Chapter 3: Open Space

A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter assesses the potential impacts of the Proposed Actions on open space resources. Open space is defined in the 2020 *City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manual* as publicly accessible, publicly, or privately owned land that is available for leisure, play, or sport, or serves to protect or enhance the natural environment. An open space assessment should be conducted if a project would have a direct effect on open space, such as eliminating or altering a public open space, or an indirect effect, such as when a substantial new population could place added demand on an area's open spaces.

As discussed in Chapter 1, "Project Description," under the Reasonable Worst Case Development Scenario (RWCDS), the Proposed Actions are expected to result in the development of approximately 78,833 gross square feet (gsf) of office uses, 17,000 gsf of retail uses, 46,667 gsf of light industrial and manufacturing uses, and 39,500 gsf of medical office uses within the Project Area. This program, a net increase of 155,360 total gsf over the existing of 26,640 gsf of service-to-businesses commercial uses on Projected Development Sites 1 and 2 (Block 2415, Lot 1, and Block 2415, Lot 6, respectively), represents the increment of the Proposed Actions when compared to the existing conditions and the Future without the Proposed Actions of the Project Area. As discussed in more detail below, the Proposed Actions would result in the introduction of non-residential uses that would increase the non-residential population within the Project Area and in the study area. Therefore, in accordance with *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines, an open space assessment was conducted to determine whether the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse open space impacts.

B. PRINCIPAL CONCLUSIONS

The Proposed Actions would not alter or eliminate any publicly accessible open space resources, nor would open space resources in the study area experience project-related significant adverse impacts in the technical areas of shadows, air quality, noise, or construction. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in the potential for significant adverse impacts related to direct effects on open space.

The Proposed Actions would facilitate new buildings on the Projected Development Sites, introducing new workers and visitors to the Project Area, which would increase demand on publicly accessible open space resources. Currently the passive open space ratio in the study area for non-residential users (1.975 acres per 1,000 people) is well above the City's guideline of 0.15 per 1,000 people, as indicated in the *CEQR Technical Manual*. The Proposed Actions would result in an 8.69-percent decrease in the passive open space ratio; however, the ratio would remain well above the guideline in both the Future without the Proposed Actions (0.852 acres per 1,000 people) and the Future with the Proposed Actions (0.778 acres per 1,000 people). Though this decrease in the open space ratio would be more than five percent compared to the No Action condition, the passive open space ratio would remain substantially higher than the City's guideline of 0.15 acres

per 1,000 non-residents and the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts related to indirect effects on open space in the study area.

C. METHODOLOGY

As defined by the *CEQR Technical Manual*, public open space is accessible to the public on a constant and regular basis, including for designated daily periods. Public open space may be under government or private jurisdiction and typically includes City, state, and federal parkland, esplanades, and plazas designated through regulatory approvals such as zoning. Private open space is not publicly accessible or is available only to limited users. It is not available to the public on a regular or constant basis. Examples of private open space are natural areas with no public access, community gardens, front and rear yards, rooftop recreational facilities, and stoops or landscaped grounds used by community facilities, such as public and private educational institutions, where the open space is accessible only to the institution-related population.

Open spaces can be characterized as either active or passive depending on the activities the space allows. In many cases, open space may be used for both active and passive recreation. Open space that is used for sports, exercise, or active play is classified as "active open space," and consists primarily of recreational facilities. Passive open spaces are used for relaxation, such as sitting or strolling. Active and passive open spaces are further defined in Section C, "Existing Conditions."

DIRECT EFFECTS

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a proposed action would directly affect open space conditions if it causes the loss of public open space, changes the use of an open space so that it no longer serves the same user population, limits public access to an open space, or results in increased noise or air pollutant emissions, odor, or shadows that would temporarily or permanently affect the usefulness of a public open space. This chapter will determine whether the Proposed Actions would directly impact any open spaces within, or in close proximity to, the Project Area.

INDIRECT EFFECTS

As described in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, open space can be indirectly affected by a proposed action if a project would add enough population, either residential or non-residential, to noticeably diminish the capacity of open space in the area to serve the future population. If a proposed action is not located within an underserved or well-served area, such as the Project Area, an open space assessment should be conducted if that project would generate more than 200 residents or 500 employees. In accordance with *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines, the open space analysis and impact assessment is based on the proposed redevelopment of Projected Development Site 1 and anticipated redevelopment on Projected Development Site 2. As discussed in Chapter 1, "Project Description," the Proposed Actions would introduce up to 523 new employees to the study area as compared with the Future without the Proposed Actions (the No Action condition). No new residents would be introduced by the Proposed Actions. Therefore, an open space assessment for only non-residential populations is warranted.

STUDY AREA

The *CEQR Technical Manual* recommends establishing a study area or areas as the first step in an open space assessment. The study areas are based on the distances that the respective users—workers (or non-residents) and residents—are likely to walk to an open space. According to the

CEQR Technical Manual, workers typically use passive open spaces and are assumed to walk approximately 10 minutes, or ¼-mile from their place of work to an open space. Residents are assumed to walk approximately 20 minutes, or ½-mile, to reach both passive and active open spaces.

The Proposed Actions would not include any new residential units; therefore, a residential open space assessment was not warranted. However, the Proposed Actions are expected to result in new commercial and community facility development that would introduce a new non-residential population to the area. The Proposed Actions would introduce new non-residential population above the 500-worker threshold described in the *CEQR Technical Manual*. Therefore, the effect of the Proposed Actions on open spaces was analyzed following *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines.

The non-residential open space study area comprises all Census Tracts with at least 50 percent of their area within a ¼-mile of the project area. As shown in **Figure 3-1**, the ¼-mile study area includes the area within Census Tracts 549 and 551.[1] This area of census tracts is bounded approximately by Grand Street to the north, Driggs Avenue to the east, South 8th Street to the south, and the East River to the west. These census tracts are mapped within Brooklyn Community District 1.

STUDY AREA POPULATION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Information regarding the existing worker population within the non-residential study area was compiled based on data from ESRI Business Analyst, a national provider of geographic planning data.

NO ACTION CONDITION

The non-residential population in the study area in the No Action condition was determined by adding the number of non-residents anticipated to result from developments that are expected to be completed in the study area by 2023 to the existing non-residential population.

WITH ACTION CONDITION

The non-residential population in the study area in the Future with the Proposed Actions (the With Action condition) was determined by adding the number of non-residents anticipated to result from the Proposed Actions to the non-residential population in the No Action condition. It is anticipated that the Proposed Actions would introduce 576 workers to the Project Area, an increment of 523 additional workers than in the No Action condition.

INVENTORY OF OPEN SPACE RESOURCES

Publicly accessible open spaces and recreational facilities within the study area were inventoried to determine their size, character, utilization, and condition. In accordance with the *CEQR Technical Manual*, publicly accessible open space is defined as facilities open to the public at designated hours on a regular basis and is assessed for impacts using both a quantitative and a qualitative analysis, whereas private open space is not accessible to the general public on a regular basis and is considered qualitatively. Open spaces that are not accessible to the general public or

[1] 2010 U.S. Census.

12.18.20



Project Area (Proposed Rezoning Area)
Projected Development Site 1
Projected Development Site 2
Quarter-mile Boundary
Census Tracts
Open Space Study Area
Open Space Resources

0 400 FEET

Open Space Study Area and Resources

307 KENT AVENUE

Figure 3-1

that do not offer usable recreational areas were excluded from the survey. Information on the size of the open spaces was obtained from the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation (NYC Parks) and using Geographic Information System (GIS) measurements. The amenities, condition, and utilization of the resources was determined through field surveys conducted during working hours in April 2019.

At each open space, active and passive recreational spaces were noted. Active open space acreage is used for activities such as jogging, field sports, and children's active play. Passive open space usage includes activities such as strolling, reading, lounging, and people watching. Some spaces, such as lawns and public esplanades, can be considered both active and passive recreation areas since they can be used for passive uses such as sitting or strolling, as well as active uses, such as jogging. For the purpose of this analysis, special attention was paid to the passive open space resources in the study area, as non-residential users are unlikely to participate in activities that require active space during the day. Based on the methodology in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the utilization level at each facility was determined based on observations of the amount of open space or equipment seen to be in use. Open spaces with less than 25 percent of space or equipment in use were categorized as low usage, those with 25 to 75 percent utilization were classified as moderate usage, and those with over 75 percent utilization were considered to have heavy usage.

ADEQUACY OF OPEN SPACE RESOURCES

COMPARISON TO GUIDELINES

The adequacy of open space in the study area is quantitatively assessed using a ratio of usable open space acreage to the study area population; this is referred to as the open space ratio. To assess the adequacy of open space resources, open space ratios are compared with planning goals set by the City as described in the *CEQR Technical Manual*. Although these open space ratios are not meant to determine whether a proposed action might have a significant adverse impact on open space resources, they are helpful guidelines in understanding the extent to which user populations are served by open space resources. For non-residential populations, 0.15 acres of passive open space per 1,000 non-residents is typically considered adequate.

D. EXISTING CONDITIONS

STUDY AREA NON-RESIDENTIAL POPULATION

Based on the data compiled from ESRI Business Analyst, the Census Tracts in the open space study area (Census Tracts 549 and 551) contain 410 businesses employing 2,370 people (see **Table 3-1**).

Table 3-1
Existing Non-Residential Population within the Study Area

Census Tract	Non-Residential Population
549	1,469
551	901
Total	**2,370**

Source: *ESRI Business Analyst; 2019 Infogroup, Inc.*

STUDY AREA OPEN SPACE RESOURCES

As shown in **Table 3-2** and **Figure 3-1**, there are six open space resources with passive features located within the non-residential study area. These open space resources are well suited for passive recreational use and include a plaza, a pedestrian pathway, two playgrounds, and two parks.

Table 3-2
Inventory of Publicly Accessible Open Space in the Non-Residential Study Area

Map No.[1]	Name	Location	Owner/ Agency	Amenities	Total Acres	Active Acres	Passive Acres	Condition	Utilization
1	George B. Post Plaza	Broadway, South 6th Street, and Bedford Avenue	DOT	Benches, tables with chairs, water fountain, information kiosk, landscaping, plaza area	0.12	0	0.12	Excellent	Moderate
2	Williamsburg Bridge Pedestrian Pathway	Williamsburg Bridge and Bedford Avenue	DOT	Pedestrian pathway	0.43[2]	0.22	0.22	Adequate	Heavy
3	Berry Playground	South 3rd Street between Bedford Avenue and Berry Street	NYC Parks	Basketball, benches, playground equipment, swings, flagpole, water fountain, spray showers	0.33	0.30	0.3	Adequate	Moderate
4	William Sheridan Playground	Grand Street, Wythe Avenue, and South 1st Street	NYC Parks/ DOE	Basketball, benches, handball, playground equipment, bathrooms, water fountains, swings, softball area	1.17	1.05	0.12	Adequate	Moderate
5	Grand Ferry Park	Grand Street and River Street	NYC Parks	Historic structure, benches, picnic tables, water fountains, tree coverage, shore area	1.7	0	1.7	Adequate	Moderate
6	Domino Park	Grand Street, River Street, South 5th Street, and the East River	Domino A LLC	Playground equipment, taco restaurant, beach volleyball, dog park, bocce courts, turf areas, lawn areas, benches, waterfront esplanade, lounge chairs, landscaping, spray showers, misters, tables with chairs, water fountains, water features, stepped seating, historic artifacts, elevated walkway	5.0	2.5	2.5	Excellent	Moderate
				Totals	**2.61**	**1.80**	**0.81**		

Notes:
[1] See **Figure 3-1** for a map of open space resources.
[2] Williamsburg Bridge Pedestrian Pathway acreage includes only the portion located within the Open Space Study Area.
Sources:
NYC Parks; Field Surveys, April 2019; MapPLUTO.

George B. Post Plaza is a new plaza constructed at the intersections of Broadway, South 6th Street, and Bedford Avenue to the southeast of the Project Area. The plaza serves as passive open space, and includes benches, tables with chairs, landscaping, a water fountain, and an informational kiosk. Well-suited for passive recreational use, this open space is currently in excellent condition and experiences moderate utilization.

The Williamsburg Bridge Pedestrian Pathway runs along the south side of the Williamsburg Bridge from Bedford Avenue in Brooklyn to Clinton Street in Manhattan. The pedestrian pathway can be used for both passive recreational uses such as walking and active recreational uses such as jogging, and therefore has been considered to be 50 percent active and 50 percent passive in nature. This resource is currently in adequate condition and experiences heavy utilization.

Berry Playground is a mid-sized playground located on the south side of South 3rd Street between Bedford Avenue and Berry Street, to the east of the Project Area. It serves primarily as active open space, offering active amenities such as basketball, playground equipment, swings, and spray showers. The playground does offer some passive amenities as well, including benches, and water fountains. This resource is currently in adequate condition and experiences moderate utilization.

William Sheridan Playground is a large playground located on the east side of Wythe Avenue between Grand Street and South 1st Street. This resource is also primarily active and offers basketball, handball, playground equipment, swings, and a softball area as active features. Passive features include benches, bathrooms, and water fountains. This resource is currently in adequate condition and experiences moderate utilization.

Grand Ferry Park is a medium-sized park located at the East River terminus of Grand Street. The park serves as passive open space. Its amenities include a historic factory smoke stack, benches, picnic tables, water fountains, tree coverage, and a rock-lined shore area that can be sat on. This resource is currently in adequate condition and experiences moderate utilization.

Domino Park, opened in 2018, is the largest open space resource in the study area. The park includes many different areas, some more passively oriented and others oriented towards active recreation. Features include playground equipment, a taco restaurant, beach volleyball, a dog park, bocce courts, a turf area, lawn areas, benches, a waterfront esplanade, lounge chairs, landscaping, spray showers, misters, tables and chairs, water fountains, water features, a stepped seating area, historic artifacts, and an elevated walkway. This resource is currently in excellent condition and experiences moderate utilization.

ADEQUACY OF OPEN SPACE RESOURCES

QUANTITATIVE ASSESSMENT

As described above, this analysis focuses on passive open space resources as these are the open space resources that non-residents would be most likely to use. To assess the adequacy of open space resources in the study area, the ratio of non-residents to acres of passive open space is compared with the City's planning goal of 0.15 acres of passive open space per 1,000 non-residents. The open space study area has an existing ratio of 1.975 acres of passive open space per 1,000 non-residents, which is well above the City's planning goal (see **Table 3-3**).

Table 3-3
Existing Conditions: Adequacy of Open Space Resources

Total Population (Non-residents)	Passive Open Space Acreage	Passive Open Space Ratio per 1,000 People	Passive Open Space Goal
2,370	8.75	1.975	0.15

Notes:
Ratios in acres per 1,000 people.
The City's open space ratio goals for total and active open spaces are not applicable to the Proposed Project under *CEQR Technical Manual* methodology, as the project would only be introducing a non-residential population to the study area.
Sources: NYC Parks; Field Surveys, April 2019; MapPLUTO.

QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT

The six existing open space resources within the study area that contain passive features are varied in size, well-suited for passive recreation, and in adequate to excellent condition. Utilization varies through the resources, with four of the six resources experiencing moderate utilization and the remaining two experiencing heavy utilization. Domino Park, the largest of the resources and containing many passive open space features, is located just to the west of the Project Area and would be particularly suitable for lunchtime recreation. These factors make the existing open space resources in the study area well-suited to providing passive recreation opportunities for the existing non-resident population in the study area.

A community garden, the Berry Street Garden, is also located within the study area to the east of the Project Site on Berry Street between South 2nd Street and South 3rd Street and would also be available to use by non-residents within the study area for passive recreation during posted public hours.

E. THE FUTURE WITHOUT THE PROPOSED ACTIONS

STUDY AREA NON-RESIDENTIAL POPULATION

PROJECT AREA

Absent the Proposed Actions, no new development is anticipated to occur within the Project Area. Existing buildings and uses observed in the existing condition would remain through the 2023 build year.

STUDY AREA

Fifteen development projects within the ¼-mile census tract-based open space study area are currently planned or underway, and are expected to introduce non-residents by 2023, the Proposed Actions' build year, see **Table 3-4**. Two additional development projects (280 and 350 Kent Avenue) are located within the study area, but are not expected to be completed until after the Proposed Actions' build year. They have been included to provide for a conservative CEQR assessment. The independent No Action condition projects within the study area are expected to introduce 3,122 additional non-residents to the study area by 2023.

Table 3-4
No Build Projects in the Open Space Study Area

Fig Ref.[1]	Project Name/Address	Project Description/Program
Open Space Study Area (1/4-mile Radius)		
1	260 Kent Avenue[4]	DUs: 332 Commercial: 159,652 zsf
2	280 Kent Avenue[2]	DUs: 680 Commercial: 11,018 zsf Community Facility: 75,145 zsf (375-seat school) Parking: 481 spaces
3	350 Kent Avenue[2]	DUs: 422 Commercial: 41,801 zsf Parking: 300 spaces
4	314 Kent Avenue (former Domino Sugar Refinery building)	Commercial: 429,068 zsf Community Facility: 35,753 zsf
5	60 South 2nd Street[4]	DUs: 28 Commercial: 50,902 zsf Parking: 14 spaces
6	72 South 2nd Street	DUs: 7 Commercial: 2,611 zsf Community Facility: 1,139 zsf Parking: 1 space
7	333 Kent Avenue[3]	DUs: 2 Commercial: 8,879 zsf
8	361 Bedford Avenue	DUs: 104 Commercial: 43,972 zsf Parking: 36 spaces
9	115 Broadway	Commercial: 3820 zsf Community Facility: 1,189 zsf
10	101 South 4th Street	DUs: 2
11	416 Kent Avenue	DUs: 252 Commercial: 3,413 zsf Parking: 105 spaces
12	288 Berry Street[3]	Community Facility: 38,004 zsf
13	271 Berry Street[3]	DUs: 2
14	349 Kent Avenue	DUs: 10 Commercial: 874 zsf
15	159 Broadway	DUs: 21 Hotel Rooms: 251 Parking; 9 spaces

Notes:
[1] See **Figure 3-2**.
[2] The completion years for 280 Kent Avenue and 350 Kent Avenue are currently unknown, but are expected to occur after the Proposed Project's 2023 build year. They have been included as No Build Projects to provide for a conservative CEQR assessment.
[3] Alteration enlarging an existing building.
[4] Construction completed in late 2019 and building is partially occupied as of 2020.
[*] Unless noted otherwise, planned projects are assumed for purposes of this analysis to be complete by the analysis year of 2023.
Sources:
DOB; AKRF, Inc., field survey, February and December 2018, December 2020; New York YIMBY (http://newyorkyimby.com); CityRealty (https://www.cityrealty.com/)



No Build Projects in the Open Space Study Area

Under the No Action condition, the non-residents from additional No Action projects (2,987) expected to be completed by 2023 in the study area would increase the non-residential population in the study area from 2,370 to 5,492.

STUDY AREA OPEN SPACE RESOURCES

No new open space resources are expected to be completed within the study area by 2023.[2] Therefore, the total amount of open space within the study area would remain at 8.75 acres, with 4.07 acres of active open space and 4.68 acres of passive open space.

ADEQUACY OF OPEN SPACE RESOURCES

As shown on **Table 3-5**, with a total non-residential population of 5,492 and 4.68 acres of passive open space, the passive open space ratio within the study area would decrease to 0.852 acres per 1,000 non-residents in the Future without the Proposed Actions. Therefore, it would remain above the City's planning goal of 0.15 acres of passive open space per 1,000 non-residents.

Table 3-5
No Action Condition: Adequacy of Open Space Resources

Total Population (Non-residents)	Passive Open Space Acreage	Passive Open Space Ratio per 1,000 People	Passive Open Space Goal
Non-Residential (¼-Mile) Study Area			
5,492	4.68	0.852	0.15

Notes:
Ratios in acres per 1,000 people.
The City's open space ratio goals for total and active open spaces are not applicable to the Proposed Actions under *CEQR Technical Manual* methodology, as the project would only be introducing a non-residential population to the study area.
Sources: NYC Parks; Field Surveys, April 2019; MapPLUTO.

F. THE FUTURE WITH THE PROPOSED ACTIONS

The assessment of conditions in the Future with the Proposed Actions examines conditions that are expected to occur as a result of the Proposed Actions. The capacity of open space resources to serve future populations in the study area is examined using quantitative and qualitative factors. The potential for direct effects on open space is also considered.

DIRECT EFFECTS

As described above in the discussion of methodology, direct adverse effects on an open space occur when a proposed project would cause the physical loss of public open space; change the use of an open space so that it no longer serves the same user population; limit public access to an open space; or cause a significant increase in noise or air pollutant emissions, odors, or shadows

[2] A portion of Domino Park adjacent to Kent Avenue was formerly utilized as the publicly accessible North Brooklyn Farms, and will become part of Domino Park in the future independent of the Proposed Actions. (https://www.ediblebrooklyn.com/2019/north-brooklyn-farms/ and https://bushwickdaily.com/bushwick/categories/news/6231-beloved-nature-escape-north-brooklyn-farms-will-close-at-the-end-of-2019, both accessed January 7, 2020.) This future open space was not included in this open space analysis to ensure a conservative analysis.

that would affect its usefulness, whether on a permanent or temporary basis. The Proposed Actions would not have direct effect impacts on open space resources.

STUDY AREA NON-RESIDENTIAL POPULATION

Under the With Action condition, the construction of new mixed-use building on Projected Development Site 1 and the expected construction of another mixed-use building on Projected Development Site 2 would be completed by 2023, and the non-residential population in the study area would be expected to increase as a result. It is anticipated that the Proposed Actions would introduce 576 workers to the Project Area, an increment of 523 workers over the No Action condition.

STUDY AREA OPEN SPACE RESOURCES

The Proposed Actions would not have a direct effect on existing or proposed open space resources within the Project Area or within the study area. The total amount of public open space within the study area would remain at 8.75 acres, including 4.07 acres of active open space and 4.68 acres of passive open space.

ADEQUACY OF OPEN SPACE RESOURCES

QUANTITATIVE ASSESSMENT

As shown on **Tables 3-6 and 3-7**, with a total non-residential population of 6,015 and 4.68 acres of passive open space, the passive open space ratio within the study area would decrease in the With Action condition compared with the No Action condition by approximately 8.69 percent. The passive open space ratio of 0.778 acres of passive open space per 1,000 non-residents would remain well above the City's planning goal of 0.15 acres of passive open space per 1,000 non-residents.

Table 3-6
With Action Condition: Adequacy of Open Space Resources

Total Population (Non-residents)	Passive Open Space Acreage	Passive Open Space Ratio per 1,000 People	Passive Open Space Goal
Non-Residential (¼-Mile) Study Area			
6,015	4.68	0.778	0.15

Notes:
Ratios in acres per 1,000 people.
The City's open space ratio goals for total and active open spaces are not applicable to the proposed project under *CEQR Technical Manual* methodology, as the project would only be introducing a non-residential population to the study area.
Sources: NYC Parks; Field Surveys, April 2019; MapPLUTO.

Table 3-7
Passive Open Space Ratios Summary

Ratio	City Goal (acres per 1,000 non-residents)	No Action Condition	With Action Condition	Percent Change
Passive	0.15	0.852	0.778	-8.69%

The *CEQR Technical Manual* indicates that a decrease in the open space ratio of five percent or more in areas that are currently below the City's median community district open space ratio of 1.5 acres per 1,000 residents would generally be considered a substantial change that requires a more detailed analysis. The Proposed Actions would result in a larger than five percent decrease in the passive open space ratio in the With Action condition compared with that of the No Action condition, but at a passive open space ratio of 0.778, the study area's open space ratio would remain substantially greater than the City's planning goal of 0.15 acres of passive open space per 1,000 non-residents. The anticipated effects of the Proposed Actions on open space resources in the study area are discussed below in the qualitative assessment.

QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT

The passive open space ratio of 0.778 with the Proposed Actions would remain well above the ratio of 0.15 acres per 1,000 non-residents recommended by the City. The public open space resources available to non-residents within the study area vary from small to large resources, and as noted above, the field survey of open spaces suggests that the majority of existing open space resources are not overcrowded by non-residents during the daytime. They are in adequate to excellent condition, and would not be overburdened by the additional non-residential population that would be introduced to the study area by the Proposed Actions. The five-acre Domino Park is located just to the west of the Project Area and includes features that would make it particularly suitable for lunchtime recreation for workers introduced by the Proposed Actions. There is also an additional passive open space resource located within the study area that could be utilized by non-residents in the study area, the Berry Street Garden.

IMPACT ASSESSMENT

A sufficient amount of passive open space, approximately 0.778 acres of passive open space per 1,000 non-residents, would remain in the study area to support the new non-residential population. Furthermore, the Proposed Actions would not directly impact any open space resources and would not substantially burden nearby open spaces resources through the introduction of a new non-residential population.

Currently, the passive open space ratio in the study area for non-residential users is well above the guidelines indicated in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, and would remain well above the guidelines in both the No Action and With Action conditions. Though the Proposed Actions would have the potential to result in a decrease in the passive open space ratio of more than five percent compared with the No Action condition, the passive open space ratio would remain substantially higher than the City's guideline (0.778 acres per 1,000 non-residents compared to the City's guideline of 0.15 acres per 1,000 non-residents). The quality of the open space resources within the study area, their moderate usage (with the exception of one resource), and the community garden within the study area would further reduce the potential effect of the additional demand generated by the Proposed Project. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts on open space resources in the study area. ✷