City Environmental Quality Review
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT STATEMENT (EAS) SHORT FORM

FOR UNLISTED ACTIONS ONLY • *Please fill out and submit to the appropriate agency* (see instructions)

Part I: GENERAL INFORMATION

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

If "yes," **STOP** and **complete the FULL EAS FORM**.

2. *Project Name* 18-15 Francis Lewis Blvd Commercial Overlay

3. *Reference Numbers*

CEQR REFERENCE NUMBER (to be assigned by lead agency)	BSA REFERENCE NUMBER (if applicable)
25DCP050Q	
ULURP REFERENCE NUMBER (if applicable)	OTHER REFERENCE NUMBER(S) (if applicable) (*e.g.*, legislative intro, CAPA)
250272ZMQ	

4a. *Lead Agency Information*			**4b. *Applicant Information***		
NAME OF LEAD AGENCY			NAME OF APPLICANT		
NYC Department of City Planning			Medident Corp.		
NAME OF LEAD AGENCY CONTACT PERSON			NAME OF APPLICANT'S REPRESENTATIVE OR CONTACT PERSON		
Stephanie Shellooe, AICP, Director, Environmental Assessment and Review Division			Scott Friedman, DDS		
ADDRESS 120 Broadway, 31st Floor			ADDRESS 518-15 Francis Lewis Boulevard		
CITY New York	STATE NY	ZIP 10271	CITY Queens	STATE NY	ZIP 11357
TELEPHONE 212-720-3328	EMAIL sshellooe@planning.nyc.gov		TELEPHONE 718-746-8900	EMAIL 2align@gmail.com	

5. *Project Description*

The Applicant, Medident, is seeking a zoning map amendment from an R3-2 zoning district to an R3-2/C1-2 zoning district (the "Proposed Action") on Block 4748, Lot 35 in the Clearview neighborhood of Queens Community District 7 (the "Projected Development Site"). The Proposed Action would facilitate the legal use of the existing professional office building and enable the Applicant to make minor interior renovations to the site plan without the burden of returning to the Board of Standards and Appeals (BSA). No new development is proposed for the Projected Development Site.

Project Location

BOROUGH Queens	COMMUNITY DISTRICT(S) 7	STREET ADDRESS 18-15 Francis Lewis Blvd
TAX BLOCK(S) AND LOT(S) Block 4748, Lot 35		ZIP CODE 11357

DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY BY BOUNDING OR CROSS STREETS 160th Street, 18th Avenue and Francis Lewis Blvd

EXISTING ZONING DISTRICT, INCLUDING SPECIAL ZONING DISTRICT DESIGNATION, IF ANY R3-2 | ZONING SECTIONAL MAP NUMBER 10c

6. *Required Actions or Approvals* (check all that apply)

City Planning Commission: ☒ YES ☐ NO ☒ UNIFORM LAND USE REVIEW PROCEDURE (ULURP)

☐ CITY MAP AMENDMENT	☐ ZONING CERTIFICATION	☐ CONCESSION
☒ ZONING MAP AMENDMENT	☐ ZONING AUTHORIZATION	☐ UDAAP
☐ ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT	☐ ACQUISITION—REAL PROPERTY	☐ REVOCABLE CONSENT
☐ SITE SELECTION—PUBLIC FACILITY	☐ DISPOSITION—REAL PROPERTY	☐ FRANCHISE
☐ HOUSING PLAN & PROJECT	☐ OTHER, explain:	

☐ SPECIAL PERMIT (if appropriate, specify type: ☐ modification; ☐ renewal; ☐ other); EXPIRATION DATE:

SPECIFY AFFECTED SECTIONS OF THE ZONING RESOLUTION

Board of Standards and Appeals: ☐ YES ☒ NO

☐ VARIANCE (use)

☐ VARIANCE (bulk)

☐ SPECIAL PERMIT (if appropriate, specify type: ☐ modification; ☐ renewal; ☐ other); EXPIRATION DATE:

SPECIFY AFFECTED SECTIONS OF THE ZONING RESOLUTION

***Department of Environmental Protection*:** ☐ YES ☒ NO ☐ Cogeneration Facility ☐ Title V Permit

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

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

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

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

***State or Federal Actions/Approvals/Funding*:** ☐ YES ☒ NO If "yes," specify:

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

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

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

Physical Setting (both developed and undeveloped areas)

Total directly affected area (sq. ft.): 2,978
Waterbody area (sq. ft) and type:
Roads, buildings, and other paved surfaces (sq. ft.): 2,978
Other, describe (sq. ft.):

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

SIZE OF PROJECT TO BE DEVELOPED (gross square feet): 5,866
NUMBER OF BUILDINGS: 1
GROSS FLOOR AREA OF EACH BUILDING (sq. ft.): 5,866
HEIGHT OF EACH BUILDING (ft.): 18
NUMBER OF STORIES OF EACH BUILDING: 1

Does the proposed project involve changes in zoning on one or more sites? ☒ YES ☐ NO
If "yes," specify: The total square feet owned or controlled by the applicant: 2,987
The total square feet not owned or controlled by the applicant: 0

Does the proposed project involve in-ground excavation or subsurface disturbance, including, but not limited to foundation work, pilings, utility lines, or grading? ☐ YES ☒ NO
If "yes," indicate the estimated area and volume dimensions of subsurface permanent and temporary disturbance (if known):
AREA OF TEMPORARY DISTURBANCE: n/a sq. ft. (width x length)
VOLUME OF DISTURBANCE: n/a cubic ft. (width x length x depth)
AREA OF PERMANENT DISTURBANCE: n/a sq. ft. (width x length)

Description of Proposed Uses (please complete the following information as appropriate)

	Residential	***Commercial***	***Community Facility***	***Industrial/Manufacturing***
Size (in gross sq. ft.)		5,866		
Type (*e.g.,* retail, office, school)	units	Office		

Does the proposed project increase the population of residents and/or on-site workers? ☐ YES ☒ NO
If "yes," please specify: NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL RESIDENTS: NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL WORKERS:
Provide a brief explanation of how these numbers were determined:

Does the proposed project create new open space? ☐ YES ☒ NO If "yes," specify size of project-created open space: sq. ft.

Has a No-Action scenario been defined for this project that differs from the existing condition? ☒ YES ☐ NO
If "yes," see Chapter 2, "Establishing the Analysis Framework" and describe briefly: Existing building would be converted into legally conforming community facility use.

9. *Analysis Year* CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 2

ANTICIPATED BUILD YEAR (date the project would be completed and operational): 2027

ANTICIPATED PERIOD OF CONSTRUCTION IN MONTHS: 6

WOULD THE PROJECT BE IMPLEMENTED IN A SINGLE PHASE? ☒ YES ☐ NO IF MULTIPLE PHASES, HOW MANY?

BRIEFLY DESCRIBE PHASES AND CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE:

10. ***Predominant Land Use in the Vicinity of the Project*** (check all that apply)

☒ RESIDENTIAL ☐ MANUFACTURING ☒ COMMERCIAL ☐ PARK/FOREST/OPEN SPACE ☐ OTHER, specify:

Part II: TECHNICAL ANALYSIS

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

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

	YES	NO
1. *LAND USE, ZONING, AND PUBLIC POLICY*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 4		
(a) Would the proposed project result in a change in land use different from surrounding land uses?	☐	☒
(b) Would the proposed project result in a change in zoning different from surrounding zoning?	☒	☐
(c) Is there the potential to affect an applicable public policy?	☐	☒
(d) If "yes," to (a), (b), and/or (c), complete a preliminary assessment and attach. See Chapter B		
(e) Is the project a large, publicly sponsored project?	☐	☒
○ If "yes," complete a PlaNYC assessment and attach.		
(f) Is any part of the directly affected area within the City's Waterfront Revitalization Program boundaries?	☐	☒
○ If "yes," complete the Consistency Assessment Form.		
2. *SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 5		
(a) Would the proposed project:		
○ Generate a net increase of 200 or more residential units?	☐	☒
○ Generate a net increase of 200,000 or more square feet of commercial space?	☐	☒
○ Directly displace more than 500 residents?	☐	☒
○ Directly displace more than 100 employees?	☐	☒
○ Affect conditions in a specific industry?	☐	☒
3. *COMMUNITY FACILITIES*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 6		
(a) Direct Effects		
○ Would the project directly eliminate, displace, or alter public or publicly funded community facilities such as educational facilities, libraries, hospitals and other health care facilities, day care centers, police stations, or fire stations?	☐	☒
(b) Indirect Effects		
○ **Early Childhood Programs:** Would the project result in 20 or more eligible children under age 6, based on the number of low or low/moderate income residential units? (See Table 6-1 in Chapter 6)	☐	☒
○ **Public Schools:** Would the project result in 50 or more elementary or middle school students, or 150 or more high school students based on number of residential units? (See Table 6-1 in Chapter 6)	☐	☒
○ **Libraries:** Would the project result in a 5 percent or more increase in the ratio of residential units to library branches? (See Table 6-1 in Chapter 6)	☐	☒
○ **Health Care Facilities and Fire/Police Protection:** Would the project result in the introduction of a sizeable new neighborhood?	☐	☒
4. *OPEN SPACE*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 7		
(a) Would the project change or eliminate existing open space?	☐	☒
(b) Would the project generate more than 200 additional residents or 500 additional employees?	☐	☒
5. *SHADOWS*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 8		
(a) Would the proposed project result in a net height increase of any structure of 50 feet or more?	☐	☒
(b) Would the proposed project result in any increase in structure height and be located adjacent to or across the street from a sunlight-sensitive resource?	☐	☒
6. *HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 9		

	YES	NO
(a) Does the proposed project site or an adjacent site contain any architectural and/or archaeological resource that is eligible for or has been designated (or is calendared for consideration) as a New York City Landmark, Interior Landmark or Scenic Landmark; that is listed or eligible for listing on the New York State or National Register of Historic Places; or that is within a designated or eligible New York City, New York State or National Register Historic District? (See the GIS System for Archaeology and National Register to confirm)	☐	☒
(b) Would the proposed project involve construction resulting in in-ground disturbance to an area not previously excavated?	☐	☒
(c) If "yes" to either of the above, list any identified architectural and/or archaeological resources and attach supporting information on whether the proposed project would potentially affect any architectural or archeological resources.		
7. *URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 10		
(a) Would the proposed project introduce a new building, a new building height, or result in any substantial physical alteration to the streetscape or public space in the vicinity of the proposed project that is not currently allowed by existing zoning?	☐	☒
(b) Would the proposed project result in obstruction of publicly accessible views to visual resources not currently allowed by existing zoning?	☐	☒
8. *NATURAL RESOURCES*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 11		
(a) Does the proposed project site or a site adjacent to the project contain natural resources as defined in Section 100 of Chapter 11?	☐	☒
○ If "yes," list the resources and attach supporting information on whether the proposed project would affect any of these resources.		
(b) Is any part of the directly affected area within the Jamaica Bay Watershed?	☐	☒
○ If "yes," complete the Jamaica Bay Watershed Protection Plan Project Tracking Form, and submit according to its instructions.		
9. *HAZARDOUS MATERIALS*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 12		
(a) Would the proposed project allow commercial or residential uses in an area that is currently, or was historically, a manufacturing area that involved hazardous materials?	☐	☒
(b) Would the proposed project introduce new activities or processes using hazardous materials and increase the risk of human or environmental exposure?	☐	☒
(c) Does the proposed project site have existing institutional controls (*e.g.*, (E) designation or Restrictive Declaration) relating to hazardous materials that preclude the potential for significant adverse impacts?	☐	☒
(d) Would the project require soil disturbance in a manufacturing area or any development on or near a manufacturing area or existing/historic facilities listed in the Hazardous Materials Appendix (including nonconforming uses)?	☐	☒
(e) Would the project result in the development of a site where there is reason to suspect the presence of hazardous materials, contamination, illegal dumping or fill, or fill material of unknown origin?	☐	☒
(f) Would the project result in development on or near a site that has or had underground and/or aboveground storage tanks (*e.g.*, gas stations, oil storage facilities, heating oil storage)?	☐	☒
(g) Would the project result in renovation of interior existing space on a site with the potential for compromised air quality; vapor intrusion from either on-site or off-site sources; or the presence of asbestos, PCBs, mercury or lead-based paint?	☐	☒
(h) Would the project result in development on or near a site with potential hazardous materials issues such as government-listed voluntary cleanup/brownfield site, current or former power generation/transmission facilities, coal gasification or gas storage sites, railroad tracks or rights-of-way, or municipal incinerators?	☐	☒
(i) Has a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment been performed for the site?	☐	☒
○ If "yes," were Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) identified? Briefly identify:	☐	☒
(j) Based on the Phase I Assessment, is a Phase II Investigation needed?	☐	☒
10. *WATER AND SEWER INFRASTRUCTURE*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 13		
(a) Would the project result in water demand of more than one million gallons per day?	☐	☒
(b) If the proposed project located in a combined sewer area, would it result in at least 1,000 residential units or 250,000 square feet or more of commercial space in Manhattan, or at least 400 residential units or 150,000 square feet or more of commercial space in the Bronx, Brooklyn, Staten Island, or Queens?	☐	☒
(c) If the proposed project located in a separately sewered area, would it result in the same or greater development than the amounts listed in Table 13-1 in Chapter 13?	☐	☒
(d) Would the proposed project involve development on a site that is 5 acres or larger where the amount of impervious surface would increase?	☐	☒
(e) If the project is located within the Jamaica Bay Watershed or in certain specific drainage areas, including Bronx River, Coney Island Creek, Flushing Bay and Creek, Gowanus Canal, Hutchinson River, Newtown Creek, or Westchester Creek, would it involve development on a site that is 1 acre or larger where the amount of impervious surface would increase?	☐	☒
(f) Would the proposed project be located in an area that is partially sewered or currently unsewered?	☐	☒
(g) Is the project proposing an industrial facility or activity that would contribute industrial discharges to a Wastewater Treatment Plant and/or generate contaminated stormwater in a separate storm sewer system?	☐	☒

	YES	NO
(h) Would the project involve construction of a new stormwater outfall that requires federal and/or state permits?	☐	☒
11. *SOLID WASTE AND SANITATION SERVICES*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 14		
(a) Using Table 14-1 in Chapter 14, the project's projected operational solid waste generation is estimated to be (pounds per week): 234		
○ Would the proposed project have the potential to generate 100,000 pounds (50 tons) or more of solid waste per week?	☐	☒
(b) Would the proposed project involve a reduction in capacity at a solid waste management facility used for refuse or recyclables generated within the City?	☐	☒
12. *ENERGY*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 15		
(a) Using energy modeling or Table 15-1 in Chapter 15, the project's projected energy use is estimated to be (annual BTUs): 1,268,816		
(b) Would the proposed project affect the transmission or generation of energy?	☐	☒
13. *TRANSPORTATION*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 16		
(a) Would the proposed project exceed any threshold identified in Table 16-1 in Chapter 16?	☐	☒
(b) If "yes," conduct the screening analyses, attach appropriate back up data as needed for each stage and answer the following questions:		
○ Would the proposed project result in 50 or more Passenger Car Equivalents (PCEs) per project peak hour?	☐	☐
If "yes," would the proposed project result in 50 or more vehicle trips per project peak hour at any given intersection? ***It should be noted that the lead agency may require further analysis of intersections of concern even when a project generates fewer than 50 vehicles in the peak hour. See Subsection 313 of Chapter 16 for more information.*	☐	☐
○ Would the proposed project result in more than 200 subway/rail, bus trips, or 50 Citywide Ferry Service ferry trips per project peak hour?	☐	☐
If "yes," would the proposed project result, per project peak hour, in 50 or more bus trips on a single line (in one direction), 200 subway/rail trips per station or line, or 25 or more Citywide Ferry Service ferry trips on a single route (in one direction), or 50 or more passengers at a Citywide Ferry Service landing?	☐	☐
○ Would the proposed project result in more than 200 pedestrian trips per project peak hour?	☐	☐
If "yes," would the proposed project result in more than 200 pedestrian trips per project peak hour to any given pedestrian or transit element, crosswalk, subway stair, or bus stop, or Citywide Ferry Service landing?	☐	☐
14. *AIR QUALITY*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 17		
(a) *Mobile Sources*: Would the proposed project result in the conditions outlined in Section 210 in Chapter 17?	☐	☒
(b) *Stationary Sources*: Would the proposed project result in the conditions outlined in Section 220 in Chapter 17?	☐	☒
○ If "yes," would the proposed project exceed the thresholds in Figure 17-3, Stationary Source Screen Graph in Chapter 17? (Attach graph as needed)	☐	☒
(c) Does the proposed project involve multiple buildings on the project site?	☐	☒
(d) Does the proposed project require federal approvals, support, licensing, or permits subject to conformity requirements?	☐	☒
(e) Does the proposed project site have existing institutional controls (*e.g.*, (E) designation or Restrictive Declaration) relating to air quality that preclude the potential for significant adverse impacts?	☐	☒
15. *GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 18		
(a) Is the proposed project a city capital project or a power generation plant?	☐	☒
(b) Would the proposed project fundamentally change the City's solid waste management system?	☐	☒
(c) If "yes" to any of the above, would the project require a GHG emissions assessment based on the guidance in Chapter 18?	☐	☒
16. *NOISE*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 19		
(a) Would the proposed project generate or reroute vehicular traffic?	☐	☒
(b) Would the proposed project introduce new or additional receptors (see Section 114 in Chapter 19) near heavily trafficked roadways, within one horizontal mile of an existing or proposed flight path, or within 1,500 feet of an existing or proposed rail line with a direct line of site to that rail line?	☐	☒
(c) Would the proposed project cause a stationary noise source to operate within 1,500 feet of a receptor with a direct line of sight to that receptor or introduce receptors into an area with high ambient stationary noise?	☐	☒
(d) Does the proposed project site have existing institutional controls (*e.g.*, (E) designation or Restrictive Declaration) relating to noise that preclude the potential for significant adverse impacts?	☐	☒
17. *PUBLIC HEALTH*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 20		
(a) Based upon the analyses conducted, do any of the following technical areas require a detailed analysis: Air Quality; Hazardous Materials; Noise?	☐	☒
(b) If "yes," explain why an assessment of public health is or is not warranted based on the guidance in Chapter 20, "Public Health." Attach a		

	YES	NO
preliminary analysis, if necessary.		
18. *NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 21		
(a) Based upon the analyses conducted, do any of the following technical areas require a detailed analysis: Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy; Socioeconomic Conditions; Open Space; Historic and Cultural Resources; Urban Design and Visual Resources; Shadows; Transportation; Noise?	☐	☒
(b) If "yes," explain why an assessment of neighborhood character is or is not warranted based on the guidance in Chapter 21, "Neighborhood Character." Attach a preliminary analysis, if necessary.		
19. *CONSTRUCTION*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 22		
(a) Would the project's construction activities involve:		
○ Construction activities lasting longer than two years?	☐	☒
○ Construction activities within a Central Business District or along an arterial highway or major thoroughfare?	☐	☒
○ Closing, narrowing, or otherwise impeding traffic, transit, or pedestrian elements (roadways, parking spaces, bicycle routes, sidewalks, crosswalks, corners, *etc.*)?	☐	☒
○ Construction of multiple buildings where there is a potential for on-site receptors on buildings completed before the final build-out?	☐	☒
○ The operation of several pieces of diesel equipment in a single location at peak construction?	☐	☒
○ Closure of a community facility or disruption in its services?	☐	☒
○ Activities within 400 feet of a historic or cultural resource?	☐	☒
○ Disturbance of a site containing or adjacent to a site containing natural resources?	☐	☒
○ Construction on multiple development sites in the same geographic area, such that there is the potential for several construction timelines to overlap or last for more than two years overall?	☐	☒
(b) If any boxes are checked "yes," explain why a preliminary construction assessment is or is not warranted based on the guidance in Chapter 22, "Construction." It should be noted that the nature and extent of any commitment to use the Best Available Technology for construction equipment or Best Management Practices for construction activities should be considered when making this determination.		

20. *APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION*

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

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

APPLICANT/REPRESENTATIVE NAME	DATE
Justin Jarboe	6/5/25

SIGNATURE Justin Jarboe

PLEASE NOTE THAT APPLICANTS MAY BE REQUIRED TO SUBSTANTIATE RESPONSES IN THIS FORM AT THE DISCRETION OF THE LEAD AGENCY SO THAT IT MAY SUPPORT ITS DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE.

Part III: DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE (To Be Completed by Lead Agency)

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

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

IMPACT CATEGORY	Potentially Significant Adverse Impact YES	NO
Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy	☐	☒
Socioeconomic Conditions	☐	☒
Community Facilities and Services	☐	☒
Open Space	☐	☒
Shadows	☐	☒
Historic and Cultural Resources	☐	☒
Urban Design/Visual Resources	☐	☒
Natural Resources	☐	☒
Hazardous Materials	☐	☒
Water and Sewer Infrastructure	☐	☒
Solid Waste and Sanitation Services	☐	☒
Energy	☐	☒
Transportation	☐	☒
Air Quality	☐	☒
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐	☒
Noise	☐	☒
Public Health	☐	☒
Neighborhood Character	☐	☒
Construction	☐	☒

2. Are there any aspects of the project relevant to the determination of whether the project may have a significant impact on the environment, such as combined or cumulative impacts, that were not fully covered by other responses and supporting materials? ☐ YES ☒ NO

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

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

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

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

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

4. ***LEAD AGENCY'S CERTIFICATION***

TITLE	LEAD AGENCY
Director, Environmental Assessment and Review Division	NYC Department of City Planning
NAME	DATE
Stephanie Shellooe, AICP	June 13, 2025
SIGNATURE	

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Statement of No Significant Effect

Pursuant to Executive Order 91 of 1977, as amended, and the Rules of Procedure for City Environmental Quality Review, found at Title 62, Chapter 5 of the Rules of the City of New York and 6 NYCRR, Part 617, State Environmental Quality Review, the Department of City Planning acting on behalf of the City Planning Commission assumed the role of lead agency for the environmental review of the proposed actions. Based on a review of information about the project contained in this environmental assessment statement (EAS) and any attachments hereto, which are incorporated by reference herein, the lead agency has determined that the proposed actions would not have a significant adverse impact on the environment.

Reasons Supporting this Determination

The above determination is based on information contained in this EAS, which finds the proposed actions sought before the City Planning Commission would not have a significant adverse impact on the environment. Reasons supporting this determination are noted below.

Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy

A detailed analysis of land use, zoning, and public policy is included in the EAS. The Applicant, Medident, is seeking a zoning map amendment from an R3-2 zoning district to an R3-2/C1-2 zoning district (the "Proposed Action") on Block 4748, Lot 35 in the Clearview neighborhood of Queens Community District 7 (the "Projected Development Site"). The Proposed Action would facilitate the legal use of the existing professional office building and enable the Applicant to make minor interior renovations to the site plan without the burden of returning to the Board of Standards and Appeals (BSA). No new development is proposed for the Projected Development Site. The Proposed Action would not result in new land uses inconsistent with the character of the surrounding area. Rather, the Proposed Action is intended to preserve and legalize existing land uses on the Projected Development Site, which serves the surrounding residential areas. The Proposed Action would not result in new land uses inconsistent with the character of the surrounding area. The proposed C1-2 commercial overlay would not result in adverse impacts to the underlying R3-2 zoning district. As such, no adverse impacts related to land use would occur because of the Proposed Action. Additionally, the Proposed Action would result in a change in zoning from R3-2 to R3-2/C1-2, however, the C1-2 zoning district would facilitate the legal use of the existing professional office building and the character that is affected by the existing underlying zoning would remain. Therefore, no adverse impacts related to zoning would occur due to approval of the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action would not create a land use conflict, nor would it conflict with public policies for the Development Site or surrounding area. As such, no adverse impacts related to public policy would occur as a result of the Proposed Action. Overall, the Proposed Action would not result in any significant adverse impacts related to land use, zoning, and public policy.

Disadvantaged Community Assessment

An assessment of the Proposed Action's potential effects on disadvantaged communities is included in this EAS. The Project Site is not located within nor is it within a 1/2 mile of identified disadvantaged communities. Additionally, the Proposed Action would not contribute to any significant environmental impacts. The commercial uses would serve the local population, while maintaining compliance with environmental regulations and best practices. Accordingly, the Proposed Action would not disproportionately affect disadvantaged communities and would not cause or increase a disproportionate pollution burden on disadvantaged communities.


No other significant effects upon the environment that would require the preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Statement are foreseeable. This Negative Declaration has been prepared in accordance with Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law (SEQRA). Should you have any questions pertaining to this Negative Declaration, you may contact Ibrahim Jobe at ijobe@planning.nyc.gov.

TITLE	LEAD AGENCY
Director, Environmental Assessment and Review Division	Department of City Planning on behalf of the City Planning Commission 120 Broadway, 31st Fl. New York, NY 10271 | 212.720.3328
NAME Stephanie Shellooe, AICP	DATE 6/13/2025
SIGNATURE	

TITLE	
Chair, City Planning Commission	
NAME Daniel R. Garodnick	DATE 6/16/2025
SIGNATURE	

18-15 Francis Lewis Boulevard, Queens

Figure 1: Site Location




Data Source: MapPLUTO 2024v1

Urban Cartographics

18-15 Francis Lewis Boulevard, Queens

Figure 2: Tax Map



Data Source: MapPLUTO 2024v1, NYC DOF Digital Tax Map 3/1/23

Urban Cartographics

18-15 Francis Lewis Boulevard, Queens

Figure 3: Land Use Map




Data Source: MapPLUTO 2024v1, NYC DOF Digital Tax Map 3/1/23

Urban Cartographics

18-15 Francis Lewis Boulevard, Queens


Figure 4: Zoning Map



Urban Cartographics

18-15 Francis Lewis Boulevard, Queens

Figure 5: Zoning Map



ZONING MAP

THE NEW YORK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Major Zoning Classifications:

The number(s) and/or letter(s) that follows an R, C or M District designation indicates use, bulk and other controls as described in the text of the Zoning Resolution.

R – RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT

C – COMMERCIAL DISTRICT

M – MANUFACTURING DISTRICT

SPECIAL PURPOSE DISTRICT
The letter(s) within the shaded area designates the special purpose district as described in the text of the Zoning Resolution.

AREA(S) REZONED

Effective Date(s) of Rezoning:

02-11-2020 C 190029 ZMQ

Special Requirements:

For a list of lots subject to CEQR environmental requirements, see APPENDIX C.

For a list of lots subject to "D" restrictive declarations, see APPENDIX D.

For Inclusionary Housing designated areas and Mandatory Inclusionary Housing areas on this map, see APPENDIX F.

MAP KEY

7a	7c	
7b	**7d**	See Sub-Plan on Map IIc
10a	10c	11a

© Copyrighted by the City of New York

ZONING MAP 7d


NOTE: Zoning information as shown on this map is subject to change. For the most up-to-date zoning information for this map, visit the Zoning section of the Department of City Planning website: **www.nyc.gov/planning** or contact the Zoning Information Desk at (212) 720-3291.

Urban Cartographics

18-15 Francis Lewis Boulevard, Queens

Figure 6: Aerial Map

Projected Development Site



Imagery Source: 2024 Bing, Microsoft Corporation

Urban Cartographics

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Introduction

Neal S. Friedman (the "Applicant"), the owner of 18-15 Francis Lewis Boulevard (Block 4748, Lot 35) in the Clearview neighborhood of Queens, in Community District 7 ("Projected Development Site"), seeks an amendment to the Zoning Map (10c) to include a C1-2 overlay on the existing R3-2 zoning district, like the other nearby commercial overlays along Francis Lewis Boulevard. The action is requested to facilitate the legal use of the existing commercial office building and enable the Applicant to make minor interior renovations to the site plan without the burden of returning to the Board of Standards and Appeals (BSA). No new development is proposed for the Projected Development Site.

Description of the Affected Area

The Projected Development Site, (Block 4748, Lot35), is a single triangular-shaped lot located at the intersection of 160th Street (70 feet wide) and Francis Lewis Boulevard (approximately 100 feet wide) in the Clearview neighborhood of Queens Community District 7. Due to the triangular nature of the intersection, the parcel also has frontage along 18th Avenue (60 feet wide) and contains a total of 2,978 square feet of lot area. The existing building is constructed with full lot coverage and no accessory off-street parking is provided.

The Projected Development Site has historically been zoned R3-2 since the inception of the 1961 Zoning Resolution ("ZR") but was constructed in the year prior (1960) with a non-conforming commercial office building containing approximately 5,866 square feet (sf) and 1.97 Floor Area Ratio (FAR) in a single-story plus cellar building. The building was constructed pursuant to a variance by the Board of Standards and Appeals (BSA) under 612-59-BZ that permitted an initial term of 20 years (expiring February 24, 1980). Another 10-year term was granted by the BSA in 1980, and a series of renewals have been granted until the present, with some minor amendments occurring to reflect the existing conditions of the property.

(**See Figure 1 – Site Location; Figure 2 – Tax Map; Figure 3 – Land Use Map; Figures 4 and 5– Zoning Map; Figure 6 – Aerial Map)**

Description of the Surrounding Study Area

The area within 400 feet of the Projected Development Site (the "Study Area") is generally bounded by 17th Road to the north, Willets Boulevard to the east, 20th Avenue to the south and 275 feet west of Francis Lewis Boulevard to the west. The Study Area is primarily composed of low-rise residential buildings. Clearview Gardens, a low-rise apartment complex is located

immediately to the northeast of the Premises within the same R3-2 zoning district. To the west is predominately one and two-family detached dwellings within an R2A zoning district.

There are several one-story commercial uses along Frances Lewis Boulevard near the Projected Development Site which is located at the northern end of Clearview's main street business district. This district extends along Francis Lewis Boulevard from 20th Road in the south to 17th Road in the north and serves the surrounding residential areas. Nearby commercial uses include a gas station and automotive shop to the north and a restaurant and bank to the south.

Description of the Proposed Development

No new development is proposed for the Projected Development Site. The Proposed Action would facilitate the legal use of the existing commercial office building with tenants that provide dental services. The Proposed Action would enable the Applicant to make minor improvements to the site plan which would modernize the facility without adding additional floor area and without the burden of returning to the BSA.

Actions Necessary to Facilitate the Proposed Development

The Proposed Action includes a zoning map amendment to include a C1-2 commercial overlay over the existing R3-2 zoning district. The C1 zoning district is a commercial overlay mapped within a residential district. C1-2 commercial overlays permit local retail (Use Group 6), such as grocery stores, restaurants and beauty parlors and generally require one off-street parking space per 300 square feet of commercial use. Within lower density residential districts, such as R3-2, the C1-2 district permits a commercial FAR of 1.6. Since the existing development predates the 1961 ZR, no accessory parking would be required, and the existing development would remain as a legal noncomplying development at 1.97 FAR.

Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action

The Proposed Action would facilitate the legal use of the existing professional office building, which includes several tenants that provide dental services. Since the property has contained commercial office use for a continuous period since 1960, it is anticipated to remain overbuilt at 1.97 FAR (where 1.6 FAR would be permitted under the Proposed Action) but would enable the property owner to modernize the facility with minor interior renovations to the site plan without adding additional floor area and without the burden of returning to the BSA.

Analysis year

The Proposed Action consists of a Zoning Map amendment, which is a discretionary action subject to ULURP. An analysis year of 2027 assumes certification of the Proposed Action in 2026 and full approval of ULURP in 2027 (the "Analysis Year")

Analysis Framework

Standard methodologies have been applied following the *2021 CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines and precedent environmental reviews, employing reasonable assumptions to identify the amount and location of future development within the Affected Area. Factors considered include soft site criteria; lot size and ownership; existing land use; and land use and development trends in the area.

A Reasonable Worst Case Development Scenario (RWCDS) is broadly defined as the potential development under both the future No-Action and With-Action Conditions that is used to determine the potential effects of the Proposed Action. The future No-Action and With-Action Conditions by the Build Year of 2027 is used to determine the change in permitted development created by the Proposed Action. The No-Action Condition estimates the projected development in the future without the Proposed Action in 2027 (the No-Action Condition). The With-Action Condition estimates the projected development in the future with the Proposed Action in 2027 (the With-Action Condition). The RWCDS analysis takes the existing observed condition and adds to it known or expected changes to arrive at a reasonable estimate of future conditions. After the baseline condition is established in the future without the Proposed Action, the RWCDS for the project is established and compared to the No-Action Condition for the environmental assessment.

Existing Conditions

As noted above, the Projected Development Site is a single triangular-shaped lot located at the intersection of 160th Street and Francis Lewis Boulevard in the Clearview neighborhood of Queens Community District 7. Due to the triangular nature of the intersection, the parcel also contains frontage along 18th Avenue and contains a total of 2,978 square feet of lot area. The 5,866 sf commercial office building has an FAR of 1.97 and has been legally nonconforming since 1960. It is constructed with full lot coverage and no accessory off-street parking is provided.

Future No-Action Condition

Absent the Proposed Action, the existing 5,866 zsf (FAR of 1.97) commercial building would not be permitted and would be converted into a legally conforming community facility use where the maximum permitted FAR for such a use is 1.6. For purposes of analysis, it is assumed that the existing building would remain but would be converted to an ambulatory care facility.

Future With-Action Condition

The With-Action Condition contemplates no new development, and the Existing Conditions would remain. Since the 5,866 sf building has contained a commercial office use for a continuous period since 1960, it is anticipated to remain in its currently legally nonconforming commercial use with an FAR of 1.97, where an FAR is 1.6 is permitted. The Applicant proposes minor interior renovations that would not affect the size or bulk of the existing building.

Existing Conditions

	Address	*Block*	*Lot*	*Lot Size*	*Zoning District*	*Community Facility GSF*	*Commercial GSF*	*FAR*
Projected Development Site	**18-15 Francis Lewis Blvd**	**4748**	**35**	**2,978**	**R3-2**	**0**	**5,866**	**1.97**

No-Action Condition

	Address	Block	Lot	Lot Size	Zoning District	Community Facility GSF	*Commercial GSF*	*FAR*
Projected Development Site	**18-15 Francis Lewis Blvd**	**4748**	**35**	**2,978**	**R3-2**	**5,866**	**0**	**1.97**

With-Action Condition (Commercial Overlay)

	Address	Block	Lot	Lot Size	Zoning District	Community Facility GSF	*Commercial GSF*	*FAR*
Projected Development Site	**18-15 Francis Lewis Blvd**	**4748**	**35**	**2,978**	**R3-2/C1-2**	**0**	**5,866**	**1.97**

Increment (Analysis Framework)

	Address	Block	Lot	Lot Size	Zoning District	Community Facility GSF	*Commercial GSF*	*FAR*
Projected Development Site	**18-15 Francis Lewis Blvd**	**4748**	**35**	**2,978**	**n/a**	**-5,866**	**+5,866**	**0.00**

Land Use, Zoning and Public Policy

A. INTRODUCTION

Under 2021 *City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manual* guidelines, a detailed analysis of land use, zoning and public policy evaluates the uses and development trends in the area that may be affected by a proposed action and determines whether the proposed action is compatible with those conditions or may affect them. An assessment of zoning is performed in conjunction with a land use analysis when the project would change the zoning on a site or result in the loss of a particular use.

As described in Chapter A, "Project Description," the proposed project consists of Zoning Map amendment (the "Proposed Action") to facilitate the legal use of the existing professional office building and enable the Applicant to make minor interior renovations at 18-15 Francis Lewis Boulevard, Block 4748, Lot 35 (the "Projected Development Site").

As the Proposed Action includes a Zoning Map amendment, a detailed analysis of Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy is warranted and provided below.

B. METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the effects of the Proposed Action on land use, zoning, and public policy and determine whether it would result in any significant adverse impacts. As described in Chapter A; in order to assess the possible effects of the Proposed Action, a reasonable worst-case development scenario (RWCDS) was established for both the current zoning (No-Action) and proposed zoning (With-Action) conditions for the 2027 analysis year for the Projected Development Site.

The incremental difference between the No-Action and With-Action Conditions on the Projected Development Site forms the basis of the impact category analyses in this chapter. Under 2021 *CEQR* guidelines, a preliminary assessment, which includes a basic description of existing and future land uses and zoning, should be provided for all projects that would affect land use or would change the zoning on a site, regardless of the project's anticipated effects.

In accordance with the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the analysis describes existing and anticipated future (i.e., No-Action) conditions to a level necessary to understand the relationship of the Proposed Action to such conditions. The analysis assesses any changes to these conditions that could be created by the Proposed Action in the 2027 analysis year. Existing land uses were identified through review of a combination of sources including field surveys and secondary sources, comprising the City's 2022 Primary Land Use Tax Lot Output (PLUTO) data files, online Geographic Information Systems (GIS) databases such as the New York City Open Accessible Space Information System (OASIS, http://www.oasisnyc.net), and ZOLA

(http://zola.planning.nyc.gov). Other publications and approved environmental review documents that have been completed for projects in the area were also consulted. New York City Zoning Maps and the Zoning Resolution of the City of New York (ZR) were consulted to describe existing zoning districts in the study areas and provided the basis for the zoning evaluation of the future No-Action and With-Action Conditions. Applicable public policies were identified, and a public policy analysis was prepared to determine the potential for the Proposed Action to alter or conflict with applicable public policies.

Secondary Study Area

According to the *2021 CEQR Technical Manual*, the appropriate study area for land use and zoning is related to the type and size of the project being proposed and the location and neighborhood context of the area that could be affected by the project. In accordance with the *2021 CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines, land use, zoning, and public policy are addressed and analyzed for two geographical areas: (1) the primary study area, which is coterminous with the Projected Development Site, Block 4748, Lot 35 (the "Affected Area"); and (2) a secondary 400-foot study area (the "Study Area") which encompasses areas that have the potential to experience indirect impacts because of the Proposed Action. The Study Area has been established in accordance with 2021 *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines.

C. ASSESSMENT

Existing Conditions

Land Use

Affected Area
The Affected Area is in the Clearview neighborhood of Queens Community District 7. Block 4748, Lot 35 (18-15 Francis Lewis Boulevard) is a single triangular-shaped lot with approximately 92 feet of frontage along 160th Street and 97 feet of frontage along Francis Lewis Boulevard. Due to the triangular nature of the intersection, the parcel also contains 63 feet of frontage along 18th Avenue. It includes a total of 2,978 square feet of lot area. The lot is currently improved with a one-story plus cellar 5,866 sf commercial office space, built in 1960, that includes six dentists provide dental services.

Study Area
Within the Study Area, side streets radiating from Francis Lewis Boulevard and Willets Point Boulevard are predominantly low-rise residential. In particular, the area extending up 160th Street, to the east is Clearview Gardens, a two-story apartment complex encompassing 88-acres. To the west of Francis Lewis Boulevard is predominantly detached one and two-family dwellings.

The Affected Area is located at the northern end of Clearview's main street business district which extends along Francis Lewis Boulevard between 20th Road to the south to 17th Road to the north, serving the surrounding residential areas. Nearby commercial uses include a gas station and automotive shop to the north and a restaurant and bank to the south.

This area of Queens does not contain immediate rail or subway service but is well serviced by New York City Transit (NYCT) buses. The Q76 provides service along Francis Lewis Boulevard, connecting College Point with Downtown Jamaica. The QM20 makes stops at Francis Lewis Boulevard and Willets Point Boulevard, providing service to Midtown Manhattan and the Q16 provides service along Willets Point Boulevard to the south, connecting the immediate area with Fort Totten.

Zoning

Affected Area
As shown in **Figures 4 and 5** of the *Project Description*, the Affected Area is located within an R3-2 zoning district. R3-2 districts are general residential districts that allow a variety of housing types, including low-rise attached houses, small multi-family apartment houses, and detached and semi-detached one- and two-family residences. It is the lowest density zoning district in which multiple dwellings are permitted.

The existing building contains approximately 5,866 square feet (1.97 FAR) in a single-story plus cellar. The Projected Development Site has historically been zoned R3-2 since the inception of the 1961 Zoning Resolution but was improved in 1960 with the one-story plus cellar professional commercial office space that exists today. The building is constructed with full lot coverage and no accessory off-street parking is provided.

In R3-2 districts, the minimum lot width for detached houses is 30 feet, the maximum lot coverage is 35% and the 0.75 floor area ratio for residential use and 1.6 for community facility use. and the maximum building height is 35 feet. The front yard must be at least 15 feet deep. One off-street parking space is required for each dwelling unit. Commercial use is not permitted as-of-right in an R3-2 zoning district.

Study Area
In addition to the R3-2 zoning district, the Study Area also includes an R2A zoning district.

In an R2A zoning district, the minimum lot width for detached houses is 40 feet, the maximum lot coverage is 30%. The maximum permitted floor area ratio is 0.5 for residential use and 1.0 for community facility use. The maximum building height is 35 feet. The front yard must be at least 15 feet deep. One off-street parking space is required for each dwelling unit. This R2A district was created in 2005 as part of the larger Whitestone Rezoning (0600055 ZMQ) which affected 310 blocks to preserve existing neighborhood scale and promote a more low-rise detached character.

In addition, a C1-2 commercial overlay is mapped along the eastside of Francis Lewis Boulevard in the R3-2 district. The C1-2 overlay permits a commercial FAR of 1.0 in R3-2 districts. One off-street parking space for every 300 sf of commercial use is required.

Public Policy

Affected Area
Public policies applicable to the Affected Area are discussed below. The Proposed Action's consistency with policies is assessed in the With-Action Condition section of this chapter.

The Affected Area is not part of, or subject to, an Urban Renewal Plan (URP), adopted community 197-a Plan, Solid Waste Management Plan, Business Improvement District (BID), Industrial Business Zone (IBZ),or the New York City Landmarks Law.

The Affected Area is not located within the boundaries of a New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development Urban Renewal Zone or Area, an Economic Development Corporation Industrial Business Zone, or former In-Place Industrial Park. Nor is the Affected Area subject to an adopted community-based 197-a Plan. Finally, the Affected Area is located outside the New York City's Coastal Management Zone (CMZ), and thus the Proposed Action is not subject to an assessment for consistency with the City's Local Waterfront Revitalization Program (LWRP).

Study Area
The policies discussed above are applicable to both the Affected Area and Study Area.

No-Action Condition

Land Use

Affected Area
Absent the Proposed Action, the existing 5,866 zsf commercial building would not be permitted and would be converted into a legally conforming community facility use with a maximum FAR of 1.0. For purposes of analysis, it is assumed to be an ambulatory care facility. Although residential use is also permitted, its location on a triangular stand-alone lot between two commercial uses along Frances Lewis Boulevard would be less likely. An ambulatory care facility would be the worst case scenario for analysis.

Study Area
No changes to land use are anticipated in the future without the Proposed Action. As such, the Existing Condition and Future No-Action Condition would be the same in terms of land use for the Study Area.

Zoning

Affected Area
In the future, without the Proposed Action, the building would remain unchanged as 5,866 square feet (1.97 FAR) single-story plus cellar building but would be converted to legally conforming community facility use such as ambulatory care. The existing FAR of 1.97 would remain where the maximum permitted FAR for community facility use is 1.0. No changes to zoning are anticipated in the future without the Proposed Action. As such, the Future No-Action Condition would be the same in terms of zoning for the Affected Area.

Study Area
No changes to zoning are anticipated in the future without the Proposed Action. As such, the Existing Condition and Future No-Action Condition would be the same in terms of zoning for the Study Area.

Public Policy

Affected Area
No changes to public policies are anticipated in the future without the Proposed Action. As such, the Existing Condition and Future No-Action Condition would be the same in terms of public policies in the Affected Area.

Study Area
The policies discussed above are applicable to both the Affected Area and Study Area.

The Future with the Proposed Action (With-Action Condition)

As described in detail in Chapter A, the Proposed Action consists of a Zoning Map amendment to the to facilitate the legal use of the existing professional office building located at 18-15 Francis Lewis Boulevard (Block 4748, Lot 35) and enable the Applicant to make minor interior renovations.

The Applicant does not intend to pursue any new development because of the zoning map amendment. This section describes the land use and zoning conditions that would result from the Proposed Action by 2027 and evaluates the potential for the Proposed Action to result in

significant adverse impacts related to land use and zoning, and their consistency with the applicable public policies described earlier in this chapter.

Land Use

Affected Area
In the future with the Proposed Action the existing land use would remain unchanged. As noted above, this site currently contains commercial office space, and this use is anticipated to remain in the Future with the Proposed Action.

Study Area
The Proposed Action would not affect land uses in the surrounding Study Area which contain a mix of residential and commercial uses. The consistency of the Proposed Action with the Study Area's land uses is discussed in the "Assessment" section, below.

Zoning

Affected Area
In the future, with the Proposed Action, The existing building would remain at approximately 5,866 square feet (1.97 FAR) single-story plus cellar. The Proposed Action consists of a Zoning Map amendment which would add a C1-2 commercial overlay onto the existing R3-2 zoning district. This change would allow the legal use of the existing commercial office space and enable the Applicant to make minor interior renovation without the burden of returning to the BSA.

Since the existing development on the Site predates the 1961 ZR, no accessory parking would be required, and the existing development would remain as a legal noncomplying development at 1.97 FAR (where 1.00 FAR is permitted).

Study Area
The Proposed Action would not alter zoning designations within the approximate 400-foot Study Area. The consistency of the Proposed Action with zoning in the Study Area is discussed in the "Assessment" section, below.

Public Policy

Affected Area
No changes to the Affected Area's applicable public policies are proposed as part of the Proposed Action.

Study Area
No changes to appliable Secondary Affected Area public policies are anticipated as part of the Proposed Action. The consistency of the Proposed Action on the Study Area's public policies is discussed in the "Assessment" section, below.

ASSESSMENT

LAND USE

Affected Area
According to the criteria set forth in Section 410 in Chapter 4 of the *2021 CEQR Technical Manual*, the Proposed Action would not result in significant adverse impacts on land use. The Proposed Action would legalize the existing commercial office use.

The site has historically been zoned R3-2 since in the inception of the 1961 Zoning Resolution but was constructed in the year prior (1960) with a professional office building containing approximately 5,866 square feet (1.97 FAR) in a single-story plus cellar. The building was constructed pursuant to a variance by the Board of Standards and Appeals (BSA) under 612-59-BZ that permitted an initial term of 20 years (expiring February 24, 1980). Another 10-year term was granted by the BSA in 1980, and a series of renewals have been granted until the present, with some minor amendments occurring to reflect the existing conditions of the property.

This land use, which has been established since 1960, would remain as the Proposed Action is sought to maintain the commercial office space which would ensure the existing use can remain.

Study Area
No land use changes would be made to the remainder of the Study Area and no new development would occur, with the uses in the Affected Area to remain. As such, the Proposed Action would have no substantive effect on land use in in the Study Area.

Conclusion
The Proposed Action would not result in new land uses inconsistent with the character of the surrounding area. Rather, the Proposed Action is intended to preserve and legalize existing land uses on the Projected Development Site, which serves the surrounding residential areas. This

change is appropriate, as the uses along this section of Francis Lewis Boulevard are commercial while the remainder of the Study Area is predominantly residential in use. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts related to land use would occur as a result of the Proposed Action.

Zoning

Affected Area
According to the criteria set forth in Section 410 in Chapter 4 of the *2021 CEQR Technical Manual*, the Proposed Action would not result in significant adverse impacts on zoning. Affected Area is in an R3-2 district and does not permit commercial use, despite the presence of such use for decades.

Study Area
Despite the Projected Development Site being zoned without a commercial overlay, the eastern side of Francis Lewis Boulevard is mapped with C1-2 overlays from 17th Road to 20th Road, where a larger intersection is mapped with C1-2 and C1-3 overlays, surrounding a cluster of neighborhood services, including restaurants, a gym, banks, drug stores, real estate services, barbers, and laundromats. It should be noted 20-02 & 20-14 Francis Lewis Boulevard were amended from R3-2 to R3-2/C1-2 in 1967 (CPC A-731, March 16, 1967) while the Site remained in a residential district, despite the presence of a commercial use. As such, it is proposed to "complete" a segment of C1-2 overlay by adding the Affected Area, which would be consistent with land use and zoning patterns in the surrounding area. The Proposed Action would have no substantive effect on zoning in in the Study Area.

Conclusion
The proposed C1-2 commercial overlay would not result in adverse impacts to the underlying R3-2 zoning district. The C1-2 zoning district would facilitate the legal use of the existing professional office building. Since the property has contained such a use for a continuous period since 1960, it is anticipated to remain as it is currently overbuilt at 1.97 FAR (where 1.0 FAR would be permitted under the Proposed Action) but would enable the property owner to make minor improvements to the site plan without the burden of returning to the BSA. As such, the character that is affected by the underlying zoning designation would remain. Therefore, no adverse impacts related to zoning would occur because of the Proposed Action.

Public Policy

Affected Area
No known public policies would be affected by the Proposed Action. As noted above, the Affected Area is not part of, or subject to any known public policies and is located outside the New York City's Coastal Management Zone (CMZ).

Study Area
The larger Study Area is not part of, or subject to any known public policies.

Conclusion
The Proposed Action would ensure the continued use of this area for the Applicant as commercial office space. It is proposed to "complete" a segment of C1-2 overlay by adding the Affected Area, which would be consistent with land use and zoning patterns in the surrounding area. As such, no impact would result on public policies in the Future with the Proposed Action.

Disadvantaged Community Assessment

A. INTRODUCTION

Effective 30 December 2024, Section 8-0109(2)(k) of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law requires that environmental reviews to include a statement of the effects of the Proposed Actions on disadvantaged communities, including whether the action may cause or increase a disproportionate pollution burden. The *2021 City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manual* predates these revisions to the Environmental Conservation Law and does not provide guidance regarding the scope of this analysis. On January 29, 2025, the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) proposed draft revisions to its State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) regulations (6 NYCRR Part 617) to implement this new statutory provision.

This assessment considers the impacts that have been identified pursuant to the CEQR Technical Manual as well as applicable guidance from NYSDEC in determining whether the Proposed Actions would result in disproportionate impacts on disadvantaged communities.

B. METHODOLOGY

The Disadvantaged Communities Assessment was conducted following the guidance provided by the NYSDEC and the City of New York's Environmental Justice (EJ) policies. The assessment is conducted pursuant to NYCDEC guidance for Project's requiring a CEQR EAS Short Form, and is structured as follows:

Identification of Disadvantaged Community Status

- New York State Disadvantaged Communities Assessment Tool (DACAT): This GIS-based tool identifies census tracts designated as disadvantaged communities (DAC) based on data from the Climate Justice Working Group (CJWG).

- Geospatial Analysis: The project location was mapped and measured for proximity to the nearest designated disadvantaged community, ensuring compliance with the ½-mile buffer analysis specified in the assessment requirements.

Assessment of Potential Impacts

If the Project Site is found to be within, or within ½ mile of a disadvantaged community, or if the Proposed Action(s) could affect a disadvantaged community, further assessment is required. If either of these conditions are met, potential direct and indirect impacts to nearby disadvantaged communities are evaluated to determine if the proposed project would create any new sources of pollution or increase pollution from existing sources in the following categories:


- Air Quality Impacts
- Noise Pollution
- Light Pollution
- Wastewater Treatment or Wastewater Discharges
- Stormwater and Flooding Considerations, Solid and Hazardous Waste Management
- Odor Impacts

The assessment considers the impacts that have been identified pursuant to the CEQR Technical Manual as well as applicable guidance from NYSDEC in determining whether the Proposed Actions would result in disproportionate impacts on disadvantaged communities.

C. ASSESSMENT

Preliminary Assessment

The Applicant and owner of 18-15 Francis Lewis Boulevard (Block 4748, Lot 35) in the Clearview neighborhood of Queens, in Community District 7, seeks an amendment to the Zoning Map (10c) to include a C1-2 overlay on the existing R3-2 zoning district, like the other nearby commercial overlays along Francis Lewis Boulevard. The Projected Development Site is not located within ½ mile of a disadvantaged community, as indicated below:





The Proposed Action is requested to facilitate the legal use of the existing commercial office building and enable the Applicant to make minor interior renovations to the site plan without the burden of returning to the Board of Standards and Appeals (BSA). No new development is proposed for the Projected Development Site.

The Proposed Action would not change land use or increase the floor area of the existing commercial office uses (dental offices). (See **Table 1: Existing, No-Action and With-Action Comparison**).

Conclusion

The Project Site is not located within nor proximate (1/2 mile) to identified disadvantaged communities. Additionally, as discussed throughout this document, the Proposed Action would not contribute to any significant environmental impacts. Further, the commercial uses would serve the local population, while maintaining compliance with environmental regulations and best practices.

Accordingly, the Proposed Action would not disproportionately affect disadvantaged communities and would not cause or increase a disproportionate pollution burden on disadvantaged communities.