# 17

# 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~~2025 *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 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 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

As described below, the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact to neighborhood character. The Proposed Actions would enhance the neighborhood character of the study area surrounding the Development Site. Specifically, the Proposed Actions would replace the existing non-conforming NYCTA Facility with a mixed-use development including affordable and market-rate housing, new publicly accessible open space, shoreline resiliency improvements, and community facility space, which would represent an improvement over existing conditions. At the NYCTA Relocation Site, the Proposed Actions would facilitate construction of a new facility that would be in character with the surrounding industrial uses.

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; urban design and visual resources; historic and cultural resources; shadows; or operational noise. While the Proposed Development would result in significant adverse impacts related to increased noise during the construction period, and increased traffic and pedestrians in the operational and construction periods, these impacts would not result in a significant adverse impact to the defining elements of neighborhood character, nor any of the defining features. The resulting traffic and pedestrian conditions would be similar to those already seen in the neighborhood defining the study area, and would not be out of character with the surrounding neighborhood, and construction impacts would be temporary in duration. As such, the significant adverse impacts related to transportation and construction would not result in a neighborhood character impact.

# Methodology

Per the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a neighborhood character assessment is generally needed 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 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 adverse impact identified in one of the technical areas that contributes to a neighborhood's character is not necessarily equivalent to a significant adverse 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 increase 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; community facilities and services; or operational noise. The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts to operational and construction traffic and pedestrian elements, and construction noise. Therefore, a preliminary assessment of neighborhood character impacts is provided below.

# Preliminary Assessment

## Defining Features of the Neighborhood

Overall, the neighborhood is defined by the features discussed in the following sections.

### Area Land Uses and Development Trends

The area within an approximate quarter-mile radius of the Development Site contains several distinct areas, distinguishable from each other by key characteristics that include land use, building bulk and density, and open space. The Greenpoint neighborhood comprises much of the study area and encompasses the Development Site. This area presents a blend of residential, commercial, industrial, and institutional uses, all contributing to its dynamic urban landscape.

The area to the northeast and east of the Development Site is primarily residential with a variety of housing types, including one-family, two-family, and multi-family walk-up buildings, mainly east of Franklin and Banker Streets and north of Norman Avenue. Recent developments, specifically along the waterfront, are higher density mixed-use buildings with ground-floor retail, such as the prominent West Wharf development, consisting of a 14-story and a 40-story building completed in 2019 and 2020, respectively.

The waterfront is experiencing an increase in mixed-use high-rise buildings like the Calyer Place development, which is adjacent to the Development Site. The commercial and industrial zones, particularly along Kent Avenue in the southeast portion, are undergoing transformations with former industrial buildings repurposed for commercial offices, local retail, creative spaces, entertainment venues, and hospitality establishments. Notable examples include the William Vale Hotel (2017) and office buildings like 25 Kent Avenue (2017), 105 N 13th Street (2023), and converted pre-war industrial structures at 67, 60, and 42 West Street.

Public facilities and institutions, such as schools, community centers, and a police precinct, are primarily located on the eastern side of the study area, especially along Meserole Avenue. Key institutions include P.S. 031 – Samuel Dupont Elementary School, the U.S. Post Office, and the NYPD 94th Precinct.

The NYCTA Relocation Site is within a manufacturing district surrounded by industrial, manufacturing, and transportation/utility uses, including a NYC Department of Sanitation Garage located two blocks southwest of the site. The area has historically been home to these types of uses and has not seen changing development trends.

### Street Grid and Open Spaces

Within the study area, the roadway network generally consists of a combination of grid-pattern and irregular streets, characterized primarily by east-west and north-south one-way streets, in addition to curbside parking across most of the streets, contributing to a well-defined but varied traffic flow and accessibility system in the area. The street network north of the Development Site follows a uniform grid pattern, characterized by east-west one-way streets and larger north-south streets like West Street and Franklin Street. However, east of the Development Site, the grid becomes irregular due to the convergence of Banker Street, Calyer Street, and Franklin Street.

Calyer Street runs east to west as a one-way street with curbside parking. Franklin Street is a two-way north-south road, featuring one moving lane in each direction and curbside parking. Quay Street is another east-west one-way road with a single moving lane and curbside parking. Similarly, West Street is a one-way street running south to north, with one moving lane and curbside parking. At the intersection with North 14th Street, Franklin Street transitions into Kent Street. Wythe Avenue cuts through the southeast section of the study area as a one-way street, providing curbside parking on both sides and featuring a bike lane. The area includes several east-west streets: Milton Street is a two-way street with curbside parking, while Noble Street, Oak Street, and Meserole Avenue are all one-way streets with curbside parking.

Within the study area, there are several parks that contribute to neighborhood character. Adjacent to and south of the Development Site is Bushwick Inlet Park, with the immediately adjacent portion, the Motiva Parcel, currently under construction. The New York City Department of Parks and Recreation (NYC Parks) anticipates completion of the Motiva Parcel ~~by the end of 2025~~in 2026, which will ultimately be part of a larger park totaling 35.53 acres of public open space. Currently, the park's accessible section encompasses approximately 5.8 acres and features amenities such as a comfort station, viewing platform, benches, and a lawn for passive recreation. Marsha P. Johnson State Park, previously known as East River State Park, spans 7 acres and is managed by the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation (OPRHP). A walkway from Marsha P. Johnson State Park connects it to the North 5th Street Pier and Park to the south.

Additionally, WNYC Transmitter Park encompasses 1.~~62~~61 acres along the East River waterfront. It includes tranquil green spaces for passive activities, fishing spots, and a children's play area. The "Schoolyard to Playground" initiative, a collaboration between NYC Parks and NYC DOE, has transformed the playgrounds at P.S. 31 and P.S. 34 into public recreational areas. The P.S. 31 playground, measuring 0.16 acres, and the P.S. 34 playground, spanning 0.24 acres, are open to the public after school hours and during weekends and holidays. Both playgrounds feature children's play equipment and seating areas.

The street network in the area of the NYCTA Relocation Site generally consists of a grid-pattern, with some irregularities and dead ends related to the intersecting Newtown Creek to the west and Long Island Rail Road (LIRR) tracks to the south. Metropolitan Avenue is a four-lane major thoroughfare to the north of the NYCTA Relocation Site running east-west. There are no public open spaces in the vicinity of this site.

## Potential to Affect the Defining Features of the Neighborhood

Overall, the Proposed Actions would not adversely affect the defining features of the neighborhood and instead, ~~would~~are intended to enhance them by developing an integrated mixed-use space that aligns with the diverse and evolving character of the Greenpoint neighborhood. The Proposed Actions aim to create a balanced area that facilitates commercial, residential, and recreational spaces, consistent with Greenpoint's vibrant and eclectic environment. The introduction of new commercial spaces, residential units, and publicly accessible amenities, along with improvements to existing open spaces and streetscape, ~~would~~is expected to enrich the neighborhood's defining features while respecting its historical context.

The Proposed Actions would allow for the removal of the existing NYCTA Facility from the Development Site, where it currently represents a barrier between the surrounding neighborhood and the waterfront. Relocating this facility would allow for more appropriate development along the

waterfront. The Proposed Development includes the development of 50,000 sf of open space including a 34,000-sf Waterfront Public Access Area (WPAA) and approximately 9,000 sf of Public Access Area (PAA), providing a pedestrian connection between the future Bushwick Inlet Park and the existing Shore Public Walkway to the north of the site, and an upland connection between the future Bushwick Inlet Park and West Street. The 7,000-sf remainder of the new open space would consist of open space for museum visitors, as well as landscaping and planting areas that ~~would~~have been designed to visually blend and physically connect with the WPAA and PAA spaces. This new open space would expand the neighborhood's open space resources, and is intended to improve overall community wellbeing by providing additional opportunities for leisure and outdoor activities.

While the Proposed Development is anticipated to increase activity and traffic to and from the Development Site, these conditions are reflective of the character of the surrounding Greenpoint-Williamsburg area, which is seeing continuous development and activity, increasingly along the waterfront. In conclusion, the Proposed Development would be consistent with the ongoing growth of the neighborhood. By introducing a mix of new residential and commercial spaces, enhancing existing public amenities, and ensuring sustainable and accessible urban design, the Proposed Development is intended to not only ~~preserves~~preserve, but to actively ~~contributes~~contribute to the defining features of the Greenpoint neighborhood and a significant adverse impact would not occur.

The NYCTA Relocation Site would be redeveloped with a building that is consistent with existing land use and zoning in the surrounding area. Therefore, there is no potential for neighborhood character to be affected, and the remainder of the assessment will focus on the Development Site and Proposed Development.

## Potential to Affect the Contributing Elements of Neighborhood Character

### Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy

As described in **Chapter 2, Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy**, the Proposed Development would not result in significant adverse impacts on land use, zoning, or public policy in the quarter-mile study area. The Proposed Actions would facilitate development that is well-integrated with current built conditions and the existing zoning framework within the study area. The proposed land uses would be consistent with existing land uses in the study area and would provide a continuation of the mixed-use development trend occurring along the Greenpoint waterfront. The increased bulk and density facilitated by the Proposed Actions would be compatible with the existing bulk and building densities along the waterfront in the study area. The Proposed Actions would support multiple public policies, including the Greenpoint-Williamsburg Waterfront Access Plan, Housing New York, and the New York City Waterfront Revitalization Program (WRP). The Proposed Development would provide approximately 50,000 sf of new open space including a 34,000-sf WPAA and approximately 9,000 sf of PAA, providing a pedestrian connection between the future Bushwick Inlet Park and the existing Shore Public Walkway to the north of the site, and an upland connection between the future Bushwick Inlet Park and West Street, which would support the Greenpoint-Williamsburg Waterfront Access Plan. The Proposed Actions would also facilitate up to approximately 300 units of affordable housing, aligning with Housing New York's goals. Additionally, the Proposed Actions would promote policies of the New York City WRP (see **Appendix B**). The Proposed Actions would not conflict with the surrounding zoning or existing uses. Instead, they would foster development that integrates with the current built environment and the existing zoning framework

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

## Socioeconomic Conditions

As discussed in **Chapter 3, Socioeconomic Conditions**, the Proposed Development would not significantly alter the socioeconomic character of the study area. A preliminary analysis of indirect residential displacement concluded that the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts to socioeconomic conditions. This residential population increase surpasses the five percent threshold over the projected No-Action condition population, prompting a preliminary assessment of indirect residential displacement. The preliminary assessment found that, the estimated average incomes of the new population would be similar to the average incomes of the study area populations, and therefore, the Proposed Actions would not be expected to significantly alter socioeconomic conditions in the study area and no further analysis is warranted. Therefore, the defining features of neighborhood character would not be adversely affected due to socioeconomic conditions, either alone or in combination with potential effects in other relevant technical areas discussed in this chapter.

## Open Space

As described in **Chapter 5, Open Space**, an analysis of the potential for the Proposed Development to indirectly impact residential open space was conducted for a half-mile study area. The analysis determined that the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact on open space. Additionally, the Proposed Development would not have a direct impact on open space resources as the Proposed Development would not cause the loss of public open space, change the use of an open space so that it no longer serves just the same user population, limit public access to an open space, or result in increased noise or air pollutant emissions, odors, or shadows that would temporarily or permanently affect the usefulness of a public space.

The Proposed Development would introduce approximately 50,000 sf of new open space at the Development Site, including a 34,000-sf WPAA and approximately 9,000 sf of PAA that would provide improved connectivity to existing waterfront open spaces such as Bushwick Inlet Park and the Shore Public Walkway to the north. Therefore, the 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.

## Shadows

As discussed in **Chapter 6, Shadows**, the Proposed Development would result in new development that would cast incremental shadows within the vicinity of the study area. Based on a detailed analysis, it was concluded that the Proposed Development would not result in significant adverse impacts to public sunlight sensitive resources. Therefore, significant adverse impacts on neighborhood character due to shadows are not expected, and defining features of neighborhood character would not be adversely affected due to potential shadows-related effects of the Proposed Development, either alone or in combination with potential impacts in other relevant technical areas discussed in this chapter.

## Historic and Cultural Resources

As discussed **in Chapter 7, Historic and Cultural Resources**, the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact on historic and cultural resources. In a letter dated October 24, 2024, the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) indicated that there are no properties with archaeological significance within the Development Site.

However, four architectural resources were identified within the quarter-mile study area of the Development Site. As set forth in **Chapter 7, Historic and Cultural Resources**, the Proposed Development would not significantly alter or affect the setting, visual relationship, or publicly accessible views of the identified historic resources within the study area. Additionally, none of the identified architectural resources contain sunlight-sensitive features and therefore, there would be no potential for the Proposed Development to result in a significant adverse impact to architectural resources. Therefore, significant adverse impacts on neighborhood character due to shadows are not expected, and defining features of neighborhood character would not be adversely affected due to potential historical and cultural resource-related effects of the Proposed Development, either alone or in combination with potential impacts in other relevant technical areas discussed in this chapter.

In a letter dated February 13, 2025, LPC indicated that there are no properties with archaeological significance within the NYCTA Relocation Site and no architectural resources within a 400-foot radius. Therefore, defining features of neighborhood character would not be adversely affected due to potential historical and cultural resource-related effects of the NYCTA Relocation Site.

## Urban Design and Visual Resources

As discussed in **Chapter 8, Urban Design and Visual Resources**, the Proposed Development would not result in significant adverse impacts to urban design or visual resources within the study area. While the Proposed Development would result in built forms and building types greater in height and bulk compared to the buildings that currently exist within the study area, the proposed buildings would be compatible with existing buildings and consistent with the scale of new developments along the Greenpoint-Williamsburg waterfront. ~~The design of~~ The Proposed Development ~~would~~has been designed to provide varied building heights and setbacks, ~~creating~~create visual interest, and ~~enhancing~~enhance the pedestrian experience. The Proposed Development would provide a publicly accessible waterfront open space and enhance connectivity to Bushwick Inlet Park and the Shore Public Walkway to the north. Additionally, the Proposed Development would not negatively affect views to visual resources located within the quarter-mile study area. Therefore, defining features of the neighborhood would not be adversely affected due to potential impacts of the Proposed Development on urban design or visual resources, either alone or in combination with potential impacts in other relevant technical areas discussed in this chapter. Development at the NYCTA Relocation Site resulting from the Proposed Actions would be appropriate and in context with the surrounding industrial area, and the new facility would represent an improvement over the existing open storage area with respect to urban design.

## Transportation

As discussed in **Chapter 12, Transportation**, the Proposed Development is expected to result in significant adverse traffic impacts at several intersections, and significant adverse pedestrian impacts at one crosswalk. As discussed below, there would be no significant adverse impacts related to

parking, subways, or safety as a result of the Proposed Actions. Furthermore, the Proposed Actions do not warrant detailed analyses of bus or ferry service.

### *Traffic*

Traffic analyses were conducted for 13 intersections, revealing that the Proposed Development would result in significant adverse traffic impacts to:

- Four intersections (at six specific traffic movements) during the weekday AM peak hour
- Four intersections (at six specific traffic movements) during the weekday midday peak hour
- Five intersections (at nine specific traffic movements) during the weekday PM peak hour, and
- Five intersections (at seven specific traffic movements) during the Saturday peak hour

Mitigation measures that could be implemented to mitigate these significant adverse traffic impacts are discussed in **Chapter 19, Mitigation**. As discussed therein, standard traffic capacity improvements typically implemented by the New York City Department of Transportation (NYCDOT), such as signal timing modifications, could mitigate traffic impacts at ~~four~~two intersections during the weekday AM peak hour, ~~four~~three intersections during the weekday midday peak hour, ~~five~~four intersections during the weekday PM peak hour, and two intersections during the Saturday peak hour.

Most unmitigated traffic intersections are currently operating under congested conditions, an issue projected to persist even without the Proposed Development. As discussed in **Chapter 12, Transportation**, in the future No-Action condition, 4both of ~~13 intersections~~the unmitigated traffic movements would operate at Level of Service (LOS) ~~D, E, or~~ F during the weekday AM ~~and~~ peak hour, the unmitigated traffic movement during the weekday PM peak ~~hours, 2 of 13 intersections~~hour would operate at LOS ~~D, E, or~~ F, and three of four unmitigated traffic movements during the Saturday peak hour would operate at LOS F. The one unmitigated traffic movement during the weekday midday peak hour~~, and 3~~ would operate at acceptable level of ~~13 intersections would operate at LOS D, E, or F~~service during the ~~Saturday~~weekday midday peak hour. Although there would be an increase in traffic activity due to the Proposed Development, the resulting conditions would be like those typically found within the study area. Therefore, the traffic impacts of the Proposed Development are not anticipated to cause substantial changes to the character of the neighborhood. The defining features of the neighborhood character are expected to remain unaffected by the traffic impacts, either alone or in combination with other factors discussed in the chapter.

### *Pedestrians*

Pedestrian analyses were conducted for a total of 22 pedestrian elements—ten sidewalk locations, four crosswalks, and eight corners—during the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday peak hours. Significant pedestrian impacts were identified at the intersection of Franklin Street and Quay Street (one crosswalk in all peak hours analyzed and at one corner during the Saturday peak hour). ~~Mitigation measures that could be implemented to mitigate these significant adverse pedestrian impacts are discussed in **Chapter 16, Mitigation**. As discussed therein~~As discussed in **Chapter 19, Mitigation**, no feasible mitigation measures were identified, and therefore, the significant adverse impacts to these pedestrian elements would remain unmitigated. Although there would be an increase in pedestrian activity due to the Proposed Development, the resulting conditions would be like those typically found within the study area. Therefore, the pedestrian impacts of the Proposed Development are not anticipated to cause substantial changes to the character of the neighborhood.

The defining features of the neighborhood character are expected to remain unaffected by the pedestrian impacts, either alone or in combination with other factors discussed in the chapter.

## Noise

As discussed in **Chapter 15, Noise**, the Proposed Development is not anticipated to include any substantial stationary source noise generators. The design and specifications for the building's mechanical equipment would incorporate sufficient noise reduction devices that would comply with applicable noise regulations and standards, including the standards contained in the revised New York City Noise Control Code. Based on the highest predicted $L_{10}$ sound levels, a minimum outdoor-to-indoor window/wall sound attenuation of 28 dBA is required for all façades of all three proposed buildings to maintain acceptable interior noise conditions per the *CEQR Technical Manual* noise exposure guidelines for residential and community facility uses. To implement this attenuation requirement, a Restrictive Declaration would be recorded against the Development Site specifying the appropriate window/wall attenuation and the need for alternate means of ventilation. Therefore, defining features of the neighborhood would not be adversely affected due to potential effects of the Proposed Development on noise conditions, either alone or in combination with potential impacts in other relevant technical areas discussed in this chapter.

## Construction

### *Traffic*

As discussed in **Chapter 18, Construction**, a detailed analysis determined that ~~two~~three of the 13 intersections analyzed would be significantly impacted during the weekday AM construction peak hour of 6:00 AM to 7:00 AM, and ~~five~~four of the 13 intersections analyzed would be significantly impacted during the weekday PM construction peak hour of 3:00 PM to 4:00 PM. Standard traffic capacity improvements typically implemented by the NYCDOT, such as signal timing modifications, could fully mitigate impacted traffic movements at the ~~two~~three intersections impacted during the weekday AM construction peak hour and at three of the intersections impacted during the weekday PM construction peak hour. Significant traffic impacts during the weekday PM construction peak hour would remain unmitigated at the ~~two intersections listed below:~~intersection of McGuinness Boulevard and Greenpoint Avenue.

~~› McGuinness Boulevard and Greenpoint Avenue~~

~~› Franklin Street and Oak Street~~

As discussed in **Chapter 19, Mitigation**, where these impacts during construction can be expected to occur, traffic capacity improvements in the form of signal timing modifications are proposed to provide full mitigation where feasible. Significant traffic impacts could be fully mitigated at the ~~two~~three significantly impacted intersections during the weekday AM construction peak hour and three of the ~~five~~four significantly impacted intersections could be fully mitigated during the PM construction peak hour (~~two intersections~~one intersection would remain unmitigated).

Although there would be an increase in traffic activity due to the construction of the Proposed Development, the resulting conditions would be like those typically found within the study area and would be temporary. Therefore, the construction traffic impacts of the Proposed Development are not anticipated to cause substantial changes to the character of the neighborhood. The defining

features of the neighborhood character are expected to remain unaffected by the construction traffic impacts, either alone or in combination with other factors discussed in the chapter.

### *Pedestrians*

As described in **Chapter 18, Construction**, construction-related activities would generate 567 pedestrian trips during the weekday AM and PM construction peak hours. While the number of construction-related pedestrian trips would be substantially lower than pedestrian trips generated by the Proposed Development, significant impacts that could not be mitigated were identified at ~~two~~one of the 22 pedestrian elements analyzed with the Proposed Development. Therefore, it is possible that construction activities could result in significant adverse pedestrian impacts, although the potential for significant pedestrian impacts during construction would be no worse than what has been identified for the operational condition, and as discussed above, the pedestrian impact during the operational condition would not result in a significant adverse impact to neighborhood character,

### *Noise*

As discussed in **Chapter 18, Construction**, because construction noise levels would exceed the thresholds for exterior increase in noise as well as the thresholds for acceptable interior noise levels for residential uses, there would be potential for construction of the Proposed Development to result in significant adverse construction noise impacts at one receptor, 3 West Street, which is located across the street from the Development Site. No construction noise impact would occur at other receptors analyzed.

As discussed in **Chapter 19, Mitigation**, with adherence to existing construction noise regulations and the implementation of a Construction Noise Mitigation Plan, including an 8-foot construction noise barrier, construction noise would be reduced but would still exceed the thresholds for significant adverse construction noise impacts. Although the construction noise impact would be unavoidable~~.~~, it would be temporary in duration and would not be anticipated to cause substantial changes to the character of the neighborhood. The defining features of the neighborhood character are expected to remain unaffected by the construction noise impacts, either alone or in combination with other factors discussed in the chapter.