DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
CITY OF NEW YORK

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND REVIEW DIVISION

Daniel R. Garodnick, *Director*
Department of City Planning

February 10, 2026

POSITIVE DECLARATION

Project Identification
Columbia Heights Rezoning
CEQR No. 26DCP094K
ULURP Nos. 260139ZMK, N260140ZRK
SEQRA Classification: Type I

Lead Agency
City Planning Commission
120 Broadway, 31st Floor
New York, NY 10271
Contact: Evren Ulker-Kacar
(212) 720-3493

Name, Description and Location of Proposal:

Columbia Heights Rezoning

The Applicant, 25-30 Columbia Heights (Brooklyn), LLC., is seeking a zoning map amendment from M2-1 to M1-5A/R10A and M1-5A/R8A affecting Block 204, Lot 1 and Block 208, Lots 1, 2, and 12 (the "Project Area); and a zoning text amendment to establish a Special Mixed-Use (MX) District and to amend Appendix F of the New York City Zoning Resolution (ZR) to establish the Project Area as a Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH) Area (collectively, the "Proposed Actions"). The Proposed Actions would facilitate a mixed-use development including the residential conversion and enlargement of two existing, underutilized commercial buildings (the "Proposed Development"). The Project Area consists of Projected Development Site 1 (25 Columbia Heights; Block 204, Lot 1) and Projected Development Site 2 (30-58 Columbia Heights; Block 208, Lots 1, 2, and 12) and is generally bounded by Doughty, Furman, Columbia and Vine Streets in between the Brooklyn Heights and Dumbo neighborhoods of Community District 2.

The Proposed Development includes a total of approximately 925,000 gross square feet (gsf), comprising 678,000 gsf of residential use (661 dwelling units [DUs]), 133-199 [20-30%] of which would be affordable pursuant to MIH depending on the option selected), 186,000 gsf of commercial and/or community facility use, and 61,000 gsf of accessory residential parking (188 parking spaces). The existing 12-story commercial building on Projected Development Site 1 would be partially converted to residential use, enlarged to a maximum height of approximately 17 stories (approximately 210 feet), and would contain approximately 460,570 gsf (12.0 FAR) comprised of 399,710 gsf of residential use (392 units, including 79-118 affordable DUs), 14,850 gsf of commercial and/or community facility use, and 46,010 gsf of accessory residential parking (165 spaces). Projected Development Site 2 would be partially converted to residential use, enlarged to a maximum height of approximately 13 stories (approximately 141 feet), and would contain approximately 464,710 gsf (6.11 FAR) comprised of 278,390 gsf of residential use (269 units, including 54-81 affordable DUs), 171,320 gsf of commercial and/or community facility use, and 15,000 gsf of accessory residential parking (23 spaces). The three smaller buildings on

Projected Development Site 2 (commercial buildings of 4 to 5 stories and 39 to 53 feet) would not have any change in bulk or use.

Specifically, the Proposed Actions include:

- **Zoning map amendment** to change the existing M2-1 district to M1-5A/R10A and M1-5A/R8A districts within a newly established Special Mixed Use District; and
- **Zoning text amendment** to establish an MX and to amend Appendix F of the ZR to establish the Project Area as an MIH area.

Under the Proposed Actions, Projected Development Site 1 would be rezoned from the existing M2-1 district to a paired M1-5A/R10A zoning district, and Projected Development Site 2 would be rezoned from the existing M2-1 district to a paired M1-5A/R8A zoning district. The entire Project Area would be mapped within an MX.

It is the Applicant's intention that approximately 25 percent of the Proposed Development's residential floor area would comprise affordable units (166 DUs), in accordance with the Applicant's preferred Option 1 of the MIH Program.

Absent the Proposed Actions, the future No-Action scenario assumes that the existing buildings within the Project Area would be retenanted with complying commercial uses, consistent with market conditions. Projected Development Site 1 would include 341,990 gsf, comprising 295,890 gsf of commercial (retail and office) use and 46,010 gsf of accessory parking (125 spaces); while Projected Development Site 2 would include 399,020 gsf of commercial (retail and office) use.

The Proposed Development would not utilize all floor area permitted under the proposed rezoning on Projected Development Site 2; therefore, to present a conservative analysis, a Reasonable Worst-Case Development Scenario (RWCDS) was developed for the future With-Action scenario. The building bulk assumed for the RWCDS reflects the achievement of full FAR utilization with efficient and practicable floorplates that could reasonably be built. Thus, the With-Action RWCDS assumes that the existing 13-story commercial building on Projected Development Site 2 would be partially converted to residential use, enlarged by approximately 145,890 gsf and from 13 stories (141 feet) to 19 stories (205 feet), and would include approximately 544,910 gsf comprised of approximately 358,590 gsf of residential use (324 dwelling units, including 65-98 affordable DUs), approximately 171,320 sf of commercial use, and 15,000 gsf of parking (23 spaces) accessory to the residential use. Projected Development Site 2 would be built to the maximum FAR of 7.2 allowed under the proposed zoning and to a building height of 205 feet. The With-Action RWCDS for Projected Development Site 1 is the same as that described above for the Proposed Development.

Overall, the RWCDS includes approximately 1,005,480 gsf of total development, consisting of 758,300 gsf of new residential use (716 total DUs, 144-216 of which would be affordable), 186,170 gsf of commercial (local retail and office), and 61,010 gsf of accessory parking (188 spaces). Three smaller commercial buildings (4-5 stories) on Projected Development Site 2 would remain unchanged in both bulk and use.

Compared to the No-Action scenario, the Proposed Actions would result in an incremental increase of 264,470 gsf of development across the Proposed Development Sites, comprising 758,300 gsf of residential use (716 DUs, including 144-216 affordable DUs), and 15,000 gsf of accessory parking (63 spaces); and a net decrease of 508,830 gsf of commercial use. The Proposed Actions would result in a net increase of 1,446 residents and a net decrease of 1,752 workers.

The Analysis Year for the Proposed Actions is 2029.

Statement of Significant Effect:

On behalf of the CPC, the Environmental Assessment and Review Division has determined, pursuant to 6 NYCRR Part 617.7, that the Proposed Actions may have a significant effect on the quality of the environment as detailed in the following environmental impacts, and that an environmental impact statement will be required: land use, zoning and public policy; hazardous materials; transportation; air quality; greenhouse gas emissions and climate change; noise; public health; neighborhood character; and construction.

The Proposed Actions would not have significant adverse impacts related to socioeconomic conditions; community facilities and services; open space; shadows; historic and cultural resources; urban design and visual resources; natural resources; water and sewer infrastructure; solid waste and sanitation services; or energy.

Supporting Statement:
The above determination is based on an Environmental Assessment Statement prepared for the Proposed Actions which finds that:

1. Land Use, Zoning and Public Policy – The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts to land use and zoning. However, the EIS will provide a brief description of land use, zoning, and public policy as well as a Waterfront Revitalization Program consistency analysis, as the Project Area is within the City's coastal zone boundary.
2. Socioeconomic Conditions – The Proposed Actions would introduce more than 250 incremental dwelling units to the Project Area as a result of the Proposed Project, warranting a preliminary assessment for indirect residential displacement. The Proposed Actions would not result in a direct residential displacement, direct or indirect business displacement, or an adverse effect to specific industries. Based on the results of the preliminary assessment, the incremental population generated by the Proposed Actions' RWCDS would not have the potential to introduce or accelerate a trend of changing socioeconomic conditions that could result in the displacement of a vulnerable population. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts to socioeconomic conditions due to indirect residential displacement.
3. Community Facilities and Services – The Proposed Actions would not displace or otherwise directly affect any community facilities, including public schools, early childhood centers, libraries, health care facilities, or police and fire protection services. Therefore, an analysis of direct effects is not warranted. The Proposed Actions would not exceed the CEQR thresholds for analysis of indirect effects to libraries, public schools, health care facilities, or police and fire protection services, therefore no analysis of such community facilities and services are necessary. However, because the Proposed Actions would introduce more than 110 affordable DUs, an analysis of analysis of early childhood programs was undertaken in accordance with *2025 CEQR Technical Manual* guidance. Based on the analysis results, under the With-Action scenario early childhood programs facilities in the study area would continue to operate under capacity and the utilization rate would increase by less than 5 percentage points. According to *2025 CEQR Technical Manual* criteria, the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact on early childhood programs, and therefore, would not result in significant adverse impacts to community facilities and services.

4. Open Space – The Proposed Actions would introduce more than 250 incremental DUs in an existing M district, thus warranting a preliminary assessment of indirect effects on open space due to residents. The analysis demonstrates that the open space ratio (OSR) for the study area would remain well above the City's guidelines of 2.5 acres per 1,000 residents in the With-Action scenario, and that it would decrease by less than five percent relative to the No-Action OSR. Accordingly, a detailed analysis is not necessary. As the Proposed Actions would introduce fewer than 500 incremental nonresidents, an analysis of indirect effects due to nonresidents is not warranted. Additionally, the Proposed Actions would not directly affect existing open space resources. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact to open space.
5. Shadows –Portions of the existing buildings on Projected Development Sites 1 and 2 would be enlarged by more than 50 feet in the With-Action scenario, and the Project Area is located adjacent to or across the street from multiple open space resources. Consequently, a shadows assessment was conducted. The detailed shadows analysis demonstrates that the RWCDS massing allowed by the Proposed Actions would result in new shadows on seven public open space resources and portions of the East River. However, because the new shadows would be transient and limited in extent and duration, the analysis concludes that the incremental shadows would not cause significant adverse impacts to any of the sunlight-sensitive resources in terms of either recreational use or health and survival of plantings and other vegetation, or, in the case of the river, marine biota. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact due to shadows.
6. Historic and Cultural Resources – The Project Area does not contain any architectural resources. The New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) confirmed that the Project Area has no archaeological concerns, and that no further analysis is warranted. However, because the Proposed Actions would result in the enlargement of existing buildings within close proximity to historic architectural resources, an assessment was undertaken. There are five known architectural historic resources within the study area, and one located just outside of the study area boundaries. The assessment indicates that the Proposed Actions would not result in any direct effects to historic resources, such as changes to architectural resources that would cause them to be a different visual entity; or cause a false historical appearance; nor would they result in any significant adverse shadow-related impacts to historic resources with sunlight sensitive features. To avoid inadvertent construction-related damage (i.e., from ground-borne construction period vibration, falling debris, collapse, etc.), listed historic resources would be protected by the New York City Department of Building's (DOB's) *Technical Policy and Procedure Notice (TPPN) #10/88* procedures. To avoid inadvertent construction-related damage to eligible historic resources, the applicant will prepare a Construction Protection Plan to be reviewed and approved by LPC in compliance with DOB's *TPPN #10/88* and *2025 CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines. The assessment also demonstrates that because the Proposed Actions would not result in the elimination or screening of significant publicly-accessible views of any architectural resources in the study are, no indirect or contextual effects would occur in the With-Action scenario. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts related to historic and cultural resources.
7. Urban Design and Visual Resources – The Proposed Actions would result in physical changes at the Projected Development Sites beyond the bulk and form currently permitted as-of-right, and such proposed changes could affect a pedestrian's experience of public space. Therefore, a preliminary assessment was conducted which demonstrates that the

Proposed Actions would bring active uses to the Project Area buildings, enhancing the vitality, walkability, and visual character of the study area. These changes would add street-level visual interest and introduce increased pedestrian activity that would enliven the sidewalks in the study area and improve the pedestrian experience. Because the proposed building enlargements would occur on existing lots, they would not obstruct any view corridors. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact related to urban design and visual resources.

8. Natural Resources – The Project Area does not contain and is not adjacent to any natural resources. The Project Area is occupied by existing buildings and located in a fully developed area in Brooklyn. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact related to natural resources.
9. Hazardous Materials – The Proposed Actions would result in new in-ground disturbance within the Proposed Rezoning Area, with the potential to increase exposure pathways to hazardous materials that may be present. Therefore, the Proposed Actions could result in a significant adverse impact related to hazardous materials, and an analysis will be included in the EIS.
10. Water and Sewer Infrastructure – The Proposed Actions' demand for water would be well under 1 million gallons per day, and the Project Area is not located in an area that experiences low water pressure. Thus, in accordance with *2025 CEQR Technical Manual* guidance, an analysis of water supply is not warranted. Connecting to the City's sewer system requires a ministerial (non-discretionary) certification from the New York City Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) as part of the building permit process. To connect the converted and enlarged Project Area buildings to the sewer system, the Applicant would be required to file a Site Connection Proposal Application for approval from DEP. The Applicant would be required to demonstrate that the existing sanitary system could handle the site-specific sanitary flows from the Proposed Development, or, if the flows would exceed the capacity of the existing built sewer system, the Applicant would be required to prepare a site-specific hydraulic analysis to identify any required sewer upgrades, including upgrades to the existing regulators. The Proposed Actions would result in increased flows to the City's combined sewer system that may be discharged as combined sewer overflow during rain events. However, because of the available capacity at the Red Hook Wastewater Resource Recovery Facility and the incorporation of best management practices to comply with the Unified Stormwater Rule, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts to local water supply or wastewater and stormwater conveyance and treatment infrastructure.
11. Solid Waste and Sanitation Services – The Proposed Actions would not generate 50 tons or more of solid waste per week, nor would they involve a reduction of capacity at a solid waste management facility. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts related to solid waste and sanitation services.
12. Energy – The Proposed Actions would not affect the transmission or generation of energy. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts related to energy.
13. Transportation – The Proposed Actions would generate additional vehicular and pedestrian traffic and increase demand for parking, bus, and subway service. Therefore, the Proposed Actions have the potential to result in a significant adverse impact related to transportation, and an analysis will be included in the EIS.

14. Air Quality – The Proposed Actions would introduce new stationary sources and create new mobile sources of pollutants, and would also introduce new sensitive receptors to an area with existing industrial sources. Therefore, the Proposed Actions could result in a significant adverse impact related to air quality, and an analysis will be provided in the EIS.
15. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change – The Proposed Actions would result in development that exceeds the 350,000-sf CEQR threshold, triggering the need for an analysis of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Additionally, a portion of the Project Area is located in a flood hazard zone. Therefore, the Proposed Actions could result in a significant adverse impact related to GHG emissions and climate change, and an analysis will be included in the EIS.
16. Noise – The Proposed Actions would introduce new residential development which would create new receptors and generate new vehicular traffic. Therefore, the Proposed Actions could result in a significant adverse impact related to noise, and an analysis will be included in the EIS.
17. Public Health – The Proposed Actions could result in unmitigated impacts related to air quality, noise, hazardous materials, or construction. Therefore, the Proposed Actions have the potential to result in a significant adverse impact related to public health, and an analysis will be provided in the EIS.
18. Neighborhood Character – The Proposed Actions could affect land use and zoning, transportation, and noise. Consequently, the Proposed Actions could have the potential to result in a significant adverse impact related to neighborhood character, and an analysis will be included in the EIS.
19. Construction – The construction period for the Proposed Actions would be longer than two years, which is considered long term, and would occur in proximity to sensitive receptors. Therefore, the Proposed Actions could result in a significant adverse impact related to construction, and an analysis will be provided in the EIS.
20. Effects on Disadvantaged Communities – The Proposed Actions may cause or increase a disproportionate pollution burden on a disadvantaged community (DAC), as identified by New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. Therefore, an assessment of the Proposed Actions' potential effects on DACs will be prepared to comply with New York State Environmental Conservation Law Section 8-0109.

Public Scoping:
The CEQR lead agency hereby requests that the applicant prepare or have prepared, at their option, a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) in accordance with 6 NYCRR 617.9(b) and Sections 6-08 and 6-12 of Executive Order No. 91 of 1977 as amended (City Environmental Quality Review).

A public scoping meeting has been scheduled for Thursday, March 12, 2026 at 2:00 PM. To continue to allow for broad public participation options, DCP will hold the public scoping meeting remotely. To join the meeting, please visit the "Calendar" page of the New York City Department of City Planning's website: https://www.nyc.gov/content/planning/pages/calendar. Please refer to participation instructions in the Public Scoping Notice that is available on the project ZAP page: https://zap.planning.nyc.gov/projects/2025K0150.

Written comments will be accepted by the lead agency through 5:00 pm, Monday, March 23, 2026. They can be submitted via email to 26DCP094K_DL@planning.nyc.gov or mailed to Evren Ulker-Kacar, AICP, Deputy Director, Environmental Assessment and Review Division, New York City Department of City Planning, 120 Broadway, 31st Floor, New York, New York 10271.

This determination has been prepared in accordance with Article 8 of the Environmental Conservation Law.

Should you have any questions pertaining to this Positive Declaration, you may contact Stacey Barron, AICP, at sbarron@planning.nyc.gov.

Evren Ulker-Kacar, AICP, Deputy Director
Environmental Assessment & Review Division
New York City Department of City Planning

February 10, 2026
Date