Estes, DEP
Owen Wells, DPR
Naim Rasheed, DOT
Aaron Werner, HPD
Gina Santucci, LPC
Olga Abinader
Stephanie Shellooe

Purnima Kapur
Howard Slatkin
Eric Kober
Anita Laremont
Amanda Eyer
Barry Dinnerstein
Jennifer Gravel
Steven Lenard
Len Garcia-Duran
John Young
Edith Hsu-Chen
Winston Von Engel
Caron Samol
Pat Bussey
Mauricio Garcia
Mehdi Amjadi
Susan Wong