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, the Bay Ridge Community Development Center, seeks a Zoning Map Amendment and a Zoning Text Amendment (the "Proposed Actions") affecting Block 6131, Lot 1 (the "Projected Development Site") in the Fort Hamilton neighborhood of Brooklyn Community District 10. The Projected Development Site is approximately 12,500 square feet and is bounded by Marine Avenue to the north, Fort Hamilton Parkway to the east, 99th Street to the south, and 4th Avenue to the west. The Zoning Map Amendment would rezone the Projected Development Site from an existing R4B district to an R6A district. The Zoning Text Amendment would modify Appendix F of the New York City Zoning Resolution to designate a Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH) area coterminous with the Projected Development Site. The Proposed Actions would facilitate the redevelopment of the Projected Development Site with a new community facility building to replace the existing community center (the "Proposed Development"). The Proposed Development would consist of a four-story building with a cellar and sub-cellar, totaling approximately 48,904 gross square feet (33,055 zoning square feet), with a floor area ratio (FAR) of 2.64. While the Proposed Actions would allow increased building height and FAR, and would support more intensive use of the site, this is appropriate given its location on a wide street. Additionally, the proposed R6A district would be consistent with the nearby existing R6A district mapped along 4the Avenue. The proposed community facility development facilitated by the Proposed Actions would be consistent with the existing community facility, as well as the surrounding residential uses. Finally, the Proposed Action would facilitate the expansion of a community facility and would be consistent with the *OneNYC* and *Rebuild, Renew, Reinvent: A Blueprint for New York City's Economic Recovery* policies. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not lead to any significant adverse impacts on land use, zoning, and public policy.

Shadows

A detailed analysis of shadows is included in the EAS. Development resulting from the Proposed Actions would cause incremental shadows to reach one open space resource, John J. Carty Park. The analysis concluded that incremental shadows on John J. Carty Park would occur on May 21/September 21, May 6/August 6, and June 21 analysis days. Incremental shadows cast on March 21/September 21 would fall on the park from 3:20 PM until 4:29 PM for a total duration of one hour and nine minutes. On the May 6/August 6 analysis days, incremental shadows would fall on the park from 3:15 PM through 5:18 PM for a total of two hours and three minutes. On the June 21st analysis day, incremental shadows would fall on the park from 3:20 PM through 6:01 PM for a total of two hours and 41 minutes. Shadows cast on the park would primarily fall on portions of the tennis and handball courts and some bench seating. Incremental shadows are not expected to result in a reduction of open space utilization during any analysis days and the park would continue to receive direct sunlight in the morning and early afternoon. The extent and duration of the incremental shadows would not significantly reduce or eliminate direct sunlight exposure on any of the sunlight sensitive features found within the open space resource, nor would they alter the public's use of the open space resource or threaten the viability of vegetation or other sunlight-sensitive features. As a result, the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse shadows impact.

Historic and Cultural Resources

A detailed analysis of historic and cultural resources is included in the EAS. There is no archaeological significance associated with the Projected Development Site and therefore, no significant adverse impacts would occur on archaeological resources as a result of the Proposed Actions. The Proposed Actions would not result in any direct or indirect impacts to any designated or eligible historic architectural resources. The existing S/NR eligible building on the Projected Development Site would be demolished and redeveloped with a new community center under both No-Action and With-Action conditions, and therefore no physical alterations or demolitions to identified eligible historic resources would occur as a result of the Proposed Actions. As such, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts to any historic resources.

Urban Design and Visual Resources

A detailed analysis related to urban design and visual resources is included in this EAS. The Proposed Actions would not adversely impact any of the urban design elements or the overall character of the neighborhood. The Proposed Actions would not adversely change the pedestrian experience or

negatively affect the vitality, walkability, or the visual character of the area. The Proposed Development as a community facility would improve the pedestrian experience, increase the vitality of the area, and provide expanded community services. There are no view corridors within the study area and the Proposed Development would be located within an existing block. No publicly accessible views of the historic architectural resources would be blocked as a result of the Proposed Actions. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts related to urban design or visual resources and no further analysis is required.

Disadvantaged Communities Assessment
The EAS includes an assessment of effects on Disadvantaged Communities (DAC). The Proposed Development is not located within a DAC, nor is it located within a 1/2 mile of a DAC. Further, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts in any technical areas analyzed in the EAS: land use, zoning, and public policy, shadows, historic and cultural resources, urban design and visual resources, hazardous materials, air quality, and noise. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not disproportionately affect disadvantaged communities, nor would they increase a disproportionate pollution burden.

Hazardous Materials, Air Quality, and Noise
An E-Designation (E- 913) related to hazardous materials, air quality, and noise would be established to ensure that no significant adverse impacts related as part of the approval of the Proposed Actions. Refer to "Determination of Significance Appendix: (E) designation" for the applicable (E) designation requirements. The hazardous materials, air quality, and noise analyses conclude that with the (E) designation in place, the proposed actions would not result in a significant adverse impact related to hazardous materials, air quality, or noise.

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 Maryam Yaghoubi at +1 212-720-3655.

TITLE Deputy Director, Environmental Assessment and Review Division	LEAD AGENCY Department of City Planning on behalf of the City Planning Commission 120 Broadway, 31st Fl. New York, NY 10271 | 212.720.3493
NAME Evren Ulker-Kacar, AICP	DATE 6/11/2026
SIGNATURE Evren Ulker Kacar	
TITLE Chair, City Planning Commission	
NAME Sideya Sherman	DATE 6/15/2026
SIGNATURE	

Project Name: 9818 Fort Hamilton Parkway Rezoning
CEQR # 26DCP053K
SEQRA Classification: Unlisted

Determination of Significance Appendix

The Proposed Action(s) were determined to have the potential to result in changes to development on the following site(s):

Development Site	Borough	Block and Lot
Projected Development Site 1	Brooklyn	Block 6131 and Lot 1

(E) Designation Requirements

To ensure that the proposed actions would not result in significant adverse impacts related to hazardous materials, air quality, and noise an (E) designation (**E-913**) would be established as part of approval of the proposed actions on **Projected Development Site 1** as described below:

Development Site	Hazardous Materials	Air Quality	Noise
Projected Development Site 1	X	X	X

Hazardous Materials

The (E) designation requirements applicable to **Projected Development Site 1** for hazardous materials would apply as follows:

Task 1-Sampling Protocol

The applicant submits to OER, for review and approval, a Phase I of the site along with a soil, groundwater and soil vapor testing protocol, including a description of methods and a site map with all sampling locations clearly and precisely represented. If site sampling is necessary, no sampling should begin until written approval of a protocol is received from OER. The number and location of samples should be selected to adequately characterize the site, specific sources of suspected contamination (i.e., petroleum based contamination and non-petroleum based contamination), and the remainder of the site's condition. The characterization should be complete enough to determine what remediation strategy (if any) is necessary after review of sampling data. Guidelines and criteria for selecting sampling locations and collecting samples are provided by OER upon request.

Task 2-Remediation Determination and Protocol

A written report with findings and a summary of the data must he submitted to OER after completion of the testing phase and laboratory analysis for review and approval. After receiving such results, a determination is made by OER if the results indicate that remediation is necessary. If OER determines that no remediation is necessary, written notice shall be given by OER.

If remediation is indicated from test results, a proposed remediation plan must be submitted to OER for review and approval. The applicant must complete such remediation as determined necessary by OER. The applicant should then provide proper documentation that the work has been satisfactorily completed.

A construction-related health and safety plan should be submitted to OER and would be implemented during excavation and construction activities to protect workers and the community from potentially significant adverse impacts associated with contaminated soil, groundwater and/or soil vapor. This plan would be submitted to OER prior to implementation.

Air Quality

The (E) designation requirements for air quality would apply as follows:

Projected Development Site 1: *Any new community facility development on the above-referenced property must exclusively use electric grid power for heating, ventilating, and air conditioning (HVAC) system and hot water equipment with no venting stacks to avoid any potential significant adverse air quality impacts.*

Noise

The (E) designation requirements for noise would apply as follows:

Projected Development Site 1: *To ensure an acceptable interior noise environment, future community facility use must provide a closed-window condition with a minimum of 28 dBA window/wall attenuation on the eastern facade facing Fort Hamilton Parkway, a minimum of 31 dBA window/wall attenuation on the northern facade facing the playground and the western facade facing the playground to maintain an interior noise level not greater than 45 dBA for community facility use. In order to maintain a closed-window condition, an alternate means of ventilation must also be provided. Alternate means of ventilation include, but is not limited to, central air conditioning or air conditioning sleeves containing air conditioners.*