Executive Summary

Introduction

The Applicants, 760 12th, LLC and 801 11th Ave., LLC, are seeking zoning map amendments, zoning text amendments, and zoning special permits (collectively, the Proposed Actions) to facilitate the development of two buildings (collectively, the Proposed Projects)—a 44-story, mixed-use residential and commercial building at 629 West 54th Street (Manhattan Block 1102, Lot 11) (Development Site 1) and a 38-story, mixed-use residential and commercial building at 801 Eleventh Avenue (Manhattan Block 1103, Lot 36) (Development Site 2).

The Proposed Projects would contain a total of approximately 1,179,321 gross square feet (gsf; 892,442 zoning square feet [zsf]), including approximately 939,934 gsf (743,701 zsf) of residential floor area and 199,750 gsf (148,740.6 zsf) of commercial floor area across the two development sites. The building at 629 West 54th Street would contain up to approximately 617 dwelling units (DUs) and 113,990 gsf of commercial auto dealership space. The building at 801 Eleventh Avenue would contain 477 DUs and 85,760 gsf of commercial auto dealership space.

The Proposed Actions include a zoning text amendment, a zoning map amendment, and zoning special permits to facilitate a transfer of floor area from the Granting Sites (Chelsea Piers, Piers 81/83, and Pier 98) within Hudson River Park to the development sites. In addition to the Proposed Actions, the Board of Directors of Hudson River Park Trust must approve the sale of the floor area from the Granting Sites, which requires a Signification Action process pursuant to the Hudson River Park Act.

Project Area and Development Sites

The Proposed Actions would affect the Project Area, which comprises two non-contiguous areas:

- **The Project Area Southern Portion**: the portion of Manhattan Block 1102 bounded by Twelfth Avenue (also known as Henry Hudson Parkway or New York State Route 9A [U.S. 9A]) to the west,

West 55th Street to the north, West 54th Street to the south, and a line parallel to and 175 feet east of Twelfth Avenue to the east. Within the Project Area Southern Portion sits Development Site 1, which is the property at 629 West 54th Street (Manhattan Block 1102, Lot 11, also known as 629 West 54th Street), owned by 760 12th, LLC.

- **The Project Area Northern Portion**: the portion of Manhattan Block 1103 bounded by Eleventh Avenue to the east, West 56th Street to the north, West 55th Street to the south, and a line parallel to and 150 feet west of Eleventh Avenue to the west. Within the Project Area Northern Portion sits Development Site 2, which is the property at 801 Eleventh Avenue (Manhattan Block 1103, Lot 36), owned by 801 11th Ave., LLC.

The Project Area is in the Hell's Kitchen neighborhood of Manhattan Community District 4 and is entirely within the New York City Coastal Zone. Refer to **Figure ES-1** for the location of the Project Area and development sites. **Photo ES-1** through **Photo ES-8** show existing conditions at the development sites.

Development Site 1 occupies the western portion of Block 1102 and has approximately 201 feet of frontage along Twelfth Avenue and 175 feet of frontage along West 54th and West 55th Streets. Development Site 1 has a total lot area of 35,145.25 square feet (sf). It is improved with a six-story, 82-foot-tall commercial auto dealership building with a total built area of approximately 152,375 gsf. The building was constructed in 1930. Development Site 1 is mapped within a M2-4 district within the C2 Subdistrict of the Special Clinton District (CL).

Development Site 2 occupies the eastern portion of Block 1103 and has approximately 201 feet of frontage along Eleventh Avenue, 100 feet of frontage along West 55th Street, and 150 feet of frontage along West 56th Street. Development Site 2 has a total lot area of approximately 26,830 sf and is occupied by two buildings that have been operating as a single commercial auto dealership—including a two-story, roughly 50-foot-tall building and a three-story, roughly 35-foot-tall building—with a total built area of approximately 57,805 gsf. The buildings were constructed in 1920, and the northern building was enlarged in 2011. Development Site 2 is mapped in a M2-3 district within the C1 Subdistrict of the CL.

Portions of Hudson River Park would be mapped in the Special Hudson River Park (HRP) District. As discussed below, zoning text amendments would define these areas as "granting sites" and the development sites as "receiving sites" (see **Figure ES-2** and **Figure ES-3**, respectively). Specifically, Pier 98 (Manhattan Block 1109, part of Lot 25 and part of Marginal Street, Wharf or Place) would be designated as B-G1, Piers 81/83 (Manhattan Block 1107, part of Lots 5 and 14) would be designated as B-G2, and Chelsea Piers (Manhattan Block 662, part of Lots 11, 16, and 19 and part of Marginal Street, Wharf, or Place) would be designated as B-G3. Development Site 2 would be designated as B-R3, and Development Site 1 would be designated as B-R4.

Figure ES-1 Site Location Map



Source: NYC DCP, MapPLUTO

Figure ES-2 Granting Sites



Source: NYC DCP, MapPLUTO

Figure ES-3 Development/Receiving Sites



Source: NYC DCP, MapPLUTO

Source: NYC DCP, MapPLUTO

Photo ES-1 View of Development Site 1 looking East across Twelfth Avenue



Photo captured December 12, 2023

Photo ES-2 View of Development Site 1 looking North across West 54th Street



Photo captured December 12, 2023

Photo ES-3 Looking West along West 54th Street, Development Site 1 at Right



Photo captured December 12, 2023

Photo ES-4 Looking West along West 55th Street, Development Site 1 at Left



Photo captured December 12, 2023

Photo ES-5 View of Development Site 2, looking West across Eleventh Avenue



Photo captured December 12, 2023

Photo ES-6 Looking South along Eleventh Avenue, Development Site 2 at Right



Photo captured December 12, 2023

Photo ES-7 View of Development Site 2 looking North along Eleventh Avenue



Photo captured December 12, 2023

Photo ES-8 Looking Northeast along Eleventh Avenue, Development Site 2 at Left



Photo captured December 12, 2023

Neighborhood Context

The area surrounding the Project Area (within a radius of roughly 400 feet) is characterized by mid-rise, high-lot-coverage commercial and utilities buildings; high-rise residential and mixed-use development; and open space. Residential uses have been introduced to the area through recent development projects. This has consisted of high-rise residential developments such as the 44-story building at 827 Eleventh Avenue (constructed in 2015), the 38-story residential building at 601 West 57th Street (constructed in 2003), and the 43-story building at 625 West 57th Street (constructed in 2013). Nearby commercial uses include several large luxury auto dealership buildings that feature integrated service centers, such as the Jaguar dealership at 787 Eleventh Avenue on the eastern portion of Block 1102 and the Audi dealership at 802 Eleventh Avenue directly east of Development Site 2. Apart from several office and warehouse buildings scattered throughout the area, other notable commercial uses include the CBS Broadcasting Studio at 530 West 57th Street and the concert venue known as Terminal 5 (located directly west of Development Site 2 on Block 1103, partially within the Project Area). The New York City Department of Sanitation (DSNY) operates a garage and salt storage facility located north of the Project Area; the building spans Blocks 1103 and 1104 and extends over the roadbed of W 56th Street. Located directly south of Development Site 1 along West 54th Street, DeWitt Clinton Park is a 5.83-acre public park with sports fields, seating areas, a playground, and a dog park. A portion of the Hudson River Greenway, a linear open space along the Hudson River waterfront, is located to the west of the Project Area across Twelfth Avenue. This includes the portion of the park known as Clinton Cove.

Surrounding zoning districts include M1-5 light manufacturing; M2-3 and M2-4 intermediate manufacturing districts containing and directly surrounding the Project Area; and a mix of residential and commercial districts along Eleventh Avenue and to the east, including R8, R8A, and R9 residence districts and C2-5, C4-7, and C6-3X commercial districts. Dewitt Clinton Park is mapped as a park, while the waterfront west of Twelfth Avenue is zoned M2-3. The Project Area and its surroundings are located within the Special Clinton District, which was created to preserve and strengthen the residential character of a community bordering Midtown, maintain a broad mix of incomes, and ensure that the community is not adversely affected by new development.

Twelfth Avenue, located directly west of the Project Area, is an eight-lane, 150-foot-wide (Wide Street) arterial road that runs along the Hudson River waterfront. Eleventh Avenue, east of the Project Area, is a 100-foot-wide (Wide Street), one-way southbound street with four vehicle lanes, a separated bike lane, and on-street parking. West 54th Street is a 60-foot-wide (Narrow Street), one-way eastbound street with two vehicle lanes, a bike lane, and on-street parking on the north side. West 55th Street is a 60-foot-wide (Narrow Street), one-way westbound street with two vehicle lanes, a bike lane, and on-street parking. West 56th Street is a 60-foot-wide (Narrow Street), one-way eastbound street with two vehicle lanes and on-street parking. The Project Area is served by the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) New York City Transit (NYCT) M11, M12, M31, and M57 buses. The M11 bus runs south along Ninth Avenue and north along Tenth Avenue. The M12 bus runs north along Twelfth Avenue and south along Eleventh Avenue. The M31 bus operates along Tenth Avenue, Eleventh Avenue, West 54th Street, and West 57th Street near the development sites. The M57 bus operates along West 57th Street near the development sites. The nearest subway station is 59th Street – Columbus Circle, which is located half a mile east of the Project Area and is served by the A, C, B, D, and 1 lines.

Proposed Actions

To facilitate the Proposed Projects, the Applicants are seeking the following actions with respect to the Project Area and Hudson River Park:

- A zoning map amendment to Zoning Map 8c, consisting of:
  - (i) an amendment to rezone the Project Area Northern Portion from a M2-3 zoning district to a C4-7 zoning district. The proposed C4-7 (CL) (HRP) to be mapped over the Project Area Northern Portion would be bounded by Eleventh Avenue, West 56th Street, West 55th Street, and a line parallel to and 150 feet west of Eleventh Avenue;
  - (ii) an amendment to rezone the Project Area Southern Portion from a M2-4 zoning district to a C4-7 zoning district. The proposed C4-7 (CL) (HRP) to be mapped over the Project Area Southern Portion would be bounded by Twelfth Avenue, West 55th Street, West 54th Street, and a line parallel to and 175 feet east of Twelfth Avenue; and
  - (iii) an amendment to establish the Special Hudson River Park District on the Project Area, Pier 81/83, Pier 98,[1] and a portion of Chelsea Piers.[2] (Piers 81/83, Pier 98, and such portion of Chelsea Piers, collectively, the Granting Sites Rezoning Area).
- A zoning text amendment to the Zoning Resolution (ZR) of the City of New York, as amended, which consists of:
  - (i) an amendment to ZR Section 89-00, et seq. to
    - (a) designate the Granting Sites as "granting sites" as defined in ZR Section 89-02,
    - (b) designate the Receiving Sites as "receiving sites" as defined in ZR Section 89-02,
    - (c) modify ZR Section 89-11 to generally apply the use and bulk regulations of an M2-3 district to the Project Area Northern Portion and to generally apply the use and bulk regulations of M2-4 district to the Project Area Southern Portion,
    - (d) create ZR Section 89-13 to allow the use and bulk regulations of a C4-7 district and a maximum residential floor area ratio of 14.4 to apply to the Receiving Sites if subject to a special permit pursuant to ZR Section 89-21,
    - (e) modify ZR Section 89-11 to allow automobile dealers and all other motor vehicle dealers within the Receiving Sites to include repair services or preparation of vehicles for delivery;
    - (f) redesignate certain existing granting and receiving sites with new identifiers and make conforming modifications to ZR Section 89-12; and
  - (ii) an amendment to ZR Section 96-02 to clarify that the requirements of the Special Hudson River Park District apply to area that are within both the Special Clinton District and the Special Hudson River Park District; and
  - (iii) an amendment to ZR Appendix F to designate the Receiving Sites as MIH areas permitting MIH Options 1 and 2.

[1] The portion of Pier 98 onto which the Special HRP District would be established includes an additional portion of Manhattan Block 1109, Lot 25 adjacent to the Pier 98 Granting Site.

[2] The portion of Chelsea Piers onto which the Special HRP District would be established includes an additional portion of Manhattan Block 662, Lot 19 adjacent to the Chelsea Piers Granting Site.

› Zoning special permits pursuant to ZR Section 89-21 (Transfer of Floor Area from Hudson River Park) to transfer approximately 84,349 zsf of unused development rights from the Granting Sites to Development Site 1, and approximately 64,392 zsf of unused development rights from the Granting Sites to Development Site 2 (equivalent to approximately 2.40 FAR on each Development Site), and modify certain bulk regulations, including

- (i) minimum base height (ZR Sections 35-632, 35-24(a)(2)(ii), and 23-432) to allow a minimum base height of 20 feet along Twelfth Avenue and within 24 feet of Twelfth Avenue along West 54th and 55th Streets at Development Site 1, which is lower than the permitted 60 feet'
- (ii) maximum base height (ZR Sections 35-632, 35-24(a)(2)(ii), and 23-432) to allow a maximum base height of 177 feet along West 55th Street at Development Site 1, which is greater than the permitted 155 feet;
- (iii) minimum setback (ZR Sections 35-632, 35-24(a)(2)(ii), and 23-433) to allow a setback of 10 feet from West 54th Street at Development Site 1, less than the required 15-foot setback; and
- (iv) street wall (ZR Section 35-631(a)) to allow the portion of the street wall at Development Site 2 along Eleventh Avenue within 66 feet of West 55th Street to not be located at the street line.

In addition to the Proposed Actions, the Board of Directors of Hudson River Park Trust must approve the sale of the floor area from the Granting Sites. This approval requires a Signification Action process, as required by the Hudson River Park Act. In addition, the Applicants will seek separate Chairperson's Certifications pursuant to ZR Section 89-21(d) to allow building permits and certificates of occupancy to be issued for the Proposed Projects.

In addition, the project approvals would include establishment of an (E)-designation (E-869) on the development sites to codify restrictions related to hazardous materials, air quality, and noise; and a Restrictive Declaration (RD) that would be recorded against the development sites to codify restrictions and commitments made related to the environmental review.

Proposed Projects

As discussed above, the Applicants intend to construct two buildings—a 44-story, mixed-use residential and commercial building on Development Site 1 and a 38-story, mixed-use residential and commercial building on Development Site 2 (collectively, the Proposed Projects) (see **Figure ES-4** and **Photo ES-5**).

The building on Development Site 1 would contain a total of approximately 664,245 gsf (506,092 zsf), including up to approximately 529,581 gsf of residential space (617 DUs, of which 154 to 185 would be designated as permanently affordable pursuant to MIH) and 113,990 gsf of commercial auto dealership space. The building on Development Site 2 would contain a total of approximately 515,076 gsf (386,350 zsf), including up to approximately 410,353 gsf of residential space (477 DUs, of which 119 to 143 would be designated as permanently affordable pursuant to MIH) and 85,760 gsf of commercial auto dealership space.

The proposed building on Development Site 1 would rise to a maximum roof height of 550 feet (up to 590 feet with a 40-foot mechanical bulkhead). The maximum base height would be 177 feet along West 55th Street and 155 feet along West 54th Street, after which a 10-foot setback from West 54th

Street and a 15-foot setback from West 55th Street would be provided before reaching the maximum building height. The maximum base height along Twelfth Avenue would be 68 feet. The commercial use would occupy the first through third floors, and the residential use would occupy the fourth through 44th floors.

The proposed building on Development Site 2 would rise to a maximum roof height of 485 feet (up to 525 feet with a 40-foot mechanical bulkhead). The maximum base height would be 155 feet, after which a 10-foot setback from Eleventh Avenue and 15-foot setbacks from West 55th Street and West 56th Street would be provided before reaching the maximum building height. The commercial use would occupy the first through third floors, and the residential use would occupy the fourth through 38th floors.

In total, the Proposed Projects would contain approximately 1,179,321 gsf (892,442 zsf), including approximately 939,934 gsf (743,701 zsf) of residential floor area and 199,750 gsf (148,740.6 zsf) of commercial floor area across the two development sites (including 2,728 gsf of loading berth area for the proposed building on Development Site 1, and 1,471 gsf of loading berth area for the proposed building on Development Site 2). The proposed building on Development Site 1 would also contain approximately 20,674 gsf of mechanical floors and bulkhead, and the proposed building on Development Site 2 would contain 18,964 gsf of mechanical floors and bulkhead. The Proposed Projects would provide up to approximately 1,094 DUs, including a total of approximately 274 to 328 permanently affordable housing units, pursuant to applicable requirements of the City's MIH program. The Proposed Projects would not include any accessory parking.

Figure ES-4 Proposed Project Site Plan: Development Site 1



Figure ES-5 Proposed Project Site Plan: Development Site 2



Project Purpose and Need

As the Project Area is currently in M2-3 (CL) and M2-4 (CL) zoning districts, no residential uses are permitted as-of-right. The Proposed Actions would allow the Applicants to pursue mixed-use residential and commercial development by mapping a commercial C4-7 district, which has an R10 residential district equivalent. The Proposed Actions would allow for the development of new housing (including affordable housing, as discussed below) where it was not previously permitted—an area of Hell's Kitchen with a dense, mixed-use character at a location in close proximity to public open space that includes DeWitt Clinton Park and Hudson River Park. Given the existing housing crisis in New York City and the capacity of the Project Area and its surroundings to support new residential uses, the Proposed Actions would be appropriate land uses on both development sites, as compared to the No-Action scenario. In the opinion of the Applicants, development of the Proposed Projects would enliven the pedestrian experience within the Project Area by introducing new residential uses and would be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood by preserving the ability to operate auto dealership uses.

The Proposed Actions include zoning map amendments to map the Special Hudson River Park district on the Project Area and the portion of the Granting Sites not already mapped within the Special Hudson River Park District, zoning text amendments to identify granting and receiving sites within the Special HRP District, and zoning special permits under ZR Section 89-21 to transfer floor area from the designated Granting Sites to the Receiving Sites. Hudson River Park is a waterfront park on the Hudson River extending from Battery Park to 59th Street. The City Planning Commission (CPC) established the Special Hudson River Park District in 2016. As listed in ZR Section 89-00, the general purposes of the district include, among others, the following:

- "To facilitate the repair and rehabilitation of piers, bulkheads, and infrastructure within Hudson River Park, and to facilitate their maintenance and development, through the transfer of development rights;"
- "To promote an appropriate range of uses that complements Hudson River Park and, to the extent housing is included, to serve residents of varied income levels;" and
- "To promote the most desirable use of land and development in this area and thus to conserve the value of land and buildings and thereby protect the City's tax revenues."

The Proposed Actions would be consistent with the general purposes of the district. They would facilitate new development of a locally desirable mix of land uses—new housing and auto dealership space—both of which are prominent uses in the surrounding neighborhood. The new housing would include affordable housing serving a variety of income levels. The Proposed Actions would also facilitate the transfer of floor area from Hudson River Park to the development sites and thereby provide for the repair and rehabilitation of piers, bulkheads, and infrastructure in Hudson River Park.

The Proposed Actions also include mapping an MIH area coterminous with the proposed C4-7 (CL) (HRP) district. The proposed MIH area would ensure permanent affordability is included in the Proposed Projects. The most recent Statement of Needs for Manhattan Community Board 4 (Fiscal Year 2026) identified a lack of affordable housing as one of the three most pressing issues facing the Community District. The creation of affordable housing is also a goal of the Special HRP District. The proposed zoning text amendment to map an MIH area would be consistent with the affordable housing goals of the Community District, the Special HRP District, and the City of New York.

The Proposed Actions include a use-related zoning text amendment to allow auto showroom uses with repair and the preparation of motor vehicles for delivery as permitted uses in the Project Area. The text amendment is necessary to continue allowing auto showroom uses within the Project Area to include, as under the existing zoning, repair and preparation of motor vehicles for delivery.

Analysis Framework

Identification of Development Sites

Proposed Development Sites

Each of the Applicant-owned sites, Development Site 1 (Block 1102, Lot 11) and Development Site 2 (Block 1103, Lot 36), are development sites. In the future with the Proposed Actions, the Applicants intend to redevelop the sites with new high-rise residential buildings with commercial uses on the base three floors, as detailed above.

Remainder of Project Area

The Project Area would also include an approximately 3,300-sf portion of the 10,800-sf, non-Applicant-owned Block 1103, Lot 23, which is adjacent to and directly southeast of Development Site 2. Lot 23 contains a single two-story, 25,519-gsf commercial building occupied by a portion of the Terminal 5 music venue. However, pursuant to the proposed text amendment, the existing M2-3 district regulations would continue to apply to the rezoned portion of Lot 23. Accordingly, no development would occur on Lot 23 as a result of the Proposed Actions.

Analysis (Build) Year

The analysis year for the Proposed Actions is 2029. This analysis year is projected based on the Proposed Projects being completed and operational in 2029 following completion of the land use review process and Hudson River Park board approvals and transactions in 2026, and approximately 36 months of construction. Construction on both development sites would be completed concurrently in a single phase.

Reasonable Worst-Case Development Scenario

For the purpose of the environmental analyses, the No-Action condition represents the future absent the Proposed Actions and serves as the baseline by which approval of the Proposed Actions (or With-Action condition) are compared to determine the potential for significant environmental impacts. The difference between the No-Action and With-Action conditions represents the increment to be analyzed in the CEQR process.

Given the range of programs that could result from the Proposed Actions, two reasonable worst-case development scenarios (RWCDS) will be assessed to ensure conservative analyses. The Maximum Commercial Scenario will assess the Proposed Projects with a more conservative mix of commercial retail and office uses instead of auto dealership space. The Maximum Residential Scenario will assess a development scenario in which the Applicants instead maximize the residential floor area that

could be developed on each development site. The site plans for the Maximum Residential Scenario are provided below, in **Figure ES-6** and **Figure ES-7.**

- Maximum Commercial Scenario. In the Maximum Commercial Scenario, the Applicants would develop the Proposed Projects, but a modified mix of commercial uses is analyzed to ensure a conservative analysis. While the Proposed Projects would have auto dealership uses on floors 1-3 and residential uses above, where appropriate to ensure conservative analysis for technical areas where the potential effects of commercial uses would be greater than those of residential uses, a development scenario (the Maximum Commercial Scenario) will be analyzed in which floors 1-3 of the buildings are occupied by a mix of commercial retail and office space instead of auto dealership space.
- Maximum Residential Scenario. In the Maximum Residential Scenario, the Applicants would maximize the residential development potential of the development sites. The buildings would have additional residential floor area in the building base, rather than commercial use. The Maximum Residential Scenario will be analyzed in technical areas where increased residential density has the potential to produce more significant effects than the Maximum Commercial Scenario.

A single maximum building envelope (Maximum Envelope) will encompass both development scenarios for each Development Site. These Maximum Envelopes will be analyzed as the RWCDS for each building's bulk, height, and massing.

Future No-Action Condition

In the future without the Proposed Actions, it is anticipated that Development Site 1 would continue to be occupied by the existing auto dealership use, and the existing auto dealership space on Development Site 2 would be leased to new tenants. No changes would occur on the portion of non-Applicant-owned Block 1103, Lot 23 comprising the balance of the Project Area. In the No-Action scenario, no floor area would be transferred from Hudson River Park.

Future With-Action Condition

In the 2029 future with the Proposed Actions, the proposed zoning map amendments, text amendments, and special permits would be approved. The development sites would be redeveloped with either the Proposed Projects or the Maximum Residential Scenario, as described above.

To ensure a conservative analysis, the scenarios below (i.e., the Maximum Commercial Scenario and the Maximum Residential Scenario) will be analyzed where appropriate. These scenarios represent the RWCDS for the Proposed Actions.

Maximum Commercial Scenario

As with the Proposed Projects, under the Maximum Commercial Scenario, the Applicants would construct two new mixed-use buildings with residential towers, each on a three-story commercial base. Rather than three stories of auto dealership, however, the commercial uses in each building would include retail on the ground floor and office on the second and third floors. Under this scenario, Development Site 1 would be redeveloped with a new, 44-story, 664,245-gsf building with approximately 617 DUs, 65,364 gsf of commercial office space, and 48,626 gsf of ground-floor and cellar retail space, while Development Site 2 would be redeveloped with a new, 38-story, 515,076-gsf building with approximately 477 DUs, 47,350 gsf of commercial office space, and 38,410 gsf of

ground-floor and cellar retail space. The total number of DUs (1,094 DUs, of which 219 to 328 would be permanently affordable under MIH[3]) would be the same as in the Proposed Projects.

Maximum Residential Scenario

Under the Maximum Residential Scenario, the Applicants would construct two new mixed-use buildings containing ground-floor and cellar-level auto dealership space, with residential in lieu of auto dealership space on the second and third floors of both development sites. As such, Development Site 1 would be redeveloped with a new, 45-story, 671,815-gsf building with approximately 701 DUs and 50,118 gsf of auto dealership space, while Development Site 2 would be redeveloped with a new, 39-story, 522,558-gsf building with 541 DUs and 38,441 gsf of auto dealership space. The residential program under the Maximum Residential Scenario assumes a rate of 850 residential gsf per DU (above-grade), yielding 1,242 DUs, of which approximately 248 to 373 would be permanently affordable under MIH,[4] depending on the MIH options selected during the public review process.

[3] The number of affordable DUs reflects the possible range of affordability under MIH Option 1 (25 percent of residential floor area affordable to households at an average of 60 percent AMI), Option 2 (30 percent of residential floor area at an average of 80 percent AMI), and Option 3 (20 percent of residential floor area at an average of 40 percent AMI). Where applicable, the MIH Option that reflects the RWCDS for any given technical area will be analyzed to ensure a conservative analysis.

[4] See Footnote No.1.

Figure ES-6 Maximum Residential Scenario: Development Site 1



Figure ES-7 Maximum Residential Scenario: Development Site 2



Increment for Analysis

The program details and increments over the No-Action condition for the Proposed Projects, Maximum Residential Scenario, and Maximum Commercial Scenario are presented in **Table ES-1**.

~~Table ES-2~~Table ES-1 Future No-Action and With-Action Comparison

				Maximum Commercial Scenario[1]		Maximum Residential Scenario	
		Existing Condition	No-Action Condition	With-Action Condition	Increment	With-Action Condition	Increment
Auto Dealership (GSF)		210,180	210,180	0	-210,180	88,559[2]	-121,621
Commercial Retail (GSF)		0	0	87,036[2]	+87,036	0	0
Commercial Office (GSF)		0	0	112,714	+112,714	0	0
Residential	GSF	0	0	939,934	+939,934	1,066,176	+1,066,176
	GSF (Above-Grade)	*0*	*0*	*929,465*	*+929,465*	*1,055,707*	*+1,055,707*
	DUs	0	0	1,094	+1,094	1,242	+1,242
	Affordable DUs	*0*	*0*	*219 to 328*	*+219 to +328*	*248 to 373*	*+248 to +373*
Mechanical GSF		0	0	39,638	+39,638	39,638	+39,638
Total GSF		**210,180**	**210,180**	**1,179,321**	**+969,141**	**1,194,373**	**+1,194,373**
Population		0	0	1,838	+1,838	2,087	+2,087
Workers		40	65	756	+691	138	+73

Notes:
[1.] The Proposed Projects are similar to the Maximum Commercial Scenario, except that in lieu of commercial retail and office uses, the Proposed Projects would have 199,750 GSF of auto dealership use (an increment of -10,430 GSF).
[2.] Includes commercial loading area

Environmental Review Process

CEQR and SEQRA

CEQR is a process by which agencies review discretionary actions for the purpose of identifying the effects those actions may have on the environment. The City of New York established CEQR regulations in accordance with SEQRA. In addition, the City has published a guidance manual for environmental review, the *2025 CEQR Technical Manual*. The SEQRA and CEQR rules guide environmental review through the following steps:

› *Establish a Lead Agency.* Under CEQR, the "lead agency" is the public entity responsible for conducting environmental review. In accordance with CEQR rules, DCP is serving as the lead agency for environmental review.

› *Environmental Review and Determination of Significance.* The lead agency determines whether the proposed actions may have a significant impact on the environment. To do so, an Environmental Assessment Statement (EAS) must be prepared. This EAS is reviewed by the lead agency, which determines if the Proposed Actions and development have the potential to result in any significant adverse impacts on the environment. As the Proposed Actions are classified as

a "Type I Action" and the EAS identified the potential for significant adverse impacts on the environment in certain impact categories, an EIS is required and must be prepared and a determination of significance must be issued. A Positive Declaration was issued by DCP as lead agency on December 30, 2024.

- *Draft Scope of Work.* A Draft Scope of Work (DSOW) is required for the preparation of an EIS and contains a description of the Proposed Actions and the tasks that will be undertaken to analyze their potential environmental impact. The issuance of the DSOW on December 30, 2024 marked the beginning of the public comment period. The scoping process allows the public a voice in framing the scope of the EIS. The scoping document sets forth the analyses and methodologies that will be utilized to prepare the EIS. During the public comment period, those interested in reviewing the DSOW may do so and give their comments to the lead agency. The public, interested agencies, and elected officials were invited to comment on the DSOW, either in writing or orally, at a public scoping meeting, which was held on January 30, 2025.
- *Final Scope of Work.* Comments received during the scoping meeting and written comments received up to 10 days after the meeting (through 5:00 PM, Monday, February 10, 2025) were considered and incorporated, as appropriate, into the Final Scope of Work (FSOW). The FSOW incorporates all relevant comments made on the DSOW and revise the extent or methodologies of the studies, as appropriate, in response to comments made during the CEQR scoping process. The FSOW was issued on December 12, 2025.
- *Draft EIS.* The Draft EIS (DEIS) was prepared in accordance with the FSOW. Once the lead agency deemed the DEIS to be complete, the document was made available for public review and comment. A public hearing was held on the DEIS in conjunction with the CPC hearing on the land use applications, on April 1, 2026, to afford all interested parties the opportunity to submit oral and written comments. The period for submitting written comments remained open through 5:00 PM on Monday, April 13, 2026.
- *Final EIS.* At the close of the public review period, a Final EIS (FEIS) was prepared. Comments made on the DEIS were responded to and incorporated into the FEIS, as appropriate. Once the lead agency certifies that the FEIS is complete, it issues a Notice of Completion (NOC) describing the FEIS, the project, and how to obtain copies of the FEIS. The lead and any involved agencies must allow at least ten (10) calendar days after the publication of the NOC to consider the findings in the FEIS before a decision is made. To demonstrate that the responsible City decision-maker has taken a hard look at the impacts, alternatives, and mitigation measures, the lead and each involved agency must adopt a formal set of written findings, known as a "Statement of Findings," setting forth its decision regarding the action it will take and drawing its conclusions about any significant adverse environmental impacts and how to avoid or mitigate them. Each lead or involved agency is responsible for its own Statement of Findings; once each adopts its findings, the CEQR process is concluded, and the agencies may then take their actions.

Principal Conclusions of Environmental Analysis

Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy

A detailed Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy analysis was conducted and concluded that the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts on land use, zoning, or public policy.

Land Use and Zoning

In both Maximum Commercial Scenario and Maximum Residential Scenario, the Proposed Actions would result in an expansion of existing land uses in the study area, leading to greater bulk and density than currently exists on Development Sites 1 and 2. Residential uses would be permitted on both development sites. The addition of the residential use would be compatible with the surrounding Hell's Kitchen Neighborhood and CL with access to public transportation and open space. Additionally, the increased bulk and density facilitated by the Proposed Actions would be compatible to the existing uses and consistent with the current development trends in the study area. The Proposed Actions would not conflict with the current zoning or existing uses within the surrounding area. Rather, the Proposed Actions would facilitate developments that would be compatible with the current built environment and the existing zoning framework within the study area. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not adversely affect surrounding land uses or zoning.

Public Policy

In both Maximum Commercial Scenario and Maximum Residential Scenario, the Proposed Actions would be supportive of several City policies, including the goals set forth in Clinton Urban Renewal Area and CL, Hudson River Waterfront Revitalization Initiative, ~~Housing New York 2.0, OneNYC 2050, Housing Our Neighbors~~City housing policies, and the Waterfront Revitalization Program (WRP). The Proposed Actions would facilitate more housing developments including affordable housing to the Hell's Kitchen neighborhood and CL. The additional funding from this project would help facilitate the repair and rehabilitation of Hudson River Park while promoting desirable land use including residential and commercial in this area, on currently underutilized lots. The proposed mixed-use developments in both Maximum Commercial Scenario and Maximum Residential Scenario would bring 24/7 mixed-use developments to the neighborhood. Neither Development Site is waterfront adjacent or located within 2050s 1% Annual Chance Floodplain. Development Site 1 is partially within a moderate risk flood zone with a 0.2% annual chance or greater of being met in any year; development on the Development Site 1 would be built to Appendix G Building Code standard as described throughout the WRP Policy response sections. The Proposed Actions would be consistent with WRP policies by supporting commercial and residential redevelopments in appropriate Coastal Zone areas, protecting ecological systems and water quality within the New York City coastal area, minimizing negative impacts on public health from hazardous materials, increasing climate resilience, and enhancing the public waterfront access (WRP# 23-225).

Socioeconomic Conditions

A preliminary analysis of indirect residential displacement assessment was conducted and determined that the Proposed Actions would have no significant adverse impacts related to socioeconomic conditions.

The Proposed Actions under the Maximum Residential Scenario would result in the development of up to 1,242 dwelling units (DUs) (including approximately 248 to 373 permanently affordable DUs pursuant to Mandatory Inclusionary Housing [MIH] regulations), introducing an estimated 2,087 people on the development sites. Since development under the Proposed Actions would result in an increase in the residential population of the quarter-mile study area by 12.8 percent compared to the 2029 No-Action condition (an increase of greater than five percent), a half-mile study area was used for the assessment of indirect residential displacement, per *CEQR Technical Manual* guidance.

The 2020 residential population of the half-mile study area was 54,305 per the 2020 US Census (adjusted to 55,176 when taking into account development since 2020), while the 2022 median household income was $105,056 (per the 2018-2022 American Community Survey [ACS] five-year estimates), higher than that of Manhattan and New York City as a whole. ~~The analysis found that third-quartile rents in the study area are roughly $4,000 for studios, $5,800 for one-bedroom units, $8,600 for two-bedroom units, and $15,000 for three-bedroom units.~~

In the No-Action condition, anticipated residential development projects would increase the study-area population to 56,416. In the future With-Action condition, the Proposed Actions would result in 2,087 residents being added to the study area population, further increasing the population of the half-mile study area to 58,503, a 3.7-percent increase compared to the No-Action condition. ~~MIH Option 3 is assumed for the purpose of a conservative analysis. Under Option 3, 20 percent of residential floor area (equivalent to approximately 248 DUs) would be set aside for residents with incomes averaging 40 percent Area Median Income (AMI). Anticipated affordable rents and average household size were used to estimate the average household income for the residents of the affordable units at $47,723, while observed third-quartile market rents and unit sizes in the study area were used to estimate the average household income for residents of the market-rate units at $298,733. The weighted average income for residents of all incremental units was estimated to be $248,531. This is higher than the average household income for the study area of $105,056.~~

~~Though the estimated weighted average incomes of the new population are expected to be higher than the average incomes of the study area populations, the estimated new population would represent an increase of less than five percent over No-Action conditions (approximately 3.7 percent). This level of population increase~~Per the *CEQR Technical Manual*, this level of population increase, below 5 percent, would not be expected to introduce or accelerate a trend leading to the displacement of vulnerable populations or create a significant indirect residential displacement adverse impact. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would have no significant adverse impacts related to socioeconomic conditions.

Community Facilities and Services

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts on Community Facilities and Services. Detailed analyses of potential indirect effects on public elementary and intermediate schools, public libraries, and publicly funded early childhood programs were conducted for the Proposed Actions. The Proposed Actions would not introduce a sizeable new population to the neighborhood, nor would it displace or alter the existing healthcare facilities and police and fire protective services. Therefore, significant adverse impacts to healthcare facilities and police and fire protective services ~~are~~would not ~~anticipated~~occur, and further analysis of those facilities is not warranted.

Indirect Effects on Public Schools

The Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact to public schools. As the Proposed Actions would generate over ~~50~~100 elementary and intermediate school students, further analysis of public elementary and intermediate schools is warranted and provided below. However, as the Proposed Actions would not introduce 150 or more high school students, no significant adverse impact to high schools would occur, and no further analysis is warranted.

Following the methodologies in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the study area for the analysis of elementary and intermediate schools is the school districts' "subdistrict" (also known as a "region" or

"school planning zone") in which the Project Area is located, specifically Subdistrict 3 of Community School District (CSD) 2.

Under the With-Action condition, the utilization rate of elementary schools would not exceed 100 percent, nor would the Proposed Actions generate more than 100 elementary-school-aged students. While the utilization rate for intermediate schools would be greater than 100 percent under the With-Action condition, the Proposed Actions would not generate more than 100 intermediate-school-aged students. Therefore, based on *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts to elementary and intermediate schools.

Indirect Effects on Early Childhood Programs

The Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact on publicly funded early childhood programs.

As compared to the No-Action condition, in the With-Action condition the Proposed Actions would result in the incremental development of approximately 1,242 dwelling units (DUs) to the Project Area, of which 373 units are intended to be affordable for non-senior households with incomes up to 80 percent of area median income (AMI). Based on the multipliers for estimating the number of children eligible for early childhood programs according to the New York City Department of Education (DOE), the Proposed Actions are anticipated to generate the need for approximately 43 childcare slots.

Based on a detailed analysis, early childhood programs in the study area would be under capacity with a surplus of 149 slots in the With-Action condition. The utilization rate would be 80.6 percent, and the change in utilization rate would be 5.6 percent. Since the collective utilization rate for early childhood programs would be less than 100 percent in the future with the Proposed Actions, the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact on publicly funded early childhood programs

Indirect Effects on Libraries

The Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact on public libraries. There are three New York Public Library (NYPL) branches within 0.75 mile of the Project Area—the New York Public Library of the Performing Arts, Riverside Library, and Columbus Library. For purposes of a conservative assessment, this analysis assumed that projected residents in the With-Action Condition would only use the Columbus Library, which is the closest library to the Project Area. As stated in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a significant adverse impact would occur if a proposed project would increase the population of the library catchment area by 5 percent or more and this increase would impair the delivery of library services in the study area. The catchment area population would increase by 1.68 percent from the No-Action to With-Action condition and the holdings per resident would decrease from 0.287 in the No-Action condition to 0.282 in the With-Action condition. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact on public libraries

Open Space

The Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse impacts with respect to open space resources.

Direct Effects

The open space analysis reveals that the Proposed Actions would not cause a significant adverse direct impact on open space resources. They also would not result in any significant adverse effects related to shadows, urban design and visual resources, air quality, noise, or other environmental impacts that could affect the usability of open spaces in the study area condition (see **Chapter 6, Shadows**; **Chapter 7, Urban Design and Visual Resources**; **Chapter 11, Air Quality**; and **Chapter 13, Noise**). According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a project is considered to have a significant adverse direct impact on open space resources if it directly displaces or alters existing open spaces within the study area in a way that negatively affects current users. The Proposed Actions would not physically displace any existing open space resources, nor would it alter their current uses.

Indirect Effects

The analysis concludes that upon completion, the Proposed Projects would not result in a significant adverse indirect impact on either passive or active open space within the non-residential quarter-mile study area or the residential half-mile study area.

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a proposed project may have a significant adverse indirect impact on open space resources if it significantly reduces the open space ratio (OSR), thereby overburdening existing facilities or exacerbating a deficiency in open space. Given that the Proposed Actions are anticipated to introduce approximately 2,087 residents (under the Maximum Residential Scenario) and 691 workers (under the Maximum Commercial Scenario) compared to the No-Action condition, an open space analysis for both the non-residential quarter-mile study area and the residential half-mile study area was conducted in accordance with *CEQR Technical Manual* guidance.

In the With-Action condition in the non-residential quarter-mile study the passive OSR would remain above the City's guideline ratio of 0.15 acre per 1,000 workers at 0.19. As such, the Proposed Actions are not expected to result in an overburdening of existing facilities or exacerbate a deficiency in open space. Therefore, no significant adverse impact ~~is anticipated~~would occur in the non-residential quarter-mile study area as a result of the Proposed Actions.

In terms of the residential population, under With-Action conditions, the total OSR in the half-mile study area would remain below the City's guideline of 2.5 acres per 1,000 residents, at approximately 0.55 acre per 1,000 residents, with an active OSR of approximately 0.19 acre per 1,000 residents (compared to the CEQR guideline of 2 acres), and a passive OSR of approximately 0.36 acres per 1,000 residents (compared to the CEQR guideline of 0.5 acres). The total OSR within the residential half-mile study area is projected to decrease by approximately 3.50 percent, whereas the active and passive OSRs are expected to decrease by approximately 3.55 and 3.48 percent, respectively. As this area is below the median OSR, it has the potential to exceed the percent change that signifies a possible adverse open space impact for total, active, and passive open space in the residential study area.

However, despite the residential study area having open space ratios below the City's guidelines and exceeding the percent change that signifies a possible adverse impact as described below, there are numerous additional open spaces within a half mile of the development sites that are not included in the quantitative analysis, including Hell’s Kitchen Park, Gutenberg Playground, Damrosch Park, and Lincoln Center Plaza. These spaces would reduce the burden on open spaces in the study area. Additionally, Riverside Park, located north of the development sites, is a 222-acre regional open space. The quantitative assessment only includes the 7.46-acre portion of the park within Census Tract 151.02 that lies in the residential study area. Nevertheless, residents of the proposed buildings

and the surrounding area will have access to the entire park, which offers a wide range of recreational activities such as hiking trails, handball, basketball, pickleball, and tennis courts, as well as soccer and baseball fields, and playgrounds. Additionally, Central Park, an iconic urban oasis, is just a 15-minute walk from the development sites, offering a vast array of recreational opportunities such as running and biking paths, playgrounds, and expansive grassy areas, further enhancing the availability and quality of open spaces for local residents. The Proposed Actions would also provide on-site resident amenity spaces with a mix of active and passive recreational uses, which would help meet project-generated demand on-site. In addition, Pier 76 is currently proposed, though plans are not finalized, to include public parkland and open space which would help absorb project-generated demand. Furthermore, open spaces in the study area contain a mix of passive and active resources and were generally found to be in fair to excellent condition. with the exception of two open spaces. These open spaces experience varying levels of utilization, from low to heavy, but are still expected to have capacity to serve new residents generated in the With-Action condition. Given these factors, the residential study area population would still have access to active and passive recreational opportunities, both within and outside of the development sites, ensuring no significant open space impacts due to the Proposed Actions.

Shadows

A detailed shadows analysis was conducted and determined that the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact related to shadows. Because future development on the development sites is expected to exceed ~~50~~250 feet in height, the CEQR threshold for a shadows analysis, Tier 1 through Tier 3 and detailed shadows analyses were undertaken for the Proposed Actions. Several sunlight-sensitive resources were identified within the potential Tier 3 shadow sweep that were advanced to a detailed analysis. These resources consist of four open space resources: DeWitt Clinton Park (O1), Hudson River Greenway (O2), Pier 96 at Hudson River Park (O3), and Pier 97 at Hudson River Park (O4), and one natural resource, the Hudson River (N1).

A detailed analysis was conducted for the resources that could receive incremental shadow on one or more of the analysis days. For the open space resources that were studied in the detailed shadows assessment, incremental shadows would be of limited duration and would occur on spaces that either receive uninterrupted sunlight during other periods of the analysis day or on spaces that do not receive uninterrupted sunlight under existing conditions. Thus, it was determined that incremental shadows would not adversely impair the public's enjoyment of the space or the viability of vegetation of these resources. Additionally, incremental shading would occur over limited portions of the Hudson River for brief periods of time during the morning hours, and the effects of incremental shadows on resident organisms within this natural resource would be minimal, temporary, and of limited duration. Further, any wildlife present in the area is tolerant of urban conditions and as incremental shadows on the Hudson River would be long, narrow, and fast-moving, no area of the Hudson River would be permanently in shade or shaded to a degree that would impact aquatic biota as a result of incremental shadows. Based on the foregoing, no adverse impacts to sunlight sensitive resources would occur due to shadows from future development under the Proposed Actions.

Urban Design and Visual Resources

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts to urban design or visual resources.

Urban Design

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts to urban design at either the Project Area or within in the study area. The development sites would include two new mixed-use towers, which would increase the area's density and diversify its land uses while seamlessly blending with the existing architectural context. Ground-floor commercial spaces would activate the streetscape, fostering a more engaging and pedestrian-friendly environment. The proposed development would maintain the cohesive street wall, ensuring visual harmony. The project's emphasis on urban design, coupled with consistent architectural treatments and setbacks, would enhance the pedestrian experience without disrupting the flow of traffic. Additionally, the Proposed Actions would support the transfer of floor area from the Granting Sites to the development sites, allowing for the maintenance and improvement of piers, bulkheads, and infrastructure within Hudson River Park.

Visual Resources

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse effects on visual resources either at the Project Area or within the study area.

The proposed building envelopes would not affect views of the Hudson River, a visual resource in the study area. Both Development Sites 1 and 2 are designed to align seamlessly with the lot line, merging smoothly with the existing street layout and preserving the characteristic street wall of the neighborhood. As a result, pedestrian views from the sidewalks and roadways within the study area would remain unobstructed.

The proposed building envelopes would integrate harmoniously with the existing street grid of Hell's Kitchen, upholding the visual corridors along the roadways. Development Site 1 would not block views, as it fits within the existing grid and is surrounded by tall buildings that already restrict visibility. Similarly, Development Site 2 would not impact views of the Hudson River, as these views are already largely obstructed by the DSNY building on West 56th Street and other structures from West 55th Street. The dense urban environment and limited view corridors to the river from sidewalks along West 54th, West 56th, and West 57th Streets further diminish the likelihood of visual impacts. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse effects on visual resources either at the Project Area or within the study area.

Hazardous Materials

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts with respect to hazardous materials with the placement of an E-designation (E-869) on Development Sites 1 and 2.

The Phase I Environmental Site Assessments (ESAs) identified a Recognized Environmental Condition (REC) and several Business Environmental Risks (BERs) at the development sites. Potential impacts relating to this condition would be reduced or eliminated through subsurface investigation and, if applicable, remediation on Development Site 1 (Manhattan Block 1102, Lot 11) and Development Site 2 (Manhattan Block 1103, Lot 36). A Phase II Environmental Site Investigation (ESI) Work Plan was prepared for each Developmental Site and approved by the New York City Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) on May 22, 2025.

A subsurface Phase II ESI for Development Site 2 was conducted between June 27 and June 30, 2025 in accordance with the DEP-approved Phase II ESI Work Plan. Based on the findings of the Phase II

ESI, it is anticipated that remedial measures would include the proper handling and off-site disposal of historic urban fill materials and soil vapor mitigation. An E-designation would be placed on Development Site 2 (E-869) as the mechanism for managing any future need for hazardous materials remediation.

~~Implementation of the~~ A subsurface Phase II ESI for Development Site 1 was conducted between October 26 and October 29, 2025, in accordance with the DEP-approved Phase II ESI Work Plan ~~for Development Site 1 has not occurred as of yet since~~. Based on the ~~existing tenant at the site has denied access for further site investigations due to concerns~~findings of the Phase II ESI, it's anticipated that ~~testing~~remedial measures would ~~disrupt and negatively impact business operations~~include the proper handling and off-site disposal of historic urban fill materials and soil vapor mitigation. As such, an E-designation would also be placed on Development Site 1 (E-869) as the mechanism for managing any future need for hazardous materials remediation.

The subsurface investigation and remedial activities, if required, for both Development Site 1 and Development Site 2 would be under the administration of the New York City Office of Environmental Remediation (OER).

In addition to the above, regulatory requirements pertaining to building materials containing ACM, LBP and/or PCBs would be addressed under standard demolition/~~renovation~~remediation procedures. With the implementation of the above measures, there would be no significant adverse impacts with respect to hazardous materials.

Water and Sewer Infrastructure

The Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse water and sewer infrastructure impacts.

The proposed developments are located in a combined sewer system area of New York City. The ~~incremental development~~ Proposed Actions would exceed the threshold ~~exceeds 250~~of 1,000 ~~square feet,~~ incremental residential units, therefore, the ~~*2021 City Environmental Quality Review*~~*CEQR Technical Manual* warrants a water and sewer infrastructure analysis.

The Proposed Actions would result in a total daily water demand of approximately 0.23 million gallons per day (mgd). Since the Proposed Actions would not exceed the threshold of 1 mgd, no further analysis of the water supply system is warranted, and the Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse impacts on the water supply.

The total volume of sanitary runoff and stormwater generated by the Proposed Actions as part of the combined sewer system would discharge into the North River Water Resource Recovery Facility (WRRF). This WRRF has a State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (SPDES)-permitted dry weather flow capacity of 170 mgd. The average monthly flow to North River WRRF over a 12-month period is 115 mgd. As part of the stormwater assessment below, the change in wastewater flow volumes to the combined sewer system during a stormwater event under With-Action conditions is expected to result in a total generation of up to 0.073 MG over the No-Action total volume. This incremental increase in combined sewage flow would represent an estimated 0.04 percent of the North River WRRF's SPDES-permitted capacity. The projected increase in combined sewage would not cause the North River WRRF to exceed its operational capacity or SPDES-permitted capacity. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse combined sewage impacts.

The Project Area is served by one storm sewer outfall—Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) Outfall NRS-035. The Proposed Actions would incorporate best management practices (BMPs) that would be required in accordance with the NYCDEP Unified Stormwater Rule (USWR) guidelines, which include requirements for bringing the development sites into compliance with the allowable stormwater release rate. To achieve the release rate, stormwater would be managed by utilizing one or a combination of detention techniques. Green infrastructure technologies and subsurface detention would be implemented to retain or release stormwater with slowed discharge rates to control peak runoff rates. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse stormwater impacts.

Transportation

The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts to transportation, including traffic and transit (buses) conditions.

Traffic

The Proposed Actions would generate a net increase of 161 vehicles per hour (vph) (74 "ins" and 87 "outs") in the weekday AM peak hour, 139 vph (71 "ins" and 68 "outs") in the weekday PM peak hour, and 157 vph (83 "ins" and 74 "outs") in the Saturday peak hour. The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse traffic impacts at one intersection—Twelfth Avenue/New York Route 9A and West 55th Street—during the Saturday peak hour; the Proposed Actions would not result significant traffic impacts during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. The identification and evaluation of traffic capacity improvements needed to mitigate the Saturday peak hour impact are presented in **Chapter 18, Mitigation**.

Parking

The Proposed Actions are expected to generate a peak parking demand of 191 parking spaces during the weekday overnight period and 194 parking spaces during the Saturday overnight period. The area within a quarter-mile radius of the development sites (an approximately 5-minute walk) currently contains 2,531 off-street parking spaces. The With-Action condition analysis determined that there would be sufficient off-street parking availability to accommodate the increased parking demand.

Subways

Subway station elements at the station located closest to the development sites—the 59th Street-Columbus Circle subway station—were analyzed during the commuter peak hours. In total, 15 stairs, one fare control and two escalators, located along the southern section of the subway station, were analyzed. The analysis determined that these subway station elements would operate at acceptable levels of service during both the weekday AM and PM commuter peak hours under the With-Action condition and the Proposed Actions would not result in significant subway impacts.

Buses

Bus line haul analyses were conducted for three bus routes (the M12, M31, and M57) during the AM and PM peak hours. The With-Action condition analysis determined that there would be significant impacts due to projected service shortfalls on the M12 bus route in the northbound and southbound

directions during the PM peak hour, and on the M57 bus route in the eastbound direction during the AM peak hour. There would be sufficient capacity for the M31 bus route during both peak hours, the M12 bus route in the AM peak hour and the M57 bus route in the westbound direction during the AM peak hour, and in both directions during the PM peak hour.

Pedestrians

Pedestrian analyses were performed for ten sidewalk elements, eight crosswalk elements, and 14 corner elements at key intersections for the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday peak hours. The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts at any of the 32 pedestrian elements analyzed.

Vehicular and Pedestrian Safety

Crash data were reviewed for the nine traffic and pedestrian analysis intersections comprising the traffic study area. One of these intersections (i.e., Eleventh Avenue at West 57th Street) was identified as a high-crash location according to the ~~*2021 *~~*CEQR Technical Manual* criteria. However, the increase in traffic volumes during the four analysis peak hours is generally considered modest and would not be expected to contribute materially to safety conditions at this intersection.

Air Quality

The air quality analysis addressed emissions from mobile sources, HVAC and hot water systems, industrial sources and large or major sources, and determined that the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts related to air quality.

Mobile Source Analyses

A mobile source intersection screening analysis was conducted for pollutants carbon monoxide (CO) and particulate matter (PM). The number of project-generated trips and equivalent heavy-duty diesel vehicles (HDDVs) would be below the CEQR thresholds for CO and $PM_{2.5}$, respectively. Additionally, the number of incremental parking spaces would be below the CEQR threshold that requires a parking analysis. Therefore, no adverse air quality impacts ~~are expected~~would result from the mobile sources generated by the Proposed Projects.

Furthermore, an analysis of atypical sources was conducted to assess the potential for impact from vehicles emissions along Route 9A on the Proposed Projects. The analysis of this source showed that emissions from vehicles traveling along Route 9A would not produce concentrations at Development Site 1 that exceed the NAAQS.

HVAC and Hot Water Analysis

An HVAC and hot water systems screening analysis was conducted using the *CEQR Technical Manual* guidance. The Maximum Residential Scenario passed the HVAC and hot water screening nomographs provided by the *CEQR Technical Manual*. The Maximum Residential Scenario was analyzed as it was the more conservative scenario due to its increased square footage. To ensure that there are no significant adverse air quality impacts with respect to stationary sources (HVAC and hot water systems), there would be an (E)-Designation (E-869) placed on the development sites.

Industrial Source Analysis

An analysis of existing light industrial/manufacturing uses within 400 feet of the Proposed Projects was conducted. The analysis determined that no adverse air quality impacts would not result from these types of sources on the Proposed Projects.

Large or Major Source Analysis

An analysis of large and/or major sources within 1,000 feet of the Proposed Projects was conducted. The analysis of nearby major sources located at the ConEdison West 59th Street facility found that concentrations at the proposed buildings from emissions of the plant's boilers and combustion turbine would be less than the NAAQS.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The Proposed Actions would be consistent with the applicable City greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction and climate change goals, and there would be no significant adverse GHG emission or climate change impacts as a result of the Proposed Actions.

Following the methodology provided in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, it is estimated that the Proposed Actions would result in approximately 4,346 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO_2e) emissions from its annual operations under the Maximum Residential Scenario and 4,186 metric tons under the Maximum Commercial Scenario. The Proposed Actions would result in 2,930 metric tons a year of CO_2e emissions from mobile sources under the worst-case traffic scenario. This represents less than 0.02 percent of the city's overall 2022 GHG emissions of 53.7 million metric tons.

Future development at the development sites under With-Action conditions will comply with the ~~2020~~2025 Energy Conservation Construction Code of New York State and ~~2020~~2025 New York City Energy Conservation Code, which govern performance requirements of heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems, as well as the exterior building envelope of new buildings. As a result, future development at the development sites will comply with the Local Law 97 requirements and will contribute towards the NYC GHG reduction goals.

Since Development Site 1 is located within the 1 percent annual chance floodplain by the 2050s, the potential effects of global climate change have been considered and are presented in **Appendix A: Waterfront Revitalization Program Consistency Assessment**. The assessment considers the effects of climate change on rising sea levels, storm surge, and coastal flooding resulting from the Proposed Actions. As detailed in **Appendix A**, it was determined that the Proposed Actions would be supportive of Policy 6.2 of the New York City Waterfront Revitalization Program (WRP). Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in adverse ~~impacts to~~ climate change ~~are not anticipated as a result of the Proposed Actions~~impacts.

Noise

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts with respect to noise. A noise assessment was conducted to determine whether the Proposed Actions would significantly increase sound levels from mobile and stationary sources at existing noise receptors within the vicinity of the Project Area, and if the new noise receptors that would be introduced by the Proposed Actions would be in an acceptable ambient sound level environment.

Predicted With-Action L_{eq} noise levels at the six analyzed receptor sites would range from 66.5 to 77.8 dBA. With-Action sound levels are expected to increase by up to 0.5 dBA over No-Action levels. Since noise increases at all locations are less than 3 dBA, the Proposed Actions would not result in a doubling of noise PCEs. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse noise impact due to mobile sources.

The Proposed Actions are not anticipated to introduce 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 L10 sound levels, a minimum outdoor-to-indoor window/wall sound attenuation of 37 dBA is required for the western façade facing Twelfth Avenue, on the southern façade facing W 54th Street within 50 feet of Twelfth Avenue and on the northern façade facing W 55th Street within 50 feet of Twelfth Avenue, 28 dBA window/wall attenuation is required on the remaining southern façade facing W 54th Street and on the eastern façade facing Eleventh Avenue within 50 feet of W 54th Street, and 31 dBA window/wall attenuation is required on the remaining northern façade facing W 55th Street and on the eastern façade facing Eleventh Avenue within 50 feet of W 55th Street; and at Development Site 2, a minimum outdoor-to-indoor window/wall sound attenuation of 31 dBA is required on northern façade facing W 56tth Street, on the western façade facing Twelfth Avenue within 50 feet of W 56th Street, on the eastern façade facing Eleventh Avenue, and on the southern façade facing W 55th Street within 50 feet within Eleventh Ave, and 28 dBA window/wall attenuation on the remaining southern facing W 55th Street and on the western façade facing Twelfth Avenue within 50 feet of W 55th Street. To implement the attenuation requirements described above, an (E) Designation (E-869) for noise would be applied to the development sites specifying the appropriate amount of window/wall attenuation and the need for alternate means of ventilation. With the implementation of the attenuation requirements described above, no significant adverse noise impacts related to building attenuation would occur as a result of the Proposed Actions.

Public Health

The Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse public health impacts as defined in the *CEQR Technical Manual*. During operation, the Proposed Actions would not result in unmitigated significant adverse impacts in the areas of air quality, noise, water quality, or hazardous materials. While significant adverse noise impacts could occur during construction, these would be temporary impacts resulting from conditions that are common during the construction of high-rise buildings in New York City. Excessive noise can affect health through the disruption of sleep or hearing. While noise during the construction period would reach applicable impact thresholds at several receptors, these thresholds are based on quality-of-life considerations as opposed to public health considerations. Noise levels during the construction period would not be high enough to constitute a public health concern. Therefore, construction of the Proposed Project would not result in chronic exposure to high levels of noise, prolonged exposure to noise levels above 85 dBA, or episodic and unpredictable exposure to short-term impacts of noise at high decibel levels. Consequently, construction of the Proposed Project would not result in a significant adverse public health impact.

Neighborhood Character

The Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact to neighborhood character. As outlined in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the assessment of neighborhood character is based on the impacts on the defining features of the neighborhood and potential impacts found in other technical areas. The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts in the technical areas of land use, zoning and public policy; socioeconomic conditions; community facilities and services; open space; historic and cultural resources; urban design and visual resources; shadows; or noise. The Proposed Actions would result in significant impacts to transportation (traffic and bus services). Therefore, a preliminary assessment of neighborhood character is provided. The Proposed Actions would result in the development of new, mixed-use buildings under both scenarios, each of which would include affordable housing and align with the Hell's Kitchen trend towards residential and mixed-use development without significantly affecting the neighborhood's defining features or existing open spaces. New development under the Proposed Actions would enhance the pedestrian experience and preserve visual corridors while supporting Hudson River Park maintenance. Regarding the impact on bus services, the resulting condition would not result in service conditions that would be out of character with the surrounding neighborhood. As such, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts on neighborhood character.

Construction

The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse traffic and noise impacts as a result of construction activities.

Governmental oversight of construction in New York City is extensive and involves a number of City, State, and Federal agencies, each with specific areas of responsibility. Construction at the development sites would be subject to government regulations and oversight described below in Construction Regulations and General Practices and would employ the general construction practices described below. Construction of the Proposed Projects would also comply with the requirements of the New York City Noise Control Code.

Transportation

Traffic

Activities related to construction would generate construction worker and delivery trips. To assess the potential for construction traffic impacts that may result from construction of the Proposed Projects, 11 key intersections in the study area were analyzed. Construction activities would be highest during the third quarter of 2028 (Q3 2028) and would generate approximately 205 construction worker auto trips and 24 construction truck trips during the AM construction peak hour, and 205 construction worker auto trips and six construction truck trips during the PM construction peak hour. Construction trucks would be required to use New York City Department of Transportation (NYCDOT)-designated truck routes to travel to the Project Area and would then use local streets to access the construction site entrances.

Significant construction traffic impacts were identified at two of the eleven intersections analyzed during the AM construction peak hour and five intersections during the PM construction peak hour. Standard traffic capacity improvements typically implemented by NYCDOT, such as signal timing modifications, could fully mitigate the significant traffic impacts at four of the five intersections

during the PM construction peak hour (refer to **Chapter 18, Mitigation**). Significant traffic impacts during both construction peak hours to the intersection of Twelfth Avenue and West 55th Street and at the intersection of Eleventh Avenue and West 56th Street during the AM construction peak hour, would result in significant traffic impacts that could not be mitigated (refer to **Chapter 18, Mitigation**, and **Chapter 21, Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts**). These significant traffic impacts are primarily due to the reduction of West 55th Street's travel lanes approaching Twelfth Avenue from three lanes to two lanes, and the reduction of West 56th Street's travel lanes approaching Eleventh Avenue from two lanes to one lane, to facilitate construction activities and protect pedestrian traffic,

Parking

Construction workers would generate an estimated maximum daily parking demand of 228 spaces during the Q3 2028 peak quarter. This parking demand could be accommodated by off-street parking supply within a one-quarter mile radius of the Project Area. A parking utilization survey was conducted, and it is anticipated that there would be approximately 1,198 spaces available during the weekday midday period in the future condition which would be sufficient to accommodate the construction worker parking demand.

Transit and Pedestrians

Based on modal split information from a 2006 survey of construction workers for the New York Times Building in Midtown Manhattan, it is anticipated that approximately 71 percent of construction workers would commute to the Project Area by public transportation. During Q3 2028 when construction worker volumes would be highest, approximately 1,605 construction workers would be expected to be working on the site, of which approximately 1,141 workers would be expected to use public transportation or walk to travel to the construction sites. It is expected that the majority of construction workers (90 percent) would arrive during the AM construction peak hour and depart during the PM construction peak hour, and they would generate approximately 1,027 construction worker trips by public transportation or walking during the AM and PM construction peak hours. These construction-related transit trips would occur outside of the peak periods of transit ridership and would be distributed to the nearby transit facilities. Construction-related transit trips would also be notably lower than during the operational peak hours. Therefore, the effects of construction-related transit trips on transit would be more moderate and are likely to be confined to the same or fewer locations as compared to the Proposed Projects' operational condition. As such, construction activities would not result in significant adverse transit impacts.

In total, construction-related activities would generate 1,445 pedestrian trips (transit trips plus auto-to-walk trips between the parking facilities and the construction sites) during the AM and PM construction peak hours. These construction worker trips would be distributed throughout the roadway network's pedestrian elements – sidewalk, crosswalks and corner reservoir areas – and would be assigned similarly to the project-generated operational trips – i.e., along similar routes to the same neighborhood parking garages, bus stops and subway station. In comparison, the Proposed Projects would generate approximately 1,352 pedestrian trips during the AM operational peak hour and 1,847 pedestrian trips during the PM operational peak hour. The construction-related pedestrian trips would occur outside of the commuter peak hours. Therefore, similar to the operational analysis, construction activities would not result in significant adverse pedestrian impacts.

Air Quality

Measures required to reduce pollutant emissions during construction include all applicable laws, regulations, and the City's building codes. These include dust suppression measures, idling restriction, and the use of ultra-low sulfur diesel (ULSD) fuel and best available tailpipe reduction technologies. With the implementation of these emission reduction measures, the dispersion modeling analysis of construction-related air emissions for both on-site and on-road sources determined that particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10}), annual-average nitrogen dioxide (NO_2), and carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations would be below their corresponding *de minimis* thresholds or National Air Quality Ambient Standards (NAAQS), respectively. Therefore, construction of the Proposed Projects would not result in significant adverse air quality impacts during construction.

Noise

Construction of the phased development would involve standard construction activities and practices for buildings in New York City. Foundation/excavation and superstructure/exterior phases of construction are typically when the noisiest activities occur. The interior phases of construction typically involve minimal exterior equipment and substantially quieter noise conditions. The Development Site is near existing residential and commercial land uses. Based on the proximity of these noise-sensitive land uses, there is the potential for construction to cause significant adverse noise impacts.

Construction noise from mobile sources has been evaluated from 6:00 AM to 7:00 AM, when construction traffic would be greatest since this is the period that most worker vehicles and trucks arrive at the Development Site. This is a period prior to construction activities and noise from stationary construction equipment would occur. Construction noise from mobile sources would not increase by 3 dBA or more and there would be no significant adverse noise impact due to construction mobile sources.

Construction noise from stationary sources has been evaluated for five different phases of construction. There would be two development sites with similar construction duration. For each phase of the construction at the development sites (i.e., Development Site 1 and Development Site 2) there would be demolition, excavation/foundation, superstructure/exterior, and interior finish phases of construction of the proposed buildings.

The potential for significant adverse construction noise impact depends on the intensity and duration of construction activities. If construction noise levels would occur continuously for 24 months or more, a detailed construction noise analysis is warranted and there is a potential for significant adverse noise impact. Construction noise occurring for shorter durations would not typically result in significant adverse noise impact unless there is a higher intensity of noise. For example, construction may cause significant adverse impact if exterior noise levels would increase by 15 dBA or more for 12 consecutive months or more or 20 dBA or more for a period of 3 consecutive months or more. These criteria apply to residential, community facility, and commercial office spaces, but do not apply to retail spaces. The chapter also investigates interior L_{10} noise levels to compare with the CEQR interior noise guideline of 45 dBA (L_{10}) for residential and community facility uses and interior noise guideline of 50 dBA (L_{10}) for commercial office uses in order to determine if a receptor would experience significant adverse construction noise impact and if potential mitigation at the receptor is needed.

Construction noise impacts would occur at the existing commercial building at 619 West 54th Street (R32) located east of Development Site 1. No construction noise impact would occur at other

receptors analyzed. In total, construction activities would cause exterior and interior noise impacts on one commercial office receptor.

With the adherence to existing construction noise regulations and the implementation of a Construction Noise Mitigation Plan, as required by the New York City Noise Code, including an 8-foot construction noise barrier, construction noise would be reduced but would still exceed the thresholds for significant construction noise impact prior to mitigation.

Vibration

Construction activities have the potential to generate ground-borne vibration that can potentially cause structural or architectural damage or annoy people in nearby vibration-sensitive spaces, such as residences. The most substantial sources of construction vibration are equipment associated with the excavation and foundation phase, such as pile drivers, drill rigs, bulldozers, and jack hammers.

There are no buildings within the Project Area listed by the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) or the State and/or National Register of Historic Places (S/NR) which would require special protections from potential damage due to vibration. There is the potential for construction vibration from some construction equipment, such as pile drivers, to cause annoyance in nearby residences. However, these construction activities would only occur for limited periods of time at any particular location and there would be no significant adverse impact as a result of construction vibration.

Other Technical Areas

Land Use and Neighborhood Character

While construction of the new buildings under the Proposed Actions would cause temporary disruption, particularly related to noise, it is expected that such effects in any given area would be relatively short in duration, even under the worst-case construction sequencing and, therefore, would not create a neighborhood character impact. Therefore, no significant adverse construction impacts to land use and neighborhood character ~~are expected~~would occur.

Socioeconomic Conditions

Construction could, in some instances, temporarily affect pedestrian and vehicular access on street frontages immediately adjacent to the development sites. Long-term lane and/or sidewalk closures are not expected during construction and therefore, would not restrict access to any existing or planned retail businesses. Utility service would also be maintained to all businesses, although there may be very short-term interruptions. Overall, construction resulting from the Proposed Actions ~~is~~would not ~~expected to~~ result in any significant adverse impacts on surrounding businesses.

Community Facilities

The construction site would be surrounded by construction fencing and barriers that would limit the potential for impacts of construction on nearby community facilities. Construction of the proposed buildings would not block or restrict access to any facilities in the area and would not affect emergency response times of the New York City Police Department (NYPD) and New York City Fire Department (FDNY) given the geographic distribution of the police and fire facilities and their

respective coverage areas. Therefore, no construction impacts ~~would be expected~~ to community facilities would occur as a result of the Proposed Actions.

Open Space

As described in **Chapter 5, Open Space** there are no existing publicly accessible open spaces on the development sites. While DeWitt Clinton Park is located directly south of Development Site 1, access to this publicly accessible open space would not be impeded during construction. In addition, measures would be implemented to control air emissions, dust, noise, and vibration on the construction site. Therefore, no construction impacts on open space would ~~be expected~~occur as a result of the Proposed Actions.

Historic and Cultural Resources

As discussed in **Part II: Technical Analyses** of the EAS, the Project Area has no archaeological significance is not located within 400 feet of existing historic and cultural resources. Therefore, construction would not affect any archaeological or architectural resources.

Natural Resources

The development sites do not contain and are not adjacent to any natural resources, as defined in the *CEQR Technical Manual*. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts related to natural resources would occur during construction of the Proposed Projects.

Hazardous Materials

As discussed in greater detail in **Chapter 8, Hazardous Materials**, the potential for significant adverse impacts related to hazardous materials resulting from the Proposed Actions would be avoided through the placement of institutional controls such as an (E)-Designation on the development sites.

Effects on Disadvantaged Communities

The Proposed Actions would not have a disproportionate effect on disadvantaged communities. Based on the technical analyses presented in the EIS pursuant to *CEQR Technical Manual* guidance, the Proposed Actions would not have the potential to result in significant adverse impacts in any technical areas other than transportation (traffic and buses) and construction (traffic and noise). The identified significant adverse operational traffic impact is expected be fully mitigated with signal timing changes which is a standard traffic capacity improvement that is typically implemented by the New York City Department of Transportation (NYC DOT). The bus impacts could be fully mitigated through the provision of additional service on the M12 and M57 bus routes. Although the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse construction noise impacts that would be unmitigable, and construction traffic impacts only partially mitigated, these impacts would not cause or increase a disproportionate pollution burden on a disadvantaged community (DAC), either alone or in conjunction with other technical areas.

Mitigation

The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts with respect to Transportation (Traffic and Buses) and construction period traffic and noise.

Mitigation measures being proposed to address those impacts, where feasible and/or practical, are discussed below. If no possible mitigation can be identified, an unavoidable significant adverse impact would result.

Transportation

Traffic

The Proposed Actions would result in a significant adverse traffic impact at the intersection of Twelfth Avenue and West 55th Street during the Saturday peak hour. This identified significant adverse traffic impact could be fully mitigated with signal timing changes which is a standard traffic capacity improvement typically implemented by the New York City Department of Transportation (NYC DOT).

Implementation of the traffic measures are subject to review and approval by NYCDOT. ~~The feasibility~~With implementation of the proposed mitigation measures ~~will~~, there would be ~~further explored by the Applicant between the Draft and Final EIS.~~ no significant adverse traffic impacts. If prior to implementation, NYCDOT determines that the mitigation measures are ~~deemed to be~~ infeasible and no alternative mitigation measures can be identified, then the significant adverse traffic impacts would remain unmitigated.

Buses

The Proposed Actions would result in a capacity shortfall for the M57 (eastbound direction) during the AM peak hour and for the M12 (northbound and southbound directions) during the PM peak hour.

Significant impacts to the M57 bus route could be mitigated with the addition of two buses in the eastbound direction in the AM peak hour. Significant impacts to the M12 bus route could be mitigated with an additional bus in both directions during the PM peak hour. The general policy of New York City Transit (NYCT) is to provide additional bus service where demand warrants, taking into account financial and operational constraints.

Construction

Traffic

As discussed in **Chapter 16, Construction**, 11 intersections were analyzed for potential significant adverse traffic impacts during the AM and PM construction traffic peak hours. Significant adverse impacts were identified at two analysis intersections during the AM peak hour and five analysis intersections during the PM peak hour. Where significant adverse impacts during construction may occur, measures such as signal timing modifications could fully mitigate significant adverse traffic impacts at four of the five significantly impacted intersection during the PM construction peak hour. Mitigation for the intersection of West 55th Street and Twelfth Avenue would not be feasible during the AM and PM construction peak hours, and for the intersection of Eleventh Avenue and West 56th Street during the AM construction peak hour. Implementation of these measures are subject to review and approval by NYCDOT. ~~The feasibility~~With implementation of the proposed mitigation measures ~~will~~, there would be ~~further explored by the Applicant between the Draft and Final EIS.~~no significant

adverse traffic impacts. If the mitigation measures are deemed to be infeasible and no alternative mitigation measures can be identified, then the significant adverse traffic impacts would remain unmitigated. Mitigation would not be feasible for the intersection of West 55th Street and Twelfth Avenue during the AM and PM construction peak hours, and for the intersection of Eleventh Avenue and West 56th Street during the AM construction peak hour. Per NYCDOT's recommendation, the applicant will coordinate with the New York City Police Department (NYPD) on the need to deploy traffic enforcement agents at the unmitigated intersection of Twelfth Avenue and West 55th Street during the stages of construction when there is a reduction in travel lanes. The applicant would be responsible for the costs associated with the deployment of traffic enforcement agents.

Noise

Since noise levels during construction would have the potential to exceed the thresholds for exterior increases in noise, there would be potential for the project to result in high exterior and interior noise levels at existing noise receptors located in the vicinity of the development sites. As described in **Chapter 16, Construction**, Construction noise impacts would occur at a single existing commercial office building located at 619 West 54th Street (R32), east of Development Site 1. No construction noise impact would occur at other receptors analyzed.

As such, noise control measures would be incorporated into a Construction Noise Mitigation Plan required under the New York City Noise Control Code to further reduce the noise impact from construction operations. Potential noise reduction measures could include a variety of source and path controls, such as temporary barriers and/or shrouds around specific equipment, and substitution with lower-noise-emitting equipment. With adherence to existing construction noise regulations and the implementation of a Construction Noise Mitigation Plan that includes an 8-foot construction noise barrier, as required by the New York City Noise Code, construction noise would be reduced but still exceed the thresholds for a significant adverse construction noise impact. As can be found through street observation, the existing commercial office building at 619 West 54th Street (R32) already has a central AC system as an alternative means of ventilation, and the building's single-paned window seems to be modern and of good quality with thicker than normal glass. If no other mitigation measures are identified, significant adverse impacts that cannot be fully mitigated through reasonably practicable measures would be considered unavoidable.

Project Permutations

Table ES-2 presents the anticipated significant impacts of the two projects individually. The technical areas in which there would be changes from the conclusions of the cumulative analysis for the Proposed Projects are described further below.

~~Table ES-3~~Table ES-2 Summary of Anticipated Significant Impacts

Area of Environmental Concern	Future with only Project on Development Site 1	Future with only Project on Development Site 2
Traffic	Impact to Twelfth Avenue and West 55th Street during the Saturday Peak hour	Impact to Twelfth Avenue and West 55th Street during the Saturday Peak hour
Bus	Impact to two bus lines (Eastbound M57 and Northbound M12)	Impact to two bus lines (Eastbound M57 and Northbound M12)
Construction - Transportation	Impacts at three intersections	Impacts at four intersections
Construction - Noise	Impacts at R32 (619 West 54th Street)	No Impact

If only Development Site 1 is developed, significant adverse traffic impacts would occur at the intersection of Twelfth Avenue and West 55th Street during the Saturday peak hour; similarly, if only Development Site 2 is developed, significant adverse traffic impacts would also occur at this intersection during the Saturday peak hour.

If only Development Site 1 is developed, there would be a significant adverse impact on two bus lines—the Eastbound M57 during the AM peak hour and the Northbound M12 during the PM peak hour—but would be less than the cumulative impact. If only Development Site 2 is developed, there would also be a significant adverse impact on the same two bus lines (during the same peak hours and in the same directions), albeit slightly less compared to the cumulative impacts.

If only Development Site 1 is developed, significant adverse traffic impacts due to construction would occur at three intersections. If only Development Site 2 is developed, significant adverse traffic impacts due to construction would occur at four intersections.

If only Development Site 1 is built, construction noise impacts are anticipated for sensitive receptors identified at 619 West 54th Street (R32). If only Development Site 2 is built, no construction noise impacts ~~are anticipated~~would occur at any sensitive receptors within the vicinity of the site

Alternatives

No-Action Alternative

The No-Action Alternative assesses the future conditions on Development Sites 1 and 2 in absence of the Proposed Actions (i.e., none of the discretionary approvals proposed as part of the Proposed Actions would be adopted). In the 2029 future under the No-Action Alternative, it is anticipated that Development Site 1 would continue to be occupied by the existing auto dealership use, and the existing auto dealership space on Development Site 2 would be leased to new tenants. These conditions are referred to throughout the EIS as the No-Action Condition or the Future Without the Proposed Actions.

The anticipated significant adverse impacts of the Proposed Actions related to buses, construction transportation (traffic), and construction noise would not occur under the No-Action Alternative. However, the No-Action Alternative would not meet the goals and objectives of the Proposed Actions. Under the No-Action Alternative, there would be no residential development on the development sites, and the Applicants would not be able to provide affordable and market-rate

housing. The existing zoning would not permit residential uses of any kind, and Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH) would not be mapped on the Project Area, meaning that no affordable or market rate housing would be developed. In addition, under the No-Action Alternative, there would be no transfer of development rights from Hudson River Park, meaning that the associated benefits to the park (i.e., funding to facilitate the repair and rehabilitation of piers, bulkheads, and infrastructure within Hudson River Park) would not occur. Therefore, the No-Action Alternative would fail to meet the objectives of the Proposed Actions.

No Unmitigated Significant Adverse Impacts Alternative

The No Unmitigated Significant Adverse Impacts Alternative assesses a scenario in which the Proposed Actions are modified such that future development would avoid the unmitigable significant adverse impacts associated with the Proposed Actions, as identified in the EIS. As discussed in **Chapter 18, Mitigation,** and **Chapter 21, Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts,** the Proposed Actions would result in unmitigable significant adverse impacts due to traffic and noise levels during construction. In order to eliminate these impacts, the Proposed Actions would have to be modified to such a point where their principal goals and objectives would not be realized.

No Special Permit Alternative

To address public input on the Draft Scope of Work for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), a No Special Permit Alternative was developed in order to assess the extent to which the anticipated impacts to buses and construction noise could be reduced or eliminated and the goals and objectives of the Proposed Actions still achieved without the special permit pursuant to ZR Section 89-21 (Transfer of Floor Area from Hudson River Park) to transfer development rights from Hudson River Park to the development sites.[5] Under the No Special Permit Alternative, residential density at both development sites would be reduced.

The No Special Permit Alternative would meet some of the goals and objectives of the Proposed Actions, though to a lesser extent than the Proposed Actions. The provision of housing, including affordable housing, is a central goal of the Proposed Actions. The No Special Permit Alternative would result in up to 219 fewer units of housing being built compared to the Proposed Actions, including up to 65 fewer permanently affordable units pursuant to MIH. As such, the No Special Permit Alternative would contribute less than the Proposed Actions to the creation of new housing, including new affordable housing. An additional goal of the Proposed Actions is to provide for the repair and rehabilitation of piers, bulkheads, and infrastructure in Hudson River Park through transfer of development rights. The No Special Permit Alternative would not meet this goal.

The anticipated significant adverse impacts of the Proposed Actions related to buses, construction traffic, and construction noise would still occur under the No Special Permit Alternative. As noted above, in order to eliminate these impacts, the Proposed Actions would have to be modified to such a point where their principal goals and objectives would not be realized. Since the No Special Permit Alternative would fail to provide the same potential benefits as the Proposed Actions, and similar impacts would still occur, the No Special Permit Alternative would fail to meet the objectives of the Proposed Actions.

[5] The proposed text amendment to ZR 89-11(c) states that the use and bulk regulations of the proposed C4-7 zoning district would only be applicable with the implementation of a Special Permit authorizing the transfer of development rights from Hudson River Park.

Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts

As described in **Chapter 18, Mitigation**, the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts related to transportation (i.e., traffic and bus service) and construction (i.e., traffic and noise conditions during construction). Mitigation measures have been identified to address the potential impacts where feasible and/or practical.

However, in some instances, no practicable mitigation has been identified to fully mitigate the significant adverse impacts, and there are no reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Actions that would meet the project's stated purpose and need, eliminate potential impacts, and not cause other or similar significant adverse impacts.

Transportation

Traffic

The Proposed Actions would result in a significant adverse traffic impact at the intersection of Twelfth Avenue and West 55th Street during the Saturday peak hour. This identified significant adverse traffic impact could be fully mitigated with signal timing changes which is a standard traffic capacity improvement typically implemented by the New York City Department of Transportation (NYCDOT).

Implementation of the traffic measures are subject to review and approval by NYCDOT. With implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, there would be no significant adverse traffic impacts. If prior to implementation, NYCDOT determines that the mitigation measures are infeasible and no alternative mitigation measures can be identified, then the significant adverse traffic impacts would remain unmitigated.

Construction

Traffic

As discussed in **Chapter 16, Construction**, eleven intersections were analyzed for potential significant traffic impacts during the AM and PM construction traffic peak hours. Significant construction traffic impacts were identified at two of the eleven intersections analyzed during the AM construction peak hour and at five intersections during the PM construction peak hour.

Signal timing modifications could fully mitigate significant adverse traffic impacts at four of the five significantly impacted intersections during the PM construction peak hour. Implementation of the traffic measures are subject to review and approval by NYCDOT. If the mitigation measures are deemed to be infeasible and no alternative mitigation measures can be identified, then the significant adverse traffic impacts would remain unmitigated.

Standard traffic capacity improvements such as signal timing modifications could not mitigate the significant traffic impacts at the two significantly impacted intersections during the AM construction peak hour and one of the five significantly impacted intersections during the PM construction peak hour. Significant traffic impacts during the AM and PM construction peak hours at the intersection of West 55th Street and Twelfth Avenue could not be mitigated due to the reduction of West 55th Street's travel lanes from three lanes to two lanes during construction to facilitate construction activities and protect pedestrian traffic. Therefore, these traffic impacts to the intersection of Twelfth Avenue and West 55th Street would remain unmitigated. Significant traffic impacts during the AM

construction peak hour at the intersection of Eleventh Avenue and West 56th Street, primarily due to the reduction of West 56th Street's travel lanes from two lanes to one lane to facilitate construction activities and protect pedestrian traffic, would result in significant traffic impacts that could not be mitigated during this time period.

Per NYCDOT's recommendation, the applicant will coordinate with the New York City Police Department (NYPD) on the need to deploy traffic enforcement agents at the unmitigated intersection of Twelfth Avenue and West 55th Street during the stages of construction when there is a reduction in travel lanes. The applicant would be responsible for the costs associated with the deployment of traffic enforcement agents.

~~Implementation of the traffic measures are subject to review and approval by NYCDOT. The feasibility of the proposed mitigation measures will be further explored by the Applicant between the Draft and *Final EIS*. If the mitigation measures are deemed to be infeasible and no alternative mitigation measures can be identified, then the significant adverse traffic impacts would remain unmitigated.~~

Noise

As described in **Chapter 16, Construction**, construction noise impacts would occur at the existing commercial office building at 619 West 54th Street (R32) located east of Development Site 1. In total, construction activities would cause exterior and interior noise impacts on one commercial office receptor due to exceedances of the thresholds for exterior increase in noise and/or thresholds for acceptable interior noise levels for commercial office uses.

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 still exceed the thresholds for significant adverse construction noise impacts. However, as can be found through street and field observation, the building at 619 West 54th Street (R32) already has a central AC system as an alternative means of ventilation, and the building's single-paned window seem to be modern and of good quality with thicker than normal glass. Therefore, as described in **Chapter 18, Mitigation**, it would not be necessary to provide window upgrade as mitigation measures. As there are no further practicable and feasible mitigation considered to fully mitigate identified significant adverse impacts related to construction noise, noise levels at this building would at times during the construction period exceed the impact criteria. Because these impacts cannot be fully mitigated, there would be temporary unavoidable significant adverse impact due to construction noise.

Growth-Inducing Aspects of the Proposed Project

The Proposed Actions would be limited to the development sites and the Granting Sites. As described in **Chapter 2, Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy**, in both the Maximum Commercial Scenario and the Maximum Residential Scenario, the Proposed Actions would result in an expansion of existing land uses in the study area, leading to greater bulk and density than that which currently exists on the development sites. Residential use would be permitted on both development sites, which is not permitted currently. The proposed Zoning Text Amendment would also allow for a maximum residential FAR of 14.4 in the Project Area. No other blocks and lots would be affected by the Proposed Actions. The increased bulk and density facilitated by the Proposed Actions are expected to be compatible with existing uses, and consistent with current development trends, in the

study area. Therefore, the Proposed Actions are not expected add substantial new land uses, new residents, or new employment to the surrounding area.

As described in **Chapter 3, Socioeconomic Conditions**, the Proposed Actions under the Maximum Residential Scenario would result in the development of up to 1,242 dwelling units (DUs) (including approximately 248 to 373 permanently affordable DUs, pursuant to Mandatory Inclusionary Housing [MIH] regulations), introducing an estimated 2,087 residents to the development sites. Anticipated residential development projects within the study area would increase the study area population to 56,416 in the future absent of the Proposed Actions. The Proposed Actions would increase the study area population by 3.7 percent, to 58,503. While the estimated weighted average household income of the new population from the incremental units introduced by the Proposed Actions is estimated to be $248,531, higher than the average household income of the study area population of $105,056, the new population would represent an increase of approximately 3.7 percent over the No-Action condition. Since the increase is less than five percent, the population increase is not expected to introduce or accelerate a trend that would lead to the displacement of vulnerable population or create a significant indirect residential displacement adverse impact.

As discussed in **Chapter 9, Water and Sewer Infrastructure**, although the Proposed Actions would result in developments that increase water demand and wastewater, the infrastructure in the study area is well equipped such that improvements associated with the Proposed Actions would not induce additional growth or overburden the existing system.

Therefore, the Proposed Actions ~~are~~would not ~~expected to~~ cause any significant secondary impacts that would lead to substantial new development in the surrounding area. Furthermore, the Proposed Actions would be limited to the boundaries of the Project Area and would not extend beyond the Project Area. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not induce significant new growth in the surrounding area.

Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources

The Proposed Actions would enable development that would constitute a long-term commitment of land resources, thereby rendering land use for other purposes highly unlikely in the foreseeable future. However, the proposed land uses that would be enabled by the Proposed Actions would be compatible with existing conditions and development trends in the surrounding neighborhood. Neither of the development sites possess any natural resource of significant value, and both development sites would have been previously developed. Furthermore, funds committed by the Applicants to the design, construction, and operation of the Proposed Projects facilitated by the Proposed Actions are not available for other projects.

These commitments of resources and materials are weighted against the benefits of the developments that would be facilitated by the Proposed Actions. As described in **Chapter 1, Project Description**, the Proposed Projects would include a 44-story, mixed-use residential and commercial building at 629 W 54th Street, containing approximately 617 dwelling units (DUs) and 113,990 gsf of commercial auto dealership space, and a 38-story, mixed-use residential and commercial building at 801 Eleventh Avenue, containing approximately 477 DUs and 85,760 gsf of commercial auto dealership space. Collectively, the Proposed Projects would introduce approximately 939,934 gsf of residential space and 199,750 gsf of commercial space, totaling 1,179,321 gross square feet (892,442 zoning square feet [zsf]) across the two development sites.

Additionally, as described in **Chapter 1, Project Description**, two reasonable worst-case development scenarios (RWCDSs) were analyzed to provide a conservative baseline in analyzing the Proposed Actions' potential impacts. One scenario is the Maximum Commercial Scenario, which assumes that the commercial space of the Proposed Projects would be developed as office and retail uses instead of auto dealership use. The second scenario is the Maximum Residential Scenario, which would maximize the residential floor area that could be developed on each Development Site.

The Proposed Actions include transferring floor area from Chelsea Piers, Piers 81/83 and Pier 98 (the Granting Sites) within Hudson River Park to the two development sites, following required approval by the Hudson River Park Trust and a Significance Action process under the Hudson River Park Act. This transfer would support the repair, rehabilitation, maintenance, and development of Hudson River Park, which is a vital waterfront open space resource and a key amenity for both the surrounding neighborhoods and the city at large. The Proposed Actions would also help transform currently underutilized lots into two mixed-use developments, adding much-needed housing, including permanently affordable units, and enlivening the streets with ground-floor retail spaces that are suited for the needs of the neighborhood.