18

Neighborhood Character

This chapter considers how the Proposed Actions would affect neighborhood character, which is defined as the elements of the environment that combine to create the context and feeling of a neighborhood.

Introduction

This analysis of neighborhood character follows the guidelines set forth in the *2021 City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manual*. As defined within the manual, neighborhood character is an amalgam of various elements that give neighborhoods a distinct "personality," including, land use, socioeconomic conditions, community facilities and services, open space resources, historic and cultural resources, urban design and visual resources, shadows, transportation, and noise. Not all these elements affect neighborhood character in all cases; a neighborhood usually draws its distinctive character from a few defining elements. For a proposed project, a neighborhood character assessment under CEQR first identifies the defining features of the neighborhood and then evaluates whether the project has the potential to affect these defining features, either through the potential for a significant adverse impact or a combination of moderate effects in relevant technical analysis areas. Thus, to determine the effects of a proposed project on neighborhood character, the salient features of neighborhood character are considered together. According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, neighborhood character impacts are rare and occur under unusual circumstances. Moreover, a significant adverse impact identified in one of the technical areas that contribute to a neighborhood's character is not automatically equivalent

to a significant adverse impact on neighborhood character, but, rather, serves as an indication that neighborhood character should be examined.

This section includes a preliminary assessment of neighborhood character; the assessment was prepared in conformance with the *CEQR Technical Manual* using information from the technical analyses presented in other relevant chapters of this EIS.

Principal Conclusions

The Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts to neighborhood character. With the exception of community facilities and services and transportation, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts in any of the technical areas that contribute to neighborhood character (i.e., the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts to land use, zoning, and public policy; socioeconomic conditions; historic and cultural resources; urban design and visual resources; or shadows). While the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts to community facilities and services, the increased demand on early childhood programs and libraries could be mitigated by the introduction of a 12,230-gsf childcare facility (implementation would occur in consultation with the New York City Department of Education (DOE)) and the provision of free services and programming for residents typically offered by the Brooklyn Public Library in the common areas of the proposed residential buildings, respectively. Regarding transportation, traffic impacts at several intersections, pedestrian impacts at several crosswalks, and fare control and bus capacity impacts are all anticipated as a result of the Proposed Actions. Regarding noise, a significant adverse impact at one existing residential building is anticipated as a result of the Proposed Actions. However, mitigation measures would be implemented by the Proposed Project to eliminate or minimize the effects of these potential impacts.

The Proposed Actions would enhance the urban design and character of the neighborhood by redeveloping an underutilized lot and surface parking with pedestrian-oriented buildings constructed close to the lot line and oriented along a coherent grid that would surround a proposed central quad. These elements, together with new publicly accessible open spaces and anchor uses including the Christian Cultural Center (CCC) and the Performing Arts Center (PAC), would contribute to improved orientation and legibility in the area as compared to the No-Action condition. In addition, proposed street-fronting retail and commercial space, residential lobbies and maisonettes, and community facility space would serve to activate the Development Site and provide needed facilities and services to the surrounding community.

Overall, the Proposed Project would contribute to a more vibrant future for the neighborhood, contributing to the goals of increasing the city's affordable housing stock and introducing development that is well-integrated with the urban fabric through expanded community facilities, open space, and an internal street network.

Overall, the Proposed Project would not result in a significant change to the defining features of neighborhood character.

Methodology

As indicated above, a neighborhood character assessment is generally needed, per the *CEQR Technical Manual*, when a proposed project has the potential to result in significant adverse impacts in certain technical areas (land use, zoning, and public policy; socioeconomic conditions; community facilities and services; open space; historic and cultural resources; urban design and visual resources; shadows; transportation; or noise) or when the project may have moderate effects on several of the elements that define a neighborhood's character. A "moderate" effect is generally defined as an effect considered reasonably close to the significant adverse impact threshold for a particular technical analysis area.

In the absence of an impact on any of the relevant technical areas, a combination of moderate effects to the neighborhood could result in an impact to neighborhood character. A significant impact identified in one of the technical areas that contribute to a neighborhood's character is not necessarily equivalent to a significant impact on neighborhood character. Therefore, an assessment of neighborhood character is generally appropriate if a proposed project has the potential to result in any significant adverse impacts in the technical areas listed above. Examples of possible changes in those technical areas that could result in an adverse effect on neighborhood character, should those technical areas be defining features of the neighborhood, are as follows:

- **Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy:** If development resulting from a proposed action would conflict with surrounding uses, conflict with land use policy or other public plans for the area, or change land use character, neighborhood character could be affected.
- **Socioeconomic Conditions:** If a proposed action results in direct or indirect displacement or addition of population, employment, or businesses; or substantial differences in population or employment density, neighborhood character could be affected.
- **Community Facilities and Services:** If a proposed action would displace or alter a community facility or increased demand on community facilities, neighborhood character could be affected.
- **Open Space:** If an action would result in a reduction or displacement of an open space or result in additional population that would place a substantial demand on open space, neighborhood character could be affected.
- **Historic and Cultural Resources:** If a proposed action would result in substantial direct changes to a historic resource or substantial changes to public views of a historic resource, neighborhood character could be affected.
- **Urban Design and Visual Resources:** If a proposed action would result in substantially different building form, size, scale, or arrangement; block form, street pattern, or street hierarchy; streetscape elements; or substantial direct changes to a visual feature, such as unique and important public view corridors and vistas, or to public visual access to such a feature, neighborhood character could be affected.
- **Shadows:** If a proposed project would cast an incremental shadow on sun-sensitive resources, neighborhood character could be affected.
- **Transportation:** If a proposed project would result in a change in traffic patterns or would substantially increase traffic volumes on residential streets, neighborhood character could be affected.

› **Noise:** If a proposed action would substantially increase noise levels in an area, neighborhood character could be affected.

A preliminary assessment of neighborhood character determines whether changes expected in other technical analysis areas may affect a defining feature of neighborhood character. As part of a neighborhood character analysis, the defining features of the neighborhood are identified and then a determination is made as to whether a project has the potential to adversely affect these defining features, either through the potential for a significant adverse impact or a combination of moderate effects in relevant technical areas. A neighborhood that has a more varied context is typically able to tolerate greater change without experiencing significant adverse impacts. If the assessment concludes that a proposed project has the potential to adversely affect defining features of a neighborhood, a detailed analysis is undertaken to determine whether the project would result in a significant adverse impact on neighborhood character.

The neighborhood character analysis draws from the technical assessments listed above. As recommended in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the study area for the neighborhood character analysis is consistent with the study areas in the relevant technical areas assessed under CEQR that contribute to the defining elements of the neighborhood. As such, the study area for neighborhood character is consistent with the quarter-mile study area used for the analysis of land use, zoning, and public policy.

As detailed in the relevant chapters of this EIS, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts in the technical areas of land use, zoning and public policy; socioeconomic conditions; open space; historic and cultural resources; urban design and visual resources; shadows; or noise. The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts in community facilities and services and transportation. Therefore, a preliminary assessment of neighborhood character impacts is provided below. The analysis begins with the identification of the defining features of the neighborhood and then assesses whether the Proposed Actions would adversely affect those defining features within the framework of the above technical areas.

Preliminary Assessment

Defining Features of the Neighborhood-Existing Conditions

"Tower in the Park" Developments

The study area is characterized by the presence of housing developments that exhibit a "tower in the park" building typology, where buildings are set back from the street and surrounded by large open spaces. In most cases, these developments are constructed on superblocks with interior walkways or roadways providing residents with pedestrian and vehicular access. Given the number and size of developments that exhibit this built condition, as detailed below, this is a defining feature of the study area.

There are three New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA) developments in the study area. Breukelen Houses, located in the west side of study area, is a low-rise housing development comprising three-story brick buildings surrounded by trees and lawns. The NYCHA Vandalia Avenue complex is a senior housing complex located just south of the Project Area. It

includes two 10-story brick towers connected by a small one-story lobby. The NYCHA Linden Houses are located in the northeast side of the study area. The Linden Houses include a series of rectangular eight-story and 15-story buildings, occupying several super blocks between Stanley Avenue to the north, Vermont Street to the west, Cozine Avenue to the south, and Van Siclen Avenue to the east.

In addition to the three NYCHA developments, there are two privately owned complexes that were also constructed in a "tower in the park" typology. The Council Towers, a three-building complex of privately owned senior housing, are located immediately southeast of the Project Area and are surrounded by landscaped lawns, trees, walkways, and surface parking.

In addition, the southwest portion of the study area is developed with the Spring Creek Towers/Starrett City complex, a large private residential development located between Flatlands Avenue to the north, Louisiana Avenue to the west, the Belt Parkway to the south, and Van Siclen Avenue to the east. Pennsylvania Avenue runs down the center of the development from north to south. Starrett City is composed of a series of 20-story brick apartment towers surrounded by large areas of grassy lawns and parking. The residential buildings do not contain ground floor retail and are set back significantly from the street network. Private security booths are located throughout the development.

Wide Thoroughfares

The study area is intersected by two major thoroughfares, Pennsylvania Avenue and Flatlands Avenue, around which the major land uses, and area traffic patterns are organized. Pennsylvania Avenue runs north-south through the east side of the study area, while Flatlands Avenue generally runs east-west, meeting at the northeast corner of the Project Area. Both streets are wide, between 110 and 125 feet within the study area, and have between two and four traffic lanes in each direction. These roadways divide the study area into distinct sections, including the largely industrial area north of Flatlands Avenue and west of Pennsylvania Avenue, and the large residential developments detailed above concentrated to the south of Flatlands Avenue and at the northeast corner of the study area. These roadways also serve as a buffer for pedestrians between these different sections, and in combination with several major superblocks, contribute to a more vehicle-centric character. Therefore, these wide streets are considered a defining feature of the neighborhood.

Large Footprint Industrial Buildings

Blocks to the north of the Project Area in the area bounded by Wortman Avenue to the north, Louisiana Avenue to the west, Flatlands Avenue to the south, and Pennsylvania Avenue to the east, are occupied by a variety of manufacturing and industrial uses, and consequently this portion of the study area is largely defined by an industrial building character distinct from the southern portion of the Project Area. Two full blocks are occupied by a one-story brick warehouse for Rainbow Clothing stores, with several curb cuts and loading bays along Cozine Avenue. There are two public facilities located on the blocks between Alabama Avenue and Georgia Avenue, including the NYC Department of Sanitation Brooklyn Community District 16 Garage and the MTA Cozine Iron Workshop South. These buildings exhibit a similar character to the surrounding industrial buildings. Along Flatlands Avenue are several automobile related businesses including a scrapyard between Alabama

Avenue and Georgia Avenue and a used car dealership between Alabama Avenue and Louisiana Avenue. Given the large land area occupied by these uses within the study area and distinct building type, this industrial area heavily influences the character of the area and therefore is a defining feature.

No-Action Condition

Project Area

As described in **Chapter 1, Project Description**, in the future without the Proposed Actions (No-Action condition), the Project Area is assumed to remain unchanged from existing conditions, with only the CCC operational on the site, surrounded by surface parking lots and vacant land serving as overflow parking.

Study Area

In the future No-Action condition, there are no new developments anticipated within the quarter-mile study area under the future No-Action condition. Therefore, there are no anticipated changes to the defining features of the neighborhood in the No-Action condition.

With-Action Condition

Potential to Affect the Contributing Elements of Neighborhood Character

The sections below discuss potential changes resulting from the Proposed Project in the following technical areas that are considered in a neighborhood character assessment under CEQR: land use, zoning, and public policy; socioeconomic conditions; community facilities; open space; historic and cultural resources; urban design and visual resources; shadows; transportation; and noise. The assessment uses the findings from the respective chapters of this EIS to identify whether the Proposed Actions would result in any significant adverse impacts or moderate adverse effects in these technical areas, and whether any such changes would have the potential to affect the defining features of neighborhood character. As described below, defining features of the study area would not be affected either through the potential of any significant adverse impact or combination of moderate effects in these technical areas.

Land Use, Zoning, Public Policy

The defining features of the neighborhood would not be adversely affected due to potential effects of the Proposed Action on land use, zoning, and public policy, either alone or in combination with potential impacts in other relevant technical areas discussed in this chapter.

As described in **Chapter 2, Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy**, the Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts on land use, zoning, or public policy in the Project Area or the quarter-mile study area in the 2031 build year. Through the introduction of residential, commercial, community facility, and open space uses, the Proposed Actions would be consistent with surrounding land uses and underlying zoning and would activate

an underutilized property within the Project Area. This infill development would provide functional resources for the neighborhood by increasing the affordable housing stock, introducing local retail and publicly accessible open space, and expanding community assets with the inclusion of the trade school and Performing Arts Center. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would be consistent with existing policies and frameworks that aim to increase housing and needed services to the community, including Housing New York 2.0 and OneNYC, as well as the New York City Waterfront Revitalization Program (WRP). The Proposed Actions would also facilitate development that is well-integrated with current conditions in the study area by providing an extension of the existing commercial uses along Flatlands Avenue, additional public open space, and large-scale residential development in line with the surrounding housing complexes that are a defining feature of the neighborhood. As such, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts on neighborhood character due to changes in land use, zoning, or public policy.

Socioeconomic Conditions

As discussed in **Chapter 3, Socioeconomic Conditions**, the Proposed Actions would have no significant impacts on socioeconomic conditions of the study area. Because the Project Area does not currently contain any residential uses, no direct or indirect residential displacement would occur under the With-Action condition. As the Proposed Project would introduce a new population that exceeds CEQR thresholds, an indirect residential displacement analysis was conducted, pursuant to the *CEQR Technical Manual* standards. Of the 2,050 new housing units, approximately 1,950 units, or 95 percent, would be affordable rental units, and no less than 100 residential units would be maisonettes under affordable home ownership or affordable condominiums, providing a path for area low-income renters looking to own their home. Overall, the analysis found that the Proposed Project would not result in a significant adverse impact due to indirect residential displacement.

Community Facilities and Services

As discussed in **Chapter 4, Community Facilities and Services**, the Proposed Actions would have significant impacts on early childhood programs and libraries. Early childhood programs would be over capacity with a shortfall of 665 slots in the With-Action condition resulting in a significant adverse impact, while the projected population change of 6.9 percent for the library catchment study area would be over the threshold outlined in the *CEQR Technical Manual*. As discussed in **Chapter 20, Mitigation**, the increased demand on early childhood programs and libraries could be mitigated. The Applicant intends to provide an approximate 12,230-gsf childcare facility to address the impacts on early childhood programs. The implementation of this facility would occur in consultation with the New York City DOE. Furthermore, the Applicant proposes to offer free internet for residents in the common areas of the proposed residential buildings and computer labs within the Proposed Project. The implementation of these mitigation measures would offset the projected impacts to early childhood programs and libraries. Therefore, the effects of the Proposed Project on community facilities would not result in a significant adverse impact on neighborhood character.

Open Space

Defining features of neighborhood character would not be adversely affected due to potential open space-related effects of the Proposed Actions, either alone or in combination with potential impacts in other relevant technical areas discussed in this chapter.

As described in **Chapter 5, Open Space**, a residential analysis of indirect effects on residential open space ratios was conducted for a half-mile study area due to the expected increase in residential population from the Proposed Actions.

Under the With-Action condition, the Proposed Actions would not result in the physical loss or direct displacement of open space. While the total, active, and passive open space ratios in the study area would decrease due to indirect effects from population increases, the potential increase in utilization would be alleviated by a variety of factors, including the introduction of both public and private open space as part of the Proposed Project and the availability of existing open space resources in the study area at Spring Creek Towers/Starrett City and NYCHA Breukelen and Linden Houses. The proposed public open space within the Project Area would complement the existing open spaces within the study area.

As described in **Chapter 5, Open Space**, there would be a temporary indirect active open space impact during construction related to the phasing of the project as new demand for open space resources would materialize from residents prior to the completion of all of the planned on-site open spaces. Therefore, a discussion of mitigation is warranted, see **Chapter 20, Mitigation**. This temporary impact would be eliminated upon full build-out of the project when all proposed open spaces are constructed.

Therefore, since the impact would be temporary in nature, the added population would not result in a significant adverse impact to neighborhood character related to open space or contribute to a combination of moderate effects with the potential to affect defining features of the neighborhood. The introduction of new publicly accessible open space in the Project Area would add to the variety of public open space option in the study area, thereby enhancing the character of the neighborhood.

Historic and Cultural Resources

As discussed in **Chapter 7, Historic and Cultural Resources**, there are no historic resources within the 400-foot study area. The New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) determined that the Development Site has no archaeological significance, and no buildings or structures on the Development Site hold architectural significance. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts on historic and cultural resources, and the defining features of the neighborhood would not be adversely affected.

Urban Design and Visual Resources

Defining features of the neighborhood would not be adversely affected due to potential impacts of the Proposed Actions on urban design or visual resources, either alone or in combination with potential impacts in other relevant technical areas discussed in this chapter.

As discussed in **Chapter 8, Urban Design and Visual Resources**, overall, the Proposed Actions would improve the urban design of the Project Area by providing infill development on vacant and underutilized lots, introducing private streets, pedestrian walkways, and publicly accessible open space that would promote an inviting urban fabric and activate the Project Area. Additionally, the built forms and building types resulting from the Proposed Actions would be similar in height and bulk to the low- to mid-density residential buildings that currently exist within the study area. The introduction of street-fronting retail; residential lobbies and maisonettes; and the trade school, PAC, and childcare facility would activate the street frontages at the perimeter of the site and within the site. The introduction of the proposed buildings around a coherent grid and central quad would contribute to orientation and legibility, facilitating an overall improvement in pedestrian conditions and the urban design features of the Development Site compared with existing conditions. In terms of visual resources, there are no views from the Project Area to Fresh Creek Nature Preserve and Fresh Creek Basin. As such, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts on the urban design and visual resources of the Project Area.

Shadows

Defining features of neighborhood character would not be adversely affected due to potential shadows-related effects of the Proposed Action, either alone or in combination with potential impacts in other relevant technical areas discussed in this chapter.

As discussed in **Chapter 6, Shadows**, the Proposed Actions would result in new development that would cast incremental shadows within the vicinity of the study area. The shadows analysis determined that Breukelen Ballfields and the Fresh Creek Nature Preserve would receive short-duration shading that would not affect the vegetation or public use of the spaces. Thus, the sunlight-sensitive resources would not experience significant adverse impacts due to shadows and therefore shadows effects would not result in a significant adverse impact on neighborhood character.

Transportation

The Proposed Actions would have significant impacts on traffic, pedestrian, and transit in the vicinity of the Project Area.

Of the 16 intersections analyzed (including new site access driveway intersections with the street network), the Proposed Project would result in significant adverse traffic impacts at nine intersections during the weekday AM peak hour, seven intersections during the weekday midday peak hour, nine intersections during the weekday PM peak hour, and seven intersections during the Saturday peak hour. For the Sunday peak hour, at the 10 intersections analyzed (including new site access driveway intersections with the street network), the Proposed Project would result in significant adverse traffic impacts at four intersections; potential mitigation measures are discussed in **Chapter 20, Mitigation**. The majority of the impacted movements are left and right turns from the key roadways in the area (e.g., Pennsylvania Avenue and Flatlands Avenue) or along the minor street approach along these key roadways and would not affect the majority of motorists traveling through the key roadways.

Of the 36 pedestrian elements analyzed, the Proposed Project would result in significant impacts at one pedestrian element (one crosswalk) during the weekday AM and midday

peak hours, two pedestrian elements (two crosswalks) during the weekday PM peak hour, and four pedestrian elements (three crosswalks and one sidewalk) during the Saturday peak hour. The Proposed Project also analyzed 14 pedestrian elements during the Sunday peak hour and due to the confluence of pedestrian activities from the Proposed Project and church services, the Proposed Project would result in significant adverse pedestrian impacts at 12 of these elements (three sidewalks, five crosswalks, and four corner analysis locations). Potential mitigation measures are discussed in **Chapter 20, Mitigation**

The Rockaway Parkway L subway station would have an impact to Glenwood Road fare control during the AM peak hour.

The Proposed Project would result in a capacity shortfall for the bus routes listed below; these bus routes would be significantly impacted.

- The B82 bus route in the westbound direction during the AM peak hour;
- The B82 SBS bus route in the westbound direction during the AM peak hour, and in the eastbound direction during the PM peak hour; and
- The B83 bus route in both directions during both the AM and PM peak hours

Overall, the significant adverse traffic impacts would primarily occur along the minor street approach or left and right turns from the key roadways in the area (e.g., Pennsylvania Avenue and Flatlands Avenue), and would not affect the majority of motorists traveling through the key roadways. Significant adverse pedestrian impacts during the Sunday peak hour would overlap with busy church service conditions and would not be out of character with existing conditions, while during the other peak hours the Proposed Project would change an area with relatively low foot traffic to a vibrant residential neighborhood. The increase in traffic would also be consistent with the level of activity in an area marked by wide thoroughfares. Therefore, these impacts would not constitute a significant adverse impact on neighborhood character.

Noise

Defining features of neighborhood character would not be adversely affected due to potential effects of the Proposed Action on noise, either alone or in combination with potential impacts in other relevant technical areas discussed in this chapter.

As discussed in **Chapter 16, Noise**, analysis indicated that some of the proposed buildings would require a minimum composite window/wall sound attenuation that would be implemented through an (E) designation (E-679). With these commitments, the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse noise impacts to new noise receptors.

The increase in noise due to mobile sources with the No-Action and With-Action conditions have been determined with proportional noise modeling at 13 intersections and 6 monitoring locations throughout the study area. Mobile source noise levels would increase by up to 1.2 dBA for the With-Action condition compared to No-Action condition due to traffic generated by the Proposed Actions. Mobile source noise levels would increase up to 1.8 dBA for the With-Action condition compared to existing conditions due to background traffic growth and traffic generated by the Proposed Actions.

The closest existing noise-sensitive building is a New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA) property at 1 Vandalia Avenue southeast of the Project Area. The building includes a 10-story

portion approximately 108 feet from the Project Site and the proposed rooftop basketball court. No-Action noise levels at this receptor would range from 56.5 dBA to 66.7 dBA (Leq). With-Action noise levels at this receptor including stationary and mobile sources would range from 58.0 to 67.6 dBA (Leq). The Proposed Actions would result in an increase up to 1.6 dBA (Leq) in noise. Since noise levels would not increase by 3 dBA or more at these receptors, there would be no significant adverse impacts due to mobile and stationary sources.

The residential building at 1180 Pennsylvania Avenue is approximately 80 feet from the Project Site and proposed daycare recreational area. No-Action noise levels at this receptor would range from 52.8 to 66.5 dBA (Leq). With-Action noise levels at this receptor including stationary and mobile sources would range from 59.4 to 67.7 dBA (Leq). The Proposed Actions would result in an increase up to 6.5 dBA (Leq) in noise. While the detailed noise analysis concluded that the Proposed Actions could result in noise levels exceeding noise increase impact criteria for greater than 5 dBA, primarily resulting from the proposed childcare facility playground at Building 4, there would be significant adverse noise impacts at 1180 Pennsylvania Avenue due to the Proposed Actions. The introduction of a solid wall along the southern perimeter of the daycare playground facility would be expected to provide 5 dBA of noise reduction, thereby mitigating noise to an acceptable level and would result in a finding of no significant adverse noise impacts at this location.

With the inclusion of the wall along the perimeter of Proposed Building 4, the Proposed Project would not result in a significant adverse impact on neighborhood character due to effects on noise conditions.

Potential to Affect the Defining Features of the Neighborhood

Overall, the Proposed Actions would not adversely affect the defining features of the neighborhood.

The Proposed Actions are consistent with New York City policies that aim to increase the city's housing stock and encourage growth into future development projects. The Proposed Actions would accomplish this by encouraging high-density mixed-use development in the form of multi-family residential development with ground-floor retail and facilities in the form of a PAC, a trade school, and open spaces. Furthermore, the Proposed Actions would reduce the prevalence of vacant land across the Project Area, converting it into functional resources for the neighborhood. As such, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts on neighborhood character due to changes in land use, zoning, or public policy.

The Proposed Actions would also provide significant new housing opportunities, including an additional 2,050 affordable dwelling units of which up to 200 units would be exclusively for seniors in the study area, which has experienced a trend toward increasing market rents. As such, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts on neighborhood character due to changes in socioeconomic conditions.

The Proposed Actions would result in increased capacity on early childhood programs and libraries. However, as discussed in **Chapter 20, Mitigation**, the Applicant intends to provide an approximate 12,230-gsf childcare facility to address the impacts on early childhood programs. Furthermore, the Applicant is proposing to provide project residents with free

internet access within lounge spaces in each building and computer labs within the Proposed Project. The implementation of these mitigation measures would offset the impacts observed on early childhood programs and libraries. Therefore, community facilities effects would not result in a significant adverse impact on neighborhood character.

Although the Proposed Actions would decrease the total, active, and passive open space ratios in the study area from population increases, the potential increase in utilization would be alleviated by a variety of factors, including the introduction of public and private active open space as part of the Proposed Project and the existing open space resources available in the study area at Spring Creek Towers/Starrett City and NYCHA Breukelen and Linden Houses. This change does not constitute an adverse impact on neighborhood character. Further, these key open space resources that constitute defining features of neighborhood character were not included in the quantitative open space analysis and would not be impacted by the Proposed Actions. The open space elements introduced by the Proposed Project contain design features such as landscaping interspersed among high-density residential development, which is characteristic of tower in the park developments. However, the integration of the entry plaza, central quad and internal street network would be designed as a neighborhood amenity for use by area residents.

Defining features of neighborhood character would not be adversely impacted due to potential effects of the Proposed Actions on shadows, historical and cultural resources, or noise.

In terms of urban design and visual resources, the Proposed Actions would improve the overall design of the neighborhood by redeveloping an underutilized lot with pedestrian-oriented buildings constructed close to the lot line and oriented along a coherent grid that would surround a proposed central quad. These elements, together with anchor uses including the CCC and the PAC, would contribute to better orientation and legibility in the area. In addition, proposed street-fronting retail and commercial space, residential lobbies and maisonettes, and community facility space would serve to activate the Development Site and provide needed facilities and services to the surrounding community.

As mentioned above, the significant traffic impacts would primarily occur along the minor street approach or left and right turns from the key roadways in the area (e.g., Pennsylvania Avenue and Flatlands Avenue), and would not affect the majority of motorists traveling through the key roadways. Significant adverse pedestrian impacts during the Sunday peak hour would overlap with busy church service conditions and would not be out of character with existing conditions, while during the other peak hours the Proposed Project would change an area with relatively low foot traffic to a vibrant residential neighborhood. The increase in traffic would also be consistent with the level of activity in an area marked by wide thoroughfares. Therefore, these impacts would not constitute a significant adverse impact on neighborhood character.

With the Proposed Actions, the portion of the East New York neighborhood located within the study area would not lose any of its defining characteristics. The neighborhood would retain its residential character south of Flatlands Avenue while integrating the existing street network through the site and creating public access and amenities both along the periphery of the site and within the site. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts to neighborhood character through a combination of moderate effects and identified impacts in the technical areas that contribute to neighborhood character.