Chapter 25: Conceptual Analysis

25.1 Introduction

As described in Chapter 1, "Project Description," the Proposed Actions consist of a series of land use actions — including zoning map amendments, zoning text amendments, and amendments under the auspices of the Jerome Avenue Neighborhood Planning Study (collectively, the "Proposed Actions"). As part of the comprehensive rezoning strategy for Jerome Avenue, the Jerome Avenue Special District and zoning text are proposed in order to establish special use, bulk, ground-floor design, and parking regulations on 92 blocks fronting on major corridors within the Rezoning Area, including Jerome Avenue, Grand Concourse, Edward L. Grant Highway, 170th Street, Tremont Avenue, and Burnside Avenue. Though much of the proposal provides a future as-of-right framework to achieve the stated land use objectives of the rezoning, when it comes to future hotel uses, a special permit, subject to a separate public review process (i.e., the Uniform Land Use Review Procedure, or ULURP) and environmental review process, is warranted. As described in more detail below, with the Proposed Actions, development of new hotel uses would only be allowed upon the issuance of a special permit by the City Planning Commission (CPC) within the Jerome Avenue Special District, an area coterminous with the Rezoning Area. The conceptual analysis presented in this chapter considers the provision and development of new hotel uses through the proposed special permit within the Rezoning Area. The future with the Proposed Actions (With-Action condition) as presented in Chapter 1, "Project Description," is based on several factors and assumptions regarding where new development could reasonably be expected to occur in the With-Action condition, as well as the type and amount of new development. The With-Action condition does not consider specific sites that would develop as a hotel use under the aforementioned special permit, since the number and locations of sites that may utilize the future special permits cannot be predicted with certainty.

Accordingly, this chapter provides a conceptual analysis to generically assess potential environmental impacts that could result from hotel development pursuant to the special permit (the "Special Permit Scenario"). The hotel special permit would be subject to a separate discretionary approval and any environmental impacts associated with such action would be assessed and disclosed pursuant to separate environmental review, with a project-specific analysis beyond what is analyzed in this chapter on a conceptual and generic basis.

25.2 Principal Conclusions

The Proposed Actions would create a new special permit related to the development, conversion, or enlargement of hotels. This conceptual analysis has been conducted to generically assess potential

environmental impacts that could result from hotel development pursuant to the special permit. Based on the assessment, development per the proposed new special permit would not result in any additional significant adverse impacts as compared with the With-Action condition analyzed for the Proposed Actions.

25.3 Hotel Special Permit

The Proposed Actions would create a zoning framework that is intended to facilitate the development of affordable housing, create new commercial and manufacturing space to support job creation, and preserve existing neighborhood character. Currently, hotel use is permitted as-of-right under several existing zoning districts within the Rezoning Area. These districts include C4-4, C8-3, M1-2, and C1-4 commercial overlays in addition to any C2-4 commercial overlays within a 1,000-foot radius of entrances or exits of a limited-access expressway, freeway, parkway, or highway. As noted in Chapter 1, "Project Description," these districts would be rezoned to R7A/C1-4 and R7A/C2-4 (replacing existing C4-4 districts), R7A, R7A/C1-4, R7A/C2-4, R7D/C2-4, R8A, R8A/C2-4, R9A, R9A/C1-4, R9A/C2-4, and C4-4D (replacing existing C8-3 districts), R8A, R8A/C2-4, R9A, R9A/C1-4, and R9A/C2-4 (replacing existing M1-2 district) in the Jerome Avenue Special District.

With the Proposed Actions, development of transient hotel uses (Use Group 5) would only be permitted on zoning lots within C2-4 districts that meet specific locational criteria set forth within ZR Section 32-14, for other zoning lots, transient hotels will require a CPC Special Permit if the residential development goal set forth in ZR Section 141.00 has not been met.

The proposed hotel special permit is intended to ensure that hotel development does not conflict with the Proposed Actions' goal to create opportunities for requiring permanently affordable housing, and to ensure that the neighborhood would continue to serve diverse housing needs. The special permit would apply to the creation of any new hotel floor area, whether through enlargement, conversion, or new development. With the Proposed Actions, the development of hotel uses would require an application to CPC for a special permit that may only be granted provided that the CPC finds that: (1) sufficient development sites are available in the area to meet the "residential development goal; and (2) a harmonious mix of residential and non-residential uses has been established in the area, and such hotel use is consistent with such character of the surrounding area. The proposed special permit could be applied for in the future for any of the projected and potential development sites in districts that allow hotel use within the Jerome Avenue Special District.

New hotel construction would be permitted upon certification by the Chairperson of the CPC to the Commissioner of Buildings that the "residential development goal" has been met for the Jerome Avenue Special District. As defined in the proposed zoning text for the Jerome Avenue Special District, the "residential development goal" will be considered to be met when certificates of occupancy have been issued for 3,006 new residential units.

25.4 Methodology and Analysis Framework

As described in Chapter 1, "Project Description," the Proposed Actions are expected to result in a net increase of approximately 3,228 dwelling units, a substantial proportion of which are expected to be affordable; approximately 20,866 square feet (sf) of commercial retail space; approximately 72,273 sf of community facility space; and a net decrease of approximately 47,795 sf of industrial space and 98,002 sf of auto-related uses.

This chapter provides a conceptual analysis of the potential effects of establishing the aforementioned new CPC Special Permit and considers the potential environmental effects as compared to those described for the Proposed Actions. While it is not known which sites may apply for the proposed special permit to facilitate hotel development at this time, for the purposes of this conceptual analysis it is assumed that Projected Development Site 12 (Block 3160, Lot 1) would be developed in accordance with the proposed new hotel special permit. Projected Development Site 12 was chosen because it is located near multiple subway lines, including the No. 4 line, which has a stop just blocks away at Burnside Avenue, and the B/D line, with a nearby stop at Tremont Avenue. The site is also accessible to several bus lines, including the Bx40, Bx42, BxM1, and BxM2, among others; and it is also located on the high-density, mixed-use Burnside Avenue corridor. Because of its location on the Burnside retail corridor and the numerous transit resources in close proximity, it is reasonable to assume that a developer would pursue the special permit to facilitate the development of a hotel on the site. Additionally, the size and shape of the site lend themselves to the development of shallower floor-plate depths above the building's base; this would efficiently accommodate a hotel use.

The following sections describe Projected Development Site 12's existing conditions, future No-Action condition and future With-Action condition, as presented in Chapter 1, "Projected Description," and for comparison purposes, also present a future Special Permit Scenario that assumes that the proposed hotel special permit is sought for the purposes of facilitating hotel development on Projected Development Site 12.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Projected Development Site 12 is a 9,796 sf site, located at the corner of East Burnside Avenue and Creston Avenue. As described in Chapter 1, Project Description, the site is located in an existing R8 district with a C1-4 overlay, which permits a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 2.0 for commercial use (Use Groups 1 to 6) and a maximum FAR of 6.5 for community facility use (Use Group 4). Typical uses under the district include automobile showrooms and repair shops, warehouses, gas stations, and car washes; community facilities, self-storage facilities, hotels, and amusements, such as theatres are also permitted. No residential uses are permitted. R8 districts also have a 60 foot base height limit, above which a structure must fit beneath a sloping sky exposure plane. The entirety of the site is currently occupied by a one story, 9,788 sf building containing neighborhood retail.

NO-ACTION CONDITION

In the future without the Proposed Actions, the site will continue to be regulated under the existing R8 zoning district. It is assumed that the current 9,788 sf structure and existing use on the site would remain.

WITH-ACTION CONDITION

In the future with the Proposed Actions, the site would be rezoned to C4-4D within the Jerome Avenue Special District, and mapped within a Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH) Area. C4-4D is an R8A equivalent, and is a mid-density commercial district that permits residential uses up to 7.20 FAR in areas designated as part of the Inclusionary Housing program, commercial uses up to 3.4 FAR, and community facilities up to 6.5 FAR. This district permits residential and community facility uses within Use Groups 1-4 as well as commercial uses within Use Groups 5-6, 8-10, and 12. Residential and mixed buildings developed within the district are subject to bulk regulations governed by the R8A district. The off-street parking requirement is one space per 1,000 square feet of commercial and community facility uses. Parking is required for residential uses at a ratio of .4 spaces per unit. No parking is required for income or age-restricted units.

Under the proposed C4-4D district, the site would be developed with a 33,306 sf mixed use building, consisting of 8,327 sf of ground-floor retail and 24,980 sf of office space on the upper floors, with a total height of 145 feet.

WITH-ACTION CONDITION WITH HOTEL ("SPECIAL PERMIT SCENARIO")

In this conceptual analysis, it is assumed that Projected Development Site 12 would be developed as a 14 story, 33,306 sf mixed-use building with both retail and hotel use (the "Conceptual Development Site") pursuant to the Hotel Special Permit (i.e., the Special Permit Scenario). The development would include 33,306 sf of commercial floor area with a height of 145 feet. Commercial floor area would include 24,980 gsf of hotel use with 62 rooms and 8,327 sf of local retail. Similar to the projected development of this site in the With-Action condition, a share of the dwelling units would be set aside for permanently affordable housing for households at various income levels.

INCREMENT FOR CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS

The Special Permit Scenario compares the potential effects of development under the Special Permit Scenario with those described for the Proposed Actions. Compared with the With-Action condition, the increment for the conceptual Special Permit Scenario is as follows:

Increase of 24,980 sf of Hotel Floor Area (62 hotel rooms)

Decrease of 24,980 sf of Office Use

As noted previously, for the purposes of analysis, this conceptual analysis looks at the effects of one site seeking the special permit in addition to the rest of the 45 Projected Development Sites that would be

developed, as identified in the With-Action condition. The incremental difference between the With-Action condition and the Special Permit Scenario serves as the basis for impact category analyses in this chapter.

25.5 Environmental Assessment

LAND USE, ZONING, AND PUBLIC POLICY

Similar to the analysis conducted in Chapter 2, "Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy," development under the Special Permit Scenario would not result in a significant adverse impact on land use, zoning, and public policy. Under the Special Permit Scenario, there would be an increase of 24,980 sf of hotel floor area (62 hotel rooms). The proposed hotel special permit would ensure that hotel development does not conflict with the Proposed Actions' goal to create opportunities for requiring permanently affordable housing, and that the neighborhood would continue to serve diverse housing needs. Similar to the conclusions of the analysis provided in Chapter 2, the Special Permit Scenario would not directly displace any land use, nor generate new land uses that would be incompatible with surrounding land uses or conflict with existing zoning or applicable public policies. As such, the Special Permit Scenario would not result in any significant adverse impacts to land use, zoning, and public policy.

SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS

As is the case for the With-Action condition, the Special Permit Scenario would not result in a significant adverse impact with respect to socioeconomic conditions. As development would occur on the same 45 projected development sites under the Special Permit Scenario, the Conceptual Development Site would not result in additional direct residential or business displacement that was not already disclosed in Chapter 3, "Socioeconomic Conditions."

The increment of 24,980 sf of additional hotel floor area and 24,980 sf less of office floor area between the Special Permit Scenario and the With-Action condition would not result in additional indirect business displacement. As discussed above, the proposed special permit is intended to ensure that hotel development does not conflict with the Proposed Actions' goal to create opportunities for requiring permanently affordable housing, and to ensure that the neighborhood would continue to serve diverse housing needs. In both the With-Action condition and Special Permit Scenario, the increment resulting from the Conceptual Development Site would not introduce or accelerate the existing market trends within the Study Area.

As compared with the With-Action condition, under the Special Permit Scenario hotels could be sited within an area where they would otherwise be prohibited. However, this change in land use as compared with the With-Action condition would not (1) add a new economic activity or add to a concentration of a

particular sector of the local economy enough to significantly alter or accelerate existing economic patterns; (2) directly displace any type of use that either directly supports businesses in the area; or (3) bring a new customer base to the area for local businesses, or directly or indirectly displace residents or workers who form the customer base of existing businesses in the area. As with the With-Action condition, the Special Permit Scenario would not result in any significant adverse impacts due to indirect business/institutional displacement. In addition, the Special Permit Scenario would not result in any significant adverse impacts on specific industries.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

Similar to the With-Action condition, the Special Permit Scenario would result in significant adverse impacts on elementary and intermediate schools. Given that the hotel special permit would result in an increase in hotel use, the increment of 1,259 elementary school students and 516 intermediate school students would remain the same. In the With-Action condition, CSD 9 Sub-district 2 would experience significant adverse elementary and intermediate schools impacts. CSD 9 Sub-district 2 elementary schools would increase from a No-Action utilization rate of 128.7 percent to 151.5 percent in the With-Action condition (a 22.8 percentage point increase), with a deficit of 1,716 elementary school seats. Intermediate schools in the same sub district would increase from a No-Action utilization rate of 125.9 percent to 171.2 percent in the With-Action condition (a 45.3 percentage point increase), and a deficit of 491 intermediate school seats. CSD 10 Sub-district 4 would also experience significant adverse elementary school impacts. CSD 10 Sub-district 4 elementary schools would increase from a No-Action utilization rate of 115.7 percent to 121.9 percent in the With-Action condition (a 6.2 percentage point increase), with a deficit of 1,111 elementary school seats. The Special Permit Scenario are expected to result in the same significant adverse impact on elementary and intermediate schools in these sub districts.

Like the With-Action condition, the Special Permit Scenario would not result in significant adverse impacts related to indirect effects on high schools, public libraries, child care facilities, or fire and police protection services. The Special Permit Scenario would also not displace or otherwise directly affect any public schools, child care centers, libraries, health care facilities, or police and fire protection service facilities

OPEN SPACE

Similar to the With-Action condition, there would be no significant adverse impacts from indirect effects on open space in the Special Permit Scenario. The Special Permit Scenario would result in a net decrease of 24,980 sf of office use and an increase of 24,980 sf of hotel floor area (62 hotel rooms), compared with the With-Action condition.

Under the Special Permit Scenario, the increase in hotel use would result in an increase of non-residential population by 165 when compared with the With-Action condition. The resulting non-residential passive open space ratio in the Special Permit Scenario would be slightly lower than that in the With-Action condition and would constitute a reduction of less than 5 percent. The passive open space ratio for

combined residents and workers would also slightly decrease between the Special Permit Scenario and With-Action condition.

Since the Conceptual Development would have the same overall building height and scale as projected on the site in the With-Action condition, the Special Permit Scenario would result in the same significant adverse shadows impacts on the Edward L Grant Greenstreet and Jerome Avenue/Grant Avenue Greenstreet, which would not receive adequate sunlight during the growing season.

SHADOWS

The Special Permit Scenario would result in the same significant adverse shadows impacts that was identified in the With-Action condition. Under the Special Permit Scenario, development on the Conceptual Development Site (Projected Development Site 12 in the With-Action condition) would have the same overall building height, floorplate and scale as projected on the site in the With-Action condition. As such, this scenario would result in the same significant adverse shadows impacts. As discussed in Chapter 6 "Shadows," the With-Action condition could result in incremental shadows on 41 open space resources. No historic resources would be affected by incremental shadows. The detailed shadows analysis identified significant adverse impacts at eight open space resources. The analysis determined that six resources (Bronx School of Young Leaders, PS 306 Schoolyard, Mount Hope Playground, Goble Playground, Inwood Park, Keltch Park) would experience significant incremental shadow coverage, duration, and/or periods of complete sunlight loss that could have the potential to affect open space utilization or enjoyment. Two resources (Edward L Grant Greenstreet, Jerome Avenue/Grant Avenue Greenstreet) would not receive adequate sunlight during the growing season (at least the four to six hour minimum specified in the *CEQR Technical Manual*) as a result of incremental shadow coverage and vegetation at these resources could be significantly impacted.

HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

Like the With-Action condition, there would be no significant adverse impacts with respect to historic and cultural resources in the Special Permit Scenario. The Proposed Actions would not result in any direct significant adverse impacts to any NYCL-designated. Since the Conceptual Development Site was analyzed as part of the With-Action condition, and that no known architectural resources were identified on the site by LPC, no additional known architectural and/or archaeological resources would be impacted under the Special Permit Scenario.

The Proposed Actions would also not result in any indirect (contextual) significant adverse impacts to any designated, listed, or eligible historic resources and S/NR listed historic districts or individual landmark buildings and structures. Any designated NYCL or S/NR-listed historic buildings located within 90 linear feet of a projected or potential new construction site are subject to the protections of the New York City Department of Building's (DOB's) Technical Policy and Procedure Notice (TPPN) #10/88.

URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES

As in the With-Action condition described in Chapter 8, "Urban Design and Visual Resources," there would be no significant adverse impacts on urban design and visual resources in the primary or secondary study areas in the Special Permit Scenario.

Under the Special Permit Scenario, development on the Conceptual Development Site (Projected Development Site 12) would have the same overall building height and scale as projected on the site in the With-Action condition; and therefore, would not result in any significant adverse impacts on urban design and visual resources.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

As with the With-Action condition, there would be no significant adverse impacts with respect to hazardous materials in the Special Permit Scenario. As discussed in Chapter 9, "Hazardous Materials," the Conceptual Development Site in the Special Permit Scenario would have an (E) designation assigned to it as part of the Proposed Actions. Therefore, the effects of hotel development pursuant to the special permit would be the same as with the With-Action condition with respect to hazardous materials, and would not result in significant adverse impacts.

WATER AND SEWER INFRASTRUCTURE

Water Supply

Similar to the With-Action condition, the Special Permit Scenario would not result in significant adverse impacts on the City's water supply system. As discussed in Chapter 10, "Water and Sewer Infrastructure," the projected development sites in the With-Action condition are expected to generate a water demand of approximately 1,364,040 gallons per day (gpd), an increase of 877,365 gpd, compared to the demand in the No-Action condition. Future incremental demand from the projected development sites would be dispersed throughout the Project Area. Under the Special Permit Scenario, an increase of 24,980 gsf of hotel floor area (62 hotel rooms) and decrease of 24,980 gsf of office use are not expected to generate a noticeable increase in water demand from the With-Action condition. Therefore the Special Permit Scenario would not result in significant adverse impacts on water supply.

Wastewater treatment

As discussed in Chapter 10, "Waste and Sewer Infrastructure," developments on the projected development sites in the With-Action condition are expected to generate a total of approximately 1,243, 567 gpd of sanitary sewage, an increase of 869,677 gpd over the No-Action condition. This additional flow of wastewater is not expected to cause a significant adverse impact to wastewater treatment infrastructure, because this WWTP has dry weather design flow capacity of 275 million gallons per day (MGD), and is currently receiving 201 MGD on average (see Table 10-2, "Monthly Average Daily Maximum

Flows, Wards Island WWTP"). As with water usage, the Special Permit Scenario is expected to generate a similar rate of sanitary sewage that would be treated by the Wards Island WWTP. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts to the City's wastewater treatment services would occur as a result of the Special Permit Scenario.

Stormwater and Drainage Management

The Special Permit Scenario is expected to have comparable sanitary flow resulting from denser development and similar amount of fully impervious rooftop area. As in the With-Action condition, increased volumes and flows would be conveyed to the Wards Island WWTP or discharged directly to the East River, depending on rainfall volume and duration. Given that the available capacity of the Wards Island WWTP is able to accommodate the increased flows to the combined sewer system from the With-Action condition, the Special Permit Scenario, which assumes the same overall floor area in the Conceptual Development Site as Projected Development Site 12, would not result in significant adverse impacts on water quality and to the City's sanitary sewage conveyance and treatment system. Additionally, as in the With-Action condition, the peak stormwater runoff rates would be reduced with the incorporation of stormwater source control BMPs that would be implemented on the Conceptual Development Site by its developer in accordance with the City's site connection requirements.

SOLID WASTE AND SANITATION SERVICES

The Special Permit Scenario, similar to the With-Action condition, would not directly affect a solid waste management facility. As discussed in Chapter 11, "Solid Waste," development resulting from the With-Action condition would generate an increment above the No-Action condition of approximately 70 tons per week of solid waste, of which approximately 97 percent would be handled by the New York City Department of Sanitation (DSNY), and the remaining 3 percent would be handled by private carters. This correlates to approximately 6 additional truckloads per week of solid waste handled by DSNY, and approximately one additional truckloads per week handled by private carters.

The Conceptual Development Site, which represents an increase of 24,980 gsf of hotel floor area, and decrease of 24,980 gsf office use from Projected Development Site 12 in the With-Action condition. Similar to the With-Action condition, additional solid waste resulting from the Conceptual Development Site would be negligible relative to the solid waste handled by the DSNY or by private carters every day. As such the Special Permit Scenario would not result in an increase in solid waste that would overburden available waste management capacity.

ENERGY

The Special Permit Scenario would not result in a significant adverse impact on energy systems. As discussed in Chapter 12, "Energy," the With-Action condition would result in increased demand of approximately 402.6 billion British Thermal Units (BTUs) of energy per year as compared with the No-

Action condition. The Special Permit Scenario, as with the With-Action condition, would result in the same incremental increase in energy demand. Therefore, no significant adverse energy impacts are expected to occur.

TRANSPORTATION

In general, Office space has much larger daily trip generation characteristics than Hotel Use, except for Saturday. Saturday daily trip rates for hotel use are much larger than office use. As shown in Chapter 14, "Transportation," and summarized in Table 25-1, office space and hotel rooms each generate between 18 and 9.4 person trips per day (Weekday), respectively. Also, office space and hotel rooms each generate between 3.9 and 9.4 person trips per day (Saturday), respectively. Accordingly, the Special Permit Scenario is expected to generate approximately half as many daily Weekday person trips and 2.5 times during Saturday as the With-Action condition. Other factors that are important to consider include temporal distributions (office use generates a higher percentage of trips during all peak hours, including Saturday, compared to hotel use).

The 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual* presents a two-tier screening procedure to determine the potential for significant impacts. The screening procedure begins with a trip generation analysis (Level 1 Screen) to estimate the number of person and vehicle trips attributable to a proposed action. If a proposed project is projected to result in fewer than 50 peak hour vehicle trips and fewer than 200 peak hour transit or pedestrian trips, then significant transportation impacts are unlikely and no further analyses are generally warranted. When these thresholds are exceeded, trip assignments (Level 2 Screen) are performed. If the trip assignments show that a proposed project would result less than 50 peak hour vehicle trips at a particular intersection, 200 or more peak hour subway trips at a subway station, 50 or more peak hour bus trips in one direction along a bus route, or 200 or more peak hour pedestrian trips traversing a pedestrian element, then significant transportation impacts are unlikely and no further quantified analyses are generally warranted.

A Level 1 trip generation screening assessment was conducted to estimate the number of person and vehicle trips associated with the increment for the conceptual Special Permit Scenario. Trip generation factors for hotel and office uses were taken from the transportation chapter of this document. The trip generation analysis for the conceptual residential and hotel developments is presented below in Table 25-1, "Conceptual Analysis Trip Generation Summary."

As shown in Table 25-1, the increment for the conceptual Special Permit Scenario results in 7, 14, 13, and 35 incremental person trips in the Weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday midday peak hours, respectively. Each of these is below the 200 pedestrian and transit trip Level 1 screening threshold. Therefore, significant pedestrian or transit (subway and bus) impacts are unlikely and no further analysis is warranted.

The information presented in Table 25-1 indicates that the increment for the conceptual Special Permit Scenario generates 5, 5, 4, and 11 incremental vehicle trips in the Weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday

midday peak hours, respectively. Each of these is below the 50 vehicle trip Level 1 screening threshold. Therefore, significant traffic impacts are unlikely and no further analysis is warranted.

The *CEQR Technical Manual* indicates that if a detailed traffic assessment is not warranted, then significant parking impacts are not likely and no further analysis is warranted. As discussed above, the conceptual Special Permit Scenario does not warrant a detailed traffic assessment and therefore significant parking impacts are not likely and no further analysis is warranted.

Table 25-1: Conceptual Analysis Trip Generation Summary

				Temporal Distribution				Person Trips			
		Weekday	Saturday	Weekday	Weekday	Weekday	Saturday	Weekday	Weekday	Weekday	Saturday
Land Use	Size	PT Rate	PT Rate	AM	MD	PM	MD	AM	MD	PM	MD
	GSF	Per 1,000gsf	Per 1,000 gsf								
Office	24,980	18	3.9 per	12%	15%	14%	17%	54	68	63	17
Hotel	24,980 (62 Rooms)	9.4	9.4	8%	14%	13%	9%	47	82	76	52
Increase/Decrease								-7	14	13	35
									Auto Trips		
Office								18	22	21	6
Hotel								15	27	25	17
Incrtease/Decrease								-3	5	4	11
									Taxi Trips		
Office								2	2	2	0
Hotel								0	2	2	0
Incrtease/Decrease								-2	0	0	0
									Vehicle Trips		
Office								20	24	23	6
Hotel								15	29	27	17
Incrtease/Decrease								-5	5	4	11

Note: Transportation Demand Factors are from Chapter 14, "Transportation." mode of travel for auto and taxi are the same for office and hotel.

AIR QUALITY

No significant air quality impacts are anticipated due to additional development pursuant to the Special Permit Scenario.

Mobile Source

Traffic associated with the additional development pursuant to the Special Permit Scenario is estimated to be greater than under the With-Action condition by 5 vehicle trips in the AM peak hour, 5 vehicle trips in the Midday peak hour, 4 vehicle trips in the PM peak hour and 11 vehicle trips in the Saturday Midday peak hours (see Table 25-1). These increases, which would be spread over the traffic study area, are not expected to cause a violation of National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) as the estimated traffic increments under the With-Action condition would be well below the applicable CEQR mobile source screening threshold for carbon monoxide and particulate matter. Therefore, the additional traffic

increments under this conceptual scenario would not be expected to exceed the CEQR screening threshold.

Stationary Source

In connection with the Proposed Actions, institutional controls are proposed to avoid significant impacts on Projected Development Site 12 with respect to air quality (heating and hot water systems). The institutional controls, also presented in Appendix F, are expected to be sufficient to avoid significant impacts under the Special Permit Scenario as discussed below.

Given the similar development size, bulk, and HVAC stack location between the Special Permit Scenario development and the With-Action condition for Projected Development Site 12, air quality effects under both scenarios are expected to be the same, and the same institutional controls listed in Appendix F would apply to hotel development pursuant to the Special Permit Scenario. With these institutional controls in place, it is expected that no significant air quality impacts would result from the Special Permit Scenario. If the eventual development's size, bulk and/or stack location is different than what is assumed in this conceptual analysis, an air quality analysis would be expected to be completed at the time an applicant applies for the special permit.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND CLIMATE CHANGE

As in the With-Action condition, no significant adverse greenhouse gas (GHG) emission impacts are expected to result from development assumed in connection with the Special Permit Scenario. Given that the overall floor area would not change, GHG emissions are anticipated to be similar to emission levels in the With-Action condition. Construction and operation of buildings developed pursuant to the Special Permit Scenario, as well as mobile source emissions, would continue to be consistent with the goals of OneNYC and PlaNYC.

NOISE

As is the case under the With-Action condition analyzed for the Proposed Actions, no significant adverse noise impacts are anticipated as a result of the Special Permit Scenario.

The mobile noise exposure from traffic movements under the Special Permit Scenario would not be perceptibly higher than those projected under the Proposed Actions. Therefore, no significant adverse noise impacts would likely occur at any of the 20 representative noise receptor locations evaluated within the study area.

As is the case with the With-Action condition, in the future under the Special Permit Scenario, noise levels associated with Projected Development Site 12 would be generally comparable to those expected under the No-Action condition. Peak hour noise levels would be comparable to those expected from development under the Special Permit Scenario.

In connection with the Proposed Actions, institutional controls are proposed to avoid significant impacts on Projected Development Site 12 with respect to noise (window-wall attenuation). The institutional controls, presented in Appendix G, would be expected to be sufficient to avoid significant impacts. Given the fact that the noise characteristic would not differ between the With-Action condition and the Special Permit Scenario, and comparable noise attenuation requirements for residential uses and hotel uses, the noise attenuation requirements under both scenarios are expected to be the same, and the same institutional controls as presented in Appendix G would apply to hotel development pursuant to the Special Permit Scenario.

Like the Proposed Actions, no significant adverse impacts related to noise would be expected to result from the Special Permit Scenario.

PUBLIC HEALTH

As is the case under the With-Action condition, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated with respect to public health as a result of the Special Permit Scenario. As discussed in other sections of this chapter, the Special Permit Scenario is not expected to result in any significant adverse impacts related to hazardous materials, air quality, or noise. Site-specific analyses of the construction-related impacts resulting from the Special Permit Scenario cannot be provided because the specific features of the buildings that may be constructed in connection with one of the special permits are not known. Development pursuant to the special permit would be a discretionary action requiring a separate environmental review; any adverse impacts on public health that could result from such development would be assessed and disclosed to the public under and pursuant to that environmental review.

NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

As is the case under the With-Action condition, the Special Permit Scenario is not expected to result in any significant adverse impacts on neighborhood character. As discussed in Chapter 18, “Neighborhood Character,” the Jerome Avenue corridor is a vibrant neighborhood with a rich cultural history that includes waves of immigration, construction of the elevated rail line in the early 20th century, densification during the first half of the twentieth century, and large-scale urban renewal projects during the mid-20th century.

The With-Action condition and Special Permit Scenario would not result in significant adverse impacts in the areas of land use, zoning, and public policy; socioeconomic conditions; open space; historic resources; urban design and visual resources; and noise. Although significant adverse impacts would occur with respect to shadows and transportation, these impacts would not result in a significant change to one of the determining elements of neighborhood character. No significant adverse impacts related to neighborhood character are therefore expected under the Special Permit Scenario.

CONSTRUCTION

Under the Special Permit Scenario, there would be an increase of 243,980 sf of hotel floor area (62 hotel rooms) and a decrease in 24,980 sf of office use. Given the similarity between the Special Permit Scenario and the With-Action condition (similar development size and bulk), the duration and magnitude of construction activities that could take place on the Conceptual Development Site would be expected to approximate those for Projected Development Site 12 in the With-Action condition. Construction activities associated with the With-Action condition would result in temporary significant adverse noise impacts and potentially transportation impacts. The Special Permit Scenario would result in the same — but no additional — construction impacts with the With-Action condition.