TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

CEQR No. 14DCP088Q

WOODWARD AVENUE REZONING

INTRODUCTION

The Woodward Avenue Rezoning's Environmental Assessment Statement (the "February '14 EAS") was completed on February 14, 2014. A Negative Declaration was issued on February 18, 2014 and the City Planning Commission (CPC) referred the proposed zoning map amendment (C 140111ZMQ) to Community Board 5 and Queens Borough President.

This Technical Memorandum addresses changes to the Applicant's proposed development since the issuance of the Negative Declaration on February 18, 2014 and modifications to the proposed action by the CPC. These changes, discussed in more detail below, are as follows:

- CPC modification of the currently proposed C1-3 commercial overlays to C2-3 commercial overlays.
- The Applicant has committed to incorporate eight affordable dwelling units within its proposed development to be constructed at 176 Woodward Avenue (Site 1).

Additionally, as noted below, the Applicant has stated its support for a potential follow up action that would include their property within the Inclusionary Housing program. Such a follow up action has not been determined yet and, therefore, is not analyzed in this Technical Memorandum. Any potential follow up land use actions would be discretionary and would need to go through ULURP and undergo its own environmental assessment per CEQR.

BACKGROUND

The CPC is proposing to modify the proposed zoning map amendment (the "**Proposed CPC Modification"**) in response to a recommendation by the Queens Borough President to allow a wider range of uses within the areas proposed to be mapped with commercial overlays. Queens Borough President added that this wider range of uses would better reflect the current range of potential businesses currently allowed within the existing M1-1 zoning district.

The CPC modification to the zoning map amendment would change the currently proposed C1-3 commercial overlays to C2-3 commercial overlays. The proposed modification would map C2-3 commercial overlays to a depth of 100 feet on either side of Woodward Avenue between Troutman Street and Starr Street, which would allow Use Groups 7 though 9 and 14 in addition to Use Groups 5 and 6 that are allowed in the currently proposed C1-3 commercial overlay. The proposed modification would affect both of the Applicant's properties (176 Woodward Avenue, Site 1 and 1901 Starr Street, Site 2) and one non-applicant owned property (175 Woodward Avenue, Site 5). Sites 3 and 4 (18-60 Troutman Street and 18-66 Troutman Street, respectively) are not affected by the CPC Modification. This Technical Memorandum analyzes whether the CPC's proposed modification would result in any significant adverse

environmental impacts. As described in more detail below, the analysis focuses on the Sites affected by the proposed modification, which are Sites 1, 2and 5.

Additionally, since the completion of the February 2014 Environmental Assessment Statement, the Applicant has stated, in a letter dated July 3, 2014, (see Appendix I) its commitment to provide eight (8) affordable dwelling units within its proposed development Site 1 (176 Woodward Avenue; Block 3395, Lot 16), which was originally projected to consist of 91 'entirely market rate dwelling units. The letter also indicates the Applicant's support for a potential follow up action that would include their property within the Inclusionary Housing program. However, such a follow up action has not been determined yet and, therefore, is not analyzed in this Technical Memorandum. Any potential follow up land use actions would be discretionary and would need to go through ULURP and undergo its own environmental assessment per CEQR. The letter also indicates the Applicant's commitment to not pull Department of Building (DOB) permits for Site 1 until such a follow-up action has completed the ULURP process. This Technical Memorandum addresses the Applicant's commitment of eight (8) affordable dwelling units on Site 1 and analyzes whether their construction would alter the conclusions of the analysis presented in the February 2014 EAS.

The analysis, as discussed below, concludes that the proposed modification and inclusion of eight (8) affordable dwelling units would not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts nor change the conclusions of the analyses presented in the February 2014 EAS for the proposed action.

Description of the Applicant's Previous Proposed Development

The Applicant, 176 Woodward Owner, LLC, is seeking a zoning map amendment to rezone portions of three city blocks from M1-1 to R5B, R6B and R6B with a C1-3 overlay. The proposed action is the subject of an application currently under consideration by the City Planning Commission (CPC) and analyzed in an Environmental Assessment Statement (EAS) completed on February 14, 2014.

The proposed action would rezone portions of Block 3395 and 3377 from M1-1 to R6B and R6B with a C1-3 overlay and portions of Block 3394 from M1-1 to R5B and R6B. The rezoning area is generally bounded by Starr Street to the south, Onderdonk Avenue to the west, Flushing Avenue to the north, and Woodward Avenue to the east and the applicant's properties are located at 176 Woodward Avenue (Block 3395, Lot 16) and 1901 Starr Street (Block 3377, Lot 84) in the Ridgewood neighborhood of Queens, Community District 5.

The proposed action (ULURP No. C 140111ZMQ) would facilitate a proposal by the applicant to develop two four-story buildings on two sites it owns. Site 1, 176 Woodward Avenue, would be developed with a 90,020 gross square feet (gsf) building containing approximately 88 market rate dwelling units, 3,115 square feet of community facility space and 6,707 square feet of commercial floor area and 107 below-grade accessory parking spaces and 11 at-grade accessory parking spaces. Site 2, 1901 Starr Street, would be developed with a 11,000 gsf mixed-use building containing 8 market rate dwelling units, 2,350 gsf of retail space and five at-grade accessory parking spaces. In total, the Applicant would develop 96 dwelling units, 6,707 gsf of retail space, 3,115 gsf of medical office space and 123 accessory parking spaces (16 at-grade and 107 below-grade spaces).

Previous Environmental Analysis

In order to assess the environmental effects of the proposed action, the February 2014 EAS established a Reasonable Worst-Case Development Scenario (RWCDS) that assumed that the proposal would be completed and operational by the build year of 2016. Five projected development sites were identified, including two applicant owned properties (Sites 1-2) and three non-applicant owned properties (Sites 3-5). Site 1, located at 176 Woodward Avenue (Block 3395, Lot 16) would be developed with a 90,020 gsf building containing 80 dwelling units, and 3,115 gsf of medical space and 6,707 gsf of retail space on the ground floor, and 107 below-grade accessory parking spaces and 11 at-grade accessory parking spaces. Site 2, located at 1901 Starr Street (Block 3377, Lot 84) would be developed with an 11,000 gsf mixed-use building containing 8 dwelling units, 2,350 gsf of retail space and five at-grade accessory parking spaces. Sites 3-5 (Block 3395, Lots 12-15; Block 3377, Lot 1) would be developed with three buildings consisting of 22 dwelling units and 2,369 gsf of retail space. Absent the proposed action, the applicant stated that their properties would be redeveloped with 23,280 gsf of commercial retail space and 71 at-grade parking spaces. It was assumed that the non-applicant owned sites would remain in their current conditions, which includes a total of approximately six (6) dwelling units.

The proposed action was anticipated to result in an increase for all projected development sites of approximately 110 new dwelling units, 3,115 gsf of medical office space, and 57 additional accessory parking spaces and a net decrease of 11,854 gsf of commercial floor area (see Table 1).

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED CPC MODIFICATION

The modification being proposed by the CPC would map a C2-3 commercial overlay instead of a C1-3 commercial overlay to a depth of 100 feet on either side of Woodward Avenue between Troutman Street and Starr Street.

C1 and C2 overlays both have a maximum FAR of 2.0 when mapped in R6 districts, though commercial uses are limited to the ground floor when residences are located above. C1-3 and C2-3 overlays both require one parking space per 400 square feet of general retail space. C1 overlays permit basic small-scale retail shops and offices and C2 overlays permit a slightly broader range of service uses, such as bicycle repair shops. C1 districts permit commercial Use Groups (UG) 5 and 6 while C2 districts permit Use Groups 5 though 9 and 14.

DESCRIPTION OF THE ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK

As described above, the proposed modification would only affect the proposed commercial overlays and would not alter the proposed residential zoning districts or zoning boundaries. The modification to map a C2-3 commercial overlay along Woodward Avenue would not alter the amount or location of commercial development nor would it change the parking requirements. The proposed modification would only change the range of commercial uses allowed where the C2-3 commercial overlay is proposed to be mapped, which include Use Groups 7 through 9 and 14.

The proposed modification would affect properties on both sides of Woodward Avenue between Troutman and Starr Street, which include both the applicant's proposed development sites (Sites 1-2) and one non-applicant owned projected development site (Site 5).

The proposed modification is not expected to induce development on properties not already identified as development sites in the February 2014 EAS since the C2-3 overlay would not increase the amount of developable floor area and these properties are already built to more than half the allowable proposed zoning floor area. The two other development sites (Sites 3-4), both non-applicant, are not within the proposed commercial overlay area and would not be affected by the proposed modification. The assumptions regarding their development under the proposed action would remain the same.

Additionally, as discussed above, in a letter dated July 3, 2014, the Applicant has stated their commitment to providing eight (8) dwelling units on their proposed development Site 1.

In order to assess the changes to the proposed action, as modified by the CPC, and the Applicant's intended development, the Technical Memorandum will analyze commercial uses permitted under C2-3 overlays but not permitted under C1-3 overlays and the development of 8 affordable dwelling units on Site 1. Three commercial uses permitted in C2-3 overlays were chosen based on land use trends and patterns surrounding the project area and to reflect a reasonable estimate of what could be built under the modification. As described above, the affected projected development sites (Sites 1-2 and 5) were expected to be developed with 6,707 gsf, 2,350 gsf and 2,369 gsf, respectively, of local commercial retail typical of C1 districts. For the purposes of this Technical Memorandum, it is assumed that these sites would be developed with a 6,707 gsf upholsterer (UG 8), a 2,350 gsf contractor glazing space (UG 7), and a 2,369 gsf bike repair shop (UG 7) (see Table 2).

LIKELY EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED MODIFICATION

The February 2014 EAS and the Negative Declaration issued on February 18th concluded that the original proposed zoning map amendment with the C1-3 commercial overlay would not have the potential for significant adverse impacts related to the environment.

The February 2014 EAS did not analyze the technical areas identified below because the anticipated projected development would not meet or exceed the CEQR TM thresholds requiring analysis. These technical areas are: Socioeconomic Conditions, Community Facilities, Shadows, Natural Resources, Water and Sewer Infrastructure, Solid Waste and Sanitation Services, Energy, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Public Health and Neighborhood Character. Additionally, the technical analyses prepared in the February 2014 EAS concluded that the proposed action would not have the potential for significant adverse impacts in the following areas: Land Use, Zoning and Public Policy, Open Space, Urban Design, Historic and Cultural Resources, Hazardous Materials, Transportation, Air Quality, Noise and Construction.

The proposed modification currently under consideration by the CPC would not alter the size or configuration of the projected development sites, induce new development nor increase in-ground disturbance due to construction. Therefore, the modification would not have the potential to alter the conclusion that there would be no significant adverse impacts in the following analysis areas and

conditions: *Shadows, Historic and Cultural Resources, Urban Design and Visual Resources, Natural Resources, Hazardous Materials, Water and Sewer Infrastructure, Solid Waste and Sanitation Services, Energy, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and Construction.*

However, the modification would modify the permitted commercial uses on a small portion of the rezoning area and additional analyses in the following areas are provided below: Land Use, Zoning, Public Policy, Socioeconomic Conditions, Open Space, Transportation, Air Quality and Noise to determine if any significant adverse impacts would occur. As discussed below, the proposed modification is not anticipated to result in any significant adverse impacts related to the environment in these analysis areas and would, therefore, also not have the potential for significant adverse impacts related to Public Health and Neighborhood Character. Additionally, a screening analysis was done for Community Facilities to determine if the construction of eight affordable dwelling units would have the potential for significant adverse impacts on child care facilities.

Land Use, Zoning and Public Policy

The modification to map a C2-3 commercial overlay along Woodward Avenue would not alter the amount or location of commercial development nor would it change the parking requirements. However, the modification would change the range of permitted commercial uses. Therefore, a preliminary land use and zoning analysis is presented below.

The modifications being proposed by the CPC would map a C2-3 commercial overlay instead of a C1-3 commercial overlay to a depth of 100 feet on either side of Woodward Avenue between Troutman Street and Starr Street. C1 and C2 overlays both have a maximum floor area ratio (FAR) of 2.0 when mapped in R6 districts, though commercial uses are limited to the ground floor when residences are located above. C1-3 and C2-3 overlays both require one parking space per 400 square feet of commercial space. C1 overlays permit basic small-scale retail shops and offices and C2 overlays permit a slightly broader range of service uses, such as bicycle repair shops. C1 districts permit commercial Use Groups (UG) 5 and 6 while C2 districts permit Use Groups 5 though 9 and 14.

The project area is located within an M1-1 zoning district, which allows Use Groups 4 through 14, 16 and 17. Most of the surrounding 400-foot radius area is also zoned M1-1. An R5B district is located to the east across Starr Street and an R4 district is located further to the south. A R4 district with a C1-3 commercial overlay is mapped along the north side of Cypress Avenue between Starr Street and Willoughby Avenue to the southeast.

The proposed C2-3 overlay would also allow Use Groups 5 through 9 and 14 but not Use Groups 4, 16 and 17. The range of uses permitted in the proposed C2-3 commercial overlay are currently allowed in the existing M1-1 district. The area reflects the diverse range of uses allowed between these existing zoning districts and is comprised of a mix of uses, including residential, commercial and light manufacturing. The C2-3 overlay would allow, among other uses, an upholsterer, a bike repair shop and a glazing contractor. These uses are similar to the other uses within 400-feet study area that includes automotive repair uses, small commercial and retail businesses, several warehouses, a restaurant, and a metal glazing operation.

TABLE 1: PROJECTED DEVELOPMENT SITE SUMMARY - Original Proposed Action

		Site Information			Existing Conditions						Future Without-Action Conditions						Future With-Action Conditions								Increment					
Site		*Tax Block*	*Tax Lot*	*Lot Area (SF)*	*Existing Zoning*	*Existing Overlay*	*Maximum FAR‡*	*Auto Rel., Storage & Other SF*	*Total SF*	*Total DU's*	*Comml SF+*	*C Fac SF*	*Parking*	*Light Industrial*	*Total SF*	*Total DU's*	*Prop. Zoning*	*Prop. Overlay*	*Local Retail SF*	*Light Industrial*	*C Fac SF*	*Parking*	*Total SF*	*Total DU's*	*Comml SF*	*C Fac SF*	*Light Industrial*	*Parking*	*Total SF*	*Total DU's*
01*	a	3395	16	45,010	M1-1	-	2.40	0	0	0	19,945	0	66	-	19,945	0	R6B	C1-3	6,707	-	3,115	118	90,020	80	(13,238)	3,115	-	52	70,075	80
02*	a	3377	84	5,505	M1-1	-	2.40	0	0	0	3,135		5	-	3,135	0	R6B	C1-3	2,350	-	-	5	11,000	8	(785)	-	-	0	7,865	8
03†	a	3395	12	2,500	M1-1	-	2.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	2,200	4	R6B	-	0	-	-	-	8,081	8	-	-	-	0	5,881	4
	b	3395	13	2,523	M1-1	-	2.40	0	2,200	4																				
04†	a	3395	14	2,523	M1-1	-	2.40	0	1,910	2	0	0	0	-	1,910	2	R6B	-	0	-	-	-	8,427	8	-	-	-	0	6,517	6
	b	3395	15	2,523	M1-1	-	2.40	0	0	0																				
05	a	3377	1	4,500	M1-1	-	2.40	200	200	0	200	0	0	-	200	0	R6B	C1-3	2,369	-		5	9,270	6	2,169	-	-	5	9,070	6
Totals:				65,084				200	4,310	6	23,280	0	71	-	27,390	6			11,426	-	3,115	128	126,798	116	(11,854)	3,115	-	57	99,408	110

*Applicant Owned Property

† Not Affected by Proposed Modification

‡Maximum FAR permitted is for Community Facility Use. Maximum FAR for manfucaturing and commerical uses is 1.0.

TABLE 2: PROJECTED DEVELOPMENT SITE SUMMARY - Modified Proposed Action

		Site Information			Existing Conditions						Future Without-Action Conditions						Future With-Action Conditions								Increment					
Site		*Tax Block*	*Tax Lot*	*Lot Area (SF)*	*Existing Zoning*	*Existing Overlay*	*Maximum FAR‡*	*Auto Rel., Storage & Other SF*	*Total SF*	*Total DU's*	*Comml SF+*	*C Fac SF*	*Parking*	*Light Industrial*	*Total SF*	*Total DU's*	*Prop. Zoning*	*Prop. Overlay*	*Local Retail SF*	*Light Industrial*	*C Fac SF*	*Parking*	*Total SF*	*Total DU's*	*Comml SF*	*C Fac SF*	*Light Industrial*	*Parking*	*Total SF*	*Total DU's*
01*	a	3395	16	45,010	M1-1	-	2.40	0	0	0	19,945	0	66	-	19,945	0	R6B	C1-3	0	6,707	3,115	118	90,020	80	(19,945)	3,115	6,707	52	70,075	80
02*	a	3377	84	5,505	M1-1	-	2.40	0	0	0	3,135		5	-	3,135	0	R6B	C1-3	0	2,350	-	5	11,000	8	(3,135)	-	2,350	0	7,865	8
03†	a	3395	12	2,500	M1-1	-	2.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	2,200	4	R6B	-	0	0	-	-	8,081	8	-	-	0	0	5,881	4
	b	3395	13	2,523	M1-1	-	2.40	0	2,200	4																				
04†	a	3395	14	2,523	M1-1	-	2.40	0	1,910	2	0	0	0	-	1,910	2	R6B	-	0	0	-	-	8,427	8	-	-	0	0	6,517	6
	b	3395	15	2,523	M1-1	-	2.40	0	0	0																				
05	a	3377	1	4,500	M1-1	-	2.40	200	200	0	200	0	0	-	200	0	R6B	C1-3	0	2,369		5	9,270	6	(200)	-	2,369	5	9,070	6
Totals:				65,084				200	4,310	6	23,280	0	71	0	27,390	6			0	11,426	3,115	128	126,798	116	(23,280)	3,115	11,426	57	99,408	110

*Applicant Owned Property

† Not Affected by Proposed Modification

‡Maximum FAR permitted is for Community Facility Use. Maximum FAR for manfucaturing and commerical uses is 1.0.

The modification would not alter the amount or location of commercial development nor would it change the parking requirements or cause a great extent of non-conformity with zoning. The broader range of uses allowed under the C2-3 commercial overlay would be consistent and compatible with both the current and proposed land use patterns in the surrounding area. The addition of eight affordable dwelling units would be consistent with the surrounding area, which as described above includes a broad range of uses including residential. The affordable units would also be consistent with the original proposed action, which included the development of mixed-use residential buildings on the Applicant's properties. Therefore, no potentially adverse impacts related to land use are expected to occur as a result of the proposed modification. The proposed modification would not affect any known public policies and is, therefore, not anticipated to result in any significant adverse impacts related to a public policy. Therefore, no further land use, zoning and public policy analysis is necessary.

Socioeconomic Conditions

The proposed actions would not affect socioeconomic conditions. The proposed modification would not induce new development, residential or commercial, but would alter the types of commercial uses anticipated to be developed under the proposed actions. As discussed above, these commercial uses are anticipated to be an upholsterer, bike repair shop, and a glazing contractor's space. These commercial uses are not anticipated to generate more workers than the previously analyzed UG 6 local retail that was expected to generate 44 new employees. The proposed modification would not alter the conclusion of the previous environmental assessment that the proposed development does not have the potential for adverse impacts related to socioeconomic conditions.

Community Facilities

A community facilities analysis is typically needed if there would be potential direct or indirect effects on a facility. Detailed community facilities analyses are most commonly associated with residential projects because demand for community services generally results from the introduction of new residents to an area.

A community facilities analysis assesses the ability of community facilities to provide services both with and without the proposed project. Whether the project would have a potential impact is based on the likelihood that the project would create demand for services greater than the ability of existing facilities to provide those services.

The February 2014 EAS concluded that there would be no potential for significant adverse impacts related to community facilities since the proposed action would not result in any direct effects to a community facility and the anticipated development from the projected sites would be well below the CEQR Technical Manual thresholds requiring an assessment.

The proposed modification by the CPC would not alter the amount or location of development on the projected sites nor would it induce new development elsewhere within the rezoning area. The modification would alter the range of permitted commercial uses on a small portion of the rezoning area and would not increase demand for community facilities according to CEQR Technical Manual guidance.

According to the CEQR Technical Manual, the threshold for a child care assessment in Queens is 139 low or low/moderate income dwelling units. While the addition of eight affordable housing units would generate some demand for child care slots it would be well below the potential to have a significant adverse impact on the City's child care centers. Therefore, no further assessment of community facilities is warranted.

Open Space

Under CEQR, an analysis of open space is conducted to determine whether or not a proposed project would have a direct impact resulting from the elimination or alteration of open space and/or an indirect impact resulting from overtaxing available open space. Open space is defined as publicly or privately owned land that is publicly accessible and available for leisure, play, or sport, or is set aside for the protection and/or enhancement of the natural environment.

An open space analysis was conducted in the February 2014 EAS since the proposed project was anticipated to generate approximately 308 residents, which surpasses the CEQR Technical Manual threshold of 50 new residents. The proposed actions were also anticipated to generate approximately 44 new employees, which is below the CEQR Technical Manual threshold of 125 new employees needed to require an analysis. The February 2014 EAS concluded that there would be no potential for significant adverse impacts related to open space since the proposed action "would not eliminate or reduce the size of any existing open space facilities, would not limit access to any open spaces, and would not alter any open space areas so that they no longer serve the same user population…" and would not "not result in overburdening existing facilities or significantly exacerbate a deficiency in open space."

The proposed modification would not induce new development, residential or commercial, but would alter the types of commercial uses anticipated to be developed under the proposed actions. As discussed above, these commercial uses are anticipated to be an upholsterer, bike repair shop, and a glazing contractor's space. These commercial uses are not anticipated to surpass the CEQR TM threshold of 125 new employees. Additionally, the modification would not increase the anticipated residential population and, therefore, would not reduce the capacity or increase the overburdening of existing facilities that would indicate, according to CEQR TM, an open space impact. Therefore, the proposed modification would not result in a significant adverse indirect impact on open space resources.

Transportation

The transportation analysis in the February 2014 EAS assessed the potential effects of the proposed action on transportation conditions. The analysis assumed a projected development scenario of a total net increase of 110 dwelling units, 3,115 gsf of professional medical office space, 9,405 square feet of accessory recreational space, 421 square feet of accessory open space, 57 accessory parking spaces, and a total net decrease of 11,854 gsf of local commercial retail space (Use Group 6). The analysis showed that the original proposed action would generate 48, -287, and -71 net person trip ends and 28, 2, and 23 net vehicle trip ends during the AM, MD, and PM peak hours, respectively. Since the analysis showed that the original proposed action would generate fewer than 200 peak hour net person trip ends and 50 peak hour net vehicle trip ends during the AM, MD, and PM peak hours, the analysis concluded that based on the CEQR Technical Manual Guidelines, no significant adverse impacts related to transportation would

occur as a result of the proposed action and no further traffic, parking, transit, or pedestrian analysis is required.

In order to determine the potential for the proposed modification by the CPC to result in significant adverse impacts related to transportation, a screening analysis was performed pursuant to the methodologies identified in the CEQR Technical Manual. The projected development scenario, as discussed above, would not be altered from the anticipated total net increase of 110 dwelling units 3,115 gsf of professional medical office space, 57 accessory parking spaces. However, instead of a total net decrease of 11,854 gsf of UG 6 local commercial retail space, the proposed modification would result in a decrease of 23,280 gsf of UG 6 local commercial retail space since the modification is anticipated to result in 11,426 gsf of UG 7 and 8 light industrial/commercial space. For the purposes of a conservative analysis, the transportation screening analysis below assumes only an increase of 11,426 gsf of general light industrial retail space, which includes a 6,707 gsf upholsterer (UG 8), a 2,350 gsf contractor glazing space (UG 7), and a 2,369 gsf bike repair shop (UG 7) and does not take into account any reduction in trips from the loss of UG 6 local commercial space.

As described in more detail below, the analysis concludes that there would be no potential for significant adverse impacts related to transportation.

Level One Screening

To assess the potential effects of the proposed action on transportation conditions, the appropriate trip generation screening analyses, Level One, have been performed, based on the 2014 CEQR Technical Manual. The resulting conclusions are summarized below.

The proposed action would generate 118, 75, and 127 net person trip ends and 40, 29, and 40 net vehicle trip ends during the AM, MD, and PM peak hours, respectively. The proposed action would generate fewer than 200 peak hour net person trip ends and 50 peak hour net vehicle trip ends during the AM, MD, and PM peak hours. Thus, based upon the 2014 CEQR Technical Manual Guidelines, no further traffic, parking, transit, or pedestrian analysis is required.

Trip Generation Characteristics

The following assumptions were utilized in estimating likely future trips from each of the land uses resulting from the proposed action as summarized in Table 1.

Residential Development

The proposed action would include 110 residential dwelling units. The residential trip generation rates and temporal distribution are all based on the CEQR Technical Manual, Table 16-2. A rate of 8.075 daily person trips per dwelling unit is assumed for the project's residential component. The mode of transportation (modal split) is estimated based on journey- to-work (JTW) data from the 2007-2011 American Community Survey (ACS) for the census tract numbers 535 and 539 in Queens, directly affected by the proposed action. Based on those census tracts, the modal split used is 29 percent autos, zero (0) percent taxi, 18 percent bus, 35 percent subway, 11 percent walk, and seven (7) percent other, such as bicycle, as summarized in Table 1 and shown in Exhibits 1 and 2 for modal split data and vehicle

occupancy rate for autos, respectively. Based on census data, the auto vehicle occupancy rate is estimated at 1.15; and for taxis, based on the Taxi Travel Survey, a rate of 1.4 is assumed for this development.

General Light Industrial-Commercial Development

As discussed above, the proposed modification would change the range of commercial uses allowed where the C2-3 commercial overlays are proposed to be mapped and is anticipated to result in a 6,707 gsf upholsterer (UG 8), a 2,350 gsf contractor glazing space (UG 7), and a 2,369 gsf bike repair shop (UG 7). These uses (UG 7 and 8) are categorized below and within as general light industrial-commercial development for trip generation rates. The General Light Industrial trip generation rates and temporal distribution information are all based on the ITE 8th Edition for Land Use number 110 and 2014 CEQR Technical Manual, Table 16-2 is also utilized to estimate truck trips. The trip generation rate is estimated at 9.54 person trips per 1,000 square feet of space. The modal split data is 66.51 percent autos, 0.23 percent taxi, 9.14 percent bus, 12.23 percent subway, 7.66 percent walk and 4.23 percent other such as bicycle, based on the 2006-2010 American Community Survey (ACS), Reverse-Journey-to-Work (RJTW) for tract numbers 545 and 539 in Queens. The auto occupancy rate of 1.2 is also based on the 2006-2010 American Community Survey (ACS), Reverse-Journey-to-Work (RJTW) for tract numbers 545 and 539. The vehicle occupancy rate of 1.4 is also assumed for taxis.

Community Facility (Professional Medical Office) Development

The proposed action would provide a total of 3,115 gsf of professional medical office space. The medical office trip generation rates, peak hour temporal distribution, and modal split information are all based on the Jamaica Plan FEIS. The trip generation rates are estimated at 10 and 33.6 person trips per 1,000 square feet of space for staff and visitors trips, respectively. The modal split data reported for the staff trips is 20 percent autos, 10 percent taxi, 30 percent bus, 30 percent subway, and 10 percent walk. The modal split information for the visitors is 25 percent autos, 25 percent taxi, 11 percent bus, 29 percent subway, and 10 percent walk. The vehicle occupancy for staff and visitors trips, respectively, are 1.00 and 1.65 for autos and 1.4 and 1.2 for taxis.

Accessory Recreation Space

The proposed action would provide approximately 9,405 square feet of accessory recreational space on the roof of the building on Projected Development Site 1 for use by the building's residents. This component would generate no external trips.

Accessory Open Space

The proposed action would include approximately 421 square feet of accessory open space on Projected Development Site 2 for use by the residents of the proposed building. This component would generate no external trips.

Delivery Vehicles

The rates of 0.06 per dwelling unit, 0.35 per 1,000 square feet of General Light Industrial use, and 0.32 per 1,000 square feet of medical office space, as reported in the 2014 CEQR Technical Manual, Table 16-2, are used to estimate daily delivery vehicles for the proposed action.

Total Person Trips

The proposed action would collectively generate 118, 75, and 127 net person trip ends during the AM, Midday, and PM peak hours, respectively, as summarized in Table 2.

Total Vehicle Trips

The proposed action would collectively generate 40, 29, and 40 net vehicle trip ends during the AM, Midday, and PM peak hours, respectively, as summarized in Table 2.

The projected development sites would collectively generate fewer than 50 net vehicle trip ends during all peak hours, thus, based upon the 2014 CEQR Technical Manual Guidelines, the proposed action would satisfy the Level One Screening and no further traffic or parking analysis is required.

Bus Trips

The proposed action would collectively generate 20, 12, and 22 net bus trips and also fewer than 50 net bus trips per bus lane per direction during the AM, Midday, and PM peak hours, respectively, as summarized in Table 2.

The proposed action would generate fewer than 200 net bus trips during the AM, Midday, and PM peak hours, respectively, as summarized in Table 2. Thus, based upon the 2014 CEQR Technical Manual Guidelines, the proposed action would satisfy the Level One Screening and no further bus analysis is required.

Subway Trips

The proposed action would collectively generate 37, 22, and 40 net subway trips during the AM, Midday, and PM peak hours, respectively, as summarized in Table 2.

The proposed action would generate fewer than 200 net subway trips, during the AM, Midday, and PM peak hours as summarized in Table 2. Thus, based upon the 2014 CEQR Technical Manual Guidelines, the proposed action would satisfy the Level One Screening and no further subway analysis is required.

Pedestrian Trips

The proposed action would collectively generate 77, 45, and 83 net pedestrian (bus, subway, walk, and other) trips during the AM, Midday, and PM peak hours, respectively, as summarized in Table 2.

Based on trip generation and mode split characteristics as described above, the proposed action would generate fewer than 200 net pedestrian trip ends, during the AM, Midday, and PM peak hours,

respectively, as summarized in Table 2. Thus, based upon the 2014 CEQR Technical Manual Guidelines, the proposed action would satisfy the Level One Screening and no further pedestrian analysis is required.

Conclusion

The results of the revised transportation analysis for the CPC Modification scenario indicate that the proposed project would generate fewer than 50 net vehicle trip ends during the AM, Midday, and PM periods. As noted above, the analysis did not take into account the reduction of approximately 23,000 gsf of UG 6 local commercial retail in order to provide a conservative assessment. Even without taking into account the reduction in local UG 6 retail space, the proposed modification would not surpass the thresholds identified in the CEQR TM. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts related to traffic and parking conditions are anticipated to occur. Similarly, no significant adverse impacts related to transit and pedestrians would be expected. No significant adverse impacts related to transportation would occur as a result of the modified proposed action, and no further assessment is warranted.

Air Quality

Based on the CEQR Technical Manual guidelines, the proposed modification would not have the potential for significant adverse air quality impacts. As noted above, he proposed modification currently under consideration by the CPC would not alter the size or configuration of the projected development sites nor would it induce new development or change the parking requirements. Additionally, the (UG8) upholsterer, bike repair shop (UG 7), and glazing contractor space (UG 7) anticipated under the broader range of uses allowed by the C2-3 overlay would not emit air toxics or malodorous pollutants. Therefore, the proposed modifications are not anticipated to result in significant adverse impacts related to air quality and further analysis is not necessary.

Noise

The CEQR Technical Manual states that if a proposed action would increase noise passenger car equivalent (Noise PCE) values by 100 percent or more, then a detailed analysis is generally performed. The proposed modification would not double Noise PCE values at any location and as detailed above would result in a modest decrease in traffic over what was anticipated in the original proposed actions.

Additionally, according to the CEQR Technical Manual, detailed noise analysis may be warranted if a sensitive receptor screening determines a proposed action would introduce a new noise-sensitive location, known as a receptor, in an area with high ambient noise levels, or other loud activities. The proposed action would not introduce a new receptor and a detailed noise analysis is not warranted. Therefore, the proposed modifications are not anticipated to result in significant adverse impacts related to noise and further analysis is not necessary.

CONCLUSION

The proposed modification is not anticipated to have any significant impacts related to the environment and does not alter the conclusions of the original EAS and Negative Declaration.

Table 3: Transportation Planning Factors
Woodward Avnue, Queens NY

Land Use	Residential	Medical Office		General Light Industrial	Recreational	Open Space
Size/Unit	d.u.	sq.ft.		sq ft.	Space(sq.ft.)	sq.ft.
	110	3,115		11,426	9,405	421
Trip Generation:	(1)	(3)	(3)	(5)		(1)
Weekday	8.075	10	33.6	9.54		139
	per d.u.	per 1,000 sq.ft.		per 1,000 sq.ft.	Accessory to	per acre
Linked-Trip	-	-	-	-	building's residents	-
Temporal Distribution	(1)	(3)	(3)	(5)	and patrons	(1)
AM Peak Hour	10%	24%	6%	14.5%	-	3%
MD Peak Hour	5%	17%	9%	14.9%	-	5%
PM Peak Hour	11%	24%	5%	15.4%	-	6%
Modal Split	(2)	(3)	(3)	(6)		(4)
	AM/MD/PM	AM/MD/PM	AM/MD/PM	AM/MD/PM	-	AM/MD/PM
Auto	29%	20%	25%	66.51%	-	0%
Taxi	0%	10%	25%	0.23%	-	0%
Subway	35%	30%	29%	12.23%	-	0%
Bus	0.18	30%	11%	9.14%	-	0%
Walk	11%	10%	10%	7.66%	-	100%
Other	7%	0%	0%	4.23%	-	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100.00%	-	100%
In/Out Splits	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3) (5)		
	In/Out	In/Out	In/Out	In/Out	-	In/Out
AM Peak Hour	0%	90/10	90/10	90/10	-	90/10
MD Peak Hour	1%	50/50	50/50	50/50	-	50/50
PM Peak Hour	14/86	14/86	14/86	14/86	-	14/86
Vehicle Occupancy	(2)	(3)	(3)	(6)		(4)
Auto	1.15	1.00	1.65	1.2	-	n/a
Taxi	1.40	1.40	1.20	1.4	-	n/a
	(1)	(1)		(1)		(4)
Truck Trip Generation	0.06	0.32		0.35	-	n/a
	per d.u.	per 1,000 sq.ft.		per 1,000 sq.ft.	-	
AM Peak Hour	(1)	(1)		(1)		(4)
	12%	10%		8%	-	n/a
MD Peak Hour	9%	11%		11%	-	n/a
PM Peak Hour	2%	2%		2%	-	n/a
AM/MD/PM	(1)	(1)		(1)		(4)
	50/50	50/50		50/50	-	n/a

Sources:

(1)-2014 CEQR Technical Manual, Table 16-2.

(2)-2007-2011 American Coummunity Survey (ACS) for tract numbers 545 and 539.

(3)-The Jamaica Plan FEIS , Tables 16-10 and 16-10a.

(4)-Saint Vincent FEIS.

(5) ITE Handbook, Land Use General Light Industrial, CODE 110.

(6)-2006 – 2010 American Community Survey (ACS), Reverse Jounery to Work for Tract numbers 545 and 539.

Table 4: Estimated Person and Vehicular Trips
Woodward Avnue, Queens NY

Land Use	Residential	Medical Office		General Light Industrial	Recreational	Open Space	Total Net Demand
Size/Unit	d.u.	sq.ft.			Space(sq.ft.)	sq.ft.	
	110	3,115		11,426	9,405	421	
Peak Hour Trips							
AM	89	7	6	16	0	0	118
MD	44	5	9	16	0	0	75
PM	98	7	5	17	0	0	127
Person Trips:							
AM							
Auto	26	1	2	11	0	0	39
Taxi	0	1	2	0	0	0	2
Subway	31	2	2	2	0	0	37
Bus	16	2	1	1	0	0	20
Walk	10	1	1	1	0	0	12
Other	6	0	0	1	0	0	7
Total	89	7	8	16	0	0	120
Midday							
Auto	13	1	2	11	0	0	27
Taxi	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Subway	16	2	3	2	0	0	22
Bus	8	2	1	1	0	0	12
Walk	5	0	1	1	0	0	7
Other	3	0	0	1	0	0	4
Total	44	5	9	16	0	0	75
PM							
Auto	28	1	1	11	0	0	42
Taxi	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Subway	34	2	2	2	0	0	40
Bus	18	2	1	2	0	0	22
Walk	11	1	1	1	0	0	13
Other	7	0	0	1	0	0	8
Total	98	7	6	17	0	0	128
Vehicular							
AM							
Auto	22	1	1	9	0	0	34
Taxi	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Taxi (Balanced)	0	2	2	0	0	0	4
Truck	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Truck (Balanced)	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Total	24	3	3	9	0	0	40
Midday							
Auto	11	1	1	9	0	0	23
Taxi	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Taxi (Balanced)	0	0	4	0	0	0	4
Truck	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Truck (Balanced)	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Total	13	1	5	9	0	0	29
PM							
Auto	25	1	1	9	0	0	36
Taxi	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Taxi (Balanced)	0	2	2	0	0	0	4
Truck	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Truck (Balanced)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	25	3	3	9	0	0	40

APPENDIX A

176 Woodward Avenue, LLC

176 Woodward Avenue Ridgewood, NY 11385

July 3, 2014

Honorable Carl Weisbrod,
Chairman
New York City Planning Commission
22 Reade Street
New York NY 10007

Re: 176 Woodward Avenue, Queens NY (Site 1)
Zoning Map Amendment Application (C 140111 ZMQ) (the "Application")

Dear Chairman Weisbrod:

We write to memorialize agreements reached with NYC Department of City Planning staff regarding the affordable housing component to be included as part of a proposed development at the above listed address. As mentioned by staff at the City Planning Commission's (the "Commission") Review Session on June 23, 2014, we concur with the goals of the Commission to secure affordable housing as a component of the above listed ULURP application. We also strongly support any future action taken by the Department of City planning that would allow for the Inclusionary Housing program to be used for the future development of Site 1.

To ensure that the proposed rezoning includes permanently affordable housing, we commit to including eight units as part of the intended development facilitated by the proposed rezoning on the site. This provision shall be made regardless of the success of any follow-up actions undertaken by the Department of City Planning. We also agree to support a follow-up action by the Department of City Planning to amend the Zoning Resolution to allow for the future development on Site 1 to take advantage of the Inclusionary Housing Program. The Inclusionary housing program would provide an additional 0.2 residential FAR and facilitate the creation of additional affordable units. We also agree to delay pulling of a new building permit for Site 1 until such time as said follow-up action has completed the ULURP process. The follow-up action to allow the future development on Site 1 to take advantage of the Inclusionary Housing Program will require fast action and strong coordination

with City Planning staff. We look forward to working with staff to implement this follow-up action quickly.

We believe that the proposed project, including the provision of eight permanently affordable units, is based on a sound land use planning rationale that provides clear benefits to the Ridgewood community and City as a whole. We also believe that the follow up action allowing future development on Site 1 to take advantage of the Inclusionary Housing Program furthers the Commission's goal of providing new affordable housing. Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,

David Schwartz, by JL

David Schwartz

cc: DOB Commissioner