AECOM

REVISED ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT STATEMENT (EAS) AND SUPPLEMENTAL STUDIES TO THE EAS

Williamsbridge Road Rezoning

18DCP071X

2712 Williamsbridge Road
Brooklyn, NY

*Revised Environmental Assessment Statement

Prepared for:
The J. Pilla Group LTD
2712 Williamsbridge Road
Bronx, NY, 10469

Prepared by:
AECOM
125 Broad Street
New York, NY 10004

AECOM Project No. 60489811

This Revised EAS and appended Technical Memorandum supersede the EAS issued on August 31st 2018 for the 2712 Williamsbridge Road Rezoning Proposal (CEQR #18DCP071X). Since Certification of the proposal on September 4th, 2018, the applicant revised the Rezoning Area and removed Block 4156, Lots 43, 44, 144, and 145 from the Rezoning Area and being removed from the analysis. This revised EAS reflects the updated Rezoning Area. As Lots 43, 44, 144, and 145 are no longer considered a projected development site, no (E) designation for Hazardous Materials or Air Quality would be required on these properties. The removal of the proposed (E) designation from these sites would not alter the conclusions of the Revised EAS. This Revised EAS and appended Technical Memorandum reflect the updated proposed project, including the potential CPC modifications.

August 31st, 2018

***Revised January 25th, 2019**

City Environmental Quality Review
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT STATEMENT (EAS) SHORT FORM

FOR UNLISTED ACTIONS ONLY • *Please fill out and submit to the appropriate agency* (see instructions)

Part I: GENERAL INFORMATION

1. *Does the Action Exceed Any Type I Threshold in 6 NYCRR Part 617.4 or 43 RCNY §6-15(A) (Executive Order 91 of 1977, as amended)?* ☐ YES ☒ NO

If "yes," **STOP** and **complete the FULL EAS FORM**.

2. *Project Name* 2712 Williamsbridge Road Rezoning

3. *Reference Numbers*

CEQR REFERENCE NUMBER (to be assigned by lead agency)	BSA REFERENCE NUMBER (if applicable)
18DCP071X	
ULURP REFERENCE NUMBER (if applicable)	OTHER REFERENCE NUMBER(S) (if applicable) (*e.g.*, legislative intro, CAPA)
180261ZMX	

4a. *Lead Agency Information*			**4b. *Applicant Information***		
NAME OF LEAD AGENCY			NAME OF APPLICANT		
New York City Department of City Planning			Paul Pilla		
NAME OF LEAD AGENCY CONTACT PERSON			NAME OF APPLICANT'S REPRESENTATIVE OR CONTACT PERSON		
Robert Dorbruskin			Richard Lobel		
ADDRESS 120 Broadway, 31st Floor			ADDRESS 18 East 41st Street, 5th Floor		
CITY New York	STATE NY	ZIP 10271	CITY New York	STATE NY	ZIP 10017
TELEPHONE (212) 720-3423	EMAIL rdobrus@planning.nyc.gov		TELEPHONE (212) 725-2727	EMAIL rlobel@sheldonlobelpc.com	

5. *Project Description*

The applicant, The J. Pilla Group LTD., seeks a zoning map amendment to rezone a portion of Bronx Block 4516, Lots 8, 46, 48, 43, 44, 144, and 45 from a C8-1 zoning district to an R7A/C2-3 zoning district to facilitate the construction of a nine-story plus cellar mixed-use 47,024 gsf (38,712 zsf) building with approximately 37,276 gross square feet (33,887 zoning square feet (zsf) of Use Group 2 residential floor area with 35 dwelling units and 5,308 gsf (4,825 zsf) of Use Group 6 commercial office space at 2712 Williamsbridge Road (Block 4516, Lots 8 and 46). The addition of 33,887 zsf of residential floor area and the proposed 4,825 zsf of commercial space would represent a combined total FAR of approximately 4.5, which is permitted in an R7A/C2-3 District. In addition to the zoning map amendment to rezone the Affected Area from C8-1 to R7A/C2-3, the applicant is also requesting a zoning text amendment to ZR Appendix F: Inclusionary Housing Designated Areas to establish the Affected Area as a Mandatory Inclusionary Housing ("MIH") Area.

Project Location

BOROUGH Bronx	COMMUNITY DISTRICT(S) 11	STREET ADDRESS 2712 Williamsbridge Road
TAX BLOCK(S) AND LOT(S) Bronx Block 4516, Lots 8 and 46		ZIP CODE 10469
DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY BY BOUNDING OR CROSS STREETS Williamsbridge Road, Colden Avenue, Boston Rd, Allerton Avenue		
EXISTING ZONING DISTRICT, INCLUDING SPECIAL ZONING DISTRICT DESIGNATION, IF ANY C8-1		ZONING SECTIONAL MAP NUMBER 4a

6. *Required Actions or Approvals* (check all that apply)

***City Planning Commission*:** ☒ YES ☐ NO ☒ UNIFORM LAND USE REVIEW PROCEDURE (ULURP)

☐ CITY MAP AMENDMENT	☐ ZONING CERTIFICATION	☐ CONCESSION
☒ ZONING MAP AMENDMENT	☐ ZONING AUTHORIZATION	☐ UDAAP
☒ ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT	☐ ACQUISITION—REAL PROPERTY	☐ REVOCABLE CONSENT
☐ SITE SELECTION—PUBLIC FACILITY	☐ DISPOSITION—REAL PROPERTY	☐ FRANCHISE
☐ HOUSING PLAN & PROJECT	☐ OTHER, explain:	

☐ SPECIAL PERMIT (if appropriate, specify type: ☐ modification; ☐ renewal; ☐ other); EXPIRATION DATE:

SPECIFY AFFECTED SECTIONS OF THE ZONING RESOLUTION

***Board of Standards and Appeals*:** ☐ YES ☒ NO

Per the note the cover page, the EAS dated August 31, 2018 has been revised. This Part 1 form has been superseded by a Revised EAS dated January 25, 2019. These changes can be found in Appendix F - Revised CEQR EAS Short Form.

☐ VARIANCE (use)
☐ VARIANCE (bulk)
☐ SPECIAL PERMIT (if appropriate, specify type: ☐ modification; ☐ renewal; ☐ other); EXPIRATION DATE:
SPECIFY AFFECTED SECTIONS OF THE ZONING RESOLUTION

***Department of Environmental Protection*:** ☐ YES ☒ NO If "yes," specify:

Other City Approvals Subject to CEQR (check all that apply)

☐ LEGISLATION
☐ RULEMAKING
☐ CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC FACILITIES
☐ 384(b)(4) APPROVAL
☐ OTHER, explain:
☐ FUNDING OF CONSTRUCTION, specify:
☐ POLICY OR PLAN, specify:
☐ FUNDING OF PROGRAMS, specify:
☐ PERMITS, specify:

Other City Approvals Not Subject to CEQR (check all that apply)

☐ PERMITS FROM DOT'S OFFICE OF CONSTRUCTION MITIGATION AND COORDINATION (OCMC)
☐ LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION APPROVAL
☐ OTHER, explain:

***State or Federal Actions/Approvals/Funding*:** ☐ YES ☒ NO If "yes," specify:

7. *Site Description:* *The directly affected area consists of the project site and the area subject to any change in regulatory controls. Except where otherwise indicated, provide the following information with regard to the directly affected area.*

***Graphics*:** *The following graphics must be attached and each box must be checked off before the EAS is complete. Each map must clearly depict the boundaries of the directly affected area or areas and indicate a 400-foot radius drawn from the outer boundaries of the project site. Maps may not exceed 11 x 17 inches in size and, for paper filings, must be folded to 8.5 x 11 inches.*

☒ SITE LOCATION MAP ☒ ZONING MAP ☒ SANBORN OR OTHER LAND USE MAP
☒ TAX MAP ☐ FOR LARGE AREAS OR MULTIPLE SITES, A GIS SHAPE FILE THAT DEFINES THE PROJECT SITE(S)
☒ PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE PROJECT SITE TAKEN WITHIN 6 MONTHS OF EAS SUBMISSION AND KEYED TO THE SITE LOCATION MAP

Physical Setting (both developed and undeveloped areas)

Total directly affected area (sq. ft.): Approx. 21,752
Waterbody area (sq. ft) and type: NA
Roads, buildings, and other paved surfaces (sq. ft.): Approx. 21,752
Other, describe (sq. ft.): NA

8. *Physical Dimensions and Scale of Project* (if the project affects multiple sites, provide the total development facilitated by the action)

SIZE OF PROJECT TO BE DEVELOPED (gross square feet): 72,923 gsf (total under RWCDS)
NUMBER OF BUILDINGS: 2
GROSS FLOOR AREA OF EACH BUILDING (sq. ft.): Projected Site 1 -(Applicant) 44,158 gsf; Projected Site 2-28,765 gsf
HEIGHT OF EACH BUILDING (ft.): 95 Feet
NUMBER OF STORIES OF EACH BUILDING: Approx 9-10

Does the proposed project involve changes in zoning on one or more sites? ☒ YES ☐ NO
If "yes," specify: The total square feet owned or controlled by the applicant: 8,659
The total square feet not owned or controlled by the applicant: 13,093

Does the proposed project involve in-ground excavation or subsurface disturbance, including, but not limited to foundation work, pilings, utility lines, or grading? ☒ YES ☐ NO
If "yes," indicate the estimated area and volume dimensions of subsurface permanent and temporary disturbance (if known):
AREA OF TEMPORARY DISTURBANCE: 21,752 sq. ft. (width x length)
VOLUME OF DISTURBANCE: TBD cubic ft. (width x length x depth)
AREA OF PERMANENT DISTURBANCE: 21,752 sq. ft. (width x length)

Description of Proposed Uses (please complete the following information as appropriate)

	Residential	***Commercial***	***Community Facility***	***Industrial/Manufacturing***
Size (in gross sq. ft.)	57,071	15,852	0	0
Type (*e.g.,* retail, office, school)	66 units	UG 6 Local Retail		

Does the proposed project increase the population of residents and/or on-site workers? ☒ YES ☐ NO
If "yes," please specify: NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL RESIDENTS: 159 NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL WORKERS: 42
Provide a brief explanation of how these numbers were determined: 3 workers per 1,000 gsf of local retail space, 2.71 people per household

Does the proposed project create new open space? ☐ YES ☒ NO If "yes," specify size of project-created open space: sq. ft.

Has a No-Action scenario been defined for this project that differs from the existing condition? ☐ YES ☒ NO
If "yes," see Chapter 2, "Establishing the Analysis Framework" and describe briefly:

9. *Analysis Year* CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 2

ANTICIPATED BUILD YEAR (date the project would be completed and operational): 2021

ANTICIPATED PERIOD OF CONSTRUCTION IN MONTHS: 16-20 months

WOULD THE PROJECT BE IMPLEMENTED IN A SINGLE PHASE? ☒ YES ☐ NO

IF MULTIPLE PHASES, HOW MANY? *Two phases as additional development is projected on parcels not under applicant's control.

BRIEFLY DESCRIBE PHASES AND CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE: ULURP and Environmental Review , Design and Financing, Construction

10. *Predominant Land Use in the Vicinity of the Project* (check all that apply)

☒ RESIDENTIAL ☐ MANUFACTURING ☒ COMMERCIAL ☐ PARK/FOREST/OPEN SPACE ☐ OTHER, specify:

Part II: TECHNICAL ANALYSIS

INSTRUCTIONS: For each of the analysis categories listed in this section, assess the proposed project's impacts based on the thresholds and criteria presented in the CEQR Technical Manual. Check each box that applies.

- If the proposed project can be demonstrated not to meet or exceed the threshold, check the "no" box.
- If the proposed project will meet or exceed the threshold, or if this cannot be determined, check the "yes" box.
- For each "yes" response, provide additional analyses (and, if needed, attach supporting information) based on guidance in the CEQR Technical Manual to determine whether the potential for significant impacts exists. Please note that a "yes" answer does not mean that an EIS must be prepared—it means that more information may be required for the lead agency to make a determination of significance.
- The lead agency, upon reviewing Part II, may require an applicant to provide additional information to support the Short EAS Form. For example, if a question is answered "no," an agency may request a short explanation for this response.

	YES	NO
1. *LAND USE, ZONING, AND PUBLIC POLICY*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 4		
(a) Would the proposed project result in a change in land use different from surrounding land uses?	☐	☒
(b) Would the proposed project result in a change in zoning different from surrounding zoning?	☒	☐
(c) Is there the potential to affect an applicable public policy?	☐	☒
(d) If "yes," to (a), (b), and/or (c), complete a preliminary assessment and attach.		
(e) Is the project a large, publicly sponsored project?	☐	☒
○ If "yes," complete a PlaNYC assessment and attach.		
(f) Is any part of the directly affected area within the City's Waterfront Revitalization Program boundaries?	☐	☒
○ If "yes," complete the Consistency Assessment Form.		
2. *SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 5		
(a) Would the proposed project:		
○ Generate a net increase of 200 or more residential units?	☐	☒
○ Generate a net increase of 200,000 or more square feet of commercial space?	☐	☒
○ Directly displace more than 500 residents?	☐	☒
○ Directly displace more than 100 employees?	☐	☒
○ Affect conditions in a specific industry?	☐	☒
3. *COMMUNITY FACILITIES*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 6		
(a) Direct Effects		
○ Would the project directly eliminate, displace, or alter public or publicly funded community facilities such as educational facilities, libraries, hospitals and other health care facilities, day care centers, police stations, or fire stations?	☐	☒
(b) Indirect Effects		
○ **Child Care Centers:** Would the project result in 20 or more eligible children under age 6, based on the number of low or low/moderate income residential units? (See Table 6-1 in Chapter 6)	☐	☒
○ **Libraries:** Would the project result in a 5 percent or more increase in the ratio of residential units to library branches? (See Table 6-1 in Chapter 6)	☐	☒
○ **Public Schools:** Would the project result in 50 or more elementary or middle school students, or 150 or more high school students based on number of residential units? (See Table 6-1 in Chapter 6)	☐	☒
○ **Health Care Facilities and Fire/Police Protection:** Would the project result in the introduction of a sizeable new neighborhood?	☐	☒
4. *OPEN SPACE*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 7		
(a) Would the proposed project change or eliminate existing open space?	☐	☒
(b) Is the project located within an under-served area in the Bronx, Brooklyn, Manhattan, Queens, or Staten Island?	☐	☒
○ If "yes," would the proposed project generate more than 50 additional residents or 125 additional employees?	☐	☐
(c) Is the project located within a well-served area in the Bronx, Brooklyn, Manhattan, Queens, or Staten Island?	☐	☒
○ If "yes," would the proposed project generate more than 350 additional residents or 750 additional employees?	☐	☐
(d) If the project in located an area that is neither under-served nor well-served, would it generate more than 200 additional residents or 500 additional employees?	☐	☒

	YES	NO
5. *SHADOWS*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 8		
(a) Would the proposed project result in a net height increase of any structure of 50 feet or more?	☒	☐
(b) Would the proposed project result in any increase in structure height and be located adjacent to or across the street from a sunlight-sensitive resource?	☐	☒
6. *HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 9		
(a) Does the proposed project site or an adjacent site contain any architectural and/or archaeological resource that is eligible for or has been designated (or is calendared for consideration) as a New York City Landmark, Interior Landmark or Scenic Landmark; that is listed or eligible for listing on the New York State or National Register of Historic Places; or that is within a designated or eligible New York City, New York State or National Register Historic District? (See the GIS System for Archaeology and National Register to confirm)	☐	☒
(b) Would the proposed project involve construction resulting in in-ground disturbance to an area not previously excavated?	☒	☐
(c) If "yes" to either of the above, list any identified architectural and/or archaeological resources and attach supporting information on whether the proposed project would potentially affect any architectural or archeological resources.		
7. *URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 10		
(a) Would the proposed project introduce a new building, a new building height, or result in any substantial physical alteration to the streetscape or public space in the vicinity of the proposed project that is not currently allowed by existing zoning?	☒	☐
(b) Would the proposed project result in obstruction of publicly accessible views to visual resources not currently allowed by existing zoning?	☐	☒
8. *NATURAL RESOURCES*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 11		
(a) Does the proposed project site or a site adjacent to the project contain natural resources as defined in Section 100 of Chapter 11?	☐	☒
○ If "yes," list the resources and attach supporting information on whether the proposed project would affect any of these resources.		
(b) Is any part of the directly affected area within the Jamaica Bay Watershed?	☐	☒
○ If "yes," complete the Jamaica Bay Watershed Form, and submit according to its instructions.		
9. *HAZARDOUS MATERIALS*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 12		
(a) Would the proposed project allow commercial or residential uses in an area that is currently, or was historically, a manufacturing area that involved hazardous materials?	☐	☒
(b) Does the proposed project site have existing institutional controls (*e.g.*, (E) designation or Restrictive Declaration) relating to hazardous materials that preclude the potential for significant adverse impacts?	☐	☒
(c) Would the project require soil disturbance in a manufacturing area or any development on or near a manufacturing area or existing/historic facilities listed in Appendix 1 (including nonconforming uses)?	☐	☒
(d) Would the project result in the development of a site where there is reason to suspect the presence of hazardous materials, contamination, illegal dumping or fill, or fill material of unknown origin?	☐	☒
(e) Would the project result in development on or near a site that has or had underground and/or aboveground storage tanks (*e.g.*, gas stations, oil storage facilities, heating oil storage)?	☐	☒
(f) Would the project result in renovation of interior existing space on a site with the potential for compromised air quality; vapor intrusion from either on-site or off-site sources; or the presence of asbestos, PCBs, mercury or lead-based paint?	☐	☒
(g) Would the project result in development on or near a site with potential hazardous materials issues such as government-listed voluntary cleanup/brownfield site, current or former power generation/transmission facilities, coal gasification or gas storage sites, railroad tracks or rights-of-way, or municipal incinerators?	☐	☒
(h) Has a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment been performed for the site?	☒	☐
○ If "yes," were Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) identified? Briefly identify: No RECs	☐	☒
10. *WATER AND SEWER INFRASTRUCTURE*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 13		
(a) Would the project result in water demand of more than one million gallons per day?	☐	☒
(b) If the proposed project located in a combined sewer area, would it result in at least 1,000 residential units or 250,000 square feet or more of commercial space in Manhattan, or at least 400 residential units or 150,000 square feet or more of commercial space in the Bronx, Brooklyn, Staten Island, or Queens?	☐	☒
(c) If the proposed project located in a separately sewered area, would it result in the same or greater development than the amounts listed in Table 13-1 in Chapter 13?	☐	☒
(d) Would the proposed project involve development on a site that is 5 acres or larger where the amount of impervious surface would increase?	☐	☒
(e) If the project is located within the Jamaica Bay Watershed or in certain specific drainage areas, including Bronx River, Coney Island Creek, Flushing Bay and Creek, Gowanus Canal, Hutchinson River, Newtown Creek, or Westchester Creek, would it involve development on a site that is 1 acre or larger where the amount of impervious surface would increase?	☐	☒

	YES	NO
(f) Would the proposed project be located in an area that is partially sewered or currently unsewered?	☐	☒
(g) Is the project proposing an industrial facility or activity that would contribute industrial discharges to a Wastewater Treatment Plant and/or generate contaminated stormwater in a separate storm sewer system?	☐	☒
(h) Would the project involve construction of a new stormwater outfall that requires federal and/or state permits?	☐	☒
11. *SOLID WASTE AND SANITATION SERVICES*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 14		
(a) Using Table 14-1 in Chapter 14, the project's projected operational solid waste generation is estimated to be (pounds per week): 6,021		
○ Would the proposed project have the potential to generate 100,000 pounds (50 tons) or more of solid waste per week?	☐	☒
(b) Would the proposed project involve a reduction in capacity at a solid waste management facility used for refuse or recyclables generated within the City?	☐	☒
12. *ENERGY*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 15		
(a) Using energy modeling or Table 15-1 in Chapter 15, the project's projected energy use is estimated to be (annual BTUs): 10,614,978 MBTUs		
(b) Would the proposed project affect the transmission or generation of energy?	☐	☒
13. *TRANSPORTATION*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 16		
(a) Would the proposed project exceed any threshold identified in Table 16-1 in Chapter 16?	☒	☐
(b) If "yes," conduct the screening analyses, attach appropriate back up data as needed for each stage and answer the following questions:		
○ Would the proposed project result in 50 or more Passenger Car Equivalents (PCEs) per project peak hour?	☐	☒
If "yes," would the proposed project result in 50 or more vehicle trips per project peak hour at any given intersection? ***It should be noted that the lead agency may require further analysis of intersections of concern even when a project generates fewer than 50 vehicles in the peak hour. See Subsection 313 of Chapter 16 for more information.*	☐	☐
○ Would the proposed project result in more than 200 subway/rail or bus trips per project peak hour?	☐	☒
If "yes," would the proposed project result, per project peak hour, in 50 or more bus trips on a single line (in one direction) or 200 subway trips per station or line?	☐	☐
○ Would the proposed project result in more than 200 pedestrian trips per project peak hour?	☐	☒
If "yes," would the proposed project result in more than 200 pedestrian trips per project peak hour to any given pedestrian or transit element, crosswalk, subway stair, or bus stop?	☐	☐
14. *AIR QUALITY*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 17		
(a) *Mobile Sources*: Would the proposed project result in the conditions outlined in Section 210 in Chapter 17?	☐	☒
(b) *Stationary Sources*: Would the proposed project result in the conditions outlined in Section 220 in Chapter 17?	☒	☐
○ If "yes," would the proposed project exceed the thresholds in Figure 17-3, Stationary Source Screen Graph in Chapter 17? (Attach graph as needed)	☐	☒
(c) Does the proposed project involve multiple buildings on the project site?	☐	☒
(d) Does the proposed project require federal approvals, support, licensing, or permits subject to conformity requirements?	☐	☒
(e) Does the proposed project site have existing institutional controls (*e.g.*, (E) designation or Restrictive Declaration) relating to air quality that preclude the potential for significant adverse impacts?	☐	☒
15. *GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 18		
(a) Is the proposed project a city capital project or a power generation plant?	☐	☒
(b) Would the proposed project fundamentally change the City's solid waste management system?	☐	☒
(c) If "yes" to any of the above, would the project require a GHG emissions assessment based on the guidance in Chapter 18?	☐	☒
16. *NOISE*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 19		
(a) Would the proposed project generate or reroute vehicular traffic?	☒	☐
(b) Would the proposed project introduce new or additional receptors (see Section 124 in Chapter 19) near heavily trafficked roadways, within one horizontal mile of an existing or proposed flight path, or within 1,500 feet of an existing or proposed rail line with a direct line of site to that rail line?	☒	☐
(c) Would the proposed project cause a stationary noise source to operate within 1,500 feet of a receptor with a direct line of sight to that receptor or introduce receptors into an area with high ambient stationary noise?	☐	☒
(d) Does the proposed project site have existing institutional controls (*e.g.*, (E) designation or Restrictive Declaration) relating to noise that preclude the potential for significant adverse impacts?	☐	☒
17. *PUBLIC HEALTH*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 20		

	YES	NO
(a) Based upon the analyses conducted, do any of the following technical areas require a detailed analysis: Air Quality; Hazardous Materials; Noise?	☐	☒
(b) If "yes," explain why an assessment of public health is or is not warranted based on the guidance in Chapter 20, "Public Health." Attach a preliminary analysis, if necessary.		
18. *NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 21		
(a) Based upon the analyses conducted, do any of the following technical areas require a detailed analysis: Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy; Socioeconomic Conditions; Open Space; Historic and Cultural Resources; Urban Design and Visual Resources; Shadows; Transportation; Noise?	☒	☐
(b) If "yes," explain why an assessment of neighborhood character is or is not warranted based on the guidance in Chapter 21, "Neighborhood Character." Attach a preliminary analysis, if necessary. A qualatative assessment of neighborhood character is provided in the supplemental studies		
19. *CONSTRUCTION*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 22		
(a) Would the project's construction activities involve:		
○ Construction activities lasting longer than two years?	☐	☒
○ Construction activities within a Central Business District or along an arterial highway or major thoroughfare?	☐	☒
○ Closing, narrowing, or otherwise impeding traffic, transit, or pedestrian elements (roadways, parking spaces, bicycle routes, sidewalks, crosswalks, corners, *etc.*)?	☒	☐
○ Construction of multiple buildings where there is a potential for on-site receptors on buildings completed before the final build-out?	☐	☒
○ The operation of several pieces of diesel equipment in a single location at peak construction?	☐	☒
○ Closure of a community facility or disruption in its services?	☐	☒
○ Activities within 400 feet of a historic or cultural resource?	☐	☒
○ Disturbance of a site containing or adjacent to a site containing natural resources?	☐	☒
○ Construction on multiple development sites in the same geographic area, such that there is the potential for several construction timelines to overlap or last for more than two years overall?	☐	☒
(b) If any boxes are checked "yes," explain why a preliminary construction assessment is or is not warranted based on the guidance in Chapter 22, "Construction." It should be noted that the nature and extent of any commitment to use the Best Available Technology for construction equipment or Best Management Practices for construction activities should be considered when making this determination. A qualtative assessment of construction impacts is provided in the supplemental studies		

20. *APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION*

I swear or affirm under oath and subject to the penalties for perjury that the information provided in this Environmental Assessment Statement (EAS) is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief, based upon my personal knowledge and familiarity with the information described herein and after examination of the pertinent books and records and/or after inquiry of persons who have personal knowledge of such information or who have examined pertinent books and records.

Still under oath, I further swear or affirm that I make this statement in my capacity as the applicant or representative of the entity that seeks the permits, approvals, funding, or other governmental action(s) described in this EAS.

APPLICANT/REPRESENTATIVE NAME	DATE
Max Meltzer	August 31st 2018

SIGNATURE Max Meltzer

PLEASE NOTE THAT APPLICANTS MAY BE REQUIRED TO SUBSTANTIATE RESPONSES IN THIS FORM AT THE DISCRETION OF THE LEAD AGENCY SO THAT IT MAY SUPPORT ITS DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE.

Part III: DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE (To Be Completed by Lead Agency)

INSTRUCTIONS: In completing Part III, the lead agency should consult 6 NYCRR 617.7 and 43 RCNY § 6-06 (Executive Order 91 or 1977, as amended), which contain the State and City criteria for determining significance.

1. For each of the impact categories listed below, consider whether the project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment, taking into account its (a) location; (b) probability of occurring; (c) duration; (d) irreversibility; (e) geographic scope; and (f) magnitude.

IMPACT CATEGORY	Potentially Significant Adverse Impact: YES	NO
Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy	☐	☒
Socioeconomic Conditions	☐	☒
Community Facilities and Services	☐	☒
Open Space	☐	☒
Shadows	☐	☒
Historic and Cultural Resources	☐	☒
Urban Design/Visual Resources	☐	☒
Natural Resources	☐	☒
Hazardous Materials	☐	☒
Water and Sewer Infrastructure	☐	☒
Solid Waste and Sanitation Services	☐	☒
Energy	☐	☒
Transportation	☐	☒
Air Quality	☐	☒
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐	☒
Noise	☐	☒
Public Health	☐	☒
Neighborhood Character	☐	☒
Construction	☐	☒

2. Are there any aspects of the project relevant to the determination of whether the project may have a significant impact on the environment, such as combined or cumulative impacts, that were not fully covered by other responses and supporting materials? ☐ YES ☒ NO

If there are such impacts, attach an explanation stating whether, as a result of them, the project may have a significant impact on the environment.

3. Check determination to be issued by the lead agency:

☐ **Positive Declaration**: If the lead agency has determined that the project may have a significant impact on the environment, and if a Conditional Negative Declaration is not appropriate, then the lead agency issues a *Positive Declaration* and prepares a draft Scope of Work for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

☐ **Conditional Negative Declaration:** A *Conditional Negative Declaration* (CND) may be appropriate if there is a private applicant for an Unlisted action AND when conditions imposed by the lead agency will modify the proposed project so that no significant adverse environmental impacts would result. The CND is prepared as a separate document and is subject to the requirements of 6 NYCRR Part 617.

☒ **Negative Declaration:** If the lead agency has determined that the project would not result in potentially significant adverse environmental impacts, then the lead agency issues a *Negative Declaration*. The *Negative Declaration* may be prepared as a separate document (see template) or using the embedded Negative Declaration on the next page.

4. ***LEAD AGENCY'S CERTIFICATION***

TITLE	LEAD AGENCY
Deputy Director, Environmental Assessment and Review Division	Department of City Planning, acting on behalf of the City Planning Commission
NAME: Olga Abinader	DATE: 8/31/2018

SIGNATURE: Olga Abinader

NEGATIVE DECLARATION (Use of this form is optional)

Statement of No Significant Effect

Pursuant to Executive Order 91 of 1977, as amended, and the Rules of Procedure for City Environmental Quality Review, found at Title 62, Chapter 5 of the Rules of the City of New York and 6 NYCRR, Part 617, State Environmental Quality Review, the Department of City Planning, acting on behalf of the City Planning Commission assumed the role of lead agency for the environmental review of the proposed project. Based on a review of information about the project contained in this environmental assessment statement and any attachments hereto, which are incorporated by reference herein, the lead agency has determined that the proposed project would not have a significant adverse impact on the environment.

Reasons Supporting this Determination

The above determination is based on information contained in this EAS, which finds that the proposed project:
and related actions sought before the City Planning Commission would have no significant effect on the quality of the environment. Reasons supporting this Determination are noted below.

Hazardous Materials and Air Quality:
1. An (E) designation (E-498) for hazardous materials and air quality has been incorporated into the proposed actions. Refer to "Determination of Significance Appendix: (E) Designation" for a list of sites affected by the (E) designation and applicable (E) designation requirements. The analyses conducted for hazardous materials and air quality conclude that with the (E) designation requirements in place, the proposed actions would not result in significant adverse impacts to hazardous materials or air quality.

Land Use, Zoning and Public Policy:
3. This EAS includes a detailed Land Use, Zoning and Public Policy section, which analyzes the potential significance of the proposed actions on land use, zoning and public policy in the study area. The proposed rezoning from C8-1 to R7A/C2-3 would facilitate a change of use from commercial to mixed residential and commercial in an area characterized by diverse uses including residential, commercial, mixed residential and commercial, and industrial uses. The C8-1 zoning district is bordered by R6, R5, and R4-1 districts and would not generate new land uses that would be incompatible with existing land uses within the study area. The analysis concludes that no significant adverse impacts related to Land Use, Zoning and Public Policy would result from the proposed actions.

No other significant effects upon the environment that would require the preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Statement are foreseeable. This Negative Declaration has been prepared in accordance with Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law (SEQRA).

TITLE	LEAD AGENCY
Deputy Director, Environmental Assessment and Review Division	Department of City Planning, acting on behalf of the City Planning Commission
NAME	DATE
Olga Abinader	8/31/2018
SIGNATURE	

TITLE	
Chair, Department of City Planning	
NAME	DATE
Marisa Lago	9/4/2018
SIGNATURE	

Determination of Significance Appendix: (E) Designation

An (E) Designation **(E-498)** related to hazardous materials and air quality will be assigned to Projected Development Site 1 (Block 4516, Lot 8 and 46) and Projected Site 2 (Block 4516, Lot 43, 44, 45, and 144) in order to preclude significant adverse impacts, as noted below.

Hazardous Materials:

The (E) Designation requirements for hazardous materials are as follows:

Task 1-Sampling Protocol

The applicant submits to OER, for review and approval, a Phase I of the site along with a soil, groundwater and soil vapor testing protocol, including a description of methods and a site map with all sampling locations clearly and precisely represented. If site sampling is necessary, no sampling should begin until written approval of a protocol is received from OER. The number and location of samples should be selected to adequately characterize the site, specific sources of suspected contamination (i.e., petroleum based contamination and non-petroleum based contamination), and the remainder of the site's condition. The characterization should be complete enough to determine what remediation strategy (if any) is necessary after review of sampling data. Guidelines and criteria for selecting sampling locations and collecting samples are provided by OER upon request.

Task 2-Remediation Determination and Protocol

A written report with findings and a summary of the data must he submitted to OER after completion of the testing phase and laboratory analysis for review and approval. After receiving such results, a determination is made by OER if the results indicate that remediation is necessary. If OER determines that no remediation is necessary, written notice shall be given by OER.

If remediation is indicated from test results, a proposed remediation plan must be submitted to OER for review and approval. The applicant must complete such remediation as determined necessary by OER. The applicant should then provide proper documentation that the work has been satisfactorily completed.

A construction-related health and safety plan should be submitted to OER and would be implemented during excavation and construction activities to protect workers and the community from potentially significant adverse impacts associated with contaminated soil, groundwater and/or soil vapor. This plan would be submitted to OER prior to implementation.

Air Quality:

The (E) Designation requirements for air quality are as follows:

Projected Site 1 (Block 4516, Lot 8 and 46)
Any new residential/commercial development on the above referenced property must ensure HVAC stack(s) is located at the highest tier and at least 98 feet above grade, to avoid any significant adverse air quality impacts.

Projected Site 2 (Block 4516, Lot 43, 44, 45, and 144)
Any new residential/commercial development on the above referenced property must ensure stack(s) is located at the highest tier and at least 98 feet above grade, to avoid any significant adverse air quality impacts.

Table of Contents

1.0 PROPOSED ACTIONS 1

1.1 Description of the Proposed Project Area 2
1.2 Required Approvals and Proposed Actions 2
1.3 Purpose and Need For Proposed Actions 14
1.4 Description of the Proposed Development 14
1.5 Build Year For Analysis 14
1.6 Reasonable Worst Case Development Scenario 14

2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW 20

2.1 LAND USE, ZONING AND PUBLIC POLICY 20
2.1.1 Land Use 20
2.1.2 Zoning 25
2.1.3 Public Policy 29
2.2 SHADOWS 30
2.2.1 Preliminary Shadow Screening Assessment 30
2.3 HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES 32
2.4 URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES 33
2.4.1 Preliminary Analysis 33
2.5 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS 43
2.6 TRANSPORTATION 44
2.6.1 Introduction 44
2.6.2 Traffic 45
2.6.3 Pedestrians 48
2.7 AIR QUALITY 51
2.7.1 Introduction 51
2.7.2 Methodology 54
2.7.3 Assessment 57
2.8 NOISE 67
2.8.1 Mobile Sources 67
2.8.2 Stationary Sources 72
2.9 NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER 73
2.9.1 Existing Conditions 74
2.9.2 Future No-Action Scenario 75
2.9.3 Future With-Action Scenario 75
2.10 CONSTRUCTION 78

Figures

Figure 1.2-1 Project Site Location 3
Figure 1.2-2a Existing Zoning Sectional Map 4
Figure 1.2-2b Proposed Zoning Change Map 5
Figure 1.2-3 Tax Map 6
Figure 1.2-4 Photo Key Map 7
Figure 1.2-5 Photographs of the Site and Surrounding Area- Photos Taken April 2018 8
Figure 1.2-6 Illustrative Rendering 13
Figure 2.1-1 Land Use Map 23
Figure 2.1-2 Zoning Map 28
Figure 2.2-1 Tier 1 Screening Assessment 31
Figure 2.4-1 Aerial Photo 35
Figure 2.4-2 Urban Design No-Action –View 1 37
Figure 2.4-3 Urban Design With Action –View 1 38
Figure 2.4-4 Urban Design No-Action – View 2 39
Figure 2.4-5 Urban Design With-Action – View 2 40
Figure 2.4-6 Urban Design No-Action – View 3 41
Figure 2.4-7 Urban Design With-Action – View 3 42

Figure 2.6-1 Project Site-Generated Pedestrian Volumes Assignments- Weekday Midday Peak Hour. 50
Figure 2.7-1 Air Quality Screening Graph – Projected Development Site 1 59
Figure 2.7-2 Air Quality Screening Graph – Projected Development Site 2 60
Figure 2.7-3 Air Quality Screening Graph – Cumulative 61
Figure 2.8-1 Noise Monitor Location 70
Figure 2.8-2 Noise Monitor Location Photos 71

Tables

Table 1 Projected Development under the Proposed Rezoning 17
Table 1a Incremental Development 18
Table 2 2014 Land Use Distribution - Bronx Community District 11 24
Table 3a Summary of Existing Zoning Regulations 26
Table 3b Summary of Future With-Action Zoning Regulations 29
Table 4 Summary of Development Densities under the Proposed Action 45
Table 5 Estimated Peak Hour Person-Trip Generation Characteristics 46
Table 6 Estimated Peak Hour Vehicle-Trip Generation Characteristics 47
Table 7 Estimated Peak Hour Person-Trip Generation Increments: Transit and Pedestrians 49
Table 8 National and New York State Ambient Air Quality Standards 53
Table 9 Background Concentration 57
Table 10 Reasonable Worst Case Development Scenario Summary 58
Table 11 HVAC Emission Rates and Stack Parameters for the Proposed Buildings 62
Table 12 Maximum Modeled Concentration ($\mu g/m^3$) from Projected Development Site 1 63
Table 13 Maximum Modeled Concentration ($\mu g/m^3$) from Projected Development Site 2 63
Table 14 Maximum Modeled Concentration ($\mu g/m^3$) from Projected Development Site 1 and Projected Development Site 2 63
Table 15 Permitted Emission Rates 64
Table 16 Relevant NYSDEC Ambient Air Contaminants Guideline Concentration Criteria 65
Table 17 AERMOD-predicted Short-term Concentrations from Existing Industrial Sources 65
Table 18 AERMOD-predicted 1-hr and 8-hr CO impact from Existing Industrial Sources 65
Table 19 Hazard Risk Index 66
Table 20 Sound Pressure Level & Loudness of Typical Noises in Indoor & Outdoor Environments 68
Table 21: Noise Levels in dBA at Location 1 72
Table 22: Noise Levels in dBA at Location 2 72

Appendices

Appendix A – Site Plans

Appendix B – Correspondence with Landmarks Preservation Commission

Appendix C – Phase I ESA

Appendix D – NYC DEP Permit Bronx Block 4515, Lot 22

Appendix E – NYC DOB C/O Bronx Block 4515, Lot 22

Appendix F – Pedestrian Level 2 Screening Back-up Data

Appendix G - Revised CEQR EAS Short Form and Negative Declaration

Appendix H - Technical Memorandum- Revised CEQR EAS with Revised Zoning Area Boundary by the City Planning Commission

1.0 PROPOSED ACTIONS

I. INTRODUCTION

The applicant, 2712 Radcliff Yates Realty LLC, proposes a zoning map amendment to rezone 2712 Williamsbridge Road & 2705, 2721, 2723, 2725, 2727, and 2729 Colden Avenue, Block 4516, Lots 8, 43, 44, 144, 45, 46, and 48 (the "Proposed Project Area" or "Rezoning Area"), in the Allerton neighborhood of Bronx Community District 11, from a C8-1 zoning district to an R7A and an R7A/C2-3 district, with the R7A zoning district mapped over the entire Proposed Project Area and the C2-3 overlay mapped within 80 feet of Williamsbridge Road. The proposed zoning map amendment will facilitate the development of a new 9-story plus cellar mixed-use building with ground floor commercial use and 35 dwelling units (the "Proposed Development") to be constructed at 2712 Williamsbridge Road and 2721 Colden Avenue, Block 4516, Lots 8 and 46 (the "Proposed Development Site").

The proposed Rezoning Area consists of a portion of an irregularly shaped block (Block 4516) bound by Williamsbridge Road, Colden Avenue, Boston Road, and Radcliff Avenue. The Applicant proposes to map an R7A/C2-3 zoning district onto the south portion of the block, which is currently zoned C8-1. The proposed text amendment of Zoning Resolution ("ZR") Appendix F: Inclusionary Housing Designated Areas and Mandatory Inclusionary Housing Areas for Community District 11, Bronx would establish the Project Area as a Mandatory Inclusionary Housing ("MIH") Area. These two actions make up the Proposed Actions of this project. The proposed text amendment would require the Applicant to develop the Development Site in accordance with the MIH program. Pursuant to the MIH program, a percentage of the new dwelling units in the Proposed Development must be affordable units, resulting in an affordable housing set-aside for either 25 percent of the residential floor area at an average of 60 percent of AMI (Option 1) or 30 percent of the residential floor area at an average of 80 percent AMI (Option 2). The proposed affordable housing set aside ensures that the development within the Project Area would address the need for housing at low-income levels. The project is not seeking HPD financing. In an R7A district, an FAR of 4.6 is permitted with the Inclusionary Housing bonus, and with basic ZQA modifications, an overall building height of 95 feet is allowed to accommodate the permitted FAR.

As described below, the development generated by the Proposed Actions would contain residential uses on the Applicant's Development Site. Therefore, this EAS contemplates a development assessment scenario based on the applicable MIH and Zoning for Quality and Affordability (ZQA) regulations. To conservatively consider the effects on the greater area, development is also projected on one additional site not controlled by the Applicant, as discussed below.

The Applicant's Development Site contains two adjacent tax lots with approximately 8,659 square feet of combined lot area. Lot 8 is improved with a one story, 2,748 gross square foot mixed residential and commercial building. Lot 46 is improved with a one-story, 1,350 gross square foot parking garage. In absence of the Proposed Actions, under the No-Action scenario, it is assumed that the Project Site would continue to be occupied by these uses.

In addition to the applicant controlled lots (Bronx Block 4516, Lots 8 and 46), the rezoning boundary would include Block 4516, Lots, 48, 43, 44, 144, and 45.

This EAS studies the potential for individual and cumulative environmental impacts related to the Proposed Actions occurring in a study area of approximately 400 feet around the Rezoning Area. This study area is generally bound by Arnow Avenue to the north, the mid-block point between Paulding and Hone Avenues to the east, Bronxwood Avenue to the west, and about 200 feet south of Allerton Avenue to the south.

II. BACKGROUND AND EXISTING CONDITIONS

1.1 Description of the Proposed Project Area

The Proposed Project Area or Rezoning Area is located within the Allerton neighborhood of Bronx Community District 11 and consists of seven tax lots: Block 4516, Lots 8, 46, 48, 43, 44, 144, and 45 (**Figure 1.2-3**). The Applicant's Proposed Development Site is a combined approximately 8,659 square foot lot located at 2712 Williamsbridge Road on Block 4516, Lots 8 and 46 (**Figure 1.2-1**). Lot 8 is improved with a one-story, 2,748 gross square foot mixed residential and commercial building with two Use Group (UG) 2 residential units (Non-conforming). Lot 46 is improved with a one-story, 1,350 gross square foot parking garage. The Development Site is located midblock with Colden Avenue to the east and Williamsbridge Road to the west. The Development Site has approximately 50 feet of frontage on Colden Avenue (Lot 46) and 91 feet of frontage on Williamsbridge Road (Lot 8). A key to photographs of the site and surrounding area is shown in **Figure 1.2-4** with the photographs displayed in **Figure 1.2-5**.

This EAS studies the potential for individual and cumulative environmental impacts related to the Proposed Actions occurring in a study area of approximately 400 feet around the Rezoning Area. This study area is generally bound by Arnow Avenue to the north, Colden Avenue to the east, Boston Post Road to the west and Astor Avenue to the south.

1.2 Required Approvals and Proposed Actions

The applicant is requesting a zoning change from C8-1 to R7A/C2-3 (**Figures 1.2-2a and 1.2-2b**) on Brooklyn Block 4516, Block 4516, Lots 8, 46, 48, 43, 44, 144, and 45 to facilitate the construction of an eight-story plus cellar mixed-use building, with ground floor commercial use and 35 residential units with an accessory gym and rooftop terrace on Block 4516, Lots 8 and 46 (lots expected to be merged). The applicant also seeks a zoning text amendment to amend Appendix F: Inclusionary Housing Designated Areas to map a Mandatory Inclusionary Housing Designated area over the proposed Project Area.



AECOM

Environmental Assessment Statement
2712 Williamsbridge Road Rezoning
Bronx, NY

Project Site Location

Figure 1.2-1



AECOM

Environmental Assessment Statement
2712 Williamsbridge Road Rezoning
Bronx, NY

Zoning Sectional Map

Figure 1.2-2a

Zoning Change Map



Current Zoning Map (4a)



Proposed Zoning Map (4a) - Project Area is outlined with dotted lines

Rezoning from C8-1 to R7A/C2-3



AECOM

Environmental Assessment Statement
2712 Williamsbridge Road Rezoning
Bronx, NY

Zoning Change Map

Figure 1.2-2b



AECOM

Environmental Assessment Statement
2712 Williamsbridge Road Rezoning
Bronx, NY

Tax Map

Figure 1.2-3



AECOM

Environmental Assessment Statement
2712 Williamsbridge Road Rezoning
Bronx, NY

Photograph Location Map

Figure 1.2-4

Figure 1.2-5 Photographs of the Site and Surrounding Area- Photos Taken April 2018



Photo 1: View of neighboring residential/commercial building from the corner of Williamsbridge Road and Allerton Avenue looking north.



Photo 2: View of Projected Development Site 1 (Lot 8) and neighboring building from Williamsbridge Road looking east.



Photo 3: View of Projected Development Site 1 (Lot 8) from Williamsbridge Road looking southeast.



Photo 4: View of Projected Development Site 1 (Lot 46) from Colden Avenue looking southwest.



Photo 5: View of Williamsbridge Road from Allerton Avenue looking northwest.



Photo 6: View of Boston Road from the corner of Boston Road and Williamsbridge Road looking northeast



Photo 7: View of commercial uses from the corner of Radcliff Avenue and Williamsbridge Avenue looking west.



Photo 8: View of retail uses and restaurant from Boston Road between Bronxwood Avenue and Williamsbridge Road looking north.



Photo 9: View of the west side of Williamsbridge Road between Allerton Avenue and Radcliff Avenue facing southwest.



Photo 10: View of intersection between Radcliff Avenue and Williamsbridge Road from west side of Radcliff Avenue looking south.

Figure 1.2-6

Illustrative Rendering



PERSPECTIVE VIEW FROM COLDEN AVENUE (PRELIMINARY PLACEHOLDER)



PERSPECTIVE VIEW FROM WILLIAMSBRIDGE ROAD (PRELIMINARY PLACEHOLDER)

1.3 Purpose and Need For Proposed Actions

Residential uses are prohibited in C8-1 zoning districts. The proposed R7A/C2-3 zoning district would permit the applicant to develop the site with residential and commercial facility uses at a combined FAR of 4.6. Absent the Proposed Actions, the applicant would be unable to construct the Proposed Development under the existing zoning and Use Group restrictions for a mixed residential and commercial building in a C8-1 district.

1.4 Description of the Proposed Development

The proposed rezoning will facilitate the development of a new 9-story plus cellar mixed-use commercial and residential building with approximately 38,712 square feet of zoning floor area (4.43 FAR) at the Proposed Development Site. The Proposed Development will consist of cellar level parking and bicycle parking, 4,825 square feet of ground floor commercial space, and 33,887 square feet of residential space with a total of 35 dwelling units on floors two through eight. The residential use will include an accessory gym and rooftop terrace on the proposed ninth floor. The Proposed Development will be built to the street line along Willamsbridge Road, will be set back 50 feet from Colden Avenue, will have a base height of 75 feet and will rise to a total height of 92'-7". The commercial space will be accessed through an entrance along the Willamsbridge Road frontage and the residential lobby will be accessed through an entrance along the Colden Avenue frontage. The two existing curb cuts will be removed and a new 14' curb cut is proposed on Willamsbridge Road to access the cellar level parking garage.

The Proposed Development will be located within an MIH Designated Area, upon approval of the proposed zoning text map amendment of ZR Appendix F, and the applicant intents to provide affordable housing units pursuant to Option 1 or Option 2 of the City's MIH program. The Proposed Development will provide either nine affordable housing units (25%) pursuant to Option 1 of the MIH program or eleven affordable housing units (30%) pursuant to Option 2 of the MIH program.

Parking Requirements per Zoning Resolution

Per Section 25-241 of the Zoning Resolution (Required Parking for Small Zoning Lots) the applicant would be required to provide parking for 30 percent of the number of market rate dwelling units. The applicant is proposing this accessory parking despite that fact that the appplicant is eliglbe for a waiver for all parking per Section 25-26 since fewer than 15 parking spaces are required.

1.5 Build Year For Analysis

Considering the approval process, and assuming a construction period of approximately 16 to 20 months, the build year of the Proposed Development is assumed to be 2019. However, as additional development is projected on parcels not under the applicant's control, an analysis year of 2021 will be used to assess the potential for environmental impacts.

1.6 Reasonable Worst Case Development Scenario

Existing Conditions

The Proposed Development Site consists of two tax lots (Block 4516, Lots 8 and 46). Lot 8 is occupied by a one-story mixed residential and commercial building. Lot 46 is occupied by a one- story parking garage. The Proposed Development Site (Block 4516, Lots 8 and 46) covers a total of approximately 8,659 square feet.

The remaining properties within the Rezoning Area are used as follows. Block 4516, Lot 43 is improved with a three story Use Group 2 residential building. Lot 44 is improved with a three story Use Group 2 residential building. Lot 144 is improved with a three story Use Group 2 residential building. Lot 45 is

improved with a three story Use Group 2 residential building, and Lot 48 is improved with a six story Use Group 2 residential building.

Future No-Action Scenario

The Proposed Development Site is located in the Allerton neighborhood of Bronx, which is densely developed. While a vacant lot was observed within 400 feet of the proposed Rezoning Area, all lots included in the Rezoning Area boundary are improved. Therefore, as there are no known development plans on any parcels, it is assumed that these conditions would remain consistent with existing conditions under the No-Action scenario.

Under the No-Action scenario, Block 4516, Lots 8 and 46 would remain improved. Lot 8 would remain improved with a one-story, approximately 2,748 square foot mixed use residential and commercial building. Lot 46 would remain improved with a one story, approximately 1,350 square foot parking facility. Block 4516, Lot 48 would remain improved with a six-story, approximately 40,228 square foot residential building. On a 7,480 square foot lot, this represents a built FAR of approximately 5.3. Lot 43 would remain improved with a three-story residential building. The building occupies a 1,653 square foot lot and contains a total of 1,782 square feet of gross floor area. This represents a built FAR of 1.07. Lot 44 would remain improved with a 1,582 three-story residential building. This building occupies a 1,458 square feet lot and represents a built FAR of 1.08. Lot 144 would remain improved with a three story 1,582 square foot residential building. Built on a 1,350 square foot lot, this building represents a build FAR of 1.17. Lot 45 would remain improved with a three story 1,582 square foot residential building. Built on 1,224 square foot lot, this building represents a built FAR of 1.29.

Future With-Action Scenario

Under the With-Action Scenario, the proposed rezoning would amend the zoning map to change the existing C8-1 district to an R7A/C2-3 district, which would facilitate the applicant's Proposed Development of an nine story plus cellar mixed building with approximately 33,887 zoning square feet of residential space (35 dwelling units) and 4,825 zoning square feet of commercial space. In order to present a conservative assessment, the With-Action Scenario assumes that the Proposed Development Site (Block 4516, Lots 8 and 46) would be constructed to the maximum allowable floor area in an R7A/C2-3 zoning district, which is 4.6 FAR.

Furthermore, in the interest of a conservative analysis, it is assumed that the following lots, Block 4516, Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45 would be merged into one projected development site. Consistent with the analysis for Block 4516, Lots 8 and 46, it is assumed Block 4516, Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45 would be constructed to the maximum allowable floor area of 4.6 allowed under ZQA/MIH regulations for an R7A/C2-3 zoning district, assuming the 20 percent affordable housing option.

In general, the following factors are considered when evaluating whether some amount of development would likely be constructed by the build year on any nearby site. Known as Soft (or Projected/Potential Development) Sites, the criteria include the following:

- *The uses and bulk allowed*: Buildings built to substantially less than the maximum allowable FAR under the existing zoning are considered "soft" enough such that there would likely be sufficient incentive to develop in the future, depending on other factors specific to the area, listed below; and

- *Size of the development site*: Lots must be large enough to be considered "soft." Generally, lots with a small lot size are not considered likely to be redeveloped, even if currently built to substantially less than the maximum allowable FAR. A small lot is often defined for this purpose as 5,000 square feet or less, but the lot size criteria is dependent on neighborhood specific trends, and common development sizes in the study area should be examined prior to establishing this criteria.

If sites meet both of the criteria above, then the following factors are considered:

- The amount and type of recent as-of-right development in the area;
- Recent real estate trends in the area;
- Recent and expected future changes in residential population and employment in the study area;
- Government policies or plans, such as a building on site being identified for a landmark designation, that may affect the development potential of a site or sites;
- Site specific conditions that make development difficult; and
- Issues relating to site control or site assemblage that may affect redevelopment potential.

Once sites are considered as development sites, they are divided into two categories – projected development sites and potential development sites. Projected development sites are considered more likely to be developed within analysis period (build year 2021) because of their size (they are either large lots or contiguous small lots in common ownership that together comprise a large site). Potential development sites are less likely to be developed within the analysis period because they are not entirely under common ownership, have an irregular shape or have some combination of these features.

Projected Development Sites

Based on these criteria, Block 4516, Lots 8 and 46, and Block 4516, Lots, 43, 44, 144, and 45 have been identified as projected development sites. In order to present a conservative assessment, the Future With-Action Scenario assumes that the Proposed Actions would result in development being constructed to the maximum allowable floor area in an R7A/C2-3 zoning district, which is 4.6 FAR. With basic ZQA modifications, an overall building height of 95 feet is allowed to accommodate the permitted FAR. Data for the lots located in the proposed rezoning area are shown in **Table 1**.

Block 4516 Lots 8 and 46 – Projected Development Site No. 1

Under the Future With-Action Scenario, it is assumed that Block 4516, Lots 8 and 46 would be developed to the maximum FAR of 4.6, pursuant to ZQA/MIH regulations. On an 8,727 square-foot lot, it is assumed that the Proposed Action would result in approximately 9,599 gross square feet (8,727 zsf) of commercial and office floor area (FAR 1.0) and 34,559 gross square feet (31,417 zsf) of residential floor area (FAR 3.6). Estimating approximately 850 square feet per dwelling unit, it is assumed 40 residential units would be constructed on-site. For CEQR analysis, assuming 20% of the units are available at 80% of AMI, the proposed rezoning would result in the creation of approximately 8 affordable units. It is assumed that the building would be built to its maximum allowable height of 95 feet.

Block 4516 Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45 – Projected Development Site No. 2

Under the With-Action Scenario, it is assumed that Block 4516, Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45 would be merged and developed to the maximum FAR of 4.6, pursuant to ZQA/MIH. On a combined 5,685 square foot lot, it is assumed that the Proposed Action would result in approximately 22,512 gsf of residential floor area (20,466 zsf of residential floor area) (FAR 3.6) and 6,253 gsf of commercial floor area (5,685 zsf feet of commercial floor area) (FAR 1.0). Estimating approximately 850 square feet per dwelling unit, it is assumed 26 residential units would be constructed on-site.

For CEQR analysis purposes assuming 20% of the units are available at 80% of AMI, the proposed rezoning would result in the creation of approximately 5 affordable units. It is assumed that the building would be built to its maximum allowable height of 95 feet.

Build Year

Considering the approval process, and assuming a construction period of approximately 16 to 20 months, the build year of the Proposed Development is assumed to be 2019. However, as additional development is projected on parcels not under the applicant's control, an analysis year of 2021 will be used to assess the potential for environmental impacts.

Sites Where Development Would Not Be Induced or Precluded by the Proposed Actions

Block 4516, Lot 48

The proposed rezoning is not expected to induce new development on Block 4516, Lot 48, which is a 7,480 square foot lot occupied by a mixed-use 40,228 gsf, six-story building containing approximately 36,875 gsf of residential space (Use Group 2), as well as approximately 3,353 gsf commercial space (Use Group 6) on the ground floor. The building has a total gross floor area of approximately 40,228 square feet and is not under the applicants' control. As discussed in Chapter 2 of the *CEQR Technical Manual*, residential buildings with six or more units constructed before 1974 are likely to be rent stabilized and difficult to legally demolish due to tenant re-location requirements. As a result, these types of buildings are typically excluded from development scenarios because they are unlikely to be re-developed as a result of a proposed project. The building on Lot 48 has 40 dwelling units and was constructed in 1928, and thus meets the criteria of a building that is unlikely to be re-developed. Therefore, it is unlikely that any development would be induced at this site under the proposed project.

Table 1 Projected Development under the Proposed Rezoning

Site No.	*Block*	*Lot*	*Lot Area*	*Existing Zoning*	*Existing FAR*	*Proposed Zoning*	*Projected Residential Floor Area (sf)*	*Projected Com Facility Floor Area (sf)*	*Projected Commercial Floor Area (sf)*	*Projected FAR*	*DUs*	*Parking Requirements*	*Height and Floor Count*
1	*4516*	*8*	*5,796*	*C8-1*	*0.47*	*R7A/C2-3*	34,559 gsf	-	*9,599 gsf*	*4.6*	*40*	*12*	*95 feet and 9 floors*
	4516	*46*	*2,863*	*C8-1*	*0.47*	*R7A/C2-3*							
2	*4516*	*43*	1,653	*C8-1*	*1.08*	*R7A/C2-3*	22,512 gsf	-	*6,253 gsf*	*4.6*	*26*	*4*	*95 Feet & 9 floors*
	4516	*44*	*1,458*	*C8-1*	*1.09*	*R7A/C2-3*							
	4516	*144*	*1,350*	*C8-1*	*1.17*	*R7A/C2-3*							
	4516	*45*	*1,224*	*C8-1*	*1.29*	*R7A/C2-3*							
	Total						***57,071 gsf***	**-**	***15,852 gsf***		***66***	***16***	

Table 1a

DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING AND PROPOSED CONDITIONS – Incrementals

	EXISTING CONDITION	NO-ACTION CONDITION	WITH-ACTION CONDITION	INCREMENT
LAND USE				
Residential	☒ YES ☐ NO	☒ YES ☐ NO	☒ YES ☐ NO	
If "yes," specify the following:				
Describe type of residential structures	Multi-family residential, single family attached homes, mixed residential and commercial	Multi-family residential, single family attached homes, mixed residential and commercial	Multi-family residential, mixed residential and commercial	
No. of dwelling units	7 - 2 (Projected Site 1 / Lot 8) - 5 (Projected Site 2 / Lot 43, 44, 144, and 45)	7 - 2 (Projected Site 1 / Lot 8) - 5 (Projected Site 2 / Lot 43, 44, 144,and 45)	66 - 40 (Projected Site 1) - 26 (Projected Site 2)	59
No. of low- to moderate-income units	Unknown	Unknown	20% MIH option: 13 - 8 (Projected Site 1) - 5 (Projected Site 2)	20% MIH option: 13
Gross floor area (sq. ft.)	7,902 - 1,374 (Projected Site 1/ Lots 8 and 46) - 6,528 (Projected Site 2 / Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45)	7,902 - 1,374 (Projected Site 1/ Lots 8 and 46) - 6,528 (Projected Site 2 / Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45)	57,071 - 34,559 (Projected Site 1/ Lots 8 and 46) - 22,512 (Projected Site 2 / Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45)	49,169 - 33,185 (Projected Site 1/ Lots 8 and 46) - 15,984 (Projected Site 2 / Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45) 0- (Lot 48)
Commercial	☒ YES ☐ NO	☒ YES ☐ NO	☒ YES ☐ NO	
If "yes," specify the following:				
Describe type (retail, office, other)	Ground-floor retail and office	Ground-floor retail and office	Ground-floor retail	
Gross floor area (sq. ft.)	-1,374 - 1,374 (Projected Site 1/ Lots 8 and 46) -0 (Projected Site 2 / Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45)	-1,374 -1,374 (Projected Site 1/ Lots 8 and 46) -0 (Projected Site 2 / Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45)	-14,412 9,599 (Projected Site 1/ Lots 8 and 46) 6,253 (Projected Site 2 / Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45)	-14,478 8,225 (Projected Site 1/ Lots 8 and 46) 6,253 (Projected Site 2 / Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45)
Manufacturing/Industrial	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	
If "yes," specify the following:				
Type of use				
Gross floor area (sq. ft.)				
Open storage area (sq. ft.)				
If any unenclosed activities, specify:				
Community Facility	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	
If "yes," specify the following:				
Type				
Gross floor area (sq. ft.)				
Vacant Land	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	
If "yes," describe:				
Other Land Uses	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	
If "yes," describe:				

	EXISTING CONDITION	NO-ACTION CONDITION	WITH-ACTION CONDITION	INCREMENT
PARKING				
Garages	☒ YES ☐ NO	☒ YES ☐ NO	☒ YES ☐ NO	
If "yes," specify the following:				
No. of public spaces	0	0	0	
No. of accessory spaces	4	4	0	(4)
Lots	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	
If "yes," specify the following:				
No. of public spaces				
No. of accessory spaces				
ZONING				
Zoning classification	C8-1	C8-1	R7A/C2-3	
Maximum amount of floor area that can be developed	1.0 Commercial FAR	1.0 Commercial FAR	4.6 Residential FAR (w/ MIH bonus); 4.0 Community Facility FAR; 2.0 Commercial FAR	4.6 Residential FAR (w/ MIH bonus); 4.0 Community Facility FAR; 1.0 Commercial FAR
Predominant land use and zoning classifications within land use study area(s) or a 400 ft. radius of proposed project	Multi-family residential, attached homes, commercial, parking facilities, industrial & manufacturing; C8-1, R4-1 R5, R6	Multi-family residential, attached homes, commercial, parking facilities, industrial & manufacturing; C8-1, R4-1 R5, R6	Multi-family residential, attached homes, commercial, parking facilities, industrial & manufacturing; R7A/C2-3, R4-1 R5, R6	R7A/C2-3

2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The following technical sections are provided as supplemental assessments to the Environmental Assessment Statement ("EAS") Short Form Part II: Technical Analyses of the EAS forms a series of technical thresholds for each analysis area in the respective chapter of the *CEQR Technical Manual*. If the proposed project was demonstrated not to meet or exceed the threshold, the 'NO' box in that section was checked; thus additional analyses were not needed. If the proposed project was expected to meet or exceed the threshold, or if this was not able to be determined, the 'YES' box was checked on the EAS Short Form, resulting in a preliminary analysis to determine whether further analyses were needed. For those technical sections, the relevant chapter of the *CEQR Technical Manual* was consulted for guidance on providing additional analyses (and supporting information, if needed) to determine whether detailed analysis was needed.

A 'YES' answer was provided in the following technical analyses areas on the EAS Short Form:

- Land Use, Zoning and Public Policy
- Shadows
- Historic and Cultural Resources
- Urban Design and Visual Resources
- Hazardous Materials
- Transportation
- Air Quality
- Noise
- Neighborhood Character
- Construction

In the following technical sections, where a preliminary or more detailed assessment was necessary, the discussion is divided into Existing Conditions, the Future No-Action Conditions (the Future Without the Proposed Actions), and the Future With-Action Conditions (the Future With the Proposed Actions).

2.1 LAND USE, ZONING AND PUBLIC POLICY

The *CEQR Technical Manual* recommends procedures for analysis of land use, zoning and public policy to ascertain the impacts of a project on the surrounding area. Land use, zoning and public policy are described in detail below.

2.1.1 Land Use

The *CEQR Technical Manual* defines land use as the activity that is occurring on the land and within the structures that occupy it. Types of land use can include single- and multi-family residential, commercial (retail and office), community facility/institutional and industrial/manufacturing uses, as well as vacant land and public parks (open recreational space). The 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual* recommends that a Proposed Action be assessed in relation to land use, zoning, and public policy. For each of these areas, a determination is made of the potential for significant impact by the proposed action. If the action does have a potentially significant impact, appropriate analytical steps are taken to evaluate the nature of the impact, possible alternatives and possible mitigation.

Existing Conditions

The *CEQR Technical Manual* recommends a land use; zoning and public policy study area extending 400 feet from the site of a Proposed Action. This study area is generally bound by Arnow Avenue to the north, Paulding Avenue to the east, Bronxwood Avenue to the west, and Mace Avenue to the south (**Figure 5**).

Existing Conditions in Rezoning Area

The Rezoning Area includes 2712 Williamsbridge Road & 2705, 2721, 2723, 2725, 2727, and 2729 Colden Avenue, Block 4516, Lots 8, 43, 44, 144, 45, 46, and 48, in the Allerton neighborhood of Bronx Community District 11. The Proposed Project Area is zoned C8-1, a low-density commercial and manufacturing district with a maximum permitted FAR of 1.0. With the exception of Lot 46, each tax lot within the Proposed Project Area contains non-conforming residential use.

The Applicant Site, 2712 Williamsbridge Road and 2721 Colden Avenue, consists of Lots 8 and 46. Williamsbridge Road (Lot 8) is improved with a one-story plus basement mixed-use building with two residential units and approximately 2,748 square feet of floor area. 2721 Colden Avenue (Lot 46) is improved with a one-story parking garage with approximately 1,350 square feet of floor area.

2705 Colden Avenue (Lot 48) is improved with a non-conforming and non-complying six-story, approximately 40,228 square foot (5.38 FAR), mixed-use commercial and residential building with ground floor commercial use and 40 dwelling units.

2723 Colden Avenue (Lot 45) is improved with a three-story, one- or two-family residential building with approximately 1,582 square feet of floor area (1.29 FAR).

2725 Colden Avenue (Lot 144) is improved with a three-story, one- or two-family residential building with approximately 1,582 square feet of floor area (1.17 FAR).

2727 Colden Avenue (Lot 44) is improved with a three-story, one- or two-family residential building with approximately 1,582 square feet of floor area (1.09 FAR).

2729 Colden Avenue (Lot 43) is improved with a three-story, one- or two-family residential building with approximately 1,782 square feet of floor area (1.08 FAR).

A field survey was conducted to determine the existing land use patterns and neighborhood characteristics of the study area. The existing land uses in the area immediately surrounding the Project Area are commercial use buildings and a mix of single- and multi-family residential, and industrial/manufacturing use buildings. The commercial uses include restaurants, automobile-oriented uses and some local retail. The prevailing built form of the area is a mix of two- to four-story residential buildings and one-story warehouse distribution buildings. There is one vacant lot and multiple parking facilities in the study area.

Summary of Existing Conditions in Rezoning Area

Projected Development Site 1 consists of Block 4516 Lots 8 and 46 while Projected Development Site 2 consists of Block 4516, Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45. A portion of the Rezoning Area is occupied by a six-story residential use building with a beauty salon, food store, a transportation car service, and a realtor on the first floor on the building (Block 4516 Lot 48). Adjacent to this building, on the east side of Colden Avenue, is a one-story four-car parking garage (Block 4516 Lot 46). North of the parking garage are four three-story multi-family residential buildings (Block 4516 Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45). These residential uses are all non-conforming. On the west side of Rezoning Area, on Williamsburg Road, there is a two-story commercial use building at Block 4516 Lot 8.

The western portion of the study area, west of Radcliff Avenue, is dominated by commercial and professional use buildings and parking lots. In the northwestern portion of the study area at Block 4515 Lots 22 and 26 are New York Motors and Transmission Service Specialist with a parking lot on the property. At Lots 27 and 28 there is a three-story multi-family residence building. Further south at Block 4515 Lot 13 there is a Popeyes Louisiana Kitchen restaurant with a drive-through and a parking lot. South of Popeyes on Block 4515 Lots 1 and 5 is a Rite Aid with a large parking lot reaching to Boston Road. West of the Projected Development Site 1 are one- and two- story commercial and professional use buildings with a parking lot. The southernmost area of the western portion contains many one- and two- family residences on Block 4445. Block 4445, on the south side

of Allerton Avenue, there are mixed commercial and residential use buildings at Lots 35-59 and a one-story funeral home at Lots 40 and 41.

The eastern portion of the study area, east of Radcliff Avenue, is dominated by residential use buildings with commercial and transportation use buildings and a few parking lots. North of the Rezoning Area, there are commercial use and industrial/manufacturing use buildings. At Block 4516 Lot 14, there is a car wash and car detail shop, a pre-owned vehicle shop, and a Western Union, money transfer service. Further north of the Rezoning Area is a one-story industrial/manufacturing use, Mega Meats Inc. Distributors (Block 4516 Lot 31) and a one-story commercial building, Mike's Pipe Yard & Plumbing, and Boston Road Lock & Safe at Block 4516 Lots 23 and 19 respectively. Further north, towards Arnow Avenue Block 4516 is Clean City, a laundromat. East of the Rezoning Area, occupying much of Block 4517 there are more one- and two-family residential buildings. On Block 4517 Lots 1, 3, 5, and 7, on the north side of Allerton Avenue are commercial, professional, and local retail properties. On the south side of Allerton Avenue, is a fueling station (Block 4447 Lot 62). Much of Blocks 4446 and 4447 are one- and two- family residences. On the south side of Allerton Avenue, on Block 4446, south of the Rezoning Area, are mixed residential and commercial use buildings.

The general mix of land use observed in the study area generally reflects the distribution of land use observed throughout the Bronx CD 11, which is summarized in **Table 2.** The most prominent land use within the Bronx CD 11 is commercial use, followed by one- to two- family residences.



AECOM

Environmental Assessment Statement
2712 Williamsbridge Road Rezoning
Bronx, NY

Land Use Map

Figure 2.1-1

There is one vacant lot in the study area: Block 4446, Lot 33. Although the land use map shows a vacant lot on the east side of Paulding Avenue (Block 4518, Lot 24), the lot functions as a small yard for the house in the neighboring lot (Lot 25).

The mix of land use observed in the study area generally reflects the distribution of land use observed throughout Brooklyn CD 11, which is summarized in **Table 2.** The most prominent land use within Brooklyn CD 11 is one and two -family residential, followed by multi-family residential and institutions.

Table 2 2014 Land Use Distribution - Bronx Community District 11

LAND USE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
Residential Uses	
1-2 Family	42.3
Multi-Family	18.0
Mixed Residential/Commercial	4.2
Subtotal of Residential Uses	*64.5*
Non-Residential Uses	
Commercial/Office	8.4
Industrial	2.2
Transportation/Utility	2.0
Institutions	17.7
Open Space/Recreation	0.7
Parking Facilities	2.0
Vacant Land	2.0
Miscellaneous	0.5
Subtotal of Non-Residential Uses	*35.5*
TOTAL	**100.0**

Source: *Community District Profiles, New York City Department of City Planning.*
Note: Percentages may not add up to 100.0 percent due to rounding.

Future No-Action Scenario

The Projected Development Sites are located in a densely developed neighborhood. While there was a vacant lot observed within 400 feet of the proposed Rezoning Area, all lots located in the proposed Rezoning Area are improved. Therefore, as there are no known development plans on any of these parcels, it is assumed that future no-action conditions would remain consistent with existing conditions.

The Rezoning Area is located in the Allerton neighborhood of Bronx, which is densely developed. While one vacant lot was observed within 400 feet of the proposed Rezoning Area, all lots included in the rezoning boundary are improved. Therefore, as there are no known development plans on any parcels, it is assumed that these conditions would remain consistent with existing conditions under the No-Action scenario.

Under the No-Action scenario, Block 4516, Lots 8 and 46 would remain improved. Lot 8 would remain improved with a one-story, approximately 2,748 square foot mixed use residential and commercial building. Lot 46 would remain improved with a one story, approximately 1,350 square foot parking facility.

Block 4516, Lot 48 would remain improved with a six-story, approximately 40,228 square foot residential building. On a 7,480 square foot lot, this represents a built FAR of approximately 5.3. Lot 43 would remain improved with a three-story residential building. The building occupies a 1,653 square foot lot and contains a total of 1,782 square feet of gross floor area. This represents a built FAR of 1.07. Lot 44 would remain improved with a 1,582 three-story residential building. This building occupies a 1,458 square feet lot and represents a built FAR of 1.08. Lot 144 would remain improved with a three story 1,582 square foot residential building. Built on a 1,350 square foot lot, this building represents a build FAR of 1.17. Lot 45 would remain improved with a three story 1,582 square foot residential building. Built on 1,224 square foot lot, this building represents a built FAR of 1.29.

Future With-Action Scenario

Under the With-Action Scenario, the proposed rezoning would amend the zoning map to change the existing C8-1 district to an R7A/C2-3 district, which would facilitate the applicant's Proposed Development of an nine story plus cellar mixed building with approximately 33,887 zoning square feet of residential space (35 dwelling units) and 4,825 zoning square feet of commercial space. In order to present a conservative assessment, the With-Action Scenario assumes that the Proposed Development Site (Block 4516, Lots 8 and 46) would be constructed to the maximum allowable floor area in an R7A/C2-3 zoning district, which is 4.6 FAR.

Furthermore, in the interest of a conservative analysis, it is assumed that the remaining parcels of land (Block 4516, Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45) would be merged into one projected development site. Consistent with the analysis for Block 4516, Lots 8 and 46, it is assumed Block 4516, Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45 would be constructed to the maximum allowable floor area of 4.6 allowed under ZQA/MIH regulations for an R7A/C2-3 zoning district, assuming the 20 percent affordable housing option.

The Proposed Actions would not introduce any new or non-conforming land uses or Use Groups that are not already located within the study area. The With-Action Scenario would see denser development of two under-utilized lots, which would create a more vibrant, mixed use stretch of Williamsbridge Road. As such, no significant adverse impacts with respect to land use are expected and no further analysis is required

2.1.2 Zoning

The *New York City Zoning Resolution* dictates the use, density and bulk of developments within New York City. Additionally, the Zoning Resolution provides required and permitted accessory parking regulations. The City has three basic zoning district classifications – residential (R), commercial (C), and manufacturing (M). These classifications are further divided into low-, medium-, and high-density districts.

Existing Conditions

Zoning designations within and around the study area are depicted in **Figure 2.1-2**, while **Table 3a** summarizes use, floor area and parking requirements for the zoning districts in the study area.

The Proposed Development Site is located in a C8-1 zoning district that is mapped generally along Allerton Avenue to the south, Colden Avenue to the east, Arnow Avenue to the north, and Matthews Avenue to the west. Retail and Commercial uses (UGs 4-14) as well as community facility uses (UG 4 only) and General Service uses (UG 16) are allowed as-of-right in C8-1 zoning districts. The built floor area ratio (FAR) for C8-1 districts ranges from 1.0 FAR for commercial uses to 2.4 for UG 4 community facility uses. Buildings in C8-1 zoning districts cannot penetrate the sky exposure plane, which begins 30' above the street line.

The blocks to the northeast of the proposed Rezoning Area are located in an R4-1 zoning district that is generally mapped along Arnow Avenue to the north, Allerton Avenue to the south, Colden Avenue to the west, and Tenbroeck Avenue to the east. Residential uses (UGs 1 and 2) as well as community facility uses (UGs 3

and 4) are allowed as-of-right in R4-1 zoning districts. The built floor area ratio (FAR) for R5 districts can reach a maximum of 2.0 for community facilities and 0.75 for residential uses. Building heights within R4-1 districts can reach a maximum height of 35 feet with a maximum perimeter wall height of 25 feet. One parking space is required for every dwelling unit.

The southern portion of the study area is located within an R5 zoning district that is generally mapped along Williamsbridge Road to the east, Allerton Avenue to the north, Wallace Avenue to the west, and Pelham Parkway to the south. Residential uses (UGs 1 and 2) as well as community facility uses (UGs 3 and 4) are allowed as-of-right in R5 zoning districts. The maximum FAR in R5 zoning districts for residential uses is 1.25 and the maximum FAR for community facility uses is 2.0. Parking is required for 85 percent of dwelling units in R5 districts and there is a maximum building height of 40 feet.

The southern portion of the proposed Rezoning Area contains both C2-2 and C1-2 overlays on both sides of Allerton Avenue. In R5 and R4-1 districts, C2-2 and C1-2 commercial overlays allow a maximum FAR of 1.0 and an overlay depth of 150 feet. Typical retail uses in such overlays include those seen in the study area, such as neighborhood grocery stores, restaurants and beauty parlors.

Pelham Gardens Rezoning

On July 27th 2005, the City Council approved the Pelham Gardens Rezoning (CEQR# 05DCP054X, ULURP No. C050289ZMX), a DCP led initiative of zoning map amendments for all or portions of 163 blocks in the northeastern Bronx neighborhood of Pelham Gardens. The rezoning eliminated C1-2 and C2-2 zoning districts within existing R4 and R5 zoning districts, changed R3-2, R4, and R5 districts to R3X, R4-1, R4A, and R6B districts, and established a C2-3 zoning district within the proposed R6B zoning district.

The Project Area is located just outside of the zoning boundary of the Pelham Gardens Rezoning, located just west of the western border of the Pelham Gardens Rezoning on Colden Avenue.

Table 3a Summary of Existing Zoning Regulations

Zoning District	Type and Use Group (UG)	Floor Area Ratio (FAR)	Parking (Required Spaces)
C8-1	Commercial UGs 4 – 14 & 16	1.0 FAR for Commercial	Parking requirements vary by use
R4-1	Residential UGs 1 - 4	0.75 FAR for Residential (+20% attic allowance) 2.0 FAR for Community Facility	1 per DU
C2-2	Commercial Overlay UGs 1 - 9 & 14	1.0 FAR – Commercial in R5 1.0 FAR – Commercial in R4-1	Parking requirements vary
C1-2	Commercial Overlay UGs 1 - 6	1.0 FAR – Commercial in R5 1.0 FAR – Commercial in R4-1	Parking requirements vary
R5	Residential UGs 1 - 4	1.25 FAR for Residential 2.0 FAR for Community Facility	85% of DU's

Source: New York City Zoning Resolution, October 2016.

The Rezoning Area is also located within an area designated for the FRESH Program (zoning discretionary tax incentives area).

Future No-Action Scenario

In the Future No-Action Scenario, zoning changes are not expected to occur on the Project Site or in the surrounding study area. The Project Site would remain within a C8-1district.



AECOM

Environmental Assessment Statement
2712 Williamsbridge Road Rezoning
Bronx, NY

Zoning Map

Figure 2.1-2

Future With-Action Scenario

The Proposed Actions would change the existing C8-1 district to an R7A/C2-3 district over Bronx Block 4516 (Lots 8, 46, 48, 43, 44, 144, and 45). Doing so would increase the maximum allowable residential floor area on the Proposed Development Site, which currently does not permit housing per C8-1 zoning district regulations, to 4.6 FAR in an R7A/C2-3 zoning district with Inclusionary Housing bonus. Additionally, the allowable commercial FAR would increase from 1.0 FAR allowed in a C8-1 zoning district to an FAR of 2.0, the maximum commercial FAR allowed in an R7A/C2-3 zoning district.

Absent the Proposed Actions, the co-applicants would be unable to construct the projected 9-story mixed-use building under the existing floor area and use group regulations of a C8-1 district.

The Proposed Actions would not have a significant impact on the extent of conformity within the current surrounding area and it would not adversely affect the viability of conforming uses on nearby properties. Ground floor commercial uses are commonplace throughout the study area. Additionally, there are adjacent existing residential districts that permit multifamily apartment buildings.

Furthermore, the proposed zoning district (R7A/C2-4) would bring the existing apartment building just south of the Project Site, located at Block 4516, lot 48 into conformance. Therefore, significant impacts to zoning are not anticipated and further zoning analysis is not warranted. **Table 3B** summarizes the Future With-Action zoning regulations.

Table 3b Summary of Future With-Action **Zoning Regulations**

Zoning District	Type and Use Group (UG)	Floor Area Ratio (FAR)	Parking (Required Spaces)
C8-1	Commercial UGs 4 – 14 & 16	1.0 FAR for Commercial	Parking requirements vary by use
R4-1	Residential UGs 1 - 4	0.75 FAR for Residential (+20% attic allowance) 2.0 FAR for Community Facility	1 per DU
R7A	Residential UGs	4.0 FAR for Residential (4.6 with MIH bonus)	50% of DUs (30% if zoning lot < 10,000sqft; waived if 15 or fewer spaces required)
C2-2	Commercial Overlay UGs 1 - 9 & 14	1.0 FAR – Commercial in R5 2.0 FAR – Commercial in R6	Parking requirements vary
C1-2	Commercial Overlay UGs 1 - 6	1.0 FAR – Commercial in R5 2.0 FAR – Commercial in R6	Parking requirements vary
R5	Residential UGs 1 - 4	1.25 FAR for Residential 2.0 FAR for Community Facility	85% of DU's
C2-3	Commercial Overlay UGs 1 - 9 & 14	2.0 FAR – Commercial in R7A	Parking requirements vary

Source: New York City Zoning Resolution, October 2016.

2.1.3 Public Policy

The Project Site is not part of, or subject to, an Urban Renewal Plan (URP), adopted community 197-a Plan, Solid Waste Management Plan, Business Improvement District (BID), Industrial Business Zone (IBZ), or the New York City Landmarks Law. The Proposed Action is also not a large publically sponsored project, and as such, consistency with the City's *PlaNYC 2030* for sustainability is not warranted. In addition, the Rezoning Area is not located in the Coastal Management Zone; therefore a consistency review is not warranted.

Waterfront Revitalization Program

The Rezoning Area is not located within New York City's designated coastal zone boundary and therefore is not subject to review for its consistency with the City's Waterfront Revitalization Program.

2.2 SHADOWS

The *CEQR Technical Manual* defines a shadow as the condition that results when a building or other built structure blocks the sunlight that would otherwise directly reach a certain area, space or feature. An incremental shadow is the additional or new shadow that a building or other built structure resulting from a proposed project would cast on a sunlight-sensitive resource during the year. Sunlight-sensitive resources are those resources that depend on sunlight or for which direct sunlight is necessary to maintain the resource's usability or architectural integrity, including public open space, architectural resources and natural resources. Shadows can have impacts on publicly accessible open spaces or natural features by adversely affecting their use and important landscaping and vegetation. In general, increases in shadow coverage make parks feel darker and colder, affecting the experience of park patrons. Shadows can also have impacts on historic resources whose features are sunlight-sensitive, such as stained-glass windows, by obscuring the features or details which make the resources significant.

The *CEQR Technical Manual* states that a shadow assessment considers projects that result in new shadows long enough to reach a sunlight-sensitive resource. Therefore, a shadow assessment is warranted only if the project would either result in: (a) new structures (or additions to existing structures including the addition of rooftop mechanical equipment) of 50 feet or more; or, (b) be located adjacent to, or across the street from, a sunlight-sensitive resource.

2.2.1 Preliminary Shadow Screening Assessment

The shadow assessment begins with a preliminary screening assessment to ascertain whether a project's shadow may reach any sunlight-sensitive resources at any time of the year. If the screening assessment does not eliminate this possibility, a detailed shadow analysis is generally warranted in order to determine the extent and duration of the net incremental shadow resulting from the project.

Tier 1 Screening Assessment

The first step in the preliminary shadow screening is a Tier 1 Screening Assessment. A base map is developed that illustrates the proposed site location in relationship to any sunlight-sensitive resources (**Figure 2.2-1**).

The longest shadow study area is then determined, which encompasses the site of the proposed project and a perimeter around the site's boundary with a radius equal to the longest shadow that could be cast by the proposed structure, which is 4.3 times the height of the structure that occurs on December 21st, the winter solstice. To find the longest shadow length, the maximum height of the structure (including any rooftop mechanical equipment) was multiplied by the factor of 4.3.

A shadow radius of 4.3 times the maximum allowable height on the projected development sites (95 feet) was calculated, resulting in a shadow radius of approximately 408 feet. According to a land use check, no sunlight sensitive resources were in the area. There were no churches with stained glass windows and no open spaces. With no sunlight sensitive resources within the Tier 1 Study Area for both Projected Development Site 1 and Projected Development Site 2, no additional shadow analysis is required.



AECOM

Environmental Assessment Statement
2712 Williamsbridge Road Rezoning
Bronx, NY

Tier 1 Screening Assessment

Figure 2.2-1

2.3 HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

An assessment of historic and cultural resources is usually necessary for projects that are located in close proximity to historic or landmark structures or districts, or for projects that require in-ground disturbance, unless such disturbance occurs in an area that has been formerly excavated.

The term "historic resources" defines districts, buildings, structures, sites, and objects of historical, aesthetic, cultural, architectural and archaeological importance. In assessing both historic and cultural resources, the findings of the appropriate city, state, and federal agencies are consulted. Historic resources include: the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC)-designated landmarks, interior landmarks, scenic landmarks, and historic districts; locations being considered for landmark status by the LPC; properties/districts listed on, or formally determined eligible for, inclusion on the State and/or National Register (S/NR) of Historic Places; locations recommended by the New York State Board for Listings on the State and/or National Register of Historic Places and National Historic Landmarks.

Architectural Resources

According to *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines, impacts on historic resources are considered on those sites affected by the Proposed Actions and in the area surrounding identified development sites. The historic resources study area is therefore defined as the Project Site plus an approximately 400-foot radius around the Proposed Action area.

The projected development site is not a designated local or S/NR historic resource or property, nor is the site part of any designated historic district. The LPC was contacted for their initial review of the project's potential to impact nearby historic and cultural resources, and a response was received on July 24, 2017, indicating that the projected development site has no architectural significance (see **Appendix B**).

In order to determine whether the projected development has the potential to affect nearby off-site historic or architectural resources, the study area was screened for historic and architectural resources. No historic or architectural resources were identified within the 400-foot study area. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts on historic or architectural resources are expected as a result of the Proposed Actions, and further assessment is not warranted.

Cultural and Archaeological Resources

Unlike the architectural evaluation of a study area that extends beyond the footprint of a project's block and lot lines, the analysis of potential and/or projected impacts to archaeological resources is controlled by the actual footprint of the limits of soil disturbance. Archeological resources are physical remains, usually subsurface, of the prehistoric and historic periods such as burials, foundations, artifacts, wells and privies. The *CEQR Technical Manual* requires a detailed evaluation of a project's potential effect on the archeological resources if it would potentially result in an in-ground disturbance to an area not previously excavated.

The existing rezoning area has not been recently disturbed and no recent or distant cultural or archaeological significance have been attached to this area. Further, utilizing the NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation's "Cultural Resource Information System" (CRIS) mapper, the Rezoning Area does not fall within an archaeologically sensitive area. Based on both current and historic photoreconnaissance of the Rezoning Area, there is little potential for impact to any known or unknown resource due to development. The LPC was contacted for their initial review of the project's potential to impact nearby historic and cultural resources, and a response was received on July 25th, 2017, indicating that the projected development site has no architectural significance (see **Appendix B**). Therefore, significant adverse impacts to archaeological resources are not expected as a result of the Proposed Actions, and further analysis is not warranted.

2.4 URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, urban design is the totality of components that may affect a pedestrian's experience of public space. Elements that play an important role in the pedestrian's experience include streets, buildings, visual resources, open space, and natural features, as well as wind as it relates to channelization and downwash pressure from tall buildings. Furthermore, according to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, if a preliminary assessment determines that changes to the pedestrian environment are sufficiently significant to require greater explanation and further study, then a detailed urban design and visual resources analysis is appropriate. Detailed analyses are generally appropriate for all area-wide rezoning applications that include an increase in permitted floor area or changes in height and setback requirements, general large scale developments, or projects that would result in substantial changes to the built environment of a historic district, or components of an historic building that contribute to the resource's historic significance. Conditions that merit consideration for further analysis of visual resources include when the project partially or totally blocks a view corridor or a natural or built rare or defining visual resource. Further conditions that merit consideration are when the project changes urban design features so that the context of a natural or built visual resource is altered, such as if a project alters the street grid so that the approach to the resource changes, or if a project changes the scale of surrounding buildings so that the context changes.

The *CEQR Technical Manual* notes an urban design assessment considers whether and how a project may change the experience of a pedestrian in the Project Area. The assessment focuses on the components of a proposed project that may have the potential to alter the arrangement, appearance, and functionality of the built environment. In general, an assessment of urban design is needed when the project may have effects on one or more of the elements that contribute to the pedestrian experience (e.g., streets, buildings, visual resources, open space, natural features, wind, etc.). An urban design analysis is not warranted if a proposed project would be constructed within existing zoning envelopes, and would not result in physical changes beyond the bulk and form permitted "as-of-right" with the zoning district.

As the Proposed Actions would result in the construction of a new building that is not allowed "as-of-right" under the existing zoning, a preliminary analysis was conducted.

2.4.1 Preliminary Analysis

As stated in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the study area for urban design is the area where the project may influence land use patterns and the built environment, and is generally consistent with the study area used for the land use analysis (i.e., 400 feet around the Project Site). The purpose of the preliminary assessment is to determine whether any physical changes proposed by a project may raise the potential to significantly and adversely affect elements of urban design, which would warrant the need for a detailed urban design and visual resources assessment.

Existing Conditions

A photographic key map is provided in the previously presented **Figure 1.2-4**; with ground-level photographs of the projected development site and the immediate surrounding area provided in the previously presented **Figure 1.2-5.** An aerial view is of the area is provided in **Figure 2.4-1.**

Projected Development Site 1 consists of two tax lots (Block 4516, Lots 8 and 46). Lot 8 is presently improved with a one-story, 2,748 gross square foot mixed residential and commercial building that is currently occupied by The J Pilla Group Ltd and has a built FAR of 0.47. Lot 46 is presently improved with a one- story, 1,350 gross square foot parking garage with a built FAR of 0.47. Projected Development Site 1 (Block 4516, Lots 8 and 46) covers a total of approximately 8,659 square feet.

Under the Future With-Action Scenario, the Proposed Actions would amend the zoning map to change the existing C8-1 district to an R7A/C2-3 district. It is assumed that Projected Development Site 1 would be developed to the maximum FAR of 4.60.

Projected Development Site 2 consists of Block 4516, Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45, which each contain attached three-story one and two-family residential buildings. It is assumed that these lots would be combined into one development site and would be developed to the maximum FAR of 4.60. These buildings all match the urban design on the neighborhood. They are low to mid-rise buildings; approximately 30 to 40 feet in height built at the back of their lots to accommodate a parking space in front of each building. The fronts of the buildings face Colden Avenue.

There is no form that ties the built environment together visually. The area is characterized by a mix of one- and two-family residential, multi-family residential, commercial and isolated vacant land or parking uses. Several vacant lots exist within the study area (Block 4446, Lot 33 and Block 4518, Lot 24). The commercial uses are comprised of Use Group 6 retail establishments such as a pharmacy, a gas station, a security system supplier, and other local retail uses such as law offices, a florist, a bank, and a liquor store.

The residential uses in the study area range from multi-family walk up buildings ranging from 2 to 3 stories in the eastern portion of the study area to mid-rise five to six story apartment buildings to the south of the Project Area. The street grid is disrupted from its regular grid like- pattern by both Boston Road and Williamsbridge Road, which cut through the grid diagonally creating two intersections in the study area which involve three or more streets. These intersections are heavily trafficked and are characterized by their predominantly commercial uses. At the intersection of Williamsbridge Road, Radcliffe Avenue, and Boston Road, there is a small triangular “Green Street” and contains plantings.

The cohesion of the study area and street grid is disrupted by Williamsbridge Road and Boston road, two heavily-trafficked arterials that influence the visual character and urban design exhibited by the study area. Williamsbridge Road is a four lane, two – way street that runs northwest to southeast parallel to the Project Area on the western portion of the study area. Boston Road is a six lane, two-way street that runs east to west just north of the Project Area. Both of these roads are classified as “principal arterial others” by the New York State Department of Transportation and both are classified as local truck routes by the New York City Department of Transportation. Both of these streets are heavily populated with commercial uses. Most of the streets contain street trees, which are generally located at irregular intervals. At the intersection of Williamsbridge Road, Radcliffe Avenue, and Boston Road, there is a small triangular “Green Street” and contains plantings. No other notable streetscape elements (e.g. benches, plazas) are located within the study area.

The study area does not contain any parks or open space, or contain any notable natural features aside from the aforementioned “Green Street”. Similarly, the study area does not contain historic resources and is generally void of visual resources.

The street hierarchy includes several different functional classifications. Williamsbridge Road and Boston Road as classified as Principal Arterial Other Roadways and Bronxwood Avenue and Allerton Avenue are classified as a Minor Arterial Roadways. Additionally, Arnow Avenue, which is located at the very northern portion of the study area, is classified as a major collector. All other roadways in the study area are classified as local roads.

Additionally, Boston Road, Williamsbridge Road, and Allerton Avenue are categorized as ‘Local Truck Routes” by the New York City Department of Transportation.



AECOM

Environmental Assessment Statement
2712 Williamsbridge Road Rezoning
Bronx, NY

Aerial Photo

Figure 2.4-1

Future No-Action Scenario

Under the Future No-Action Condition, significant changes to the study area are not expected by the analysis year of 2021. It is anticipated that while tenants within area buildings may change, the overall use of these buildings would remain the same, and any physical changes would comply with applicable zoning regulations. No significant changes to the area's urban character are anticipated.

Future With-Action Scenario

As the Projected Development Sites would be built within the existing lot footprint on the Project Site, the development in the With-Action Scenario would not alter or disrupt the existing street grid or change the arrangement and orientation of streets in the area. Additionally, the Proposed Action would not permanently alter the existing sidewalks that border the Project Site to the east and west. Furthermore, there would not be any changes to the existing sidewalk layout. Overall, the development in the Future With-Action would not alter with the existing streets, street grid, streetscape, and sidewalks, though an approximately 15-foot wide curb cut would serve as an access point to a below-grade garage the applicant is proposing at Projected Development Site 1.

The development under the Future With-Action Scenario would result in a building that is larger in scale and height than buildings in the surrounding study area, which are typically two to five stories and 20 to 50 feet in height. As previously discussed, the With- Action scenario could result in a development of up to 9 stories and 95 feet in height. Although the development under the With-Action Scenario would be larger and taller than the existing low to mid rise buildings in the study area, the buildings would be uniformly massed towards wide streets, with frontage along Williamsbridge Road and Colden Avenue. Furthermore, the additional density in the With-Action Scenario allows for the opportunity to produce more affordable housing, which would be unattainable in the No-Action Scenario.

The projected development under the With-Action Scenario would include retail uses on the ground floor. In comparison to the existing ground floor uses in the Project Area, which include a construction company office, and a parking garage, these uses would further activate currently underused sites at the street level and improve the visual quality of the streetscape. As such, the Proposed Action would enhance the commercial corridor and view corridor along Williamsbridge Road, and Colden Avenue by activating uses to the streetscape and promoting pedestrian activity.

While the With-Action Scenario would bring a density (up to 9 stories and 95 feet) to the study area that does not currently exist, the Proposed Action would not negatively affect urban design in the area. There are no architecturally significant buildings in the area and the building would not significantly affect any views of the area. While the proposed building would change views of the site as witnessed by pedestrians on Williamsbridge Road, Colden Avenue, Allerton Avenue, and other roadways, significant adverse impacts to urban design and visual resources would not occur. The Proposed Actions would not result in any conditions that would merit further detailed assessment of urban design and visual resources. While no other 9-story buildings are located within the study area, several other four to six story 40 to 50 foot mid-rise buildings are found in the surrounding study area. The Proposed Actions would also not block any view corridors or views to/from any natural areas with rare or defining features, as the proposed building is contained to the subject site. Therefore, the Proposed Actions are not expected to result in any significant adverse urban design or visual resource related impacts. **Figures 2.4-2 to 2.4-7** highlight the future With-Action Scenario of both the Applicant-owned and non-Applicant owned sites.



No Action Conditions– View of Projected Site 1 from Williamsbridge Road, facing northwest towards Boston Road

AECOM

Environmental Assessment Statement
2712 Williamsbridge Road Rezoning
Bronx, NY

Urban Design No-Action –View 1

Figure 2.4-2



With-Action Conditions – View of Projected Site 1 from Williamsbridge Road, facing northwest towards Boston Road

AECOM

Environmental Assessment Statement
2712 Williamsbridge Road Rezoning
Bronx, NY

Urban Design With Action –View 1

Figure 2.4-3



No Action Conditions – View of Projected Site 2 (green) and 1 (blue) from Colden Avenue, facing south towards Allerton Road

AECOM

Environmental Assessment Statement
2712 Williamsbridge Road Rezoning
Bronx, NY

Urban Design No-Action – View 2

Figure 2.4-4



With-Action Conditions – View of Projected Site 2 (green) and 1 (blue) from Colden Avenue, facing south towards Allerton Road

AECOM

Environmental Assessment Statement
2712 Williamsbridge Road Rezoning
Bronx, NY

Urban Design With-Action – View 2

Figure 2.4-5



No Action Conditions – View of Projected Site 1 from the corner of Williamsbridge Road and Radcliff Avenue, facing southwest

AECOM

Environmental Assessment Statement
2712 Williamsbridge Road Rezoning
Bronx, NY

Urban Design No-Action – View 3

Figure 2.4-6



With-Action Conditions – View of Projected Site 1 from the corner of Williamsbridge Road and Radcliff Avenue, facing southwest

AECOM

Environmental Assessment Statement
2712 Williamsbridge Road Rezoning
Bronx, NY

Urban Design With-Action – View 3

Figure 2.4-7

2.5 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The J Pilla Group LTD (JPG) contracted with AECOM Technical Services, Inc. (AECOM) to perform a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) of the property located at 2712 Williamsbridge Road and 2721 Colden Avenue, Bronx, Kings County, New York (subject property). This assessment was conducted as part of the potential commercial and residential redevelopment of the subject property. This Phase I ESA was performed in general conformance with the scope and limitations of the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Standard Practice Designation E 1527-13 for ESAs. Exceptions to, or deletions from, this practice are described in this report.

The approximately 8,660 square-foot (0.2-acre) subject property is developed with a one-story residential apartment and office building, a wood-framed storage shed, and a parking lot located at 2712 Williamsbridge Road, and a four-bay automotive / storage garage located at 2721 Colden Avenue, Bronx, New York. According to the City of New York Department of Finance, the subject property is designated as Block 4516, Lots 8 and 46. During the site visit, no visual evidence of underground storage tanks (e.g., vent pipes, fill ports), potable water wells, monitoring wells, dry wells, clarifiers, septic tanks, stormwater drains or leach fields was observed on the subject property. A pit to collect groundwater is located in the basement next to several natural gas-fired furnaces. A pit containing what appeared to be former utility conduits was located to the north of the residential/office building. No visual evidence of discolored soil, water, or unusual vegetative conditions or odors was observed during the site visit. However, empty and partially full 55-gallon kerosene drums were observed on the subject property. Two drums containing kerosene were stored in a locked cage while seven empty drums were randomly stored on the ground surface behind the four-bay garage. The kerosene is used by JPG for fueling portable forced air heaters on construction sites. No staining or distressed vegetation were observed in the vicinity of the drums; however, none of the drums were located within secondary containment.

The subject property is bordered to the north by an car wash a check cashing operation, and residential dwellings, beyond which are an auto repair shop and plumbing supply store; to the east by Colden Avenue, beyond which are residential dwellings; to the south by retail shops and a residential apartment building; and to the west by Williamsbridge Road, beyond which is a professional building with a parking lot. Based on AECOM's site reconnaissance of the surrounding neighborhood and review of the regulatory status of the adjacent car wash (i.e. case closure for former underground storage tanks), no off-site sources of concern were identified.

Historical research indicates the subject property was vacant in the late 19th century through at least 1908. According to historical Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps (Sanborn Maps), a one-story dwelling similar in size, shape and location to the present-day building was present at the subject property by 1919. The 1924 historical aerial photograph also shows this building. However, the New York City Department of Finance (DOF) indicates that the building was constructed in 1925. An automobile shed/private garage was identified northwest of the residential/office building in 1929, but is not present by 1950. The automobile garage/storage building along Colden Avenue was identified by the DOF as being constructed in 1948 and was visible on the 1950 Sanborn Map. The subject property has remained relatively unchanged since 1950.

The subject property addresses were not identified in the site-specific environmental database report. A number of surrounding sites were identified in the environmental database search report. However, based on AECOM's review and analysis of the database listings, none of the surrounding sites are expected to present a recognized environmental condition (REC) to the subject property, based on their distance (generally greater than 500 feet), regulatory status (i.e. regulatory closure, no violations found), media impacted (soil only), and/or topographical position relative to the subject property (i.e. down-gradient or cross-gradient).

Based on the above-described activities, no RECs, controlled RECs (CRECs), historical RECs (HRECs) or de minimis conditions were identified in connection with the subject property.

Due to the conclusions of the Phase I ESA, the Applicant has agreed to preclude any potential impacts related to hazardous materials via an E designation (E-498) that would be placed on the project site once

the Proposed Actions have been approved. The NYC Office of Environmental Remediation will oversee all future testing and any required remediation for the site.

The text of the (E) designation (E-498) would be as follows with regards to Hazardous Materials:

Projected Development Site 1 (Block 4516, Lot 8 and 46)

Projected Development Site 2 (Block 4516, Lot 43, 44, 45, and 144)

Task 1-Sampling Protocol

The applicant submits to OER, for review and approval, a Phase I of the site along with a soil, groundwater and soil vapor testing protocol, including a description of methods and a site map with all sampling locations clearly and precisely represented. If site sampling is necessary, no sampling should begin until written approval of a protocol is received from OER. The number and location of samples should be selected to adequately characterize the site, specific sources of suspected contamination (i.e., petroleum based contamination and non-petroleum based contamination), and the remainder of the site's condition. The characterization should be complete enough to determine what remediation strategy (if any) is necessary after review of sampling data. Guidelines and criteria for selecting sampling locations and collecting samples are provided by OER upon request.

Task 2-Remediation Determination and Protocol

A written report with findings and a summary of the data must he submitted to OER after completion of the testing phase and laboratory analysis for review and approval. After receiving such results, a determination is made by OER if the results indicate that remediation is necessary. If OER determines that no remediation is necessary, written notice shall be given by OER. If remediation is indicated from test results, a proposed remediation plan must be submitted to OER for review and approval. The applicant must complete such remediation as determined necessary by OER. The applicant should then provide proper documentation that the work has been satisfactorily completed. A construction-related health and safety plan should be submitted to OER and would be implemented during excavation and construction activities to protect workers and the community from potentially significant adverse impacts associated with contaminated soil, groundwater and/or soil vapor. This plan would be submitted to OER prior to implementation.

With this (E) designation in place, no significant adverse impacts related to hazardous materials are expected, and no further analysis is warranted.

2.6 TRANSPORTATION

2.6.1 Introduction

According to the March 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual*, interrelationships between the key technical areas of the transportation system Traffic, Parking, Transit, and Pedestrians should be taken into account in any assessment. Furthermore, the individual technical areas should be separately assessed to determine whether a project has the potential to adversely and significantly affect a specific area of the transportation system. The *CEQR Technical Manual* states that a preliminary trip generation assessment should be prepared to determine whether a quantified analysis of any technical areas of the transportation system is necessary. Except in unusual circumstances, a further quantified analysis would typically not be needed for a technical area if the projected development would result in fewer than the following increments:

- 50 peak hour vehicle trips;
- 200 peak hour subway/rail or bus transit riders; or
- 200 peak hour pedestrian trips.

The *CEQR Technical Manual* also states that if the threshold for traffic is not surpassed, it is likely that further parking assessment is also not needed.

2.6.2 Traffic

The preliminary screening thresholds in the *CEQR Technical Manual* suggest that any project which generates 50 or more peak hour incremental vehicle trips through a single intersection in any given peak hour is likely to warrant a detailed traffic operations analysis. Conversely, projects that are anticipated to generate fewer than 50 peak hour incremental vehicle trips through a single intersection generally do not warrant detailed traffic assessments, and potential traffic impacts are not expected.

Estimated Trip Generation Characteristics

Under the Proposed Action , there would be an incremental increase of approximately 59 new dwelling units, approximately 14,478 square feet of new local retail space on Bronx Block 4516 (**Table 4**).

In order to determine the number of trips generated by the Proposed Action, trip generation estimates were prepared for each of the land uses proposed as part of the zoning amendment, namely residential, and local retail uses. The Proposed Project is located within Traffic Zone 3 according to the *CEQR Technical Manual,* which states that a transportation analysis is required if the proposed project would result in the addition of 200 dwelling units or the addition of 15,000 sf of local retail floor area. While the Proposed Action would not result in either of those thresholds being exceeded, the combination of the addition of 59 new dwelling units and 14,478 sf of new local retail floor area, further analysis of the potential of transportation impacts is required.

Table 4 Summary of Development Densities under the Proposed Action

Block	No-Action				With-Action				Increments			
	DUs	Local Retail	Medical Office	Community Facility	DUs	Local Retail	Medical Office	Community Facility	DUs	Local Retail	Medical Office	Community Facility
Site 1	2	1,374	0	0	40	9,599		0		8,225	0	0
Site 2	5	0	0	0	26	6,253	0	0		6,253	0	0
TOTALS =	**7**	**1,374**	**0**	**0**	**66**	**15,852**	**0**	**0**	**59**	**14,478**	**0**	**0**

Tables 5 and 6 show the estimated person-trips and vehicle-trips, respectively, for the Proposed Action during the weekday AM, weekday midday, weekday PM, and Saturday midday peak hours, as well as the associated transportation planning assumptions. As shown in **Table 6,** the Proposed Action is estimated to generate vehicle trips as follows:

Weekday AM	24 Total Vehicular Trips (6inbound and 18 outbound)
Weekday Midday	32 Total Vehicular Trips (16inbound and 16 outbound)
Weekday PM	38 Total Vehicular Trips (22 inbound and 16 outbound)
Saturday Midday	32 Total Vehicular Trips (16 inbound and 16 outbound)

The projected development would not induce more than 50 peak hour vehicular trips during any peak hour phase. Therefore, no further analysis is required as no significant adverse impacts related to traffic are expected.

Table 5
Estimated Peak Hour Person-Trip Generation Characteristics
Williamsbridge Road Rezoning
Future With-Action Condition

Site 1

Land Use	Size	Weekday Daily Person-Trip Rate	Saturday Daily Person-Trip Rate	Temporal Distribution (%)				Estimated Person-Trips			
				Weekday AM	Weekday MD	Weekday PM	Saturday MD	Weekday AM	Weekday MD	Weekday PM	Saturday MD
Residential	38 units	8.075 trips per DU	9.6 trips per DU	10.0%	5.0%	11.0%	8.0%	31	15	34	29
Local Retail	8,225 SF	205 trips per 1,000 sq. ft.	240 trips per 1,000 sq. ft.	3.0%	19.0%	10.0%	10.0%	51	320	169	197
							TOTAL PERSON-TRIPS =	**81**	**336**	**202**	**227**

Site 2

Land Use	Size	Weekday Daily Person-Trip Rate	Saturday Daily Person-Trip Rate	Temporal Distribution (%)				Estimated Person-Trips			
				Weekday AM	Weekday MD	Weekday PM	Saturday MD	Weekday AM	Weekday MD	Weekday PM	Saturday MD
Residential	21 units	8.075 trips per DU	9.6 trips per DU	10.0%	5.0%	11.0%	8.0%	17	8	19	16
Local Retail	6,253 SF	205 trips per 1,000 sq. ft.	240 trips per 1,000 sq. ft.	3.0%	19.0%	10.0%	10.0%	38	244	128	150
							TOTAL PERSON-TRIPS =	**55**	**252**	**147**	**166**

Residential trip rates and temporal distributions based on Residential (3 or more floors) from *CEQR Technical Manual* (Table 16-2).
Local Retail trip rates and temporal distributions based on Local Retail from *CEQR Technical Manual* (Table 16-2).

Totals
Residential = 59 units
Local Retail = 14,478 SF

Table 6
Estimated Peak Hour Vehicle-Trip Generation Characteristics
Williamsbridge Road Rezoning
Future With-Action Condition

Site 1

Land Use	Size	Truck Trip Rate Weekday	Truck Trip Rate Saturday	AM	Midday	PM	Saturday	In	Out
Residential	38	0.06	0.02	12%	9%	2%	9%	50%	50%
Local Retail	8,225	0.35	0.04	8%	11%	2%	11%	50%	50%
Linked-Trip / Pass-by Trip									
Net New Trips =									
TOTAL =									

Land Use	Estimated Person-Trips			
	Weekday AM	Weekday MD	Weekday PM	Saturday MD
Residential	31	15	33	29
Local Retail	51	320	169	197
Linked-Trip / Pass-by Trip				
Net New Trips =				
TOTAL =	**81**	**336**	**202**	**227**

Land Use	Estimated Mode Split (AM, MD, PM)						
	Auto	Taxi	Sub-way	Rail-road	Bus	Walk	Total
Residential	40.0%	2.0%	36.0%	1.0%	14.0%	7.0%	100.0%
Local Retail	11.0%	0.0%	4.0%	0.0%	3.0%	82.0%	100.0%
Linked-Trip / Pass-by Trip							
Net New Trips =							
TOTAL =							

Land Use	Estimated Mode Split (SAT)						
	Auto	Taxi	Sub-way	Rail-road	Bus	Walk	Total
Residential	40.0%	2.0%	36.0%	1.0%	14.0%	7.0%	100.0%
Local Retail	8.0%	0.0%	7.0%	0.0%	4.0%	81.0%	100.0%
Linked-Trip / Pass-by Trip							
Net New Trips =							
TOTAL =							

Land Use	Estimated Truck-Trips																				
	Weekday AM			Weekday MD			Weekday PM			Saturday MD			Weekday AM			Weekday MD			Weekday PM		
	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out
Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	2	10	6	3	3	14	9	5
Local Retail	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	2	17	9	9	12	6	6
Linked-Trip / Pass-by Trip													*-1*	*0*	*0*	*-4*	*-2*	*-2*	*-3*	*-2*	*-2*
Net New Trips =													3	1	1	13	6	6	9	5	5
TOTAL =	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**15**	**4**	**11**	**19**	**9**	**9**	**23**	**13**	**9**

Land Use	Estimated Car-Trips												Estimated Vehicle-Trips								
	Weekday AM			Weekday MD			Weekday PM			Saturday MD			Weekday AM			Weekday MD			Weekday PM		
	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out
Residential	12	2	10	6	3	3	14	9	5	12	6	6	13	3	10	6	3	3	14	9	5
Local Retail	4	2	2	17	9	9	12	6	6	10	5	5	4	2	2	17	9	9	12	6	6
Linked-Trip / Pass-by Trip	*-1*	*0*	*0*	*-4*	*-2*	*-2*	*-3*	*-2*	*-2*	*-2*	*-1*	*-1*	*-1*	*0*	*0*	*-4*	*-2*	*-2*	*-3*	*-2*	*-2*
Net New Trips =	3	1	1	13	6	6	9	5	5	7	4	4	3	1	1	13	6	6	9	5	5
TOTAL =	**15**	**4**	**11**	**19**	**9**	**9**	**23**	**13**	**9**	**19**	**10**	**10**	**15**	**4**	**11**	**19**	**10**	**10**	**23**	**13**	**9**

Land Use	Estimated Vehicle-Trips								
	Weekday MD			Weekday PM			Saturday MD		
	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out
Residential	6	3	3	14	9	5	12	6	6
Local Retail	17	9	8	12	6	6	10	5	5
Linked-Trip / Pass-by Trip	*-4*	*-2*	*-2*	*-3*	*-2*	*-2*	*-2*	*-1*	*-1*
Net New Trips =	13	6	6	9	5	5	7	4	4
TOTAL =	**19**	**10**	**10**	**23**	**13**	**9**	**19**	**10**	**10**

Site 2

Land Use	Size	Truck Trip Rate Weekday	Truck Trip Rate Saturday	AM	Midday	PM	Saturday	In	Out
Residential	21	0.06	0.02	12%	9%	2%	9%	50%	50%
Local Retail	6,253	0.35	0.04	8%	11%	2%	11%	50%	50%
Linked-Trip / Pass-by Trip									
Net New Trips =									
TOTAL =									

Land Use	Estimated Person-Trips			
	Weekday AM	Weekday MD	Weekday PM	Saturday MD
Residential	17	8	19	16
Local Retail	38	244	128	150
Linked-Trip / Pass-by Trip				
Net New Trips =				
TOTAL =	**55**	**252**	**147**	**166**

Land Use	Estimated Mode Split (AM, MD, PM)						
	Auto	Taxi	Sub-way	Rail-road	Bus	Walk	Total
Residential	40.0%	2.0%	36.0%	1.0%	14.0%	7.0%	100.0%
Local Retail	11.0%	0.0%	4.0%	0.0%	3.0%	82.0%	100.0%
Linked-Trip / Pass-by Trip							
Net New Trips =							
TOTAL =							

Land Use	Estimated Mode Split (SAT)						
	Auto	Taxi	Sub-way	Rail-road	Bus	Walk	Total
Residential	40.0%	2.0%	36.0%	1.0%	14.0%	7.0%	100.0%
Local Retail	8.0%	0.0%	7.0%	0.0%	4.0%	81.0%	100.0%
Linked-Trip / Pass-by Trip							
Net New Trips =							
TOTAL =							

Land Use	Estimated Truck-Trips																				
	Weekday AM			Weekday MD			Weekday PM			Saturday MD			Weekday AM			Weekday MD			Weekday PM		
	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out
Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	5	3	2	2	8	5	3
Local Retail	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	13	6	6	9	5	5
Linked-Trip / Pass-by Trip													*-1*	*0*	*0*	*-3*	*-2*	*-2*	*-2*	*-1*	*-1*
Net New Trips =													2	1	1	10	5	5	7	4	4
TOTAL =	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**9**	**2**	**7**	**13**	**7**	**7**	**15**	**8**	**6**

Land Use	Estimated Car-Trips												Estimated Vehicle-Trips								
	Weekday AM			Weekday MD			Weekday PM			Saturday MD			Weekday AM			Weekday MD			Weekday PM		
	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out
Residential	7	1	5	3	2	2	8	5	3	6	3	3	7	1	6	4	2	2	8	5	3
Local Retail	3	1	1	13	6	6	9	5	5	8	4	4	3	1	1	13	7	7	9	5	5
Linked-Trip / Pass-by Trip	*-1*	*0*	*0*	*-3*	*-2*	*-2*	*-2*	*-1*	*-1*	*-2*	*-1*	*-1*	*-1*	*0*	*0*	*-3*	*-2*	*-2*	*-2*	*-1*	*-1*
Net New Trips =	2	1	1	10	5	5	7	4	4	6	3	3	2	1	1	10	5	5	7	4	4
TOTAL =	**9**	**2**	**7**	**13**	**7**	**7**	**15**	**8**	**6**	**12**	**6**	**6**	**9**	**2**	**7**	**13**	**7**	**7**	**15**	**8**	**6**

Land Use	Estimated Vehicle-Trips								
	Weekday MD			Weekday PM			Saturday MD		
	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out
Residential	4	2	2	8	5	3	7	3	3
Local Retail	13	7	7	9	5	5	8	4	4
Linked-Trip / Pass-by Trip	*-3*	*-2*	*-2*	*-2*	*-1*	*-1*	*-2*	*-1*	*-1*
Net New Trips =	10	5	5	7	4	4	6	3	3
TOTAL =	**13**	**7**	**7**	**15**	**8**	**6**	**12**	**6**	**6**

GRAND TOTAL= **TOTAL TRIPS (ALL BLOCKS) =** **24 6 18 32 16 16 37 22 16 31 16 16**

Residential mode split and auto occupancy (1.07) based on census JTW data for tracts 324, 340, 342, 344, 370.

Residential Taxi occupancy (1.40) based on Bedford-Stuyvesant North Rezoning EAS.

Residential In/Out directional distributions (AM: 20/80, MD: 50/50, PM: 65/35, SAT: 50/50) based on *Bedford-Stuyvesant North Rezoning EAS* .

Local Retail mode split, auto occupancy (1.5 for weekday and 1.6 for weekend) based on NYC Department of City Planning.

Local Retail In/Out directional distributions (AM: 50/50, MD: 50/50, PM: 50/50, SAT: 50/50) based on *Bedford-Stuyvesant North Rezoning EAS* .

Linked-Trip / Pass-by Trip Reduction credit of 25% as per *CEQR Technical Manual* .

2.6.3 Pedestrians

The March 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual* indicates that a detailed pedestrian analysis be performed for projects that are likely to generate 200 or more incremental pedestrian trips during any peak hour on any one pedestrian element (i.e., a crosswalk, street corner, or sidewalk).

As shown in **Table 7** the proposed project is projected to generate more than 200 combined new pedestrian trips (i.e., the combined total of subway, bus, and walk trips) during the weekday midday, weekday PM, and Saturday midday peak hours (400 trips, 233 trips, and 275 trips, respectively).

Because the proposed Action is projected to generate a significantly higher number of trips during the weekday midday than periods, the weekday midday peak hour is assumed to represent a reasonable worst-case scenario. Therefore, a Level 2 screening was performed for Pedestrians during the Midday peak hour (which had the highest number of pedestrian trips). Subway, bus and walk-only trips were assigned to the surrounding roadway network based on the location of the nearest subway station, bus stops in the vicinity of the site, and walking routes to and from the site based on household distribution for adjacent census tracts. The pedestrian assignments were based on the ground floor plan, which indicates that there are entrances/exits on Williamsbridge Road and Colden Avenue. Accordingly, pedestrian trips were assigned to both entrances and exits based on expected origins/destinations.

Pedestrian Trip Distribution and Trip Assignments

The following assumptions were made for the trip distribution patterns for pedestrians traveling to and from the proposed rezoning sites:

- *Subway trips* – All subway riders were assumed to walk to and from the Allerton Avenue station (on the "2" or "5" subway line), located 7 and a half blocks, west of the proposed rezoning site.

- *Bus trips* – The proposed rezoning site is served by the Bx8 line, which is routed along Williamsbridge Road, Bx26 line, which is routed along Allerton Avenue and 0060,0061,0062 Bee-line Bus Service, which is routed along Boston Road. Bus trips were assigned to and from the site based on the geographic location of each bus route relative to the site and the bus route within the borough, as follows:

    - 36 percent to/from the Bx8
    - 36 percent to/from the Bx26
    - 28 percent to/from the Bee-Line 0060,0061,0062

- *Walk trips* – Walk trips were assumed to be distributed, as following, based on the site's location

    - 35 percent to/from the north
    - 16 percent to/from the south
    - 12 percent to/from the east
    - 37 percent to/from the west

Based on the trip generation estimates shown in **Table 7** and the trip distribution estimates, by mode, identified above, pedestrians were assigned through the study intersections for the weekday midday peak hour, which is the time period with the highest number of site-generated pedestrian trips.

Figures 2.6-1 shows the resulting assignments of the incremental site-generated pedestrian volumes (i.e., combined subway, bus, and walk trips) projected during the midday at intersections in the vicinity of the proposed rezoning sites. The incremental pedestrian volumes generated on pedestrian elements beyond all intersections during the weekday midday are below the 200-trip threshold. Based on the Level 2 screening, Pedestrians screened out during the Midday peak hour (the highest hour); and therefore in accordance with the CEQR Technical Manual, no detailed pedestrian analyses are required.

Table 7

Estimated Peak Hour Person-Trip Generation Increments: Transit and Pedestrians
Williamsbridge Road Rezoning
Future With-Action Condition

Site 1

Land Use	Estimated Person-Trips				Mode Split (AM, MD, PM)			Mode Split (SAT)			Weekday AM												Weekday Midday											
											Subway			Bus			Walk			Subway			Bus			Walk								
	Weekday AM	Weekday MD	Weekday PM	Saturday MD	Subway	Bus	Walk	Sub-way	Bus	Walk	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out
Residential	31	15	34	29	36.0%	14.0%	7.0%	36.0%	14.0%	7.0%	11	2	9	4	1	3	2	0	2	6	3	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	12	8	4	5	3	2
Local Retail	51	320	169	197	4.0%	3.0%	82.0%	7.0%	4.0%	81.0%	2	1	1	2	1	1	41	21	21	13	6	6	10	5	5	263	131	131	7	3	3	5	3	3
Linked-Trip / Pass-by Trip Reduction (25%)=											*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*-66*	*-33*	*-33*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*
Net New Trips =											2	1	1	2	1	1	41	21	21	13	6	6	10	5	5	197	99	99	7	3	3	5	3	3
TOTAL =	**81**	**336**	**202**	**227**	**TOTAL NET NEW PERSON-TRIPS =**						**13**	**3**	**10**	**6**	**2**	**4**	**44**	**21**	**22**	**18**	**9**	**9**	**12**	**6**	**6**	**198**	**99**	**99**	**19**	**11**	**8**	**10**	**6**	**4**

Land Use	Weekday PM										Saturday Midday											
	Subway			Bus			Walk				Subway			Bus			Walk					
	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out		Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out			
Residential	12	8	4	5	3	2	2	2	1		11	5	5	4	2	2	2	1	1			
Local Retail	7	3	3	5	3	3	138	69	69		14	7	7	8	4	4	160	80	80			
Linked-Trip / Pass-by Trip Reduction (25%)=	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*-35*	*-17*	*-17*		*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*-40*	*-20*	*-20*			
Net New Trips =	7	3	3	5	3	3	104	52	52		14	7	7	8	4	4	120	60	60			
TOTAL =	**19**	**11**	**8**	**10**	**6**	**4**	**106**	**53**	**53**		**24**	**12**	**12**	**12**	**6**	**6**	**122**	**61**	**61**			

Total AM Ped Trips = 63 **Total Midday Ped Trips = 228** **Total PM Ped Trips = 135** **Total SAT Ped Trips = 158**

Site 2

Land Use	Estimated Person-Trips				Mode Split (AM, MD, PM)			Mode Split (SAT)			Weekday AM												Weekday Midday											
											Subway			Bus			Walk			Subway			Bus			Walk								
	Weekday AM	Weekday MD	Weekday PM	Saturday MD	Subway	Bus	Walk	Subway	Bus	Walk	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out
Residential	17	8	19	16	36.0%	14.0%	7.0%	36.0%	14.0%	7.0%	6	1	5	2	0	2	1	0	1	3	2	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	7	4	2	3	2	1
Local Retail	38	244	128	150	4.0%	3.0%	82.0%	7.0%	4.0%	81.0%	2	1	1	1	1	1	32	16	16	10	5	5	7	4	4	200	100	100	5	3	3	4	2	2
Linked-Trip / Pass-by Trip Reduction (25%)=											*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*-50*	*-25*	*-25*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*
Net New Trips =											2	1	1	1	1	1	32	16	16	10	5	5	7	4	4	150	75	75	5	3	3	4	2	2
TOTAL =	**55**	**252**	**147**	**166**	**TOTAL NET NEW PERSON-TRIPS =**						**8**	**2**	**6**	**4**	**1**	**2**	**33**	**16**	**17**	**13**	**6**	**6**	**8**	**4**	**4**	**150**	**75**	**75**	**12**	**7**	**5**	**6**	**4**	**3**

Land Use	Weekday PM										Saturday Midday											
	Subway			Bus			Walk				Subway			Bus			Walk					
	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out		Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out			
Residential	7	4	2	3	2	1	1	1	0		6	3	3	2	1	1	1	1	1			
Local Retail	5	3	3	4	2	2	105	53	53		11	5	5	6	3	3	122	61	61			
Linked-Trip / Pass-by Trip Reduction (25%)=	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*-26*	*-13*	*-13*		*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*-30*	*-15*	*-15*			
Net New Trips =	5	3	3	4	2	2	79	39	39		11	5	5	6	3	3	91	46	46			
TOTAL =	**12**	**7**	**5**	**6**	**4**	**3**	**80**	**40**	**40**		**16**	**8**	**8**	**8**	**4**	**4**	**92**	**46**	**46**			

Total AM Ped Trips = 44 **Total Midday Ped Trips = 172** **Total PM Ped Trips = 98** **Total SAT Ped Trips = 117**

Linked-Trip / Pass-by Trip Reduction credit assumed to be 25% as per *CEQR Technical Manual* and applies to walk trips only during weekday midday, weekday PM, and Saturday midday peak hours.

TOTAL PEDESTRIAN TRIPS = **GRAND TOTAL=** **21 5 16 9 3 7 76 37 39 31 16 16 20 10 10 348 174 174 31 18 13 16 9 7 186 94 93 41 20 20 20 10 10 214 107 107**

TOTAL TRIPS INCLUDING TRANSIT = **GRAND TOTAL AM Ped Trips = 106** **GRAND TOTAL Midday Ped Trips = 400** **GRAND TOTAL PM Ped Trips = 233** **GRAND TOTAL SAT Ped Trips = 275**



AECOM	2712 Williamsbridge Rd Bronx, New York	Project Site-Generated Pedestrian Volumes Assignments **Figure 2.6-1** Weekday Midday Peak Hour

2.7 AIR QUALITY

2.7.1 Introduction

This section examines the potential for air quality impacts from the proposed action. According to the 2014 CEQR Technical Manual, air quality impacts can be characterized as either direct or indirect impacts. Direct impacts result from emissions generated by stationary sources, such as stack emissions from on-site fuel burned for boilers and heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems. Indirect effects are caused by off-site emissions associated with a project, such as emissions from on-road motor vehicles ("mobile sources") traveling to and from a project site. An assessment of traffic associated with the proposed project was conducted to determine if the proposed action would have potential air quality mobile sources concerns.

As indicated in Section 2.5, "Transportation," the Proposed Action would not result in 50 or more incremental vehicle trips. It's unlikely that the number of incremental trips generated by the proposed action at any given intersection would exceed the CEQR Technical Manual CO-based screening threshold of 170 vehicles per hour, as well as the PM2.5-based screening threshold of 23 or more Heavy Duty Diesel Vehicles (HDDV). Therefore, traffic from the Proposed Action would not result in a significant adverse impact on mobile source air quality and a quantified assessment of on-street mobile source emissions is not warranted.

Pollutants of Concern

Air pollution is of concern because of its demonstrated effects on human health. Of special concern are the respiratory effects of the pollutants and their potential toxic effects, as described below.

Carbon Monoxide

Carbon monoxide (CO) is a colorless and odorless gas that is a product of incomplete combustion. Carbon monoxide is absorbed by the lungs and reacts with hemoglobin to reduce the oxygen carrying capacity of the blood. At low concentrations, CO has been shown to aggravate the symptoms of cardiovascular disease. It can cause headaches, nausea, and at sustained high concentration levels, can lead to coma and death.

Particulate Matter

Particulate matter is made up of small solid particles and liquid droplets. PM10 refers to particulate matter with a nominal aerodynamic diameter of 10 micrometers or less, and PM2.5 refers to particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 2.5 micrometers or less. Particulates can enter the body through the respiratory system. Particulates over 10 micrometers in size are generally captured in the nose and throat and are readily expelled from the body. Particles smaller than 10 micrometers, and especially particles smaller than 2.5 micrometers, can reach the air ducts (bronchi) and the air sacs (alveoli) in the lungs. Particulates are associated with increased incidence of respiratory diseases, cardiopulmonary disease, and cancer.

Nitrogen Oxides

When combustion temperatures are extremely high, such as in engines, atmospheric nitrogen gas may combine with oxygen gas to form various oxides of nitrogen. Of these, nitric oxide (NO) and nitrogen dioxide (NO2) are the most significant air pollutants. This group of pollutants is generally referred to as nitrogen oxides or NOX. Nitric oxide is relatively harmless to humans but quickly converts to NO2. Nitrogen dioxide has been found to be a lung irritant and can lead to respiratory illnesses. Nitrogen oxides, along with VOCs, are also precursors to ozone formation.

Sulfur Dioxide

Sulfur Dioxide (SO2) emissions are the main components of the "oxides of sulfur," a group of highly reactive gases from fossil fuel combustion at power plants, other industrial facilities, industrial processes, and burning of high sulfur containing fuels by locomotives, large ships, and non-road equipment. High concentrations of SO2 will lead to formation of other sulfur oxides. By reducing the SO2 emissions, other forms of sulfur oxides are also expected to decrease. When oxides of sulfur react with other compounds in the atmosphere, small particles that can affect the lungs can be formed. This can lead to respiratory disease and aggravate existing heart disease.

Non-criteria Pollutants

In addition to the criteria pollutants discussed above, non-criteria pollutants may be of concern. Non-criteria pollutants are emitted by a wide range of man-made and naturally occurring sources. These pollutants are sometimes referred to as hazardous air pollutants (HAP) and when emitted from mobile sources, as Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs). Emissions of non-criteria pollutants from industrial sources are regulated by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).

Federal ambient air quality standards do not exist for non-criteria pollutants; however, the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) has issued standards for certain non-criteria compounds, including beryllium, gaseous fluorides, and hydrogen sulfide. NYSDEC has also developed guidance document DAR-1 (February 2014). DAR-1 contains a compilation of annual and short term (1-hour) guideline concentrations for these compounds. The NYSDEC guidance thresholds represent ambient levels that are considered safe for public exposure. EPA has also developed guidelines for assessing exposure to non-criteria pollutants. These exposure guidelines are used in health risk assessments to determine the potential effects to the public.

Impact Criteria

The predicted concentrations of pollutants of concern associated with a proposed project are compared with either the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for criteria air pollutants or ambient guideline concentrations for non-criteria pollutants. In general, if a project would cause the standards for any pollutant to be exceeded, it would likely result in a significant adverse air quality impact. In addition, for CO from mobile sources and for PM2.5, the de minimis criteria are also used to determine significance of impacts.

National Ambient Air Quality Standards

The Clean Air Act (CAA) requires the USEPA to set standards on the pollutants that are considered harmful to public health and the environment. The NAAQS were implemented as a result of the CAA, amended in 1990 (see **Table 8**). The NAAQS applies to six principal ("criteria") pollutants: carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO2), particulate matter 10 (PM10), particulate matter 2.5 (PM2.5), sulfur dioxide (SO2), and ozone.

Non-criteria Pollutant Thresholds

Non-criteria, or toxic, air pollutants include a multitude of pollutants of ranging toxicity.
No federal ambient air quality standards have been promulgated for toxic air pollutants. However, USEPA and NYSDEC have issued guidelines that establish acceptable ambient levels for these pollutants based on human exposure.

The NYSDEC DAR-1 guidance document presents guideline concentrations in micrograms per cubic meter ($\mu g/m^3$) for the one-hour and annual average time periods for various air toxic compounds.

In order to evaluate impacts of non-carcinogenic toxic air emissions, USEPA developed a methodology called the "Hazard Index Approach." The acute hazard index is based on short-term exposure, while the chronic non-carcinogenic hazard index is based on annual exposure limits. If the combined ratio of pollutant concentration divided by its respective short-term or annual exposure threshold for each of the toxic pollutants is found to be less than 1.0, no significant adverse air quality impacts are predicted to occur due to these pollutant releases.

Table 8 National and New York State Ambient Air Quality Standards

Pollutant	Averaging Time	Standards
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	1-hour	35 ppm (40,000 µg/m^3)
	8-hour	9 ppm (10,000 µg/m^3)
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO_2)	1-hour	100 ppb (188 µg/m^3)
	annual	53 ppb (100 µg/m^3)
Ozone	8-hour	0.075 ppm
Particular Matter (PM_{10})	24-hour	150 µg/m^3
Particular Matter ($PM_{2.5}$)	24-hour	35 µg/m^3
	annual	12 µg/m^3
Sulfur Dioxide (SO_2)	1-hour	75 ppb (196 µg/m^3)
	3-hour	0.5 ppm (1,300 µg/m^3)

In addition, USEPA has developed unit risk factors for carcinogenic pollutants. USEPA considers an overall incremental cancer risk from a proposed action of less than one-in-one million to be insignificant. Using these factors, the potential cancer risk associated with each carcinogenic pollutant, as well as the total cancer risk of the releases of all the carcinogenic toxic pollutants combined, can be estimated. If the total incremental cancer risk of all the carcinogenic toxic pollutants combined is less than one-in-one million, no significant adverse air quality impacts are predicted to occur due to these pollutant releases.

Carbon Monoxide (CO) De Minimis Criteria

New York City has developed de minimis criteria to assess the significance of the increase in CO concentrations that would result from the impact of proposed projects or actions on mobile sources, as set forth in the 2014 CEQR Technical Manual. These criteria set the minimum change in CO concentration that defines a significant environmental impact. Significant increases of CO concentrations in New York City are defined as: (i) an increase of 0.5 ppm or more in the maximum eight-hour average CO concentration at a location where the predicted No-Action eight-hour concentration is equal to or between 8.0 and 9.0 ppm; or (ii) an increase of more than half the difference between baseline (i.e., No-Action) concentrations and the eight-hour standard, when No-Action concentrations are below 8.0 ppm.

Particulate Matter (PM2.5) *De Minimis* Criteria

New York City uses *de minimis* criteria to determine the potential for significant adverse $PM_{2.5}$ impacts under CEQR. The *de minimis* criteria are as follows:

- Predicted increase of more than half the difference between the background concentration and the 24-hour standard;
- Annual average $PM_{2.5}$ concentration increments which are predicted to be greater than 0.1 µg/m^3 at ground level on a neighborhood; or

- Annual average $PM_{2.5}$ concentration increments which are predicted to be greater than 0.3 µg/m^3 at a discrete receptor location (elevated or ground level).

2.7.2 Methodology

Stationary Sources

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines, air quality analyses of stationary sources may be warranted if a project would (i) create new stationary sources of pollutants – such as emission stacks of industrial plants, hospitals, other large institutional uses, or even a building's boilers – that may affect surrounding uses; (ii) introduce certain new uses near existing or planned emissions stacks that may affect the use, or (iii) introduce structures near such stacks so that changes in the dispersion of emissions from the stacks may affect surrounding uses.

HVAC Systems Analysis

As described in Section 220 and Section 321 in Chapter 17 of the *CEQR Technical Manual*, for single building projects that would use fossil fuels (i.e., fuel oil or natural gas) for HVAC systems, a preliminary stationary source screening analysis is typically warranted to evaluate the potential for impacts on existing buildings from HVAC systems emissions for the proposed project. The *CEQR Technical Manual* provides screening nomographs based on fuel type, stack height, minimum distance from the source to the nearest receptor buildings with similar or greater heights, and floor area of development resulting from the proposed project. There are three different curves representing three different stack heights (30 feet, 100 feet and 165 feet) on the figures, and the number closest to but not higher than the proposed stack height should be selected. The screening methodology determines the minimum required distance from the source to the nearest receptor of similar or greater height, beyond which the action would not have a significant adverse impact. Based on the development size, if the distance from the development site to the nearest building of similar or greater height is less than the minimum required distance determined, there is the potential for a significant air quality impact from the project's boilers, and further analysis needs to be conducted using the USEPA's AERSCREEN and/or AERMOD model.

Dispersion Modeling

Potential impacts were evaluated using the EPA AERMOD dispersion model. AERMOD is a state-of-the-art dispersion model, applicable to rural and urban areas, flat and complex terrain, surface and elevated releases, and multiple sources (including point, area, and volume sources). AERMOD is a steady-state plume model that incorporates current concepts about flow and dispersion in complex terrain, including updated treatments of the boundary layer theory, understanding of turbulence and dispersion, and includes handling of terrain interactions. The AERMOD model calculates pollutant concentrations from one or more points (e.g., exhaust stacks) based on hourly meteorological data, and has the capability to calculate pollutant concentrations at locations where the plume from the exhaust stack is affected by the aerodynamic wakes and eddies (downwash) produced by nearby structures. The analysis of potential impacts from exhaust stacks was performed assuming stack tip downwash, urban dispersion and surface roughness length, with and without building downwash, and elimination of calms. The AERMOD model also incorporates the algorithms from the PRIME model, which is designed to predict impacts in the "cavity region" (i.e., the area around a structure which under certain conditions may affect an exhaust plume, causing a portion of the plume to become entrained in a recirculation region). The Building Profile Input Program (BPIP) program for the PRIME model (BPIPRM) was used to determine the projected building dimensions modeling with the building downwash algorithm enabled. The modeling of downwash from sources accounts for all obstructions within a radius equal to five obstruction heights of the stack.

Methodology Utilized for Estimating NO_2 Concentrations
The 1-hour and annual average NO_2 concentration increments from the proposed project's stationary combustion sources were estimated using AERMOD model's Tier 2 updated Ambient Ratio Method,

referred as “ARM2”. ARM2 does not require additional input data that is subject to case-by-case review and approval. The model execution time for ARM2 is faster than for those more computationally intensive refined methods. The ARM2 method performs better than the old ARM method, and is comparable to the more refined EPA modeling methods for 1-hour ambient NO_2 concentrations.

Total 1-hour NO_2 concentrations were determined following methodologies that are accepted by the EPA, and which are considered appropriate and conservative. The methodology used to determine the compliance of total 1-hour NO_2 concentrations from the proposed sources with the 1-hour NO2 NAAQS was based on adding the monitored background to modeled concentrations, as follows: hourly modeled concentrations from proposed sources were first added to the seasonal hourly background monitored concentrations; then the highest combined daily 1-hour NO_2 concentration was determined at each receptor location and the 98th percentile daily 1-hour maximum concentration for each modeled year was calculated within the AERMOD model; finally the 98th percentile concentrations were averaged over the latest five years.

Same seasonal hourly monitored NO_2 concentrations were added to hourly modeled concentrations to derive the total annual NO_2 concentration

Meteorological Data

The meteorological data set consisted of five consecutive years of meteorological data: surface data collected at La Guardia Airport (2012–2016), and concurrent upper air data collected at Brookhaven, New York. The meteorological data provide hour-by-hour wind speeds and directions, stability states, and temperature inversion elevation over the five-year period. These data were processed using the EPA AERMET program to develop data in a format which can be readily processed by the AERMOD model. The land uses around the site where meteorological surface data were available were classified using categories defined in digital United States Geological Survey (USGS) maps to determine surface parameters used by the AERMET program.

Receptor Placement

A comprehensive receptor network (i.e., locations with continuous public access) was developed for the modeling analyses. Discrete receptors (i.e., locations at which concentrations are calculated) were modeled along the existing and proposed buildings’ façades to represent potentially sensitive locations such as operable windows and intake vents. For each of the proposed buildings, receptors were conservatively placed on the façades of the maximum development envelope. Rows of receptors at spaced intervals on the modeled buildings were analyzed at multiple elevations.

Industrial Sources Analysis

The potential impacts of existing industrial operations on pollutant concentrations at the project sites were analyzed. Potential industrial air pollutant emission sources within 400 feet of the project sites’ boundaries were considered for inclusion in the air quality impact analyses, as recommended in the *CEQR Technical Manual*.

Land use and Sanborn maps were reviewed to identify potential sources of emissions from manufacturing/industrial operations. A permit search for DEP and DEC air permits was also conducted. Only one industrial facility with one expired air toxic operation permit within 400 feet of the Rezoning Area was identified as below:

- Precision Analyst, Inc. under Permit No. PA102789X, located at 2801 Boston Road (Block 4515, Lot 22).

A screening analysis is usually performed based on Table 17-3 in Chapter 17 of *CEQR Technical Manual*. The screen table provides the maximum 1-hour, 8-hour, 24-hour and annual average modeled values based on a generic emission rate of 1 gram per second of a pollutant from a 20-foot tall point

source for the distances from 30 feet to 400 feet from the receptor of same height. Predicted impact from the industrial source of concern based on the screen table will be compared with the short-term guideline concentrations (SGCs) and annual guideline concentration (AGCs) recommended in NYSDEC's DAR-1 AGC/SGC Tables. If a proposed project fails the above screening analysis, further refined analysis using the USEPA's AERSCREEN and/or AERMOD model will be warranted to determine any potential for significant adverse impacts.

Large or Major Sources Analysis

The *CEQR Technical Manual* requires an assessment of any actions that could result in the location of sensitive uses within 1,000 feet of a large or major emission source. The *CEQR Technical Manual* defines "large" emission sources as sources located at facilities which require a State facility permit, and "major" sources as sources located at Title V permitted facilities or facilities that require Prevention of Significant Deterioration permits.

To evaluate the potential effects of these existing sources on the proposed projects, a review of existing DEC permitted facilities was conducted. It was found that one dry cleaning business within 1000 feet of the study area has an Air State Facility Permit to operate as below:

- Reda Cleaners, under Permit No. 2-6002-00407/00001, located at 800 Allerton Avenue (Block 4440, Lot 71).

A detailed analysis is usually performed for such sources to determine any potential for significant adverse impact.

Health Risk Assessment

Toxic air pollutants can be grouped into two categories: carcinogenic and non-carcinogenic air pollutants with their toxicity ranging from high to low.

Based on SGCs and AGCs, EPA-developed methodologies can be used to estimate the potential impacts of non-carcinogenic air toxics pollutants from single or multiple emission sources. The "Hazard Index Approach" can be used to estimate the potential impacts. If the sum of the combined ratios of the estimated pollutant concentrations divided by the respective SGCs or AGCs value for each of the toxic pollutants is found to be less than 1, no significant air quality impact is predicted to occur.

The derived health risk values are additive and can be used to determine the total risk posed by the release of multiple air pollutants.

For carcinogenic pollutants, unit risk factors based on the toxicity of each pollutant were used. EPA and NYSDEC do not consider an overall incremental cancer risk of less than one-in-one million from a proposed action to be significant. Using these factors, the potential cancer risk associated with each carcinogenic pollutant, as well as the total cancer risk of the releases of all carcinogenic toxic pollutants combined, can be estimated. If the total incremental cancer risk of all carcinogenic toxic pollutants combined is less than one-in-one million, no significant air quality impacts were predicted to occur due to these releases.

Individual lifetime cancer risk through direct inhalation of carcinogen was estimated by multiplying predicted annual ambient air concentration of specific pollutant by the pollutant-specific inhalation unit risk factor provided. Since DAR-1 AGCs were established on a one-per-million base, they represent unit risk factors. Therefore, the ratio of predicted annual pollutant concentration and the corresponding AGC should be compared to the one-per-million cancer threshold to determine potential health risk for a carcinogen pollutant.

2.7.3 Assessment

Existing Conditions

The total concentrations experienced at receptors include background concentrations from existing surrounding emission sources. Background concentrations are ambient pollution levels associated with existing stationary, mobile, and other area emission sources. The NYSDEC maintains an air quality monitoring network and produces annual air quality reports that include monitoring data for CO, NO_2, PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, and SO_2. To develop background levels, pollutant concentrations from monitoring sites located closest to the project area were obtained from the New York State Ambient Air Quality Report for 2016. **Table 9** summarizes the background concentrations for each of the pollutants.

$PM_{2.5}$ impacts are assessed on an incremental basis and compared with the $PM_{2.5}$ *de minimis* criteria, without considering the annual background. Therefore, the annual $PM_{2.5}$ background is not presented in the table.

Table 9 Background Concentration

Pollutant	Averaging Time	Monitoring Station	Background Concentration
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	1-hour	Botanic Garden	2.4 ppm
	8-hour	Botanic Garden	1.6 ppm
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO_2)	1-hour	Botanic Garden	108.2 µg/m^3
	annual	Botanic Garden	32.3 µg/m^3
Particular Matter (PM_{10})	24-hour	IS 52	42 µg/m^3
Particular Matter ($PM_{2.5}$)	24-hour	Botanic Garden	24 µg/m^3
	annual	Botanic Garden	9 µg/m^3
Sulfur Dioxide (SO_2)	1-hour	Botanic Garden	28.8 µg/m^3

No-Action Condition

As described in Section 1.0, “Project Description”, in the Future- No Action condition, the Proposed Project Area would remain consistent with the existing conditions.

Under the No-Action condition, Block 4516, Lots 8 and 46 would remain improved. Lot 8 would remain improved with a one-story, approximately 2,748 square foot mixed use residential and commercial building. Lot 46 would remain improved with a one story, approximately 1,350 square foot parking facility. Block 4516, Lot 48 would remain improved with a six-story, approximately 40,228 square foot residential building. On a 7,480 square foot lot, this represents a built FAR of approximately 5.3. Lot 43 would remain improved with a three-story residential building. The building occupies a 1,653 square foot lot and contains a total of 1,782 square feet of gross floor area. This represents a built FAR of 1.07. Lot 44 would remain improved with a 1,582 square foot three-story residential building. This building occupies a 1,458 square feet lot and represents a built FAR of 1.08. Lot 144 would remain improved with a three story 1,582 square foot residential building. Built on a 1,350 square foot lot, this building represents a build FAR of 1.17. Lot 45 would remain improved with a three story 1,582 square foot residential building. Built on 1,224 square foot lot, this building represents a built FAR of 1.29.

With- Action Condition

Stationary Sources- HVAC Screening Analysis

A screening analysis was conducted using the methodology previously described to evaluate the potential impacts on existing buildings from emissions from individual as well as cumulative HVAC systems for the Proposed Project. For conservative purposes, the shortest distance between the source and the receptor assuming the maximum building footprints was used. It was assumed that the exhaust stacks would be located three feet above roof height (per the *CEQR Technical Manual*). The screening analysis was initially performed using the *CEQR Technical Manual* procedures assuming the use of No. 2 fuel oil. If the screening results failed with the use of No. 2 fuel oil, a second screening procedure was conducted, assuming use of natural gas. The proposed project would result in the development of two Projected Development Sites of varying sizes, summarized in Table 10, shown below.

Table 10 Reasonable Worst Case Development Scenario Summary

Site No.	Block	Lot	Lot Area (sq. ft.)	Proposed Zoning	Max Allowable (sq. ft.)	Max Allowable Height (ft.)
Projected Development Site 1	4516	8, 46	8,727	R7A/C2-3	44,158	95
Projected Development Site 2	4516	43, 44, 45, 144	5,685	R7A/C2-3	28,765	95

In addition to the individual HVAC analysis, cumulative impacts on existing or other proposed buildings from the HVAC emissions of Projected Development Site 1 and 2 combined.

As shown in **Figure 2.7-1,** the minimum allowable distance to screen out detailed air quality impact analysis for any sensitive receptors with similar or greater height from Projected Development Site 1 is 70 feet, As indicated in **Figure 2.7-2**, the minimum allowable distance to screen out of detailed air quality impact analysis for any sensitive receptors with similar or greater height from Projected Development Site 2 is 55 feet. As shown in **Figure 2.7-3**, the minimum allowable distance for any sensitive receptors with similar or greater height from the Projected Development Site 1 and 2 combined is 90 feet. No other residential buildings with a height of 95 feet or above were found in the 90-foot radius of Projected Development Site 1 or 2.

However, as indicated in *CEQR Technical Manuel*, this screening figure is only appropriate for sources at least 30 feet from the nearest buildings of similar or greater height. Since Projected Development Site 1 and Projected Development Site 2 are adjacent and would be attached to each other, a refined dispersion modeling analysis approach is warranted. Additionally, the residential building located at 2705 Colden Avenue (Block, 4516, Lot 48) would be immediately adjacent to Projected Development Site 1, and less than 30 feet from Projected Development Site 2, a detailed modeling analysis is also required to determine the impact from the Projected Development Site 1 and Projected Development Site 2 on this building.

Dispersion Modeling Analysis

For the refined analysis, the exhaust stacks for HVAC systems were assumed to be located at the edge of the development massing closest to the receptor, unless the source and receptor were immediately adjacent to each other. Since the two Projected Development Sites were immediately adjacent to each other, the stack was assumed to be located at an initial distance of 10 feet from the nearest receptor. To be conservative, multiple stacks were established in different corners on the rooftop of the two Projected Development Sites to evaluate the worst case scenario.

Figure 2.7-1 Air Quality Screening Graph – Projected Development Site 1

HVAC Screening Analysis

Site: Projected Site 1

FIG App 17-5
SO_2 BOILER SCREEN
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT - FUEL OIL #2



Stack Height: 98 ft
Proposed Maximum SQFA: 44,158 ft²
Minimum Allowable Distance to Nearest Building: 70 ft

Figure 2.7-2 Air Quality Screening Graph – Projected Development Site 2

HVAC Screening Analysis

Site: Projected Site 2

FIG App 17-5
SO_2 BOILER SCREEN
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT - FUEL OIL #2



Stack Height: 98 ft
Proposed Maximum SQFA: 28,765 ft²
Minimum Allowable Distance to Nearest Building: 55 ft

Figure 2.7-3 Air Quality Screening Graph – Cumulative
HVAC Screening Analysis

Site:Cumulative



Stack Height: 98 ft
Proposed Maximum SQFA: 72,923 ft²
Minimum Allowable Distance to Nearest Building: 90 ft

The refined dispersion modeling analysis was performed for criteria pollutants of $PM_{2.5}$, PM_{10}, NO_2 and SO_2 for which the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) have been established, with emission rates for No. 2 fuel oil. If a source could not be in compliance with the NAAQS or $PM_{2.5}$ *de minimis* criteria established in the *CEQR Technical Manuel*, the stack would then be set back in 5-foot increments until the source met the respective criteria.

An estimate of the emissions from the HVAC systems was made based on the projected development size, type of fuel used and type of construction with below fuel consumptions rates applicable for residential developments: 60.3 ft^3/ft^2-year and 0.43 gal/ft^2-year for natural gas and fuel oil, respectively. Short-term fuel consumption rates were based on peak hourly fuel consumption estimates for each HVAC system relevant to individual Projected Development Site. HVAC emission factors for each fuel type were obtained from the EPA *Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors, AP-42, Fifth Edition, Volume I: Stationary Point and Area Sources*. **Table 11** presents the HVAC emission rates firing No. 2 fuel oil and stack parameters used in the AERMOD.

Table 11 HVAC Emission Rates and Stack Parameters for the Proposed Buildings

	Projected Development Site 1	**Projected Development Site 2**
Emission Rate (g/s)		
1-Hr NO_x	2.00E-02	1.30E-02
Annual NO_x	5.47E-03	3.56E-03
24-Hr PM_{10}	3.30E-03	2.15E-03
24-Hr $PM_{2.5}$	3.30E-03	2.15E-03
Annual $PM_{2.5}$	9.03E-04	5.88E-04
1-Hr SO_2	2.13E-04	1.39E-04
Stack Parameters		
Stack Height (ft)	98	98
Stack Diameter (ft)	1	1
Exhaust Velocity (m/s)	1.87	1.22

Impacts concentrations would first be predicted using AERMOD assuming that all HVAC systems are powered by the #2 fuel oil. If exceedances of criteria were predicted under the #2 fuel oil option, a further modeling analysis under the natural gas option would be warranted .

AERMOD Modeling Concentration

Table 12 summarizes the AERMOD-predicted potential air quality impacts under the #2 fuel oil option from Projected Development Site 1. No exceedances were predicted from the operation of Projected Development Site 1, resulting in no significant adverse air quality impacts.

Table 12 Maximum Modeled Concentration (µg/m^3) from Projected Development Site 1

Pollutant	Averaging Time	Maximum Modeled Concentration	Background Concentration	Total Concentration	NAAQS/ *de minimis*
NO_2	annual	77.2	-	77.2	100.0
	1-hour	153.2	-	153.2	188.0
SO_2	1-hour	39.9	28.8	68.7	196
PM_{10}	24-hour	3.7	42	45.7	150
$PM_{2.5}$	annual	0.15	-	0.15	0.3
	24-hour	3.7	-	3.7	5.5

Table 13 summarizes the AERMOD-predicted potential air quality impacts from Projected Development Site 2. No exceedances were predicted from the operation of Projected Development Site 2, resulting in no significant adverse air quality impacts.

Table 13 Maximum Modeled Concentration (µg/m^3) from Projected Development Site 2

Pollutant	Averaging Time	Maximum Modeled Concentration	Background Concentration	Total Concentration	NAAQS/ *de minimis*
NO_2	annual	77.1	-	77.1	100.0
	1-hour	149.6	-	149.6	188.0
SO_2	1-hour	18.6	28.8	48.1	196
PM_{10}	24-hour	2.9	42	44.9	150
$PM_{2.5}$	annual	0.12	-	0.12	0.3
	24-hour	2.9	-	2.9	5.5

Table 14 summarizes the AERMOD-predicted potential cumulative air quality impacts from Projected Development Site 1 and 2. No exceedances were predicted from the operation of Projected Development Site 1 and 2 combined, resulting in no significant adverse air quality impacts.

Table 14 Maximum Modeled Concentration (µg/m^3) from Projected Development Site 1 and Projected Development Site 2

Pollutant	Averaging Time	Maximum Modeled Concentration	Background Concentration	Total Concentration	NAAQS/ *de minimis*
NO_2	annual	76.8	-	76.8	100.0
	1-hour	113.1	-	114.0	188.0
SO_2	1-hour	0.2	28.8	29.0	196
PM_{10}	24-hour	1.0	42	43.0	150
$PM_{2.5}$	annual	0.06	-	0.06	0.3
	24-hour	1.0	-	1.0	5.5

Proposed (E) Designation

To ensure that there are no significant adverse impacts related to emissions from the HVAC systems associated with the With-Action development onto existing or other projected buildings of similar or greater height, certain restrictions would be required regarding fuel type and/or exhaust stack location for some of the development sites. The text of the (E) designation (E-498) would be as follows:

- Projected Development Site 1 (Block 4516, Lot 8 and 46) - Any new residential/commercial development on the above-referenced property must ensure HVAC stack(s) is located at the highest tier and at least 98 feet above grade, to avoid any significant adverse air quality impacts.

- Projected Development Site 2 (Block 4516, Lot 43, 44, 45, and 144) - Any new residential/commercial development on the above-referenced property must ensure stack(s) is located at the highest tier and at least 98 feet above grade, to avoid any significant adverse air quality impacts.

Industrial Source and Large or Major Source Analysis

Pollutants emitted from the exhaust vents of existing permitted industrial facilities were examined to identify potential adverse impacts on future residents of the recommended development sites. All industrial air pollutant emission sources within 400 feet of the projected Rezoning Area were considered for inclusion in the air quality impact analyses..
In accordance with CEQR guidance, a search of the NYCDEP CAT database was conducted and one industrial facility with one expired air toxic operation permit within 400 feet of the Rezoning Area was identified as below:

- Permit No. PA102789X for Precision Analyst, Inc., located at 2801 Boston Road (Block 4515, Lot 22).

Based on a search of New York State Open Data (https://data.ny.gov/), it was found that one dry cleaning business within 1000 feet of the study area has an Air State Facility Permit to operate as below:

- Permit No. 2-6002-00407/00001 for Reda Cleaners, located at 800 Allerton Avenue (Block 4440, Lot 71).

The permitted emission rates are summarized in **Table 15** and stack parameters obtained from the permits were inputted into the AERMOD dispersion model. Since the Air State Facility Permit for Block 4440 does not specify the stack exit velocity or flow rate, 0.001 meter/sec exhaust velocity at all loads per *CEQR Technical Manuel* was assumed in in the analysis.

Table 15 Permitted Emission Rates

Facility	Permit No.	Pollutant	CAS number	1-Hour Emission Rate (g/s)	Annual Emission Rate (g/s)
Precision Analyst, Inc	PA102789	Carbon Monoxide	00630-08-0	9.79E+00	8.94E-01
		Hydrocarbon	68476-44-8	4.46E-01	4.07E-02
Reda Cleaners	2600200407	Stoddard Solvent	08052-41-3	3.63E-01	3.63E-01

The NYSDEC DAR-1 guidance document presents guideline concentrations in micrograms per cubic meter for the short-term guideline concentration (SGC) and annual guideline concentration (AGC) over one-hour and annual average time periods, respectively, for various air toxic pollutants. The only

applicable AGC relevant to this project is shown in **Table 16** for Stoddard Solvent with potential to affect the receptors located within Projected Development Sites 1 and 2.

Table 16 Relevant NYSDEC Ambient Air Contaminants Guideline Concentration Criteria

Pollutant	CAS #	SGC (µg/m^3)	AGC (µg/m^3)
Stoddard Solvent	08052-41-3	--	900

Predicted worst-case impacts on Projected Development Sites 1 and 2 were compared with the applicable SGCs and/or AGCs to determine if the future residents of Projected Development Sites 1 and 2 could be significantly impacted by nearby existing sources of air pollution.

For carbon monoxide emissions, the predicted worst-case concentrations including ambient background concentration levels were compared with the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS).

Hydrocarbon is not considered an air toxic pollutant and was not modeled.

Modeling Results

Table 17 presents the AERMOD-predicted annual impacts from the existing industrial sources on the proposed residential buildings. No exceedances of the representative NYSDEC's DAR-1 AGC were predicted. Therefore, there would be no long-term significant adverse air quality impacts from Stoddard Solvent emitted from the existing industrial sources.

Table 17 AERMOD-predicted Short-term Concentrations from Existing Industrial Sources

Pollutant	CAS #	AGC (µg/m^3)	Modeled Results (µg/m^3)
Stoddard Solvent	08052-41-3	900	2.73

Table 18 presents the AEMOD-predicted CO 1-hr and 8-hr impacts from existing industrial sources on the proposed residential buildings. No exceedances of Not-to-Exceed criteria were predicted. Therefore, there would be no significant impact of CO from the existing industrial sources.

Table 18 AERMOD-predicted 1-hr and 8-hr CO impact from Existing Industrial Sources

Pollutant	Averaging Time	Maximum Modeled Concentration	Background Concentration	Total Concentration	NAAQS (µg/m^3)
CO	1-hour	20,643	2,748	23,391	40,000
	8-hour	4,188	1,832	6,020	10,000

Health Risk Assessment

Since Stoddard Solvent is considered a non-carcinogenic pollutant, the corresponding health risk in terms of Hazard Risk Index is determined and presented in **Table 19.** No exceedances of Hazard Risk Index of 1 or greater were predicted and therefore no significant adverse impacts of non-carcinogenic pollutant emissions from the existing industrial sources would occur.

Table 19 Hazard Risk Index

Pollutant	CAS #	Short-term	Annual
Stoddard Solvent	08052-41-3	--	3.03E-03
Total		**--**	**3.03E-03**

Based on the predicted worst-case Stoddard Solvent and CO concentrations, it can be concluded that air pollutant emissions from existing industrial sources would not result in significant air quality impacts on the proposed residential buildings. Therefore, no further analysis is warranted.

2.7.4 Conclusion

The air quality analysis demonstrates that the potential pollutant concentrations and/or concentration increment from mobile sources emissions associated with the proposed action would not exceed the NAAQS or the City's *de minimis* thresholds, as the project would not generate enough vehicle trips to cause air quality impacts.

As for the HVAC stationary source emissions, with the adoption of (E) Designation (E-498) for two of the projected buildings associated with the Proposed Actions, the Project would not exceed the NAAQS and the City's *de minimis* criteria. One industrial source were found within 400-foot radius and one large or major source were found within a 1000-foot radius of the Project Area, however, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated from these sources on the proposed residential buildings.

Therefore, there no significant adverse air quality impacts would occur as a result of the Proposed Actions.

2.8 NOISE

Noise is defined as any unwanted sound, and sound is defined as any air pressure variation that the human ear can detect. Human beings can detect a large range of sound pressures ranging from 20 to 20 million micropascals, but only these air-pressure variations occurring within a particular set of frequencies are experienced as sound. Air pressure changes that occur between 20 and 20,000 times a second, stated as units of Hertz (Hz), are registered as sound.

In terms of hearing, humans are less sensitive to low frequencies (<250 Hz) than mid-frequencies (500-1,000 Hz). Humans are most sensitive to frequencies in the 1,000 to 5,000 Hz range. Since ambient noise contains many different frequencies all mixed together, measures of human response to noise assign more weight to frequencies in this range. This is known as the A-weighted sound level. Noise is measured in sound pressure level (SPL), which is converted to a decibel scale. The decibel is a relative measure of the sound level pressure with respect to a standardized reference quantity. Decibels on the A-weighted scale are termed "dB(A)." The A-weighted scale is used for evaluating the effects of noise in the environment because it most closely approximates the response of the human ear. On this scale, the threshold of discomfort is 120 dB(A), and the threshold of pain is about 140 dB(A). **Table 20** shows the range of noise levels for a variety of indoor and outdoor noise levels.

Because the scale is logarithmic, a relative increase of 10 decibels represents a sound pressure level that is 10 times higher. However, humans do not perceive a 10 dB(A) increase as 10 times louder; they perceive it as twice as loud. The following are typical human perceptions of dB(A) relative to changes in noise level:

- 3 dB(A) change is the threshold of change detectable by the human ear;
- 5 dB(A) change is readily noticeable; and
- 10 dB(A) increase is perceived as a doubling of the noise level.

As a change in land use may result in a change in type and intensity of noise perceived by residents, patrons and employees of a neighborhood, the *CEQR Technical Manual* recommends an analysis of the two principal types of noise sources: mobile sources and stationary sources. Both types of noise sources are examined in the following sections.

2.8.1 Mobile Sources

Mobile noise sources are those which move in relation to receptors. The mobile source screening analysis addresses potential noise impacts associated with vehicular traffic generated by the Proposed Actions. According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, if existing passenger car equivalent (PCE) values are increased by 100 percent or more due to a Proposed Actions, a detailed analysis is generally performed. Vehicular traffic studies are not warranted, as the Proposed Actions are not expected to generate over 50 vehicle trips through any local intersection during peak periods. As discussed in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, if the proposed project is located in an area with high ambient noise levels, which typically include those near heavily-traveled thoroughfares or other loud activities, further noise analysis may be warranted to determine the attenuation measures for the project. The Projected Development Sites are located adjacent to Williamsbridge Road and Boston Road, in an area with high ambient noise levels. Although the project is unlikely to generate sufficient traffic volumes to warrant a mobile source analysis, the ambient noise levels were measured to provide an assessment of the potential for traffic noise to have a significant adverse effect on future residents.

Table 20 Sound Pressure Level & Loudness of Typical Noises in Indoor & Outdoor Environments

Noise Level dB(A)	Subjective Impression	Typical Sources		Relative Loudness (Human Response)
		Outdoor	Indoor	
120-130	Uncomfortably Loud	Air raid siren at 50 feet (threshold of pain)	Oxygen torch	32 times as loud
110-120	Uncomfortably Loud	Turbo-fan aircraft at take-off power at 200 feet	Riveting machine Rock band	16 times as loud
100-110	Uncomfortably Loud	Jackhammer at 3 feet		8 times as loud
90-100	Very Loud	Gas lawn mower at 3 feet Subway train at 30 feet Train whistle at crossing Wood chipper shredding trees Chain saw cutting trees at 10 feet	Newspaper press	4 times as loud
80-90	Very Loud	Passing freight train at 30 feet Steamroller at 30 feet Leaf blower at 5 feet Power lawn mower at 5 feet	Food blender Milling machine Garbage disposal Crowd noise at sports event	2 times as loud
70-80	Moderately Loud	NJ Turnpike at 50 feet Truck idling at 30 feet Traffic in downtown urban area	Loud stereo Vacuum cleaner Food blender	Reference loudness (70 dB(A))
60-70	Moderately Loud	Residential air conditioner at 100 feet Gas lawn mower at 100 feet Waves breaking on beach at 65 feet	Cash register Dishwasher Theater lobby Normal speech at 3 feet	2 times as loud
50-60	Quiet	Large transformers at 100 feet Traffic in suburban area	Living room with TV on Classroom Business office Dehumidifier Normal speech at 10 feet	1/4 as loud
40-50	Quiet	Bird calls Trees rustling Crickets Water flowing in brook	Folding clothes Using computer	1/8 as loud
30-40	Very quiet		Walking on carpet Clock ticking in adjacent room	1/16 as loud
20-30	Very quiet		Bedroom at night	1/32 as loud
10-20	Extremely quiet		Broadcast and recording studio	
0-10	Threshold of Hearing			

Sources: Noise Assessment Guidelines Technical Background, by Theodore J. Schultz, Bolt Beranek and Newman, Inc., prepared for the US Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Research and Technology, Washington, D.C., undated; Sandstone Environmental Associates, Inc.; Highway Noise Fundamentals, prepared by the Federal Highway Administration, US Department of Transportation, September 1980; Handbook of Environmental Acoustics, by James P. Cowan, Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1994.

The *CEQR Technical Manual* provides noise exposure guidelines in terms of L_{eq} and L_{10} for the maximum amount of allowable noise under existing regulations. L_{eq} is the continuous equivalent sound level. The sound energy from the fluctuating sound pressure levels (SPLs) is averaged over time to create a single number to describe the mean energy or intensity level. High noise levels during a measurement period will have greater effect on the L_{eq} than low noise levels. The L_{eq} has an advantage over other descriptors because L_{eq} values from different noise sources can be added and subtracted to determine cumulative noise levels. In comparison, L_{10} is the SPL exceeded 10 percent of the time. Similar descriptors include the L_{50}, L_{01}, and L_{90} values.

This analysis describes the noise measurement results collected on Jun 21st, 2017 at two locations in front of the 2712 Williamsbridge Road Rezoning site consisting of two Projected Development Sites, Projected Development Sites 1 and 2, as shown in **Figure 2.8-1.** These measurements were then compared with New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP)-established exterior noise exposure guidelines, Table 19-2 in the *City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manuel*, to determine the appropriate building noise attenuation values with potential to be required for any of proposed buildings to achieve acceptable interior noise levels per Table 19-3 in the *CEQR Technical Manual*.

Noise Measurement

Noise measurement was conducted at two locations (**Figure 2.8-1**) during peak vehicular travel periods, 8:00-9:00 am, 12:00-1:00 pm, and 5:00-6:30 pm. The weather condition is normal with calm wind and is considered suitable for an ambient noise measurement.

A Type 1 Larson Davis LxT sound level meter with wind shield was used to conduct the noise monitoring. The meter was placed on a tripod at a height of approximately five feet above the ground, away from any reflective surfaces. The meter was calibrated prior to and following each monitoring session.

Noise measurements were conducted in front of each Projected Development Site on the sidewalk at:

- Location 1: middle block of Williamsbridge Road between Boston Road and Allerton Avenue (Figure 2.7-2);
- Location 2: middle block of Colden Avenue between Boston Road and Allerton Avenue (Figure 2.7-2).

Traffic volumes and vehicle classification along the adjacent roads at each location were counted concurrently during the noise measurement duration.



AECOM

Environmental Assessment Statement
2712 Williamsbridge Road Rezoning
Bronx, NY

Measurement Locations

Figure 2.8-1

Figure 2.8-2 Noise Monitor Location Photos



Meter Setup at Location 1



Meter Setup at Location 2

Measurement Summary

Tables 21 and 22 present the ambient noise levels in terms of various noise metrics measured at two locations mentioned above during three daytime periods. L_{10} is the metric used by NYCDEP in establishing the exterior noise exposure guidelines.

Table 21: Noise Levels in dBA at Location 1

Noise Metric	Time Period		
	8:21-8:42 AM	12:00-12:21 PM	5:53-6:14 PM
L_{eq}	64.4	63.8	68.3
L_{max}	81.0	85.1	93.0
L_{10}	**67.3**	**65.8**	**67.1**
L_{50}	60.6	59.8	60.7
L_{90}	56.9	55.2	55.9
L_{min}	53.6	52.3	51.8

Table 22: Noise Levels in dBA at Location 2

Noise Metric	Time Period		
	8:44-9:05 AM	12:24-12:45 PM	5:29-5:50 PM
L_{eq}	58.8	59.2	54.6
L_{max}	79.7	80.7	69.1
L_{10}	**58.2**	**60.6**	**56.4**
L_{50}	53.1	54.4	51.7
L_{90}	50.7	52.9	49.2
L_{min}	49.5	51.8	47.3

Observation and Assessment

Based on field observation and recorded data during noise measurement, both Projected Development Sites 1 and 2 are located in a pretty quiet neighborhood with light traffic.

A car-wash shop is next to Projected Development Site 1 on Williamsbridge Road. Noise from a high-pressure water gun can be clearly heard from the measurement location 1.

In terms of *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines, existing noise levels measured at both locations are in the "marginally acceptable" category. Therefore, no window-wall attenuation is required for Projected Development Sites 1 and 2.

2.8.2 Stationary Sources

The *CEQR Technical Manual* states that based upon previous studies, unless existing ambient noise levels are very low and/or stationary source levels are very high (and there are no structures that provide shielding), it is unusual for stationary sources to have significant impacts at distances beyond 1,500 feet. A detailed analysis may be appropriate if the proposed project would: cause a substantial stationary source (i.e., unenclosed mechanical equipment for manufacturing or building ventilation purposes, playground, etc.) to be operating within 1,500 feet of a receptor, with a direct line of sight to that receptor; or introduce a receptor in an area with high ambient noise levels resulting from stationary sources, such as unenclosed manufacturing activities or other loud uses. Machinery, mechanical equipment, heating, ventilating and air-conditioning units,

loudspeakers, new loading docks, and other noise associated with building structures may also be considered in a stationary source noise analysis. Impacts may occur when a stationary noise source is near a sensitive receptor, and is unenclosed.

No unenclosed stationary noise sources of concern were observed during field inspections. As the Projected Development Sites are not subject to high ambient noise levels from any nearby stationary source, no stationary source noise impacts from surrounding uses are anticipated. Additionally, as the proposed project would not introduce a new stationary noise source, no significant adverse stationary source impacts are anticipated as a result of the Proposed Actions, and no further analysis is warranted.

2.9 NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

As defined by the *CEQR Technical Manual*, neighborhood character is considered to be an amalgam of the various elements that give a neighborhood its distinct personality. The elements, when applicable, typically include land use, socioeconomic conditions, open space and shadows, historic and cultural resources, urban design and visual resources, transportation, and noise, as well as any other physical or social characteristics that help to define a community. Not all of these elements affect neighborhood character in all cases; a neighborhood usually draws its distinctive character from a few defining features.

If a project has the potential to result in any significant adverse impacts on any of the above technical areas, a preliminary assessment of neighborhood character may be appropriate. A significant impact identified in one of these technical areas is not automatically equivalent to a significant impact on neighborhood character; rather, it serves as an indication that neighborhood character should be examined.

In addition, depending on the project, a combination of moderate changes in several of these technical areas may potentially have a significant effect on neighborhood character. As stated in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a "moderate" effect is generally defined as an effect considered reasonably close to the significant adverse impact threshold for a particular technical analysis area. When considered together, there are elements that may have the potential to significantly affect neighborhood character. Moderate effects on several elements may affect defining features of a neighborhood and, in turn, a pedestrian's overall experience. If it is determined that two or more categories may have potential "moderate effects" on the environment, CEQR states that an assessment should be conducted to determine if the proposed project result in a combination of moderate effects to several elements that cumulatively may affect neighborhood character. If a project would result in only slight effects in several analysis categories, then further analysis is generally not needed.

This chapter reviews the defining features of the neighborhood and examines the proposed actio n's potential to affect the neighborhood character of the surrounding study area. The study area is generally coterminous with the study area used for the land use and zoning analysis in Chapter 2.1. The impact analysis of neighborhood character that follows below focuses on changes to the technical areas listed above that exceeded CEQR preliminary screening thresholds that were assessed in this EAS Short Form.

The assessment begins with a review of existing conditions and the neighborhood of the study area. The information is drawn from the preceding sections of this EAS, but is presented in a more integrated way. While the other sections present all relevant details about particular aspects of the environmental setting, the discussion for neighborhood character focuses on a limited number of important features that gives the neighborhood its own sense of place and that distinguish them from other parts of the city. A concise discussion of the changes anticipated by the 2021 analysis year under the Future No-Action Condition is then included. A brief overview of the Proposed Action is then presented, along with an analysis of whether any anticipated significant adverse impacts and moderate adverse effects, regarding the relevant technical CEQR assessment categories for neighborhood character, would adversely affect any of the defining features.

2.9.1 Existing Conditions

Land Use, Zoning and Public Policy

Land uses throughout the study area include a mix of residential, commercial, and industrial/manufacturing uses. The residential housing stock of the study area is primarily made up of one and two family homes and two – to four story single- and multi-family homes. These are generally found on the Avenues that run north-south surrounding the Project Site, such as Colden Avenue and Paulding Avenue. Mixed commercial and residential uses are located throughout the study area as well, such as the 6-story residential building directly south of the Project Area, which contains ground floor commercial uses that include a beauty salon, a realty office, and a Caribbean market among others. The prevailing built form of the area is a mix of two- to four-story residential buildings and one-story warehouse distribution buildings.

The northwestern portion of the study area features a high concentration of commercial uses, due to the intersection of two heavy commercial corridors (Boston Road and Williamsbridge Road). There is a small "Green Street" triangle located in the northwest of the study area at the intersection of Boston Road, Williamsbridge Road, and Radcliff Avenue. Directly across Allerton Avenue from the Project Site, on an irregularly shaped lot bound by Williamsbridge Road, Allerton Avenue, and Colden Avenue, there is a Shell gas station. The majority of the eastern portion of the study area is occupied by single- and multi-family residential uses. There are no community facilities, institutions, open spaces, or recreation spaces in the study area. There is one vacant lot and a few parking facilities in the study area.

The Rezoning Area is located along the southern portion of the irregularly shaped block that is bound by Williamsbridge Road, Colden Avenue, and Radcliff Avenue. It extends about 300 feet to the north from the intersection of Williamsbridge Road, Colden Avenue, and Allerton Avenue. Land use in the Rezoning Area consists of residential, mixed- residential and commercial buildings, and parking facilities.

The Projected Development Sites are located in a C8-1 zoning district that is mapped generally along Allerton Avenue to the south, Colden Avenue to the east, Arnow Avenue to the north, and Matthews Avenue to the west. Retail and Commercial uses as well as community facility uses and General Service uses (UG 16) are allowed as-of-right in C8-1 zoning districts. The built floor area ratio (FAR) for C8-1 districts ranges from 1.0 FAR for commercial uses to 2.4 for UG 4 community facility uses. Buildings in C8-1 zoning districts cannot penetrate the sky exposure plane, which begins 30' above the street line.

The blocks to the northeast of the proposed Rezoning Area are located in an R4-1 zoning district. Residential uses as well as community facility uses are allowed as-of-right in R4-1 zoning districts. The built FAR for R5 districts can reach a maximum of 2.0 for community facilities and 0.75 for residential uses. Building heights within R4-1 districts can reach a maximum height of 35 feet with a maximum perimeter wall height of 25 feet. The southern portion of the study area is located within an R5 zoning district. Residential uses as well as community facility uses are allowed as-of-right in R5 zoning districts. The maximum FAR in R5 zoning districts for residential uses is 1.25 and 2.0 for community facilities and the maximum building height is 40 feet. The southern portion of the proposed Rezoning Area contains both C2-2 and C1-2 overlays on both sides of Allerton Avenue. In R5 and R4-1 districts, C2-2 and C1-2 commercial overlays allow a maximum FAR of 1.0 and an overlay depth of 150 feet. Typical retail uses in such overlays include those seen in the study area, such as neighborhood grocery stores, restaurants and beauty parlors.

Additionally, the Project Site is not part of, or subject to, an Urban Renewal Plan (URP), adopted community 197-a Plan, Solid Waste Management Plan, Business Improvement District (BID), Industrial Business Zone (IBZ), or the New York City Landmarks Law. The Proposed Action is also not a large publically sponsored project, and as such, consistency with the City's *PlaNYC 2030* for sustainability is not warranted. In addition, the Rezoning Area is not located in the Coastal Management Zone; therefore a consistency review is not warranted. The project is also not located within New York City's designated coastal zone boundary and therefore is not subject to review for its consistency with the City's Waterfront Revitalization Program.

Transportation

Williamsbridge Road and Boston Road as classified as Principal Arterial Other Roadways and Bronxwood Avenue and Allerton Avenue are classified as a Minor Arterial Roadways. Additionally, Arnow Avenue, which is located at the very northern portion of the study area, is classified as a major collector. All other roadways in the study area are classified as local roads. Additionally, Boston Road, Williamsbridge Road, and Allerton Avenue are all categorized as 'Local Truck Routes" by the New York City Department of Transportation.

The area is well served by public transit. The MTA's Bx26 and Bx8 stop approximately 1 block south of the Project Site at the intersection of Williamsbridge Road and Allerton Avenue. The Bx26 runs from Bedford Park Blvd/Lehman College to Co-op City while the Bx8 runs from Locust Point to Williamsbridge-225th Street. The nearest subway stop is the MTA's "2" and '5" trains at Allerton Avenue, approximately four-tenths of a mile west of the Project Site.

Urban Design and Visual Resources

The architecture throughout the study area is eclectic, with no unity of form to tie the built form together visually. The area is characterized by a mix of single- and multi-family residential, mixed residential and commercial, commercial, industrial/manufacturing, and parking uses. One vacant lot also exists within the study area. The commercial uses are comprised of chain restaurants, a pharmacy, a realty office, a beauty parlour and other local retail. The prevailing built form in the area is a mix of low- to mid-rise residential and small apartment buildings in both the eastern and southern portions of the study area, and commercial and parking uses in both the northern and western portions of the study area. The street grid is disrupted from its regular grid like- pattern by both Boston Road and Williamsbridge Road, which cut through the grid diagonally creating two intersections in the study area which involve three or more streets. These intersections are heavily trafficked and are characterized by their predominantly commercial uses.

There are few streetscape elements present within the study area and little in the way of visual interest. At the intersection of Williamsbridge Road, Radcliffe Avenue, and Boston Road, there is a small triangular "Green Street" and contains plantings. No other notable streetscape elements (e.g. benches, plazas) are located within the study area. Most of the streets contain street trees, which are generally located at irregular intervals. No other notable streetscape elements (e.g. benches) are located within the study area.

2.9.2 Future No-Action Scenario

In the Future No-Action Scenario, it is expected that the existing uses within the Rezoning Area would remain in their current form.

Significant changes to the study area are not expected by the analysis year of 2021. In the Future No-Action Scenario, it is expected that while tenants within surrounding area buildings may change, the overall use of these buildings would remain the same, and any physical changes would comply with designated zoning regulations and other surrounding districts.

2.9.3 Future With-Action Scenario

The elements that comprise neighborhood character are reviewed individually below, with a following supporting and cumulative conclusion.

Land Use, Zoning and Public Policy

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, development resulting from a Proposed Action could alter neighborhood character if it introduces new land uses, conflicts with land use policy or other public plans for the area, changes land use character, or generates significant land use impacts.

In the Future With-Action Scenario, the Proposed Actions would amend the zoning map to change the existing C8-1 district to an R7A/C2-3 district. On Projected Development Site 1 (Block 4516, Lots 8 and 46) this action would facilitate the development of 34,559 GSF of residential space (40 units) and 9,599 GSF of commercial office space. Four additional lots are projected to be developed as one projected development site as a result of the Proposed Actions. This projected development site is made up of Block 4516 Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45. Under this analysis this site is projected to be developed with approximately 6,253 GSF of commercial floor area and 22,512 GSF of residential floor area with 26 units.

Additionally, the proposed project is consistent with the Mayor's *Housing New York Plan,* which aims to build and preserve affordable housing units for low income New Yorkers. The With-Action Scenario would lead to the creation of approximately 13 affordable residential units.

Historic and Cultural Resources

According to CEQR, when an action results in substantial direct changes to a historic or cultural resource or substantial changes to public views of a resource, or when a historic or cultural resource analysis identified a significant impact in this category, there is a potential to affect neighborhood character.

The Project Site is not a designated local LPC or S/NR historic resource or property, nor is the site part of any designated historic district. The LPC was contacted for their initial review of the project's potential to impact nearby historic and cultural resources, and a response was received on July 24, 2017, indicating that the projected development site has no architectural or archaeological significance. Therefore, significant adverse impacts to these resources are not expected as a result of the Proposed Actions and further analysis is not warranted.

Urban Design and Visual Resources

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, in developed areas, urban design changes have the potential to affect neighborhood character by introducing substantially different building bulk, form, size, scale, or arrangement. Urban design changes may also affect block forms, street patterns, or street hierarchies, as well as streetscape elements such as street walls, landscaping, curb cuts, and loading docks. Visual resource changes could affect neighborhood character if they directly alter key visual features such as unique and important public view corridors and vistas, or block public visual access to such features.

The Proposed Actions would not diminish or disturb the existing aesthetic continuity, pedestrian features of the community or neighborhood, and as the Proposed Actions would not block any view corridors of any natural areas with rare or defining features, nor would the Proposed Actions impact an historical or culturally sensitive community features, the Proposed Actions are not expected to result in any significant adverse urban design. Visual resource changes would also not occur, as the Proposed Actions would not directly alter any key visual features, such as unique and important public view corridors and vistas, or block public visual access to such features.

Shadows

According to CEQR, when shadows from a proposed project fall on a sunlight-sensitive resource and substantially reduce or completely eliminate direct sunlight exposure such that the public's use of the resource is significantly altered or the viability of vegetation or other resources is threatened, there is a potential to affect neighborhood character.

As noted in Section 2.2, a shadow radius of 4.3 times the maximum allowable height on the projected development sites (95 feet) was calculated, resulting in a shadow radius of approximately 408 feet. According to a land use check, no sunlight sensitive resources were in the area. There were no churches with stained glass windows and no open spaces. With no sunlight sensitive resources within the Tier 1 Study Area for both Projected Development Site 1 and Projected Development Site 2, no additional shadow analysis is required.

Transportation

According to CEQR, changes in traffic and pedestrian conditions can affect neighborhood character in a number of ways. For traffic to have an effect on neighborhood character, it must be a contributing element to the character of the neighborhood (either by its absence or its presence), and it must change substantially as a result of the actions. According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, such substantial traffic changes can include: changes in level of service (LOS) to C or below; change in traffic patterns; change in roadway classifications; change in vehicle mixes, substantial increase in traffic volumes on residential streets; or significant traffic impacts, as identified in the technical traffic analysis. Regarding pedestrians, when a proposed project would result in substantially different pedestrian activity and circulation, it has the potential to affect neighborhood character.

The Proposed Actions would not lead to an increase of 50 or more vehicle trips at any one intersection in the vicinity of the Projected Development Sites. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not lead to any significant adverse traffic impacts.

The Proposed Actions are projected to generate a total of approximately more than 200 pedestrian trips during the weekday midday, weekday PM and Saturday midday peak hours. However, the incremental pedestrian volumes generated on pedestrian elements beyond all intersections during the weekday midday are below the 200-trip threshold. Based on the Level 2 screening, Pedestrians screened out during the Midday peak hour (the highest hour); and therefore in accordance with the CEQR Technical Manual, no detailed pedestrian analyses are required.

Additionally, since this estimated trip generation exceeds the threshold by only a handful of pedestrians, and given the typical daily variation in pedestrian volumes of approximately up to ten percent, no further analysis regarding pedestrians was deemed necessary.

Noise

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, if existing passenger car equivalent (PCE) values are increased by 100 percent or more due to the Proposed Actions, a detailed analysis is generally performed. Vehicular traffic studies are not warranted, as the Proposed Actions are not expected to generate over 50 vehicle trips through any local intersection during peak periods.

As discussed in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, if the proposed project is located in an area with high ambient noise levels, which typically include those near heavily-traveled thoroughfares or other loud activities, further noise analysis may be warranted to determine the attenuation measures for the project. The Projected Development Sites are located adjacent to Williamsbridge Road and Boston Road, in an area with high ambient noise levels. Although the project is unlikely to generate sufficient traffic volumes to warrant a mobile source analysis, the ambient noise levels were measured to provide an assessment of the potential for traffic noise to have a significant adverse effect on future residents.

The *CEQR Technical Manual* provides noise exposure guidelines in terms of L_{eq} and L_{10} for the maximum amount of allowable noise under existing regulations. L_{eq} is the continuous equivalent sound level. The sound energy from the fluctuating sound pressure levels (SPLs) is averaged over time to create a single number to describe the mean energy or intensity level. High noise levels during a measurement period will have greater effect on the L_{eq} than low noise levels. The L_{eq} has an advantage over other descriptors because L_{eq} values from different noise sources can be added and subtracted to determine cumulative noise levels. In comparison, L_{10} is the SPL exceeded 10 percent of the time. Similar descriptors include the L_{50}, L_{01}, and L_{90} values.

This analysis describes the noise measurement results collected on Jun 21st, 2017 at two locations in front of the 2712 Williamsbridge Road Rezoning site consisting of two projected development sites, Projected Development Sites 1 and 2, as shown previously. These measurements were then compared with New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP)-established exterior noise exposure guidelines, Table 19-2 in the *City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manuel*, to determine the appropriate building noise attenuation values with potential to be required for any of

proposed buildings to achieve acceptable interior noise levels per Table 19-3 in the *CEQR Technical Manual*.

Noise measurement was conducted at two locations (**Figure 2.7-1**) during peak vehicular travel periods, 8:00-9:00 am, 12:00-1:00 pm, and 5:00-6:30 pm. The weather condition is normal with calm wind and is considered suitable for an ambient noise measurement.

A Type 1 Larson Davis LxT sound level meter with wind shield was used to conduct the noise monitoring. The meter was placed on a tripod at a height of approximately five feet above the ground, away from any reflective surfaces. The meter was calibrated prior to and following each monitoring session.

- Location 1: mid- block of Williamsbridge Road between Boston Road and Allerton Avenue (Figure 2.7-2);

- Location 2: mid- block of Colden Avenue between Boston Road and Allerton Avenue (Figure 2.7-2).

Traffic volumes and vehicle classification along the adjacent roads at each location were counted concurrently during the noise measurement duration.

Based on field observation and recorded data during noise measurement, both Projected Development Sites are located in a pretty quiet neighborhood with light traffic.

A car-wash shop is next to Projected Development Site 1 on Williamsbridge Road. Noise from a high-pressure water gun can be clearly heard from the measurement location 1.

In terms of *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines, existing noise levels measured at both locations are in the "marginally acceptable" category. Therefore, no window-wall attenuation is required for both Projected Development Sites.

Conclusions

Of the relevant technical areas specified in the *CEQR Technical Manual* that comprise neighborhood character, the Proposed Actions would not cause significant adverse impacts with regard to any of them. Moderate adverse effects that would potentially impact such a defining feature, either singly or in combination, have also not been identified for more than one technical area. Therefore, as the proposed actions would not have a significant adverse neighborhood character impact and would not result in a significant adverse impact to a defining feature of the neighborhood, further analysis is not necessary.

2.10 CONSTRUCTION

Construction, although temporary, can result in disruptive and noticeable effects on a proposed action area. A determination of the significance of construction and the need for mitigation is based on the duration and magnitude of these effects. Construction is typically of greatest importance when it could affect traffic conditions, archaeological resources, and the integrity of historic resources, noise patterns, or air quality conditions. All analyses were undertaken in accordance with the guidelines contained in the *CEQR Technical Manual*.

In addition to the site controlled by the applicant, there is one projected development site in the Rezoning Area. While the duration of construction on the applicant's site is expected to last approximately 20 months, the remaining projected development site is anticipated to be developed in the four years following the adoption of the proposed rezoning.

As construction induced by the Proposed Actions would be gradual, taking place over a four-year period, potential impacts would be minimal and, as discussed below, not expected to have any significant adverse impacts. The following is a brief discussion of the effects associated with construction related activities on traffic,

air quality, noise, historical resources and hazardous materials resulting from the construction of the projected development sites.

Effect of Construction on Traffic

The Proposed Actions would result in new development, over a three-year period, on up to two projected development sites. These developments would replace existing uses on the each site. During construction, the sites would generate trips from workers traveling to and from the construction sites, and from the movement of materials and equipment.

Given typical construction hours of 7:00 AM to 4:00 PM, worker trips would be concentrated in off-peak hours typically before both the AM and PM peak commuter periods. Truck movements typically would be spread throughout the day on weekdays, and would generally occur between the hours of 7:00 AM and 4:30 PM. Traffic generated by construction workers and construction truck traffic would not represent a substantial increment during the area's peak travel periods.

Construction activities may result in short-term disruption of both traffic and pedestrian movements at the development sites. This would occur primarily due to the temporary loss of curbside lanes from the staging of equipment and the movement of materials to and from the site. Additionally, construction would result in the temporary closing of sidewalks adjacent to the site at times. These conditions would not lead to significant adverse effects on traffic and transportation conditions.

Effect of Construction on Air Quality

Possible impacts on local air quality during construction induced by the Proposed Actions include fugitive dust (particulate) emission from land clearing operation and demolition as well as mobile source emissions (hydrocarbons, nitrogen oxide, and carbon monoxide) generated by construction equipment and vehicles.

Fugitive dust emissions from land clearing operations can occur from excavation, hauling, dumping, spreading, grading, compaction, wind erosion, and traffic over unpaved areas. Actual quantities of emissions depend on the extent and nature of the clearing operations, the type of equipment employed, the physical characteristics of the underlying soil, the speed at which construction vehicles are operated, and the type of fugitive dust control methods employed. Much of the fugitive dust generated by construction activities would be of a short-term duration and relatively contained within a proposed site, not significantly impacting nearby buildings or residents. All appropriate fugitive dust control measures – including watering of exposed areas and dust covers for trucks – would be employed during construction of the development sites. Therefore, the fugitive source emissions generated by the Proposed Actions would not be significant.

Mobile source emissions may result from the operation of construction equipment, trucks delivering materials and removing debris, workers' private vehicles, or occasional disruptions in traffic near the construction site. As the number of construction-related vehicle trips generated by the Proposed Actions would be relatively small and the emissions from such vehicles as well as construction equipment would occur over a four-year period and be dispersed throughout the proposed Rezoning Area, the mobile source emissions generated by the Proposed Actions would not be significant. Overall, the Proposed Actions would not have the potential to result in significant adverse air quality impacts.

Effect of Construction on Noise

Noise and vibration from construction equipment operation and noise from construction workers' vehicles and delivery vehicles traveling to and from the construction sites can affect community noise levels. The level of impact of these noise sources depends on the noise characteristics of the equipment and activities involved the construction schedule, and the location of potentially sensitive noise receptors.

Noise and vibration levels at a given location are dependent on the kind and number of pieces of construction equipment being operated, as well as the distance of the location from the construction site and the types of structures, if any, between the location and the noise source. Noise levels caused by construction activities can vary widely, depending on the phase of construction (e.g. demolition, land clearing and excavation, foundation, erection of structure, construction of exterior walls) and the specific task being undertaken.

Construction noise associated with the Proposed Actions is expected to be similar to noise generated by other residential construction projects in the city. Increased noise level caused by construction activities can be expected to be more significant during early excavation phases of construction and would be of relatively short duration. Increases in noise levels caused by delivery trucks and other construction vehicles would not be significant.

Construction noise is regulated by the *New York City Noise Control Code* and by the Environmental Protection Agency noise emission standards for construction equipment. These local and federal requirements mandate that certain classifications of construction equipment and motor vehicles meet specified noise emissions standards; that, except under exceptional circumstances, construction activities be limited to weekdays between the hours of 7:00 AM and 6:00 PM; and that construction material be handled and transported in such a manner as not to create unnecessary noise. In addition, whenever possible, appropriate low noise emission level equipment and operational procedures can be utilized to minimize noise and its effect on adjacent uses.

Thus, while there may be short periods of time when noise is greater than the Noise Control Code, these regulations would be followed in such a matter that no significant adverse noise impacts would be expected to result from the Proposed Actions.

Effect of Construction on Historic Resources

In order to determine whether the projected development has the potential to affect nearby off-site historic or architectural resources, the study area was screened for historic and architectural resources. No historic or architectural resources were identified within the 400-foot study area. Therefore, adverse construction-related impacts are not expected to any historic resource in the vicinity of the Rezoning Area.

Effect of Construction on Hazardous Materials

The Proposed Actions would result in new development in the Rezoning Area. As such, a hazardous materials assessment was undertaken, as presented in Section 2.5 above. As discussed in the section, all contaminants and contaminated materials are expected to be removed in accordance with environmental regulations and no significant adverse impacts are expected.

Conclusion

Construction-related activities are not expected to have any significant adverse impacts on traffic, air quality, noise, historic resources, or hazardous materials conditions as a result of the Proposed Actions.

Appendices

Appendix A-
Site Plans

DRAWING INDEX

SHEET #	DRAWING #	DRAWING NAME
		ZONING
01	Z-00.00	ZONING ANALYSIS, RENDERINGS & DRAWING LIST
02	Z-01.00	ZONING LOT SITE PLAN
03	Z-02.00	FIRST FLOOR PLAN
04	Z-03.00	UPPER FLOOR PLANS
05	Z-04.00	BUILDING SECTIONS
06	Z-05.00	BUILDING ELEVATIONS

ZONING ANALYSIS
2712 Williamsbridge Road, Bronx NY
Block: 4516
Lot: 8 & 46
Zoning Map: 4a
Zone: C8-1 Proposed Zoning change to R7A/C2-3
Lot Dimensions: 91'-8" x 98'-4" (irregular)
Lot Area: 8,727 sf (approximately)

ZR	Item/Description	Permitted/Required	Proposed	Compliance/Lack of Compliance and Notes
	USES			
22-10	Uses permitted as-of-right: R7A	UG 1, 2, 3, 4, 6C	2	
32-10	Uses permitted as-of-right: C2	1, 2, 3, 4, 6A - F, 7A-E, 8A-E, 9A-C, 14	6	
	FAR			
23-154	Residential	4.60	3.88	
33-121	Commercial	2.00	0.55	
	FLOOR AREA			
23-154	Residential	4.60 x 8,727 sf = 40,144 sf	33,887 sf	
33-121	Commercial	2.0 x 8,727 sf = 17,454 sf	4,825 sf	
35-30	Max. for Zoning Lot	4.6 x 8,727 sf = 40,144 sf	38,712 sf	
	LOT COVERAGE			
23-154	Residential	65% (0.65 x 8,725 = 5,673 sf)	50% (4,397 sf)	
	DENSITY			
23-20	Dwelling Unit Factor	680		
	Number of Dwelling units	33887 / 680 = 50 Units Max.	35 Units	
	YARD			
23-45	Front yard	None required	None	
23-462c	Side yard	None required	None	
23-47	Rear yard	30'-0"	30'-0"	Interior lot
23-533(a)	Rear yard equivalent through lot	60'-0"	10'-0" @ Williamsbridge 50'-0" @ Colden Avenue	
	HEIGHT AND SETBACK			
	Minimum Base Height	40 feet	75'-0"	
23-664	Maximum Base Height	75 feet	75'-0"	
23-664	Proposed Building Height	95 feet	92'-7"	With qualifying ground floor
23-621c	Permitted obstructions	Allowable dormer width = 47'-8"	41'-8"	Street wall below base height = 91'-8" Height of dormer above base height = 8'-1" Dormer width reduction: 60% - 8% = 52% Allowable dormer width: 0.52 x 91'-8" = 47'-8"
	PARKING			
25-241	Required Parking for Small Zoning Lots	30% of total dwelling units: 0.3 x 35 = 11 spaces	16 spaces	Waiver per 25-26 below 15 spaces.
25-811	Required Bicycle Parking	1 per 2 dwelling units: 35/2 = 17.5	18 spaces	
36-20	Required Parking for PRC-B1	1 per 400 sf: 4,825 / 400 = 12 spaces	None	Waiver per 36-21 below 25 spaces.
	STREET TREE PLANTING			
26-41		1 per 25 feet of street frontage		
		Williamsbridge Road: 91'-8" / 25 = 4 trees	2 trees	
		Colden Avenue: 50'/25 = 2 trees	2 trees	
		Existing trees to be removed	0	
		Existing trees to remain	0	
		Trees to be planted off-site	2	
		Total trees required = 6	6	
	THE QUALITY HOUSING PROGRAM			
28-12	Refuse Storage and Disposal	2.9 cf per dwelling unit		
		2.9 x 35 = 102 sf	141 sf	See Cellar Compactor Room
		Refuse disposal room of not less than 12 sf at each residential floor	Provided	See floor plans. 12 sf Zoning floor area deduction taken per floor.
		Refuse storage at community facility and commercial uses	Provided	See floor plans
28-21	Recreation Space	3.3% of residential floor area		
		33,887 sf x 0.033 = 1,118 sf	1,994 sf	
28-31	Density per Corridor	# DU per corridor < 11	5 DU	50% of corridor floor area deducted from zoning floor area



PERSPECTIVE VIEW FROM COLDEN AVENUE (PRELIMINARY PLACEHOLDER)



PERSPECTIVE VIEW FROM WILLIAMSBRIDGE ROAD (PRELIMINARY PLACEHOLDER)

The J. Pilla Group Limited

PROJECT TITLE:
2712 WILLIAMSBRIDGE RD
BRONX, NY 10469

LOCATION INFO:



BOROUGH: BRONX
BLOCK: 4516
LOT: 8 & 46
AREA: 8717 SF

NO: REVISION: DATE:

SEAL & SIGNATURE:

DRAWING TITLE:
ZONING ANALYSIS & RENDERINGS

ARCHITECT:
OCV
DALLANEGRA GOODMAN & TUTTO PC
ARCHITECTS
WWW.OCVARCH.COM
14 EAST 4TH STREET, SUITE 402
NEW YORK CITY NEW YORK 10012

DATE: 07/07/2016
JOB #: 16R014
DRAWN BY: BH GG
SCALE: NTS
DRAWING #: Z-00.00
RE #:
PAGE #: 1 OF 6



NOTE:

- INFORMATION OUTSIDE OF THE BOUNDARIES OF THE ZONING LOT IS FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSE ONLY, AND MAY NOT BE EXACT. THE ARCHITECT BEARS NO RESPONSIBILITY FOR INEXACT INFORMATION ON SURROUNDING PROPERTIES.
- BUILDING ENTRANCES ARE SHOWN FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY.

LEGEND

- ZONING LOT
- TAX LOT
- BUILDING FOOTPRINT
- ZONING DISTRICT BOUNDARY
- EXISTING TREES
- PROPOSED TREES
- BUILDING ENTRANCE
- HARDSCAPE AREA
- PLANTED AREA

The J. Pilla Group Limited

PROJECT TITLE:
2712 WILLIAMSBRIDGE RD
BRONX, NY 10469

LOCATION INFO:



BOROUGH: BRONX
BLOCK: 4516
LOT: 8 & 46
AREA: 8717 SF

NO: REVISION: DATE:

SEAL & SIGNATURE:

DRAWING TITLE:
ZONING LOT SITE PLAN

ARCHITECT:
OCV
ARCHITECTS
WWW.OCVARCH.COM
14 EAST 4TH STREET, SUITE 402
NEW YORK CITY NEW YORK 10012

DATE: 07/07/2016
JOB #: 16R014
DRAWN BY: BH GG
SCALE: 1/16" = 1'-0"

DRAWING #:
Z-01.00

NTS #:

PAGE #: 2 OF 6



NOTE:
- INFORMATION OUTSIDE OF THE BOUNDARIES OF THE ZONING LOT IS FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSE ONLY, AND MAY NOT BE EXACT. THE ARCHITECT BEARS NO RESPONSIBILITY FOR INEXACT INFORMATION ON SURROUNDING PROPERTIES.

LEGEND
- ZONING LOT
- TAX LOT
- ZONING DISTRICT BOUNDARY
- EXISTING TREES
- PROPOSED TREES
- BUILDING ENTRANCE
- COMMERCIAL
- HARDSCAPE AREA
- PLANTED AREA

The J. Pilla Group Limited

PROJECT TITLE:
2712 WILLIAMSBRIDGE RD
BRONX, NY 10469

LOCATION INFO:



BOROUGH: BRONX
BLOCK: 4516
LOT: 8 & 46
AREA: 8717 SF

NO: REVISION: DATE:

SEAL & SIGNATURE:

DRAWING TITLE:
FIRST FLOOR PLAN

ARCHITECT:
OCV
ARCHITECTS
WWW.OCVARCH.COM
14 EAST 4TH STREET, SUITE 402
NEW YORK CITY NEW YORK 10012

DATE: 07/07/2016
JOB #: 16R014
DRAWN BY: BH GG
SCALE: 1/16" = 1'-0"
DRAWING #: Z-02.00
RE #:
PAGE #: 3 OF 6



9TH FLOOR PLAN 1/16"=1'-0"



TYP (3RD-8TH) FLOOR PLAN 1/16"=1'-0"



2ND FLOOR PLAN 1/8"=1'-0"

LEGEND
- ZONING LOT
- BUILDING ENTRANCE
- RESIDENTIAL

0 ft 25 50

N

NOTE:
- INFORMATION OUTSIDE OF THE BOUNDARIES OF THE ZONING LOT IS FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSE ONLY, AND MAY NOT BE EXACT. THE ARCHITECT BEARS NO RESPONSIBILITY FOR INEXACT INFORMATION ON SURROUNDING PROPERTIES.

The J. Pilla Group Limited

PROJECT TITLE:
2712 WILLIAMSBRIDGE RD
BRONX, NY 10469

LOCATION INFO:



BOROUGH: BRONX
BLOCK: 4516
LOT: 8 & 46
AREA: 8717 SF

NO: REVISION: DATE:

SEAL & SIGNATURE:

DRAWING TITLE:
UPPER FLOOR PLANS

ARCHITECT:
OCV
DALIANIS GORDAN & TSITO PC
ARCHITECTS
WWW.OCVARCH.COM
14 EAST 4TH STREET, SUITE 403
NEW YORK CITY, NEW YORK 10012
(212) 677-6410 (212) 677-6420

DATE: 07/07/2016
JOB #: 16R014
DRAWN BY: BH GG
SCALE: 1/16" = 1'-0"
DRAWING #: Z-03.00
RE #:
PAGE #: 4 OF 6



02 SECTION 'AA' 1/16" = 1'-0"



01 KEY PLAN 1/32" = 1'-0"



03 SECTION 'BB' 1/16" = 1'-0"

LEGEND

- RESIDENTIAL
- COMMERCIAL
- ZONING LOT
- CURB LEVEL
- ZONING DISTRICT BOUNDARY

NOTE:

- INFORMATION OUTSIDE OF THE BOUNDARIES OF THE ZONING LOT IS FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSE ONLY, AND MAY NOT BE EXACT. THE ARCHITECT BEARS NO RESPONSIBILITY FOR INEXACT INFORMATION ON SURROUNDING PROPERTIES.
- ELEVATIONS ARE MEASURED FROM THE BASE PLAN

0 ft 25 50

The J. Pilla Group Limited

PROJECT TITLE:

2712 WILLIAMSBRIDGE RD
BRONX, NY 10469

LOCATION INFO:



BOROUGH: BRONX
BLOCK: 4516
LOT: 8 & 46
AREA: 8717 SF

NO: REVISION: DATE:

SEAL & SIGNATURE:

DRAWING TITLE:

SECTIONS

ARCHITECT:
OCV
DAELMANS GOODMAN & TITTO PC
ARCHITECTS
WWW.OCVARCH.COM
14 EAST 4TH STREET, SUITE 403
NEW YORK CITY NEW YORK 10012
(P) 646.478.8470 (F) 646.478.8755

DATE: 07/07/2016

JOB #: 16R014

DRAWN BY: BH GG

SCALE: 1/16" = 1'-0"

DRAWING #: Z-04.00

RE #:

PAGE #: 5 OF 6



02 ELEVATION AT WILLIAMSBRIDGE ROAD 1/16"=1'-0"



01 KEY PLAN 1/32"=1'-0"



03 ELEVATION AT COLDEN AVENUE 1/16"=1'-0"

N

0 ft 25 50

NOTE:
- INFORMATION OUTSIDE OF THE BOUNDARIES OF THE ZONING LOT IS FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSE ONLY, AND MAY NOT BE EXACT. THE ARCHITECT BEARS NO RESPONSIBILITY FOR INEXACT INFORMATION ON SURROUNDING PROPERTIES.
- ELEVATIONS ARE MEASURED FROM THE BASE PLAN
- STREET TREE LOCATIONS & ADJACENT BUILDINGS ARE SHOWN FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSE ONLY.

LEGEND
- ZONING LOT
- CURB LEVEL
- TAX LOT

The J. Pilla Group Limited

PROJECT TITLE:
2712 WILLIAMSBRIDGE RD
BRONX, NY 10469

LOCATION INFO:



BOROUGH: BRONX
BLOCK: 4516
LOT: 8 & 46
AREA: 8717 SF

NO: REVISION: DATE:

SEAL & SIGNATURE:

DRAWING TITLE:
ELEVATIONS

ARCHITECT:
OCV
DALIANIS GORDAN & TSITO PC
ARCHITECTS
WWW.OCVARCH.COM
14 EAST 4TH STREET, SUITE 403
NEW YORK CITY NEW YORK 10012
(P) 646.478.8470 (F) 646.478.8700

DATE: 07/07/2016
JOB #: 16R014
DRAWN BY: BH GG
SCALE: 1/16" = 1'-0"
DRAWING #: Z-05.00
RE #:
PAGE #: 6 OF 6

Appendix B- NYC LPC Correspondence

Landmarks Preservation Commission

1 Centre Street
9th Floor North
New York, NY 10007

Voice (212)-669-7700
Fax (212)-669-7960
http://nyc.gov/landmarks

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Project number: DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING / LA-CEQR-X
Project: WILLIAMSBRIDGE RD. REZONING
Date received: 7/13/2017

Properties with no Architectural or Archaeological significance:

1) ADDRESS: 2712 Williamsbridge Road, BBL: 2045160008
2) ADDRESS: 2721 Colden Avenue, BBL: 2045160046
3) ADDRESS: 2705 Colden Avenue, BBL: 2045160048
4) ADDRESS: 2729 Colden Avenue, BBL: 2045160043
5) ADDRESS: 2727 Colden Avenue, BBL: 2045160044
6) ADDRESS: 2725 Colden Avenue, BBL: 2045160144
7) ADDRESS: 2723 Colden Avenue, BBL: 2045160045

Gina Santucci 7/24/2017

SIGNATURE DATE
Gina Santucci, Environmental Review Coordinator

File Name: 32584_FSO_DNP_07142017.doc

Appendix C- Phase I ESA

Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
The J. Pilla Group
2712 Williamsbridge Road / 2721 Colden Avenue
Bronx, New York

The J. Pilla Group LTD

60489811

October, 2017

Quality information

Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by
		
Nelson J. Abrams, PG Senior Project Manager nelson.abrams@aecom.com (212) 377-8705	Lindsay Jones Project Specialist lindsay.jones.@aecom.com (610) 832-8838	Kristen Galeckas Environmental Geologist kristen.galeckas@aecom.com 978-905-2210

Revision History

Revision	Revision date	Details	Authorized	Name	Position

Distribution List

# Hard Copies	PDF Required	Association / Company Name

Prepared for:

The J. Pilla Group LTD
2712 Williamsbridge Road
Bronx, New York, 10469

Prepared by:

AECOM
125 Broad Street
New York, New York 10004
USA
www.aecom.com

Copyright © 2017 by AECOM

All rights reserved. No part of this copyrighted work may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means without the prior written permission of AECOM.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction 1-1
1.1 Purpose 1-1
1.2 Scope of Work 1-1
1.3 Study Limitations 1-1
1.4 Site-Related Limiting Conditions 1-3
1.5 Data Gaps/Data Failure 1-3
2. Site Description 2-1
2.1 Site Location and Parcel Description 2-1
2.2 Site Ownership 2-1
2.3 Site Visit 2-1
2.3.1 Site and Facility Description 2-1
2.3.2 Surrounding Properties 2-2
2.3.3 Petroleum Products and Hazardous Materials 2-2
2.3.4 Polychlorinated Biphenyls 2-2
2.3.5 Aboveground Storage Tanks 2-2
2.3.6 Underground Storage Tanks 2-2
2.3.7 Solid Waste 2-3
2.3.8 Hazardous Waste 2-3
2.3.9 Water 2-3
2.3.10 Wastewater 2-3
2.3.11 Stormwater 2-3
2.3.12 Heating and Cooling 2-3
3. Environmental Setting 3-1
3.1 Topography 3-1
3.2 Soil/Geology 3-1
3.3 Groundwater/Hydrology 3-1
4. Site and Area History 4-1
4.1 Subject Property 4-1
4.2 Off-site Properties 4-1
4.3 Previously Prepared Environmental Reports 4-2
5. Database and Records Review 5-1
5.1 User Provided Information 5-1
5.2 Title Records/Environmental Liens 5-1
5.3 Database Information 5-1
5.3.1 Subject Property 5-1
5.3.2 Surrounding Sites 5-2
5.4 Vapor Encroachment Screening 5-3
5.4.1 Subject Property 5-3
5.4.2 Off-site 5-3
5.5 Agency File Review 5-4
5.5.1 Local 5-4
5.5.2 State 5-4
5.5.3 Federal 5-4
6. Findings and Opinions 6-1

6.1 Recognized Environmental Conditions 6-1
6.2 Controlled Recognized Environmental Conditions 6-1
6.3 Historical Recognized Environmental Conditions 6-1
6.4 De Minimis Conditions 6-1
7. Conclusions 7-1
8. Environmental Professional Statement 8-1
9. References 9-1
9.1 Persons Interviewed 9-1
9.2 Agencies Contacted 9-1
9.3 Documents Reviewed 9-1

List of Appendices

Appendix A Representative Site Photographs
Appendix B Environmental Database Report
Appendix C Qualifications of Environmental Professional

List of Figures

1. Site Location Map
2. Site Plan

Executive Summary

The J Pilla Group LTD (JPG) contracted with AECOM Technical Services, Inc. (AECOM) to perform a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) of the property located at 2712 Williamsbridge Road and 2721 Colden Avenue, Bronx, Kings County, New York (subject property). This assessment was conducted as part of the potential commercial and residential redevelopment of the subject property. This Phase I ESA was performed in general conformance with the scope and limitations of the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Standard Practice Designation E 1527-13 for ESAs. Exceptions to, or deletions from, this practice are described in this report.

The approximately 8,660 square-foot (0.2-acre) subject property is developed with a one-story residential apartment and office building, a wood-framed storage shed, and a parking lot located at 2712 Williamsbridge Road, and a four-bay automotive / storage garage located at 2721 Colden Avenue, Bronx, New York. According to the City of New York Department of Finance, the subject property is designated as Block 4516, Lots 8 and 46. During the site visit, no visual evidence of underground storage tanks (e.g., vent pipes, fill ports), potable water wells, monitoring wells, dry wells, clarifiers, septic tanks, stormwater drains or leach fields was observed on the subject property. A pit to collect groundwater is located in the basement next to several natural gas-fired furnaces. A pit containing what appeared to be former utility conduits was located to the north of the residential/office building. No visual evidence of discolored soil, water, or unusual vegetative conditions or odors was observed during the site visit. However, empty and partially full 55-gallon kerosene drums were observed on the subject property. Two drums containing kerosene were stored in a locked cage while seven empty drums were randomly stored on the ground surface behind the four-bay garage. The kerosene is used by JPG for fueling portable forced air heaters on construction sites. No staining or distressed vegetation were observed in the vicinity of the drums; however, none of the drums were located within secondary containment.

The subject property is bordered to the north by an car wash a check cashing operation, and residential dwellings, beyond which are an auto repair shop and plumbing supply store; to the east by Colden Avenue, beyond which are residential dwellings; to the south by retail shops and a residential apartment building; and to the west by Williamsbridge Road, beyond which is a professional building with a parking lot. Based on AECOM's site reconnaissance of the surrounding neighborhood and review of the regulatory status of the adjacent car wash (i.e. case closure for former underground storage tanks), no off-site sources of concern were identified.

Historical research indicates the subject property was vacant in the late 19th century through at least 1908. According to historical Sanborn® Fire Insurance Maps (Sanborn Maps), a one-story dwelling similar in size, shape and location to the present-day building was present at the subject property by 1919. The 1924 historical aerial photograph also shows this building. However, the New York City Department of Finance (DOF) indicates that the building was constructed in 1925. An automobile shed/private garage was identified northwest of the residential/office building in 1929, but is not present by 1950. The automobile garage / storage building along Colden Avenue was identified by the DOF as being constructed in 1948 and was visible on the 1950 Sanborn Map. The subject property has remained relatively unchanged since 1950.

The subject property addresses were not identified in the site-specific environmental database report. A number of surrounding sites were identified in the environmental database search report. However, based on AECOM's review and analysis of the database listings, none of the surrounding sites are expected to present a recognized environmental condition (REC) to the subject property, based on their distance (generally greater than 500 feet), regulatory status (i.e. regulatory closure, no violations found), media impacted (soil only), and/or topographical position relative to the subject property (i.e. down-gradient or cross-gradient).

Based on the above-described activities, no RECs, controlled RECs (CRECs), historical RECs (HRECs) or de minimis conditions were identified in connection with the subject property.

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose

This Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was performed pursuant to AECOM's written proposal, dated July 26, 2017. This assessment was conducted per the request of The J Pilla Group LTD (JPG, Client) as part of the rezoning activities associated with the subject property located in the Bronx, New York. The purpose of this Phase I ESA is to provide the client with information for use in evaluating recognized environmental conditions (RECs) associated with the subject property.

Per the ASTM standard, potential findings can include RECs, including historical RECs (HRECs), controlled RECs (CRECs), and de minimis conditions (DMCs). A REC is defined by the ASTM standard as "the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or at a property: (1) due to any release to the environment; (2) under conditions indicative of a release to the environment; or (3) under conditions that pose a material threat of a future release to the environment." The term includes hazardous substances or petroleum products even under conditions in compliance with laws. HRECs are a past release of any hazardous substances or petroleum products that has occurred in connection with the property and has been addressed to the satisfaction of the applicable regulatory authority or meeting unrestricted use criteria established by a regulatory authority, without subjecting the property to any required controls. CRECs are a recognized environmental condition resulting from a past release of hazardous substances or petroleum products that has been addressed to the satisfaction of the applicable regulatory authority, with hazardous substances or petroleum products allowed to remain in place subject to the implementation of required controls. DMCs are those situations that do not present a material risk of harm to public health or the environment and generally would not be subject to enforcement action if brought to the attention of the regulating authority.

This assessment is based on a review of existing conditions, reported pre-existing conditions, and observed operations at the subject property and adjacent properties.

1.2 Scope of Work

The Phase I ESA included a site visit, regulatory research, historical review, and a review and an environmental database analysis of the subject property. In conducting the Phase I ESA, AECOM assessed the subject property for visible signs of possible contamination, researched public records for the subject property and adjacent properties (as applicable), and conducted interviews with persons knowledgeable about the subject property.

This project was performed in general accordance with ASTM Standard Practice Designation E 1527-13 and AECOM's proposal, dated July 26, 2017. Conclusions reached in this report are based upon the assessment performed and are subject to limitations set forth in Sections 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5 below.

1.3 Study Limitations

This report describes the results of AECOM's Phase I ESA to identify the presence of contamination-related liabilities materially affecting the subject facility and/or property. In the conduct of this assessment, AECOM assessed the presence of such problems within the limits of the established scope of work as described in our proposal.

As with any due diligence assessment, there is a certain degree of dependence upon oral information provided by facility or site representatives, which is not readily verifiable through visual observations or supported by any available written documentation. AECOM shall not be held responsible for conditions or consequences arising from relevant facts concealed, withheld, or not fully disclosed by facility or site representatives at the time this assessment was performed. In addition, the findings and opinions expressed in this report are subject to certain conditions and assumptions, which are noted in the report. Any party reviewing the findings of the report must carefully review and consider all such conditions and assumptions.

This report and all field data and notes were gathered and/or prepared by AECOM in accordance with the agreed upon scope of work and generally accepted engineering and scientific practice in effect at the time of AECOM's assessment of the subject property. The statements, findings and opinions contained in this report are only intended to give approximations of the environmental conditions at the subject property.

As specified in the ASTM standard (referred to below as "this practice"), it is incumbent the client and any other parties who review and rely upon this report understand the following inherent conditions surrounding any Phase I ESA:

- Uncertainty Not Eliminated - No ESA can wholly eliminate uncertainty regarding the potential for REC in connection with a property. Performance of this practice is intended to reduce, but not eliminate, uncertainty regarding the potential for REC in connection with a property, and this practice recognizes reasonable limits of time and costs. (Section 4.5.1 of the ASTM standard)
- Not Exhaustive - "All appropriate inquiry" does not mean an exhaustive assessment of a clean property. There is a point at which the cost of information obtained outweighs the usefulness of the information and, in fact, may be a material detriment to the orderly completion of transactions. One of the purposes of this practice is to identify a balance between the competing goals of limiting the costs and time demands inherent in performing an ESA and the reduction of uncertainty about unknown conditions resulting from additional information. (Section 4.5.2 of the ASTM Standard)
- Comparison with Subsequent Inquiry - ESAs must be evaluated based on the reasonableness of judgments made at the time and under the circumstances in which they were made. Subsequent ESAs should not be considered valid standards to judge the appropriateness of any prior assessment based on hindsight, new information, use of developing technology or analytical techniques, or other factors. (Section 4.5.4 of the ASTM Standard)

A similar set of inherent limitations exist in cases where the Phase I ESA included a screening-level assessment of vapor migration or vapor encroachment; such an assessment is a required part of a Phase I ESA when the ASTM E1527-13 standard is employed. According to the ASTM E2600-15 Standard Guide for Vapor Encroachment Screening on Property Involved in Real Estate Transactions, the following limitations apply:

- Uncertainty Not Eliminated in Screening - No vapor encroachment screen (VES) can wholly eliminate uncertainty regarding the identifications of vapor encroachment conditions (VECs) in connection with the target property. (Section 4.5.1)
- Not Exhaustive - The guide is not meant to be an exhaustive screening. There is a point at which the cost of information obtained outweighs the usefulness of the information and, in fact, may be a material detriment to the orderly completion of real estate transactions. One of the purposes of this guide is to identify a balance between the competing goals of limiting the

costs and time demands inherent in performing a VES and the reduction of uncertainty about unknown conditions resulting from additional information. (Section 4.5.2)

- Comparison with Subsequent Investigations - It should not be concluded or assumed that an investigation was not adequate because the investigation did not identify any VECs in connection with a property. The VES must be evaluated based on the reasonableness of judgments made at the time and under the circumstances in which they were made. Subsequent VESs should not be considered valid bases to judge the appropriateness of any prior screening if based on hindsight, new information, use of developing technology or analytical techniques, or similar factors. (Section 4.5.4)

This report was prepared pursuant to an agreement between the Client and AECOM and is for the exclusive use of the Client. No other party is entitled to rely on the conclusions, observations, specifications, or data contained herein without first obtaining AECOM's written consent and provided any such party signs an AECOM-generated Reliance Letter. A third party's signing of the AECOM Reliance Letter and AECOM's written consent are conditions precedent to any additional use or reliance on this report.

The passage of time may result in changes in technology, economic conditions, site variations, or regulatory provisions, which would render the report inaccurate. Reliance on this report after the date of issuance as an accurate representation of current site conditions shall be at the user's sole risk.

1.4 Site-Related Limiting Conditions

The following site-specific limitations were encountered during the course of this assessment:

- A thorough visual inspection of a four bay automobile storage garage was not possible. The owner of the garage did not have access to three of the bays as they were leased to other individuals. The owner of the garage indicated that two of the bays contained automobiles while the third contained supplies and equipment used by the garage owner’s former partner.
- During the site visit, AECOM did not access the roof of the subject property buildings. AECOM's evaluation of the subject property focused on areas where hazardous substances are handled. The site contact did not report any hazardous materials associated with the roofs. Based on this information, this particular site-related limiting condition is not expected to have a significant limitation to this assessment.

1.5 Data Gaps/Data Failure

The following data failure/data gaps were encountered during the course of this assessment:

- As specified in the agreed upon scope of work, title and environmental lien searches were not conducted as part of this ESA. However, based upon historical data collected from other sources, this data gap is not expected to impact the results of this assessment. In addition, the user was not aware of environmental liens or activity use limitations (AULs) that have been placed on the subject property.
- Per ASTM, past owners, operators, and occupants of the subject property who are likely to have material information regarding the potential for contamination at the subject property shall be contacted to the extent that they can be identified and that the information likely to be obtained is not duplicative of information already obtained from other sources. AECOM was unable to interview past owners and/or operators at the subject property. However, based

upon historical data collected from other sources, this data gap is not expected to impact the results of this assessment.

- Per the agreed scope-of-work and the ASTM Standard, information related to certain site-specific items should be provided by the ESA report user to AECOM. To assist the user in gathering information that may be material to identifying RECs, AECOM provided the Client (the users) with the User Questionnaire from the ASTM Standard; at this time the completed form has not been returned for inclusion in this report. However, this data gap is not expected to represent a significant limitation to this investigation given the historical use of the subject property.
- As of the date of this report, AECOM has not received any responses to Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests made to the New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP), New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH), or New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC). However, based upon historical data collected from other sources, this data gap is not expected to impact the results of this assessment.

2. Site Description

2.1 Site Location and Parcel Description

The subject property is located at 2712 Williamsbridge Road and 2721 Colden Avenue, Bronx, New York. The subject property is situated approximately 165 feet north of the intersection of Williamsbridge Road, Colden Avenue, and Allerton Avenue approximately 250 feet southeast of State Route 1 (Boston Avenue). The subject property is accessed from Williamsbridge Road from the west and Colden Avenue from the east.

According to the City of New York Department of Finance (NYCDOF), the subject property consists of two contiguous parcels of land designated as Block 4516, Lots 8 and 46. The location of the subject property is illustrated on Figure 1 - Site Location Map.

2.2 Site Ownership

According to the NYCDOF, the subject property is owned by the 2712 Radcliff Yates Realty LLC.

2.3 Site Visit

Mr. Nelson J. Abrams with AECOM's 125 Broad Street, New York, New York office visited the subject property on August 15, 2017. During the site visit, Mr. Abrams interviewed Mr. Paul Pilla, owner of The J. Pilla Group LTD, a general construction contracting firm. As previously stated, access to three of the four bays for the automobile / storage garage located on Colden Avenue were not accessible. No other site-related limiting conditions were encountered during this assessment.

The site visit methodology consisted of walking over accessible areas of the subject property, including the building interiors and exteriors, the perimeter, and the portions of the surrounding area. The following sections summarize the results of the site visit.

2.3.1 Site and Facility Description

The approximately 8,660 square-foot (0.2-acre) subject property is developed with a one-story residential apartment and office building with a basement, a concrete block storage shed, and a parking lot located at 2712 Williamsbridge Road and a four-bay automotive / storage garage located at 2721 Colden Avenue, Bronx, New York. The office portion of the building was occupied by JPG.

The residential/office structure is a wood-framed building with an asphalt singled roof and a stone foundation. The wood-framed storage shed is on a wood base with an asphalt shingled roof. The four bay automotive storage garage is a cinder / cement block building built on a concrete slab with a flat asphalt roof.

The remainder of the subject property consisted of a gravel parking area located to the northwest of the residential/office building and some landscaping/trees along the property boundaries and between the residential/office building and garage.

During the site visit, no visual evidence of underground storage tanks (e.g., vent pipes, fill ports), potable water wells, monitoring wells, dry wells, clarifiers, septic tanks, stormwater drains or leach fields was observed on the subject property. A pit to collect groundwater is located in the basement of the commercial/residential building next to several natural gas-fired furnaces. A pit containing what appeared to be former utility conduits was located to the north of the residential/office building.

No visual evidence of discolored soil, water, or unusual vegetative conditions or odors was observed during the site visit. The general layout of the subject property is illustrated on Figure 2 - Site Plan and Representative Site Photographs are provided in Appendix A.

2.3.2 Surrounding Properties

The subject property is bordered to the north by an car wash a check cashing operation, and residential dwellings, beyond which are an auto repair shop and plumbing supply store; to the east by Colden Avenue, beyond which are residential dwellings. Retail shops and a residential apartment building are located to the south and to the west by Williamsbridge Road, beyond which is a professional building with a parking lot.

AECOM observed a gasoline station (Shell) located southeast of the subject property within 500 feet of the subject property, while no dry cleaners were observed within 500 feet of the subject property. According to historical sources, spills related to the operations of the gasoline station were remediated in 1992 and closed by the NYSDEC. The car wash located adjacent to the north had formerly consisted of a gasoline filling station on the western portion of the property. This site is discussed in further detail in Sections 4.3 and 5.3.2; however, based on a review the environmental database report, the underground storage tanks (USTs) do not present a REC to the subject property. No sensitive receptors (i.e. day care centers, schools, hospitals, water bodies) are located adjacent to the subject property. Based on AECOM's site reconnaissance of the surrounding neighborhood, no off-site sources of concern were identified.

2.3.3 Petroleum Products and Hazardous Materials

Empty and partially full 55-gallon kerosene drums were observed on the subject property. Two drums containing kerosene were stored in a locked cage located near the concrete block storage shed while seven empty drums were randomly stored on the subject property to the west of the garage. The kerosene is used by JPG for fueling portable forced air heaters on construction sites. No staining or distressed vegetation were observed in the vicinity of the drums; however, none of these drums were located within a secondary containment pallet.

2.3.4 Polychlorinated Biphenyls

Polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB)-containing dielectric fluids have been widely used as coolants and lubricants in transformers, capacitors, and other electric equipment due to their insulating and nonflammable properties. No hydraulic equipment (transformers, trash compactors, lifts) was observed on the subject property during the site visit or reported to have historically been located on-site.

2.3.5 Aboveground Storage Tanks

Aboveground storage tanks (ASTs) were not observed during the site visit. In addition, no ASTs were listed in the site-specific environmental database report reviewed by AECOM, or otherwise identified during AECOM's review of historical aerial photographs.

2.3.6 Underground Storage Tanks

Visual evidence of underground storage tanks (USTs) (e.g., vent pipes, fill ports) was not observed during the site visit. In addition, no USTs were listed in the site-specific environmental database report, or otherwise identified during AECOM's review of historical documents. It should be noted that AECOM was unable to trace the historic heat source of the subject property back to first developed use.

2.3.7 Solid Waste

Solid waste consisting of general household and office trash generated from the two apartment units and from the office is placed in plastic bags and brought out onto the curb along Williamsbridge Road for pickup. The solid waste is removed from the subject property by the New York City Department of Sanitation.

2.3.8 Hazardous Waste

No evidence of hazardous waste generation was observed at the subject property, and the site contact reported no such activities. In addition, the subject property was not listed as a generator of hazardous waste in the site-specific database report.

2.3.9 Water

The residential/office building along Williamsbridge Road receives its potable water supply from the NYCDEP. The garage along Colden Avenue does not have a potable water supply. No potable water wells were observed at the subject property or reported by the site contact to be present on-site.

2.3.10 Wastewater

Sanitary wastewater generated from the residential/office building including the sump in the basement along Williamsbridge Road discharges into the NYCDEP combined sewer system. No wastewater is generated from the garage located along Colden Avenue.

2.3.11 Stormwater

No stormwater drains were observed on the subject property at the time of AECOM's site reconnaissance. Stormwater is expected to flow into the combined sewers maintained by the NYCDEP along Williamsbridge Road and Colden Avenue.

2.3.12 Heating and Cooling

Heating at the residential/office building is supplied by natural gas furnaces to both the office and residential apartments. The natural gas is supplied by Consolidated Edison. There is no information indicating that there was ever any other source of fuel other than natural gas; however, AECOM was unable to tract the historic fuel source of the property back to first developed. Individual window and wall-mounted air conditioning units are located throughout the residential/office building. There are no heating or cooling systems in the garage.

3. Environmental Setting

3.1 Topography

According to the United States Geological Survey (USGS) topographic map of the subject property area (Flushing, NY quadrangle map) and a review of the Google Earth application, the elevation of the subject property is approximately 140 feet above mean sea level (msl). Based on a review of these technical resources and AECOM's site visit, the subject property is generally flat with a slight downward slope toward the northwest.

3.2 Soil/Geology

Site-specific geologic information was not identified during the course of this assessment. The environmental database report indicates that the subject property is underlain with Urban Land, which is considered to be historic fill of unknown origin and is typically covered by streets, parking lots, buildings, and other structures of urban areas.

According to geologic information obtained from the United States Geological Survey, the soils underlying the surface soils at the subject property likely consist of unconsolidated strata of clay, silt, sand and gravel of late Cretaceous and Late Pleistocene ages. This consolidated material lies on crystalline bedrock of Ordovician age consisting of granitic gneiss of the Hartland Formation.

3.3 Groundwater/Hydrology

Site-specific hydrologic information was not identified during the course of this assessment. Based on the topographic gradient in the area of the subject property, the groundwater flow beneath the subject property and in the surrounding area is anticipated to flow in a westerly direction toward the Bronx River located approximately ¾-mile west of the subject property. Based on a review of the topographic map and previous work conducted in the area of the subject property, groundwater is anticipated to be present at a depth between 15 to 25 feet below ground surface (bgs). However, the actual groundwater flow direction and depth in the vicinity of the subject property cannot be determined without site-specific groundwater monitoring well data.

4. Site and Area History

Historical information for the subject property and surrounding properties is based on AECOM's review and analysis of the following historical sources:

- Aerial photographs dated 1924, 1951, 1954, 1962, 1966, 1974, 1976, 1985, 1991, 1994, 2006, 2009, and 2011;
- Sanborn® Fire Insurance Maps (Sanborn Maps) dated 1897, 1908, 1919, 1929, 1950, 1977, 1978, 1981, 1983, 1986, 1988, 1991 – 1996, 1998, and 2001 – 2007;
- Topographic maps dated 1897, 1898, 1900, 1947, 1955, 1956, 1966, 1979, 1995, 1997, 1998, and 2013;
- City directories for the years 1927, 1931, 1940, 1949, 1956, 1961, 1965, 1971, 1976, 1983, 1993, 2000, 2005, 2010 and 2014; and
- Online Property Information reviewed via the NYCDOF and the City of New York City Department of Buildings (NYCDOB) websites.

In addition, an interview was conducted with Mr. Paul Pilla, owner of The J. Pilla Group LTD.

4.1 Subject Property

Historical research indicates the subject property was vacant in the late 19th century through at least 1908. According to historical Sanborn® Fire Insurance Maps (Sanborn Maps), a one-story dwelling similar in size, shape and location to the present-day building was present at the subject property by 1919. The 1924 historical aerial photograph also shows this building. However, the New York City Department of Finance (DOF) indicates that the building was constructed in 1925. An automobile shed/private garage was identified northwest of the dwelling building in 1929, but is not present by 1950. The automobile garage / storage building along Colden Avenue was identified by the DOF as being constructed in 1948 and was visible on the 1950 Sanborn Map. The subject property has remained relatively unchanged since 1950.

4.2 Off-site Properties

NORTH

The properties to the north were identified as vacant in 1897 and as a park in 1919. Sometime between 1919 and 1924, two residential dwellings were constructed. By 1950, a few additional residential dwellings are present. By 1954, additional buildings are present to the north and in 1962 a portion of these properties appear to be used motor vehicle parking along with residential dwellings. By 1966, the parking area is a filling station with an automobile car wash. By 1998, the filling station is no longer present. All other buildings and operations to the north remain relatively unchanged since 1998. Information pertaining to the USTs historically located at the former filling station are discussed in detail below in Section 5.3.2.

EAST

The properties to the east were identified as vacant in 1897 and remained as such until sometime between 1919 and 1924 when a few residential dwellings were present across from Colden Avenue. By 1950 additional residential dwellings were present with further residential development by 1966. The properties to the east have remained relatively unchanged since 1966.

SOUTH

The properties to the south were identified as vacant in 1897 and as a park in 1919. Sometime between 1924 and 1929 an apartment building with retail shops on the first floor (one labeled as a drug store) was constructed immediately adjacent to the subject property. Additional residential dwellings and retail shops were also present further to the south across Williamsbridge Road and Allerton Avenue by 1929. A few additional residential dwellings were present to the south by 1977. No significant changes were identified to the southern properties since 1977.

WEST

The properties to the west across Williamsbridge Road and Radcliff Avenue were identified as vacant in 1897 and as a park in 1919. By 1919, the area is identified as a lumber yard. The lumber yard's operations appear to have expanded by 1950 and by 1977 it's identified as Boston Post Lumber Yard. By 1995, the property is identified only as a lumber storage yard and the following year it is identified as a commercial building. No subsequent changes have occurred to this area since 1996.

Based on a review of historical sources for the surrounding properties, no off-site sources of concern were identified that present a REC to the subject property.

4.3 Previously Prepared Environmental Reports

AECOM inquired about existing environmental reports associated with the subject property. Previously prepared environmental reports were not identified during this assessment. Mr. Pilla indicated that no previous environmental assessments or reports associated with the subject property.

5. Database and Records Review

5.1 User Provided Information

Section 6 of the ASTM Standard states that certain tasks, which will help to determine the possibility of RECs associated with the subject property, are generally conducted by the ESA report user. This includes the following: reviewing title records for environmental liens or activity and land use limitations and considering awareness of any specialized knowledge (e.g., information about previous ownership or environmental litigation), experience related to RECs at the subject property, or significant reduction in the purchase price of the subject property. Per the agreed scope-of-work, information related to these items should be provided by the ESA report user to AECOM. The User Questionnaire from the ASTM Standard was not provided to the client at the time of this report was prepared. This data gap is not expected to represent a significant limitation to this investigation based on other documentation reviewed as part of the Phase I ESA.

5.2 Title Records/Environmental Liens

Per the agreed upon scope of work, a chain-of-title and an environmental lien search were not performed as part of this assessment.

5.3 Database Information

In accordance with the scope of work and ASTM Standard E-1527-13, a search of various governmental databases was conducted by EDR. The site-specific environmental database report was reviewed to evaluate if soil and or groundwater from an on-site and/or off-site sources of concern has the potential to impact the subject property. The database abbreviations are provided in the site-specific environmental database report.

The database report includes various reports detailing database information for each of the sites identified/geocoded within the specified radius. Additional sites that EDR was not able to map to specific locations due to insufficient/contradicting address information (“orphan sites”) were not identified within the database report. A summary of AECOM’s review and analysis of the site-specific environmental database report is presented below. A copy of the database report is provided in Appendix B.

Based on AECOM’s research, the subject property is not located on or within a one-mile radius of tribal lands.

5.3.1 Subject Property

The subject property is not identified in the site-specific environmental database report.

5.3.2 Surrounding Sites

According to the environmental database report, over 90 sites were identified within their respective ASTM and/or EDR search distances from the subject property. Based on AECOM's review of these database listings, none of these sites are expected to present a REC to the subject property based on their distance from the subject property, regulatory status (i.e. closed, no violations found), media impacted (i.e. soil only), and/or topographical position from the subject property (i.e. down-gradient or cross-gradient).

Based on their close proximity and historical presence, the following nearby sites are described in greater detail:

- MBE Enterprises Inc. / Pronto Petroleum Corporation 6 / Smiley Car Wash / URA Realty Corporation at 2800 Boston Road is located approximately 100 feet north-northwest of the subject property. The site is listed on the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Non-Generators / No Longer Regulated (RCRA NonGen/NLR), Facility Index System/Facility Registry System (FINDS), Enforcement and Compliance History Information (ECHO), New York Spills (NY Spills), New York Underground Storage Tank (NY UST), EDR Historic Automobile Station (EDR Hist Auto) databases. According to the EDR database report, this site was a former gasoline service station which had some minor fuel spills that were closed as well the removal of several USTs as well as impacted soil. The USTs were closed in 1996 and the spill was closed in 2005 as the NYSDEC confirmed that the contaminated soil had been removed. Based on status and gradient, it is AECOM's opinion that these listings are not considered a REC.

- Willets Service Station at 981 Allerton Avenue is located approximately 250 feet southeast of the subject property. The site is listed on the EDR Hist Auto database. According to the EDR database report, this site was a service station between 2010 and 2014. The site is currently a small strip mall for retail stores. Any impacts from this former operation is unlikely as historical aerial photographs, Sanborn Maps, and information from the DOF indicate that this address was a domestic dwelling until 2007 when the strip mall was expanded. Based on status and gradient, it is AECOM's opinion that these listings are not considered a REC.

- Getty Formula One Inc. at 2801 Boston Road is located approximately 260 feet northwest of the subject property. The site is listed on the EDR Hist Auto database. According to the EDR database report, this site was listed as either an automotive repair shop and/or a gasoline service station between 1995 and 2009. The site is currently a transmission repair shop and a used car lot. The EDR database did not identify any USTs, ASTs, or spills at this property. Based on status and gradient, it is AECOM's opinion that these listings are not considered a REC.

- Five JS Automotive LTD A COR at 934 Allerton Avenue is located approximately 270 feet south of the subject property. The site is listed on the EDR Hist Auto database. According to the EDR database report, this site was listed a gasoline service station between 2003 and 2012. However, the historical aerial photographs and the Sanborn Maps indicate that the property was vacant until the late 1980s when it was used as a parking lot and a residential / retail building. The use of this property has not changed since the late 1980s and no gasoline service station was identified. Based on status and gradient, it is AECOM's opinion that these listings are not considered a REC.

- Shell / Harry Glidewell at 950 Allerton Avenue is located approximately 290 feet south-southeast of the subject property. The site is listed on the New York Leaking Tanks (NY

LTANKS), United States Air Facility System Data (US AIRS), New York Manifest (NY Manifest), New York Aboveground Storage Tanks (NY AST), RCRA NonGen/NLR, FINDS, ECHO, New York Spills (NY Spills), NY UST, and EDR Hist Auto databases. The site is an active gasoline station. According to the EDR database report, a spill was reported in 1989 as two 4,000 gallon USTs failed their tank tightness tests. The USTs were removed along with impacted soils and impacted groundwater was detected. The site was mitigated using a soil vapor extraction system and closed in 1992. Based on status and gradient, it is AECOM's opinion that these listings are not considered a REC.

- A-1 Glass Inc. at 2751 Boston Road is located approximately 310 feet west-northwest of the subject property. The site is listed on the EDR Hist Auto database. According to the EDR database report, this site was a gasoline service station or automotive repair shop between 1969 and 1983. The site is currently a fast food restaurant (Popeye's Chicken). Based on status and gradient, it is AECOM's opinion that these listings are not considered a REC.

5.4 Vapor Encroachment Screening

AECOM conducted a Tier 1 vapor encroachment screening (VES) as part of this assessment. This screening was conducted in general accordance with the ASTM E2600 *Standard Guide for Vapor Encroachment Screening on Property Involved in Real Estate Transactions* dated October 2015. The objective of the VES was to determine if a VEC exists or if a VEC does not exist.

5.4.1 Subject Property

No on-site sources of vapor encroachment (e.g. UST, contaminated soil, groundwater plume, etc.) were identified during this assessment. Based on this information, a VEC due to an on-site source does not appear to exist.

5.4.2 Off-site

To conduct the VES of the nearby area, AECOM conducted a detailed review and analysis of the site-specific environmental database report with particular focus on the follow two types of sites:

1. Off-site properties that are impacted by chlorinated volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and/or semi-volatile-organic compounds (SVOCs) and are located within approximately 1,750 feet of the subject property, and
2. Off-site properties that are impacted by petroleum hydrocarbons and are located within approximately 525 feet of the subject property.

The following paragraph summarizes the results of AECOM's VES of the nearby area.

A review of the site-specific environmental database indicates that one chlorinated VOC/SVOC and 14 petroleum hydrocarbon impacted sites are located with the above-described radii of the subject property. However, all of the sites can be ruled out due to their regulatory status (i.e. regulatory closure has been issued), media impacted (i.e. soil only), and/or topographical position from the subject property (i.e. down-gradient or cross-gradient). Based on this information, it is AECOM's opinion that a VEC at the subject property due to an off-site source does not appear to exist.

5.5 Agency File Review

5.5.1 Local

AECOM submitted Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests to the NYCDEP and Fire Department of the City of New York. Information received from the Fire Department indicated that no motor fuel or fuel storage tanks have been registered at the subject property. No additional information pertaining to other aboveground or underground tanks were received from the Fire Department.

As of the date of this report, a response to AECOM's FOIA request to the NYCDEP has not been received. Based on AECOM's research to date, AECOM does not anticipate the response (if any) from this agency to our FOIA request will significantly alter the conclusions or recommendations of this report. However, if information is received from this FOIA request that significantly impacts the conclusions of this report, this information will be forwarded upon receipt.

5.5.2 State

In addition, AECOM submitted a FOIA request to the NYSDEC and the NYSDOH. As of the date of this report, a response to AECOM's FOIA request to the NYSDEC and the NYSDOH has not been received. Based on AECOM's research to date, AECOM does not anticipate the response (if any) from this agency to our FOIA request will significantly alter the conclusions or recommendations of this report. However, if information is received from this FOIA request that significantly impacts the conclusions of this report, this information will be forwarded upon receipt.

AECOM also reviewed the following databases, in addition to those identified in Section 5.3.2:

- New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Bulk Storage Database Search. The subject property was not identified in the database.
- New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Spill Incident Database Search. The subject property was not identified in the database.

5.5.3 Federal

AECOM searched the U.S. EPA's Envirofacts and Superfund Enterprise Management System (SEMS) online databases. The SEMS database replaced the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Information System (CERCLIS) which has since been retired. SEMS includes the same data fields and content as CERCLIS. The Envirofacts database retrieves information obtained from 17 national systems, including the CERCLIS, Superfund program (NPL sites), hazardous waste sites, and potential hazardous waste sites. The subject property was not listed on either the Envirofacts or the SEMS databases.

6. Findings and Opinions

AECOM performed a Phase I ESA of the subject property in conformance with the scope and limitations of ASTM Practice E 1527-13, which meets the requirements of Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations Part 312 and is intended to constitute *all appropriate inquiry* for purposes of the landowner liability protections. Any exceptions to, or deletions from, this practice are described in Section 1.3 through 1.5 of this report.

The following sections summarize the findings and opinions of this Phase I ESA of the subject property.

6.1 Recognized Environmental Conditions

Based on the above-described activities, no RECs were identified in connection with the subject property.

6.2 Controlled Recognized Environmental Conditions

Based on the above-described activities, no CRECs were identified in connection with the subject property.

6.3 Historical Recognized Environmental Conditions

Based on the above-described activities, no HRECs were identified in connection with the subject property.

6.4 De Minimis Conditions

Based on the above-described activities, no de minimis conditions were identified in connection with the subject property.

7. Conclusions

We have performed a Phase I ESA in conformance with the scope and limitations of ASTM Practice E 1527-13 of 2712 Williamsbridge Road, Bronx, New York, the subject property. Any exception to, or deletions from, this practice are described in Sections 1.3 through 1.5 of this report. This assessment has revealed no evidence of RECs, controlled RECs (CRECs), historical RECs (HRECs) or de minimis conditions were identified in connection with the subject property.

8. Environmental Professional Statement

Mr. Abrams was the Environmental Professional (EP) for this project. Mr. Abrams' EP statement is below and his resume is provided in Appendix C:

I declare that, to the best of our professional knowledge and belief, I meet the definition of an EP as defined in §312.10 of 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) and that I have the specific qualifications based on education, training, and experience to assess a property of the nature, history, and setting of the subject property. I have developed and performed all the appropriate inquiries in conformance with the standards and practices set forth in 40 CFR Part 312.

Signature:  Date: October 18, 2017

9. References

9.1 Persons Interviewed

Pilla, Paul. Owner, The J Pilla Group LTD. 2712 Williamsbridge Road, Bronx, New York, 10469, (718) 653-7766. paul@jpillagroup.com. Provided site history of the subject property during site visit on August 15, 2017.

9.2 Agencies Contacted

Environmental Protection Agency Envirofacts database - http://www.epa.gov/enviro/

Environmental Protection Agency Superfund Enterprise Management System (SEMS) database, https://cumulis.epa.gov/supercpad/cursites/srchsites.cfm .

Fire Department of the City of New York, Public Records Unit / Tanks Section, 9 MetroTech Center, Brooklyn, New York 11201-3857. (718) 999-2441 or 2442.

New York City Department of Buildings. Building permits accessed online at: http://www.nyc.gov/html/dob/html/home/home.html

New York City Department of Finance. Review of Digital Tax Maps. System accessed online at: http://www1.nyc.gov/subject property/finance/taxes/property-digital-tax-map.page

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Bulk Storage Database Search, bulk storage information pertaining to the subject property, retrieved online at http://www.dec.ny.gov/cfmx/extapps/derexternal/index.cfm?pageid=4

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Spill Incidents Database Search, spill information pertaining to the subject property, retrieved online at http://www.dec.ny.gov/cfmx/extapps/derexternal/index.cfm?pageid=2

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Office of General Counsel, 625 Broadway, Albany, New York 12233-1500.

New York State Department of Health, 59-17 Junction Boulevard, Corona, New York 11368.

9.3 Documents Reviewed

ASTM E1527-13, Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process, dated November 2013. www.astm.org.

ASTM E2600-15, Standard Guide for Vapor Encroachment Screening on Property Involved in Real Estate Transactions, dated October 2015. www.astm.org.

Brock, Pamela Chase, and Brock, Patrick W.G. Geologic Map of New York City, dated October 2001. State University of New York at Stony Brook, www.geo.sunusb/reports/ny-city/full-map.png.

EDR 7.5 Minute Topographic Maps, prepared for The J Pilla Group, 2712 Williamsbridge Road, Bronx, New York 10469, dated August 9, 2017. Inquiry number 5018227.4. Topographic Maps

1897, 1898, 1900, 1947, 1955, 1956, 1966, 1979, 1995, 1997, 1998, and 2013. Report prepared by Environmental Data Resources Inc., 6 Armstrong Road, Shelton, Connecticut 06484, (800) 352-0050, www.edrnet.com.

EDR Aerial Photos Decade Package prepared for The J Pilla Group, 2712 Williamsbridge Road, Bronx, New York 10469, dated August 10, 2017. Inquiry number 5018227.9. Aerial photographs dated 1924, 1951, 1954, 1962, 1966, 1974, 1976, 1985, 1991, 1994, 2006, 2009, and 2011. Report prepared by Environmental Data Resources Inc., 6 Armstrong Road, Shelton, Connecticut 06484, (800) 352-0050, www.edrnet.com.

EDR City Directory Abstract prepared The J Pilla Group, 2712 Williamsbridge Road, Bronx, New York 10469, dated August 10, 2017. Inquiry number 5018227.5. City directories reviewed included 1927, 1931, 1940, 1949, 1956, 1961, 1965, 1971, 1976, 1983, 1993, 2000, 2005, 2010 and 2014. Report prepared by Environmental Data Resources Inc., 6 Armstrong Road, Shelton, Connecticut 06484, (800) 352-0050, www.edrnet.com.

EDR Radius Map with GeoCheck®, prepared for The J Pilla Group, 2712 Williamsbridge Road, Bronx, New York 10469, dated August 9, 2017. Inquiry number 5018227.2s. Report prepared by Environmental Data Resources Inc., 6 Armstrong Road, Shelton, Connecticut 06484, (800) 352-0050, www.edrnet.com.

EDR Sanborn® Map Report, prepared for The J Pilla Group, 2712 Williamsbridge Road, Bronx, New York 10469, dated August 10, 2017. Inquiry number 5018227.3. Sanborn Maps dated 1897, 1908, 1919, 1929, 1950, 1977, 1978, 1981, 1983, 1986, 1988, 1991 – 1996, 1998, and 2001 – 2007. Report prepared by Environmental Data Resources Inc., 6 Armstrong Road, Shelton, Connecticut 06484, (800) 352-0050, www.edrnet.com.

Google Earth website, www.google.earth.com. This information was reviewed online by Mr. Abrams with AECOM on October 6, 2017.

Figures



Scale 1:24,000

FLUSHING/MOUNT VERNON/CENTRAL PARK/YONKERS, NY
7.5 Minute U.S.G.S. Quadrangles – 2013

AECOM

Figure 1
Site Location Map
The J. Pilla Group LTD
2712 Williamsbridge Road / 2721 Colden Avenue
Bronx, New York



AECOM

Figure 2
Site Plan
The J. Pilla Group, LTD
2712 Williamsbridge Road / 2721 Colden Avenue
Bronx, New York

Appendix D- NYC DEP Permit Block 4515, Lot 22

Environmental Protection

Register with CATS
Login into CATS

NYC .gov always open

NYC DEP CATS Information

PREMISES: 2801 BOSTON ROAD BRONX BIN: 088571 BLOCK: 04515 LOT: 0022				
Owner: THOMAS J. CANNISTRACI	**Application #:** PA102789	**Type:** CERTIFICATE TO OPERATE - INDUSTRIAL	**Expiration Date:** 8/28/1993	
Business Type: NONE	**Request Type:** Industrial Request Renewal CO	**Status:** EXPIRED	**Submitted Date:** NA	**Decision Date:** 12/18/1989
Boiler Make / Model: NA	**Fuel Type 1:** NA	**Fuel Type 2:** NA	**Heat Input (Million BTU/Hr.):** NA	
Burner Make / Model: NA	**Number of Identical Units:** 25			
	AKA : 2750 WILLIAMSBRIDGE ROAD BRONX | ARNOW AVENUE BRONX | RADCLIFF AVENUE BRONX | 2803 GARAGE BOSTON ROAD BRONX			

Appendix E- NYC DOB C/O Block 4515, Lot 22

N.B. 261/87
J.F.
B Form 54 (Rev. 8/85)

THE CITY OF NEW YORK

DEPARTMENT OF BUILDINGS
CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY

DATE: JUN 4 - 1990 NO. 59202

BOROUGH BRONX

ZONING DISTRICT C 8-1

This certificate supersedes C.O. No.

THIS CERTIFIES that the new ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ building-premises located at Block 4515 Lot 22

2803 BOSTON ROAD N.E. CORNER WILLIAMSBRIDGE RD.

CONFORMS SUBSTANTIALLY TO THE APPROVED PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS AND TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF ALL APPLICABLE LAWS, RULES, AND REGULATIONS FOR THE USES AND OCCUPANCIES SPECIFIED HEREIN

PERMISSIBLE USE AND OCCUPANCY

STORY	LIVE LOAD LBS PER SQ. FT.	MAXIMUM NO. OF PERSONS PERMITTED	ZONING DWELLING OR ROOMING UNITS	BUILDING CODE HABITABLE ROOMS	ZONING USE GROUP	BUILDING CODE OCCUPANCY GROUP	DESCRIPTION OF USE
FIRST	O.G.	30			16	D-1	AUTOMOBILE REPAIR SHOPS, INCLUDING BODY REPAIRS, OFFICES AND STORAGE.
OPEN	O.G.				16	C	AUTOMOBILE SALES & PARKING.

THIS CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY MUST BE POSTED WITHIN THE BUILDING IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE RULES OF THE DEPARTMENT PROMULGATED MARCH 31ST, 1967.

150,000

OPEN SPACE USES _____ (SPECIFY-PARKING SPACES, LOADING BERTHS, OTHER USES, NONE)

NO CHANGES OF USE OR OCCUPANCY SHALL BE MADE UNLESS A NEW AMENDED CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY IS OBTAINED

THIS CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY IS ISSUED SUBJECT TO FURTHER LIMITATIONS, CONDITIONS AND SPECIFICATIONS NOTED ON THE REVERSE SIDE.

X-5

Ernst W. Crocoliaches
BOROUGH SUPERINTENDENT

Kevin Shaker

Rudolf J. Rinaldi
COMMISSIONER

☐ ORIGINAL ☒ OFFICE COPY-DEPARTMENT OF BUILDINGS ☐ COPY

B Form 54 (Back) (Rev. 8-82)

THAT THE ZONING LOT ON WHICH THE PREMISES IS LOCATED IS BOUNDED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING at a point on the NORTHEAST side of
distant BOSTON RD. feet from the corner formed by the intersection of
and WILLIAMSBRIDGE RD.

running thence N. 150 feet; thence E. 100 feet;
thence NW 5.21 feet; thence N. 88.10 feet;
thence E. 50 feet; thence S. 225.19 feet;
thence W. 62.10 feet; thence feet;
to the point or place of beginning.

N.B. or ~~AXX~~ No. 261/87 DATE OF COMPLETION 4/9/90 CONSTRUCTION CLASSIFICATION ID
BUILDING OCCUPANCY GROUP CLASSIFICATION D-1 HEIGHT 15 STORIES. 1 FEET

THE FOLLOWING FIRE DETECTION AND EXTINGUISHING SYSTEMS ARE REQUIRED AND WERE INSTALLED IN COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LAWS.

	YES	NO		YES	NO
STANDPIPE SYSTEM			AUTOMATIC SPRINKLER SYSTEM		
YARD HYDRANT SYSTEM					
STANDPIPE FIRE TELEPHONE AND SIGNALLING SYSTEM					
SMOKE DETECTOR					
FIRE ALARM AND SIGNAL SYSTEM					

STORM DRAINAGE DISCHARGES INTO:
A) STORM SEWER ☐ B) COMBINED SEWER [XX] C) PRIVATE SEWAGE DISPOSAL SYSTEM ☐

SANITARY DRAINAGE DISCHARGES INTO:
A) SANITARY SEWER ☐ B) COMBINED SEWER [XX] C) PRIVATE SEWAGE DISPOSAL SYSTEM ☐

LIMITATIONS OR RESTRICTIONS
BOARD OF STANDARDS AND APPEALS CAL. NO. _____
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION CAL. NO. _____
OTHERS.

Appendix F- Pedestrian Level 2 Screening Back-up Data

Appendix G- Revised CEQR EAS Short Form, Part III and Negative Declaration

City Environmental Quality Review
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT STATEMENT (EAS) SHORT FORM

FOR UNLISTED ACTIONS ONLY • *Please fill out and submit to the appropriate agency* (see instructions)

Part I: GENERAL INFORMATION

1. *Does the Action Exceed Any Type I Threshold in 6 NYCRR Part 617.4 or 43 RCNY §6-15(A) (Executive Order 91 of 1977, as amended)?* ☐ YES ☒ NO

If "yes," **STOP** and **complete the FULL EAS FORM**.

2. *Project Name* 2712 Williamsbridge Road Rezoning

3. *Reference Numbers*

CEQR REFERENCE NUMBER (to be assigned by lead agency)	BSA REFERENCE NUMBER (if applicable)
18DCP071X	
ULURP REFERENCE NUMBER (if applicable)	OTHER REFERENCE NUMBER(S) (if applicable) (*e.g.*, legislative intro, CAPA)
180261ZMX	

4a. *Lead Agency Information*			**4b. *Applicant Information***		
NAME OF LEAD AGENCY			NAME OF APPLICANT		
New York City Department of City Planning			Paul Pilla		
NAME OF LEAD AGENCY CONTACT PERSON			NAME OF APPLICANT'S REPRESENTATIVE OR CONTACT PERSON		
Olga Abinader			Richard Lobel		
ADDRESS 120 Broadway, 31st Floor			ADDRESS 18 East 41st Street, 5th Floor		
CITY New York	STATE NY	ZIP 10271	CITY New York	STATE NY	ZIP 10017
TELEPHONE (212) 720-3493	EMAIL oabinad@planning.nyc.gov		TELEPHONE (212) 725-2727	EMAIL rlobel@sheldonlobelpc.com	

5. *Project Description*

The applicant, The J. Pilla Group LTD., seeks a zoning map amendment to rezone a portion of Bronx Block 4516, Lots 8, 46, 48 from a C8-1 zoning district to an R7A/C2-3 zoning district to facilitate the construction of a nine-story plus cellar mixed-use 47,024 gsf (38,712 zsf) building with approximately 37,276 gross square feet (33,887 zoning square feet (zsf) of Use Group 2 residential floor area with 35 dwelling units and 5,308 gsf (4,825 zsf) of Use Group 6 commercial office space at 2712 Williamsbridge Road (Block 4516, Lots 8 and 46). The addition of 33,887 zsf of residential floor area and the proposed 4,825 zsf of commercial space would represent a combined total FAR of approximately 4.5, which is permitted in an R7A/C2-3 District. In addition to the zoning map amendment to rezone the Affected Area from C8-1 to R7A/C2-3, the applicant is also requesting a zoning text amendment to ZR Appendix F: Inclusionary Housing Designated Areas to establish the Affected Area as a Mandatory Inclusionary Housing ("MIH") Area.

Project Location

BOROUGH Bronx	COMMUNITY DISTRICT(S) 11	STREET ADDRESS 2712 Williamsbridge Road
TAX BLOCK(S) AND LOT(S) Bronx Block 4516, Lots 8 and 46		ZIP CODE 10469
DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY BY BOUNDING OR CROSS STREETS Williamsbridge Road, Colden Avenue, Boston Rd, Allerton Avenue		
EXISTING ZONING DISTRICT, INCLUDING SPECIAL ZONING DISTRICT DESIGNATION, IF ANY C8-1		ZONING SECTIONAL MAP NUMBER 4a

6. *Required Actions or Approvals* (check all that apply)

***City Planning Commission*:** ☒ YES ☐ NO ☒ UNIFORM LAND USE REVIEW PROCEDURE (ULURP)

☐ CITY MAP AMENDMENT	☐ ZONING CERTIFICATION	☐ CONCESSION
☒ ZONING MAP AMENDMENT	☐ ZONING AUTHORIZATION	☐ UDAAP
☒ ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT	☐ ACQUISITION—REAL PROPERTY	☐ REVOCABLE CONSENT
☐ SITE SELECTION—PUBLIC FACILITY	☐ DISPOSITION—REAL PROPERTY	☐ FRANCHISE
☐ HOUSING PLAN & PROJECT	☐ OTHER, explain:	

☐ SPECIAL PERMIT (if appropriate, specify type: ☐ modification; ☐ renewal; ☐ other); EXPIRATION DATE:

SPECIFY AFFECTED SECTIONS OF THE ZONING RESOLUTION

***Board of Standards and Appeals*:** ☐ YES ☒ NO

☐ VARIANCE (use)

☐ VARIANCE (bulk)

☐ SPECIAL PERMIT (if appropriate, specify type: ☐ modification; ☐ renewal; ☐ other); EXPIRATION DATE:
SPECIFY AFFECTED SECTIONS OF THE ZONING RESOLUTION

***Department of Environmental Protection*:** ☐ YES ☒ NO If "yes," specify:

Other City Approvals Subject to CEQR (check all that apply)

☐ LEGISLATION
☐ RULEMAKING
☐ CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC FACILITIES
☐ 384(b)(4) APPROVAL
☐ OTHER, explain:
☐ FUNDING OF CONSTRUCTION, specify:
☐ POLICY OR PLAN, specify:
☐ FUNDING OF PROGRAMS, specify:
☐ PERMITS, specify:

Other City Approvals Not Subject to CEQR (check all that apply)

☐ PERMITS FROM DOT'S OFFICE OF CONSTRUCTION MITIGATION AND COORDINATION (OCMC)
☐ LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION APPROVAL
☐ OTHER, explain:

***State or Federal Actions/Approvals/Funding*:** ☐ YES ☒ NO If "yes," specify:

7. *Site Description:* *The directly affected area consists of the project site and the area subject to any change in regulatory controls. Except where otherwise indicated, provide the following information with regard to the directly affected area.*

***Graphics*:** *The following graphics must be attached and each box must be checked off before the EAS is complete. Each map must clearly depict the boundaries of the directly affected area or areas and indicate a 400-foot radius drawn from the outer boundaries of the project site. Maps may not exceed 11 x 17 inches in size and, for paper filings, must be folded to 8.5 x 11 inches.*

☒ SITE LOCATION MAP ☒ ZONING MAP ☒ SANBORN OR OTHER LAND USE MAP
☒ TAX MAP ☐ FOR LARGE AREAS OR MULTIPLE SITES, A GIS SHAPE FILE THAT DEFINES THE PROJECT SITE(S)
☒ PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE PROJECT SITE TAKEN WITHIN 6 MONTHS OF EAS SUBMISSION AND KEYED TO THE SITE LOCATION MAP

Physical Setting (both developed and undeveloped areas)

Total directly affected area (sq. ft.): Approx. 16,139
Waterbody area (sq. ft) and type: NA
Roads, buildings, and other paved surfaces (sq. ft.): Approx. 16,139
Other, describe (sq. ft.): NA

8. *Physical Dimensions and Scale of Project* (if the project affects multiple sites, provide the total development facilitated by the action)

SIZE OF PROJECT TO BE DEVELOPED (gross square feet): 44,158 gsf
(total under RWCDS)
NUMBER OF BUILDINGS: 1
GROSS FLOOR AREA OF EACH BUILDING (sq. ft.): Projected Site 1 -(Applicant) 44,158 gsf
HEIGHT OF EACH BUILDING (ft.): 95 Feet
NUMBER OF STORIES OF EACH BUILDING: Approx 9-10

Does the proposed project involve changes in zoning on one or more sites? ☒ YES ☐ NO
If "yes," specify: The total square feet owned or controlled by the applicant: 8,659
The total square feet not owned or controlled by the applicant: 7,480

Does the proposed project involve in-ground excavation or subsurface disturbance, including, but not limited to foundation work, pilings, utility lines, or grading? ☒ YES ☐ NO
If "yes," indicate the estimated area and volume dimensions of subsurface permanent and temporary disturbance (if known):
AREA OF TEMPORARY DISTURBANCE: 8,659 sq. ft. (width x length)
VOLUME OF DISTURBANCE: TBD cubic ft. (width x length x depth)
AREA OF PERMANENT DISTURBANCE: 8,659 sq. ft. (width x length)

Description of Proposed Uses (please complete the following information as appropriate)

	Residential	***Commercial***	***Community Facility***	***Industrial/Manufacturing***
Size (in gross sq. ft.)	34,559	9,599	0	0
Type (*e.g.,* retail, office, school)	40 units	UG 6 Local Retail		

Does the proposed project increase the population of residents and/or on-site workers? ☒ YES ☐ NO
If "yes," please specify: NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL RESIDENTS: 108 NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL WORKERS: 27
Provide a brief explanation of how these numbers were determined: 3 workers per 1,000 gsf of local retail space, 2.71 people per household

Does the proposed project create new open space? ☐ YES ☒ NO If "yes," specify size of project-created open space: sq. ft.

Has a No-Action scenario been defined for this project that differs from the existing condition? ☐ YES ☒ NO
If "yes," see Chapter 2, "Establishing the Analysis Framework" and describe briefly:

9. *Analysis Year* CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 2

ANTICIPATED BUILD YEAR (date the project would be completed and operational): 2021

ANTICIPATED PERIOD OF CONSTRUCTION IN MONTHS: 16-20 months

WOULD THE PROJECT BE IMPLEMENTED IN A SINGLE PHASE? ☒ YES ☐ NO

IF MULTIPLE PHASES, HOW MANY? *Two phases as additional development is projected on parcels not under applicant's control.

BRIEFLY DESCRIBE PHASES AND CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE: ULURP and Environmental Review , Design and Financing, Construction

10. *Predominant Land Use in the Vicinity of the Project* (check all that apply)

☒ RESIDENTIAL ☐ MANUFACTURING ☒ COMMERCIAL ☐ PARK/FOREST/OPEN SPACE ☐ OTHER, specify:

Part II: TECHNICAL ANALYSIS

INSTRUCTIONS: For each of the analysis categories listed in this section, assess the proposed project's impacts based on the thresholds and criteria presented in the CEQR Technical Manual. Check each box that applies.

- If the proposed project can be demonstrated not to meet or exceed the threshold, check the "no" box.
- If the proposed project will meet or exceed the threshold, or if this cannot be determined, check the "yes" box.
- For each "yes" response, provide additional analyses (and, if needed, attach supporting information) based on guidance in the CEQR Technical Manual to determine whether the potential for significant impacts exists. Please note that a "yes" answer does not mean that an EIS must be prepared—it means that more information may be required for the lead agency to make a determination of significance.
- The lead agency, upon reviewing Part II, may require an applicant to provide additional information to support the Short EAS Form. For example, if a question is answered "no," an agency may request a short explanation for this response.

	YES	NO
1. *LAND USE, ZONING, AND PUBLIC POLICY*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 4		
(a) Would the proposed project result in a change in land use different from surrounding land uses?	☐	☒
(b) Would the proposed project result in a change in zoning different from surrounding zoning?	☒	☐
(c) Is there the potential to affect an applicable public policy?	☐	☒
(d) If "yes," to (a), (b), and/or (c), complete a preliminary assessment and attach.		
(e) Is the project a large, publicly sponsored project?	☐	☒
○ If "yes," complete a PlaNYC assessment and attach.		
(f) Is any part of the directly affected area within the City's Waterfront Revitalization Program boundaries?	☐	☒
○ If "yes," complete the Consistency Assessment Form.		
2. *SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 5		
(a) Would the proposed project:		
○ Generate a net increase of 200 or more residential units?	☐	☒
○ Generate a net increase of 200,000 or more square feet of commercial space?	☐	☒
○ Directly displace more than 500 residents?	☐	☒
○ Directly displace more than 100 employees?	☐	☒
○ Affect conditions in a specific industry?	☐	☒
3. *COMMUNITY FACILITIES*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 6		
(a) Direct Effects		
○ Would the project directly eliminate, displace, or alter public or publicly funded community facilities such as educational facilities, libraries, hospitals and other health care facilities, day care centers, police stations, or fire stations?	☐	☒
(b) Indirect Effects		
○ **Child Care Centers:** Would the project result in 20 or more eligible children under age 6, based on the number of low or low/moderate income residential units? (See Table 6-1 in Chapter 6)	☐	☒
○ **Libraries:** Would the project result in a 5 percent or more increase in the ratio of residential units to library branches? (See Table 6-1 in Chapter 6)	☐	☒
○ **Public Schools:** Would the project result in 50 or more elementary or middle school students, or 150 or more high school students based on number of residential units? (See Table 6-1 in Chapter 6)	☐	☒
○ **Health Care Facilities and Fire/Police Protection:** Would the project result in the introduction of a sizeable new neighborhood?	☐	☒
4. *OPEN SPACE*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 7		
(a) Would the proposed project change or eliminate existing open space?	☐	☒
(b) Is the project located within an under-served area in the Bronx, Brooklyn, Manhattan, Queens, or Staten Island?	☐	☒
○ If "yes," would the proposed project generate more than 50 additional residents or 125 additional employees?	☐	☐
(c) Is the project located within a well-served area in the Bronx, Brooklyn, Manhattan, Queens, or Staten Island?	☐	☒
○ If "yes," would the proposed project generate more than 350 additional residents or 750 additional employees?	☐	☐
(d) If the project in located an area that is neither under-served nor well-served, would it generate more than 200 additional residents or 500 additional employees?	☐	☒
5. *SHADOWS*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 8		

	YES	NO
(a) Would the proposed project result in a net height increase of any structure of 50 feet or more?	☒	☐
(b) Would the proposed project result in any increase in structure height and be located adjacent to or across the street from a sunlight-sensitive resource?	☐	☒
6. *HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 9		
(a) Does the proposed project site or an adjacent site contain any architectural and/or archaeological resource that is eligible for or has been designated (or is calendared for consideration) as a New York City Landmark, Interior Landmark or Scenic Landmark; that is listed or eligible for listing on the New York State or National Register of Historic Places; or that is within a designated or eligible New York City, New York State or National Register Historic District? (See the GIS System for Archaeology and National Register to confirm)	☐	☒
(b) Would the proposed project involve construction resulting in in-ground disturbance to an area not previously excavated?	☒	☐
(c) If "yes" to either of the above, list any identified architectural and/or archaeological resources and attach supporting information on whether the proposed project would potentially affect any architectural or archeological resources.		
7. *URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 10		
(a) Would the proposed project introduce a new building, a new building height, or result in any substantial physical alteration to the streetscape or public space in the vicinity of the proposed project that is not currently allowed by existing zoning?	☒	☐
(b) Would the proposed project result in obstruction of publicly accessible views to visual resources not currently allowed by existing zoning?	☐	☒
8. *NATURAL RESOURCES*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 11		
(a) Does the proposed project site or a site adjacent to the project contain natural resources as defined in Section 100 of Chapter 11?	☐	☒
○ If "yes," list the resources and attach supporting information on whether the proposed project would affect any of these resources.		
(b) Is any part of the directly affected area within the Jamaica Bay Watershed?	☐	☒
○ If "yes," complete the Jamaica Bay Watershed Form, and submit according to its instructions.		
9. *HAZARDOUS MATERIALS*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 12		
(a) Would the proposed project allow commercial or residential uses in an area that is currently, or was historically, a manufacturing area that involved hazardous materials?	☐	☒
(b) Does the proposed project site have existing institutional controls (*e.g.*, (E) designation or Restrictive Declaration) relating to hazardous materials that preclude the potential for significant adverse impacts?	☐	☒
(c) Would the project require soil disturbance in a manufacturing area or any development on or near a manufacturing area or existing/historic facilities listed in Appendix 1 (including nonconforming uses)?	☐	☒
(d) Would the project result in the development of a site where there is reason to suspect the presence of hazardous materials, contamination, illegal dumping or fill, or fill material of unknown origin?	☐	☒
(e) Would the project result in development on or near a site that has or had underground and/or aboveground storage tanks (*e.g.*, gas stations, oil storage facilities, heating oil storage)?	☐	☒
(f) Would the project result in renovation of interior existing space on a site with the potential for compromised air quality; vapor intrusion from either on-site or off-site sources; or the presence of asbestos, PCBs, mercury or lead-based paint?	☐	☒
(g) Would the project result in development on or near a site with potential hazardous materials issues such as government-listed voluntary cleanup/brownfield site, current or former power generation/transmission facilities, coal gasification or gas storage sites, railroad tracks or rights-of-way, or municipal incinerators?	☐	☒
(h) Has a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment been performed for the site?	☒	☐
○ If "yes," were Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) identified? Briefly identify: No RECs	☐	☒
10. *WATER AND SEWER INFRASTRUCTURE*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 13		
(a) Would the project result in water demand of more than one million gallons per day?	☐	☒
(b) If the proposed project located in a combined sewer area, would it result in at least 1,000 residential units or 250,000 square feet or more of commercial space in Manhattan, or at least 400 residential units or 150,000 square feet or more of commercial space in the Bronx, Brooklyn, Staten Island, or Queens?	☐	☒
(c) If the proposed project located in a separately sewered area, would it result in the same or greater development than the amounts listed in Table 13-1 in Chapter 13?	☐	☒
(d) Would the proposed project involve development on a site that is 5 acres or larger where the amount of impervious surface would increase?	☐	☒
(e) If the project is located within the Jamaica Bay Watershed or in certain specific drainage areas, including Bronx River, Coney Island Creek, Flushing Bay and Creek, Gowanus Canal, Hutchinson River, Newtown Creek, or Westchester Creek, would it involve development on a site that is 1 acre or larger where the amount of impervious surface would increase?	☐	☒
(f) Would the proposed project be located in an area that is partially sewered or currently unsewered?	☐	☒

	YES	NO
(g) Is the project proposing an industrial facility or activity that would contribute industrial discharges to a Wastewater Treatment Plant and/or generate contaminated stormwater in a separate storm sewer system?	☐	☒
(h) Would the project involve construction of a new stormwater outfall that requires federal and/or state permits?	☐	☒
11. *SOLID WASTE AND SANITATION SERVICES*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 14		
(a) Using Table 14-1 in Chapter 14, the project's projected operational solid waste generation is estimated to be (pounds per week): 6,021		
○ Would the proposed project have the potential to generate 100,000 pounds (50 tons) or more of solid waste per week?	☐	☒
(b) Would the proposed project involve a reduction in capacity at a solid waste management facility used for refuse or recyclables generated within the City?	☐	☒
12. *ENERGY*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 15		
(a) Using energy modeling or Table 15-1 in Chapter 15, the project's projected energy use is estimated to be (annual BTUs): 10,614,978 MBTUs		
(b) Would the proposed project affect the transmission or generation of energy?	☐	☒
13. *TRANSPORTATION*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 16		
(a) Would the proposed project exceed any threshold identified in Table 16-1 in Chapter 16?	☒	☐
(b) If "yes," conduct the screening analyses, attach appropriate back up data as needed for each stage and answer the following questions:		
○ Would the proposed project result in 50 or more Passenger Car Equivalents (PCEs) per project peak hour?	☐	☒
If "yes," would the proposed project result in 50 or more vehicle trips per project peak hour at any given intersection? ***It should be noted that the lead agency may require further analysis of intersections of concern even when a project generates fewer than 50 vehicles in the peak hour. See Subsection 313 of Chapter 16 for more information.*	☐	☐
○ Would the proposed project result in more than 200 subway/rail or bus trips per project peak hour?	☐	☒
If "yes," would the proposed project result, per project peak hour, in 50 or more bus trips on a single line (in one direction) or 200 subway trips per station or line?	☐	☐
○ Would the proposed project result in more than 200 pedestrian trips per project peak hour?	☐	☒
If "yes," would the proposed project result in more than 200 pedestrian trips per project peak hour to any given pedestrian or transit element, crosswalk, subway stair, or bus stop?	☐	☐
14. *AIR QUALITY*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 17		
(a) *Mobile Sources*: Would the proposed project result in the conditions outlined in Section 210 in Chapter 17?	☐	☒
(b) *Stationary Sources*: Would the proposed project result in the conditions outlined in Section 220 in Chapter 17?	☒	☐
○ If "yes," would the proposed project exceed the thresholds in Figure 17-3, Stationary Source Screen Graph in Chapter 17? (Attach graph as needed)	☐	☒
(c) Does the proposed project involve multiple buildings on the project site?	☐	☒
(d) Does the proposed project require federal approvals, support, licensing, or permits subject to conformity requirements?	☐	☒
(e) Does the proposed project site have existing institutional controls (*e.g.*, (E) designation or Restrictive Declaration) relating to air quality that preclude the potential for significant adverse impacts?	☐	☒
15. *GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 18		
(a) Is the proposed project a city capital project or a power generation plant?	☐	☒
(b) Would the proposed project fundamentally change the City's solid waste management system?	☐	☒
(c) If "yes" to any of the above, would the project require a GHG emissions assessment based on the guidance in Chapter 18?	☐	☒
16. *NOISE*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 19		
(a) Would the proposed project generate or reroute vehicular traffic?	☒	☐
(b) Would the proposed project introduce new or additional receptors (see Section 124 in Chapter 19) near heavily trafficked roadways, within one horizontal mile of an existing or proposed flight path, or within 1,500 feet of an existing or proposed rail line with a direct line of site to that rail line?	☒	☐
(c) Would the proposed project cause a stationary noise source to operate within 1,500 feet of a receptor with a direct line of sight to that receptor or introduce receptors into an area with high ambient stationary noise?	☐	☒
(d) Does the proposed project site have existing institutional controls (*e.g.*, (E) designation or Restrictive Declaration) relating to noise that preclude the potential for significant adverse impacts?	☐	☒
17. *PUBLIC HEALTH*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 20		
(a) Based upon the analyses conducted, do any of the following technical areas require a detailed analysis: Air Quality; Hazardous Materials; Noise?	☐	☒

	YES	NO
(b) If "yes," explain why an assessment of public health is or is not warranted based on the guidance in Chapter 20, "Public Health." Attach a preliminary analysis, if necessary.		
18. *NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 21		
(a) Based upon the analyses conducted, do any of the following technical areas require a detailed analysis: Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy; Socioeconomic Conditions; Open Space; Historic and Cultural Resources; Urban Design and Visual Resources; Shadows; Transportation; Noise?	☒	☐
(b) If "yes," explain why an assessment of neighborhood character is or is not warranted based on the guidance in Chapter 21, "Neighborhood Character." Attach a preliminary analysis, if necessary. A qualatative assessment of neighborhood character is provided in the supplemental studies		
19. *CONSTRUCTION*: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 22		
(a) Would the project's construction activities involve:		
○ Construction activities lasting longer than two years?	☐	☒
○ Construction activities within a Central Business District or along an arterial highway or major thoroughfare?	☐	☒
○ Closing, narrowing, or otherwise impeding traffic, transit, or pedestrian elements (roadways, parking spaces, bicycle routes, sidewalks, crosswalks, corners, *etc.*)?	☒	☐
○ Construction of multiple buildings where there is a potential for on-site receptors on buildings completed before the final build-out?	☐	☒
○ The operation of several pieces of diesel equipment in a single location at peak construction?	☐	☒
○ Closure of a community facility or disruption in its services?	☐	☒
○ Activities within 400 feet of a historic or cultural resource?	☐	☒
○ Disturbance of a site containing or adjacent to a site containing natural resources?	☐	☒
○ Construction on multiple development sites in the same geographic area, such that there is the potential for several construction timelines to overlap or last for more than two years overall?	☐	☒
(b) If any boxes are checked "yes," explain why a preliminary construction assessment is or is not warranted based on the guidance in Chapter 22, "Construction." It should be noted that the nature and extent of any commitment to use the Best Available Technology for construction equipment or Best Management Practices for construction activities should be considered when making this determination. A qualtative assessment of construction impacts is provided in the supplemental studies		

20. *APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION*

I swear or affirm under oath and subject to the penalties for perjury that the information provided in this Environmental Assessment Statement (EAS) is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief, based upon my personal knowledge and familiarity with the information described herein and after examination of the pertinent books and records and/or after inquiry of persons who have personal knowledge of such information or who have examined pertinent books and records.

Still under oath, I further swear or affirm that I make this statement in my capacity as the applicant or representative of the entity that seeks the permits, approvals, funding, or other governmental action(s) described in this EAS.

APPLICANT/REPRESENTATIVE NAME	DATE
Max Meltzer	Janaury 25nd, 2019

SIGNATURE

PLEASE NOTE THAT APPLICANTS MAY BE REQUIRED TO SUBSTANTIATE RESPONSES IN THIS FORM AT THE DISCRETION OF THE LEAD AGENCY SO THAT IT MAY SUPPORT ITS DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE.

Part III: DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE (To Be Completed by Lead Agency)

INSTRUCTIONS: In completing Part III, the lead agency should consult 6 NYCRR 617.7 and 43 RCNY § 6-06 (Executive Order 91 or 1977, as amended), which contain the State and City criteria for determining significance.

1. For each of the impact categories listed below, consider whether the project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment, taking into account its (a) location; (b) probability of occurring; (c) duration; (d) irreversibility; (e) geographic scope; and (f) magnitude.

IMPACT CATEGORY	Potentially Significant Adverse Impact YES	NO
Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy	☐	☒
Socioeconomic Conditions	☐	☒
Community Facilities and Services	☐	☒
Open Space	☐	☒
Shadows	☐	☒
Historic and Cultural Resources	☐	☒
Urban Design/Visual Resources	☐	☒
Natural Resources	☐	☒
Hazardous Materials	☐	☒
Water and Sewer Infrastructure	☐	☒
Solid Waste and Sanitation Services	☐	☒
Energy	☐	☒
Transportation	☐	☒
Air Quality	☐	☒
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐	☒
Noise	☐	☒
Public Health	☐	☒
Neighborhood Character	☐	☒
Construction	☐	☒

2. Are there any aspects of the project relevant to the determination of whether the project may have a significant impact on the environment, such as combined or cumulative impacts, that were not fully covered by other responses and supporting materials? ☐ ☒

If there are such impacts, attach an explanation stating whether, as a result of them, the project may have a significant impact on the environment.

3. Check determination to be issued by the lead agency:

☐ **Positive Declaration:** If the lead agency has determined that the project may have a significant impact on the environment, and if a Conditional Negative Declaration is not appropriate, then the lead agency issues a *Positive Declaration* and prepares a draft Scope of Work for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

☐ **Conditional Negative Declaration:** A *Conditional Negative Declaration* (CND) may be appropriate if there is a private applicant for an Unlisted action AND when conditions imposed by the lead agency will modify the proposed project so that no significant adverse environmental impacts would result. The CND is prepared as a separate document and is subject to the requirements of 6 NYCRR Part 617.

☒ **Negative Declaration:** If the lead agency has determined that the project would not result in potentially significant adverse environmental impacts, then the lead agency issues a *Negative Declaration*. The *Negative Declaration* may be prepared as a separate document (see template) or using the embedded Negative Declaration on the next page.

4. ***LEAD AGENCY'S CERTIFICATION***

TITLE	LEAD AGENCY
Acting Director, Environemntal Assessment and Review Division	Department of City Planning, acting on behalf of the City Planning Commission
NAME	DATE
Olga Abinader	1/25/2019

SIGNATURE



REVISED NEGATIVE DECLARATION - supersedes the Negative Declaration issued September 4, 2018*

Statement of No Significant Effect

Pursuant to Executive Order 91 of 1977, as amended, and the Rules of Procedure for City Environmental Quality Review, found at Title 62, Chapter 5 of the Rules of the City of New York and 6 NYCRR, Part 617, State Environmental Quality Review, the Department of City Planning, acting on behalf of the City Planning Commission assumed the role of lead agency for the environmental review of the proposed project. Based on a review of information about the project contained in this environmental assessment statement and any attachments hereto, which are incorporated by reference herein, the lead agency has determined that the proposed project would not have a significant adverse impact on the environment.

Reasons Supporting this Determination

The above determination is based on information contained in this EAS, which finds the proposed actions sought before the City Planning Commission would have no significant effect on the quality of the environment. Reasons supporting this determination are noted below.

Hazardous Materials and Air Quality

1. An (E) designation (E-498) for hazardous materials and air quality and has been incorporated into the proposed actions. Refer to "Determination of Significance Appendix: (E) Designation" for a list of the sites affected by the proposed (E) designation and applicable (E) designation requirements. The analyses conducted for hazardous materials and air quality conclude that with these (E) Designation requirements in place, the proposed actions would not result in significant adverse impacts to hazardous materials or air quality.

Land Use, Zoning and Public Policy

2. This EAS includes a detailed Land Use, Zoning and Public Policy section, which analyzes the potential significance of the proposed actions on land use, zoning and public policy in the study area. The proposed rezoning from C8-1 to R7A/C2-3 would facilitate a change of use from commercial to mixed residential and commercial in an area characterized by diverse uses including residential, commercial, mixed residential/commercial and industrial uses. The C8-1 zoning district is bordered by R6, R5, and R4-1 districts and would not generate new land uses that would be incompatible with existing land uses within the study area. The analysis concludes that no significant adverse impacts related to Land Use, Zoning and Public Policy would result from the proposed actions.

No other significant effects upon the environment that would require the preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Statement are foreseeable. This Negative Declaration has been prepared in accordance with Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law (SEQRA).

TITLE	LEAD AGENCY
Acting Director, Environmental Assessment and Review Division	Department of City Planning, acting on behalf of the City Planning Commission
NAME	DATE
Olga Abinader	1/25/2019
SIGNATURE	

Project Name: Williamsbridge Road Rezoning
CEQR #: 18DCP071X
SEQRA Classification: Unlisted

TITLE Chair, City Planning Commission	
NAME Marisa Lago	DATE 1/30/2019
SIGNATURE	

*Following certification of the related land use application (ULURP No. 180261ZMX) on September 4, 2018, the applicant has revised the proposed actions to exclude Block 4156, Lots 43, 44, 144, and 145, collectively Projected Development Site 2, from the proposed rezoning area. This Revised Negative Declaration supersedes the Negative Declaration issued on September 4, 2018 and reflects the Revised EAS dated January 25, 2019, which assesses the change to the application. As described in the Revised EAS, the change would not alter the conclusions of the previous EAS. As Lots 43, 44, 144, and 145 have been removed from the rezoning area, these lots are no longer considered a projected development site and would therefore not require an (E) designation for Hazardous Materials or Air Quality. The removal of the proposed (E) designation from these sites would not alter the conclusions of the Negative Declaration.

Project Name: Williamsbridge Road Rezoning
CEQR #: 18DCP071X
SEQRA Classification: Unlisted

Determination of Significance Appendix: (E) Designation (E-498)

To ensure that there would be no significant adverse hazardous materials or air quality impacts associated with the proposed project, an (E) designation (E-498) will be placed on Projected Development Site 1 (Block 4516, Lot 8 and 46).

Hazardous Materials

Task 1
The applicant submits to OER, for review and approval, a Phase 1A of the site along with a soil and groundwater testing protocol, including a description of methods and a site map with all sampling locations clearly and precisely represented.

If site sampling is necessary, no sampling should begin until written approval of a protocol is received from OER. The number and location of sample sites should be selected to adequately characterize the site, the specific source of suspected contamination (i.e., petroleum based contamination and non-petroleum based contamination), and the remainder of the site's condition. The characterization should be complete enough to determine what remediation strategy (if any) is necessary after review of sampling data. Guidelines and criteria for selecting sampling locations and collecting samples are provided by OER upon request.

Task 2
A written report with findings and a summary of the data must be submitted to OER after completion of the testing phase and laboratory analysis for review and approval. After receiving such results, a determination is made by OER if the results indicate that remediation is necessary. If OER determines that no remediation is necessary, written notice shall be given by OER.

If remediation is indicated from the test results, a proposed remediation plan must be submitted to OER for review and approval. The applicant must complete such remediation as determined necessary by OER. The applicant should then provide proper documentation that the work has been satisfactorily completed.

An OER-approved construction-related health and safety plan would be implemented during evacuation and construction and activities to protect workers and the community from potentially significant adverse impacts associated with contaminated soil and/or groundwater. This plan would be submitted to OER for review and approval prior to implementation.

Project Name: Williamsbridge Road Rezoning
CEQR #: 18DCP071X
SEQRA Classification: Unlisted

Air Quality

Projected Development Site 1 (Block 4516, Lot 8 and 46)

Any new residential/commercial development on the above referenced property must ensure HVAC stack(s) is located at the highest tier and at least 98 feet above grade, to avoid any significant adverse air quality impacts

Appendix H- Technical Memorandum- Revised CEQR EAS with Revised Rezoning Area Boundary by the City Planning Commission

Technical Memorandum

2712 Williamsbridge Road Rezoning

CEQR No. 18DCP071X

ULURP # 180261ZMX

1- Introduction

On August 31st, 2018, the New York City Department of City Planning (DCP), as lead agency, issued a Negative Declaration for the 2712 Williamsbridge Road Rezoning Environmental Assessment Statement (EAS). The EAS considered discretionary actions proposed by The J. Pilla Group LTD (the "Applicant") that included a zoning map amendment that would rezone a portion of Bronx Block 4516 in the Allerton neighborhood of the Bronx Community District 11, ad a related zoning text amendment to Appendix F of the New York City Planning Zoning Resolution (ZR) to establish the proposed R7A/C2-3 zoning district as a Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH) Area subject to affordability requirements of the MIH program. The Proposed Zoning Map Amendment would change the zoning on Block 4516, Lots 8, 46, 48, 43, 44, 144, and 45 from C8-1 to R7A/C2-3.

The Proposed Actions would facilitate the development of a new 9-story plus cellar mixed-use building with ground floor commercial use and 35 dwelling units to be constructed at 2712 WIlliamsbridge Road and 2721 Colden Avenue (The Proposed Development).

The below text describes the Future With-Action Scenario for the Rezoning Area.

Block 4516 Lots 8 and 46 - Projected Development Site No. 1

Under the Future With-Action Scenario, it is assumed that Block 4516, Lots 8 and 46 would be developed to the maximum FAR of 4.6, pursuant to ZQA/MIH regulations. On an 8,727 square-foot lot, it is assumed that the Proposed Action would result in approximately 9,599 gross square feet (8,727 zsf) of commercial and office floor area (FAR 1.0) and 34,559 gross square feet (31,417 zsf) of residential floor area (FAR 3.6). Estimating approximately 850 square feet per dwelling unit, it is assumed 40 residential units would be constructed on-site. For CEQR analysis, assuming 20% of the units are available at 80% of AMI, the proposed rezoning would result in the creation of approximately 8 affordable units. It is assumed that the building would be built to its maximum allowable height of 95 feet.

Block 4516 Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45 - Projected Development Site No. 2

Under the With-Action Scenario, it is assumed that Block 4516, Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45 would be merged and developed to the maximum FAR of 4.6, pursuant to ZQA/MIH. On a combined 5,685 square foot lot, it is assumed that the Proposed Action would result in approximately 22,512 gsf of residential floor area (20,466 zsf of residential floor area) (FAR 3.6) and 6,253 gsf of commercial floor area (5,685 zsf feet of commercial floor area) (FAR 1.0). Estimating approximately 850 square feet per dwelling unit, it is assumed 26 residential units would be constructed on-site.

The August 2018 EAS was subsequently revised in January of 2019 to reflect an update to the Applicant's requested Zoning Map Amendment. The Zoning Map Amendment and Rezoning Area no longer include Lots 43, 44, 144, and 145 on Block 4516, which was analyzed in the August 2018 EAS.

The RWCDS in the August 2018 EAS assumed that Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45 would be combined as one development site (Projected Development Site 2) in the Future With-Action Scenario and would be improved with a mixed residential and commercial building with 6,253 gsf of commercial floor area and 22,512 gsf of residential floor area with 26 dwelling units. In total, it was assumed the building would be constructed to an FAR of 4.6.

Since the issuance of the Negative Declaration, the New York City Planning Commission is considering a modification to the rezoning boundary to shrink the size of the Rezoning Area to just include Block 4516, Lots 8, 46, and 48 in the Proposed Actions. Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45 will remain C8-1 and will not be part of the Proposed Actions and Proposed Zoning Map Amendment, therefore eliminating Projected Development Site 2 analyzed in the August 2018 EAS. The Technical Memorandum describes the Proposed Actions under the City Planning Commission's potential modification and examines whether it would result in any new or different significant adverse environmental impacts not already identified in the August 2018 EAS and Negative Declaration.

2- Description of the Previous Proposed Actions and Reasonable Worst Case Development Scenario.

Zoning Map Amendment

The previous proposed zoning map amendment would rezone the southern portion of Bronx Block 4516, Lots 8, 46, 48, 43, 44, 144, and 45 from C8-1 zoning to R7A/C2-3 zoning with a total area to be rezoned of approximately 21,752 sf.

Zoning Text Amendment

In addition to the zoning map amendment to rezone the Affected Area from C8-1 to R7A/C2-3, the applicant is also requesting a zoning text amendment to ZR Appendix F: Inclusionary Housing Designated Areas to establish the Affected Area as a Mandatory Inclusionary Housing ("MIH") Area.

The MIH Area Sets a new maximum permitted residential FAR which supersedes the FAR permitted by the underlying zoning district. With both the designation of the proposed rezoning area as an MIH Area and its rezoning to R7A/C2-3 zoning, the maximum permitted FAR within the proposed rezoning area in the R7A district would be 4.6 and the maximum permitted building height would be 95 feet. As described in the August 2018 EAS, the applicant intends on constructing a nine-story plus cellar mixed use building with approximately 37,276 gsf (22,887 zsf) of UG 2 residential floor area with 35 dwelling units and 5,308 (4,825 zsf) of UG 6 commercial floor area and office space at 2712 Williamsbridge Road on Lots 8 and 46.

As described in the August 2018 Reasonable Worst Case Development Scenario (RWCDS), it is expected that the Proposed Action would result in a development slightly larger than what the applicant is proposing on Lots 8 and 46 (Projected Development Site 1) and would also result in development on Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45, which would be merged as one development site (Projected Development Site 2). The RWCDS for each projected site are below.

<u>Block 4516 Lots 8 and 46 - Projected Development Site No. 1</u>

Under the Future With-Action Scenario, it is assumed that Block 4516, Lots 8 and 46 would be developed to the maximum FAR of 4.6, pursuant to ZQA/MIH regulations. On an 8,727 square-foot lot, it is assumed that the Proposed Action would result in approximately 9,599 gross square feet (8,727 zsf) of commercial and office floor area (FAR 1.0) and 34,559 gross square feet (31,417 zsf) of residential floor area (FAR 3.6). Estimating approximately 850 square feet per dwelling unit, it is assumed 40 residential units would be constructed on-site. For CEQR analysis, assuming 20% of the units are available at 80% of AMI, the proposed rezoning would result in the creation of approximately 8 affordable units. It is assumed that the building would be built to its maximum allowable height of 95 feet.

<u>Block 4516 Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45 - Projected Development Site No. 2</u>

Under the With-Action Scenario, it is assumed that Block 4516, Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45 would be merged and developed to the maximum FAR of 4.6, pursuant to ZQA/MIH. On a combined 5,685 square foot lot, it is assumed that the Proposed Action would result in approximately 22,512 gsf of residential floor area (20,466 zsf of residential floor area) (FAR 3.6) and 6,253 gsf of commercial floor area (5,685 zsf feet of commercial floor area) (FAR 1.0). Estimating approximately 850 square feet per dwelling unit, it

is assumed 26 residential units would be constructed on-site.

3- Description of the Current Proposed Actions and RWCDS

Since the issuance of the August, 2018 EAS, the City Planning Commission is considering modifications to the Proposed Actions as follows:

- Eliminating Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45 from the Proposed Zoning Map Amendment

As a result of the proposed potential modification to the rezoning area boundary, the above referenced lots will maintain their C8-1 zoning and will no longer be part of the applicants zoning map amendment. Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45 made up Projected Development Site 2 in the August 2018 EAS. Therefore, these lots should no longer be considered a projected site as they are no longer part of the Proposed Actions. The modifications to the EAS analyzed in August of 2018 and revised in January of 2019 would result in a smaller RWCDS. See table 1 below.

Table 1- Comparison of Previous and Current RWCDS

Use	*Previous RWCDS*	*Current RWCDS*	*Difference*
Residential-	57,071 gsf (66 units)	34,559 gsf (40 units)	-22,512 gsf (-26 units)
Commercial-	15,852 gsf UG 6 Commercial floor area	9,599 gsf UG 6 Commercial floor area	-6,253 gsf UG 6 Commercial floor area

The RWCDS that would result from the potential modifications to the Proposed Actions would include only 40 dwelling units occupying 34,559 gsf (26 fewer dwelling units and -22,512 gsf of residential floor area) than what was originally analyzed and would have only 9,599 gsf of UG 6 commercial floor area, 6,253 gsf less than what was originally analyzed. The build year of 2021 remains unchanged. The potential modifications to the Proposed Actions and RWCDS would not result in any additional discretionary actions.

4- Likely Effects of the Proposed Modifications

The August 2018 EAS and Negative Declaration concluded that the Proposed Actions would not have the potential for significant adverse impacts related to the environment. As discussed above, the August 2018 EAS was revised in January of 2019 to reflect an update to zoning map amendment boundary. The zoning map amendment boundary was changed, and no longer includes Block 4516, Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45. Therefore, Projected Development Site 2 which was originally analyzed in the EAS from August 2018, which was comprised of Block 4516, Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45, is no longer analyzed as it is no longer within the zoning map amendment boundaries. The screening and detailed analyses prepared for the original Proposed Actions in the August 2018 EAS and the January 2019 revised EAS concluded that the current Proposed Actions would not have the potential for significant adverse impacts in the following areas: Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy, Shadows, Historic and Cultural Resources, Urban Design and Visual Resources, Hazardous Materials, Transportation, Air Quality, Noise, Neighborhood Character, and Construction.

Since the potential modifications resulted in a smaller Reasonable Worst Case Development Scenario, and is resulting in one fewer Projected Development Site in the Future With-Action Scenario, the revised EAS based on the current Proposed Actions did not meet or exceed CEQR Technical Manual thresholds for any new impact categories.

As discussed above, the RWCDS resulting from the potential modifications to the Proposed Actions would result in less projected development within the proposed rezoning area than what was originally analyzed in the August 2018 EAS. This is because the lots which made up Projected Development Site 2 (Block 4516, Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45) have been removed from the Proposed Actions.

The following paragraphs provide technical explanations for each analysis category that was analyzed in the August 2018 EAS and why the current Proposed Actions would not result in significant environmental impacts. Revised maps which clearly indicate the revised rezoning area boundary are also provided.

Land Use, Zoning and Public Policy

Land Use

Under the With-Action Scenario, the proposed rezoning would amend the zoning map to change the existing C8-1 district to an R7A/C2- Proposed Development of an nine story plus cellar mixed building with approximately 40 dwelling units and 9,599 gsf of commercial floor area on Block 4516, Lots 8 and 46. In order to present a conservative assessment, the With-Action Scenario assumes that the Proposed Development Site (Block 4516, Lots 8 and 46) would be constructed to the maximum allowable floor area in an R7A/C2-3 zoning district, which is 4.6 FAR. The Proposed Actions would not introduce any new or non-conforming land uses or Use Groups that are not already located within the study area. The With-Action Scenario would see denser development of two under-utilized lots, which would create a more vibrant, mixed use stretch of Williamsbridge Road. As such, no significant adverse impacts with respect to land use are expected and no further analysis is required.

Zoning

The Proposed Actions would change the existing C8-1 district to an R7A/C2-3 district over Bronx Block 4516 (Lots 8, 46, and 48). Doing so would increase the maximum allowable residential floor area on the Proposed Development Site, which currently does not permit housing per C8-1 zoning district regulations, to 4.6 FAR in an R7A/C2-3 zoning district with Inclusionary Housing bonus. Additionally, the allowable commercial FAR would increase from 1.0 FAR allowed in a C8-1 zoning district to an FAR of 2.0, the maximum commercial FAR allowed in an R7A/C2-3 zoning district. Absent the Proposed Actions, the applicant would be unable to construct the projected 9-story mixed-use building under the existing floor area and use group regulations of a C8-1 district.

The Proposed Actions would not have a significant impact on the extent of conformity within the current surrounding area and it would not adversely affect the viability of conforming uses on nearby properties. Ground floor commercial uses are commonplace throughout the study area. Additionally, there are adjacent existing residential districts that permit multifamily apartment buildings. Furthermore, the proposed zoning district (R7A/C2-4) would bring the existing apartment building just south of the Project Site, located at Block 4516, Lot 48 into conformance. Therefore, significant impacts to zoning are not anticipated and further zoning analysis is not warranted.

Public Policy

The Project Site is not part of, or subject to, an Urban Renewal Plan (URP), adopted community 197-a Plan, Solid Waste Management Plan, Business Improvement District (BID), Industrial Business Zone (IBZ), or the New York City Landmarks Law. The Proposed Action is also not a large publically sponsored project, and as such, consistency with the City's PlaNYC 2030 for sustainability is not warranted. In addition, the Rezoning Area is not located in the Coastal Management Zone; therefore a consistency review is not warranted. The Rezoning Area is not located within New York City's designated coastal zone boundary and therefore is not subject to review for its consistency with the City's Waterfront Revitalization Program.

Shadows

A shadow radius of 4.3 times the maximum allowable height on Projected Development Site 1 (Applicant Site -95 feet) was calculated, resulting in a shadow radius of approximately 408 feet. According to a land use check, no sunlight sensitive resources were in the area. There were no churches with stained glass windows and no open spaces. With no sunlight sensitive resources within the Tier 1 Study Area for

Projected Development Site 1, no additional shadow analysis is required and no adverse impacts are expected.

Historic and Cultural Resources

According to *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines, impacts on historic resources are considered on those sites affected by the Proposed Actions and in the area surrounding identified development sites. The historic resources study area is therefore defined as the Project Site plus an approximately 400-foot radius around the Proposed Action area.

The projected development site is not a designated local or S/NR historic resource or property, nor is the site part of any designated historic district. The LPC was contacted for their initial review of the project's potential to impact nearby historic and cultural resources and a response was received on July 24, 2017, indicating that the projected development site has no architectural significance.

In order to determine whether the projected development has the potential to affect nearby off-site historic or architectural resources, the study area was screened for historic and architectural resources. No historic or architectural resources were identified within the 400-foot study area. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts on historic or architectural resources are expected as a result of the Proposed Actions, and further assessment is not warranted.

Unlike the architectural evaluation of a study area that extends beyond the footprint of a project's block and lot lines, the analysis of potential and/or projected impacts to archaeological resources is controlled by the actual footprint of the limits of soil disturbance. Archeological resources are physical remains, usually subsurface, of the prehistoric and historic periods such as burials, foundations, artifacts, wells and privies. The *CEQR Technical Manual* requires a detailed evaluation of a project's potential effect on the archeological resources if it would potentially result in an in-ground disturbance to an area not previously excavated. The existing rezoning area has not been recently disturbed and no recent or distant cultural or archaeological significance have been attached to this area. Further, utilizing the NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation's "Cultural Resource Information System" (CRIS) mapper, the Rezoning Area does not fall within an archaeologically sensitive area. Based on both current and historic photoreconnaissance of the Rezoning Area, there is little potential for impact to any known or unknown resource due to development. The LPC was contacted for their initial review of the project's potential to impact nearby historic and cultural resources, and a response was received on July 25th, 2017, indicating that the projected development site has no architectural significance. Therefore, significant adverse impacts to archaeological resources are not expected as a result of the Proposed Actions, and further analysis is not warranted.

While this response from the LPC was received in 2017, when the Proposes Actions still included Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45, the LPC response indicates that no lots in the current proposed Rezoning Area (Block 4516, Lots 8, 46, and 48) have any archaeological or architectural significance. Therefore no significant adverse impacts regarding historic and cultural resources are expected and no further analysis is required.

Urban Design and Visual Resources

As the Projected Development Site would be built within the existing lot footprint on the Project Site, the development in the With-Action Scenario would not alter or disrupt the existing street grid or change the arrangement and orientation of streets in the area. Additionally, the Proposed Action would not permanently alter the existing sidewalks that border the Project Site to the east and west. Furthermore, there would not be any changes to the existing sidewalk layout. Overall, the development in the Future With-Action would not alter with the existing streets, street grid, streetscape, and sidewalks, though an approximately 15-foot wide curb cut would serve as an access point to a below-grade garage the applicant is proposing at Projected Development Site 1.

The development under the Future With-Action Scenario would result in a building that is larger in scale and height than buildings in the surrounding study area, which are typically two to five stories and 20 to 50 feet in height. As previously discussed, the With- Action scenario could result in a development of up to 9 stories and 95 feet in height. Although the development under the With-Action Scenario would be larger and taller than the existing low to mid rise buildings in the study area, the buildings would be uniformly massed towards wide streets, with frontage along Williamsbridge Road and Colden Avenue. Furthermore, the additional density in the With-Action Scenario allows for the opportunity to produce more affordable housing, which would be unattainable in the No-Action Scenario.

The projected development under the With-Action Scenario would include retail uses on the ground floor. In comparison to the existing ground floor uses in the Project Area, which include a construction company office, and a parking garage, these uses would further activate currently underused sites at the street level and improve the visual quality of the streetscape. As such, the Proposed Action would enhance the commercial corridor and view corridor along Williamsbridge Road, and Colden Avenue by activating uses to the streetscape and promoting pedestrian activity.

While the With-Action Scenario would bring a density (up to 9 stories and 95 feet) to the study area that does not currently exist, the Proposed Action would not negatively affect urban design in the area. There are no architecturally significant buildings in the area and the building would not significantly affect any views of the area. While the proposed building would change views of the site as witnessed by pedestrians on Williamsbridge Road, Colden Avenue, Allerton Avenue, and other roadways, significant adverse impacts to urban design and visual resources would not occur. The Proposed Actions would not result in any conditions that would merit further detailed assessment of urban design and visual resources. While no other 9-story buildings are located within the study area, several other four to six story 40 to 50 foot mid-rise buildings are found in the surrounding study area. The Proposed Actions would also not block any view corridors or views to/from any natural areas with rare or defining features, as the proposed building is contained to the subject site. Therefore, the Proposed Actions are not expected to result in any significant adverse urban design or visual resource related impacts. The below figures highlight the With-Action Scenario.



No Action Conditions– View of Projected Site 1 from Williamsbridge Road, facing northwest towards Boston Road

AECOM

Environmental Assessment Statement
2712 Williamsbridge Road Rezoning
Bronx, NY

Urban Design No-Action –View 1



With-Action Conditions – View of Projected Site 1 from Williamsbridge Road, facing northwest towards Boston Road

AECOM

Environmental Assessment Statement
2712 Williamsbridge Road Rezoning
Bronx, NY

Urban Design With Action –View 1



No Action Conditions – View of Projected Site 1 from the corner of Williamsbridge Road and Radcliff Avenue, facing southwest

AECOM

Environmental Assessment Statement
2712 Williamsbridge Road Rezoning
Bronx, NY

Urban Design No-Action – View 2



With-Action Conditions – View of Projected Site 1 from the corner of Williamsbridge Road and Radcliff Avenue, facing southwest

AECOM

Environmental Assessment Statement
2712 Williamsbridge Road Rezoning
Bronx, NY

Urban Design With-Action – View 2

Hazardous Materials

The J Pilla Group LTD (JPG) contracted with AECOM Technical Services, Inc. (AECOM) to perform a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) of the property located at 2712 Williamsbridge Road and 2721 Colden Avenue, Bronx, Kings County, New York (subject property). This assessment was conducted as part of the potential commercial and residential redevelopment of the subject property. This Phase I ESA was performed in general conformance with the scope and limitations of the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Standard Practice Designation E 1527-13 for ESAs. Exceptions to, or deletions from, this practice are described in this report.

The approximately 8,660 square-foot (0.2-acre) subject property is developed with a one-story residential apartment and office building, a wood-framed storage shed, and a parking lot located at 2712 Williamsbridge Road, and a four-bay automotive / storage garage located at 2721 Colden Avenue, Bronx, New York. According to the City of New York Department of Finance, the subject property is designated as Block 4516, Lots 8 and 46. During the site visit, no visual evidence of underground storage tanks (e.g., vent pipes, fill ports), potable water wells, monitoring wells, dry wells, clarifiers, septic tanks, stormwater drains or leach fields was observed on the subject property. A pit to collect groundwater is located in the basement next to several natural gas-fired furnaces. A pit containing what appeared to be former utility conduits was located to the north of the residential/office building. No visual evidence of discolored soil, water, or unusual vegetative conditions or odors was observed during the site visit. However, empty and partially full 55-gallon kerosene drums were observed on the subject property. Two drums containing kerosene were stored in a locked cage while seven empty drums were randomly stored on the ground surface behind the four-bay garage. The kerosene is used by JPG for fueling portable forced air heaters on construction sites. No staining or distressed vegetation were observed in the vicinity of the drums; however, none of the drums were located within secondary containment.

The subject property is bordered to the north by an car wash a check cashing operation, and residential dwellings, beyond which are an auto repair shop and plumbing supply store; to the east by Colden Avenue, beyond which are residential dwellings; to the south by retail shops and a residential apartment building; and to the west by Williamsbridge Road, beyond which is a professional building with a parking lot. Based on AECOM's site reconnaissance of the surrounding neighborhood and review of the status of the adjacent car wash (i.e. case closure for former underground storage tanks), no off-site sources of concern were identified.

Historical research indicates the subject property was vacant in the late 19th century through at least 1908. According to historical Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps (Sanborn Maps), a one-story dwelling similar in size, shape and location to the present-day building was present at the subject property by 1919. The 1924 historical aerial photograph also shows this building. However, the New York City Department of Finance (DOF) indicates that the building was constructed in 1925. An automobile shed/private garage was identified northwest of the residential/office building in 1929, but is not present by 1950. The automobile garage/storage building along Colden Avenue was identified by the DOF as being constructed in 1948 and was visible on the 1950 Sanborn Map. The subject property has remained relatively unchanged since 1950.

The Applicant has agreed to preclude any potential impacts related to hazardous materials via an E designation (E-498) that would be placed on the project site once the Proposed Actions have been approved. The NYC Office of Environmental Remediation will oversee all future testing and any required remediation for the site.

As discussed above, Projected Development Site 2 (Block 4615, Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45) is no longer included within the proposed Rezoning Area and therefore would not be considered a Projected Site and is not included in the revised analysis. Projected Development Site 2 has an (E) designation placed on the site for requirements related to Hazardous Materials. As the Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45 have been removed from the Rezoning Area, the proposed (E) designation would no longer apply to these lots. The revised (E) designation text would be as follows with regards to Hazardous Materials:

Projected Development Site 1 (Block 4516, Lot 8 and 46)

Task 1-Sampling Protocol

The applicant submits to OER, for review and approval, a Phase I of the site along with a soil, groundwater and soil vapor testing protocol, including a description of methods and a site map with all sampling locations clearly and precisely represented. If site sampling is necessary, no sampling should begin until written approval of a protocol is received from OER. The number and location of samples should be selected to adequately characterize the site, specific sources of suspected contamination (i.e., petroleum based contamination and non-petroleum based contamination), and the remainder of the site's condition. The characterization should be complete enough to determine what remediation strategy (if any) is necessary after review of sampling data. Guidelines and criteria for selecting sampling locations and collecting samples are provided by OER upon request.

Task 2-Remediation Determination and Protocol

A written report with findings and a summary of the data must he submitted to OER after completion of the testing phase and laboratory analysis for review and approval. After receiving such results, a determination is made by OER if the results indicate that remediation is necessary. If OER determines that no remediation is necessary, written notice shall be given by OER. If remediation is indicated from test results, a proposed remediation plan must be submitted to OER for review and approval. The applicant must complete such remediation as determined necessary by OER. The applicant should then provide proper documentation that the work has been satisfactorily completed. A construction-related health and safety plan should be submitted to OER and would be implemented during excavation and construction activities to protect workers and the community from potentially significant adverse impacts associated with contaminated soil, groundwater and/or soil vapor. This plan would be submitted to OER prior to implementation.

With this (E) designation in place, no significant adverse impacts related to hazardous materials are expected, and no further analysis is warranted.

Transportation

As discussed above, Projected Development Site 2 (Block 4615, Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45) is no longer included within the proposed Rezoning Area and therefore would not be considered a Projected Site and is not included in the revised analysis.

The August 2018 EAS found that all transportation elements with the exception of pedestrian trips, screened out after a level one screening, while pedestrian trips screened out at a level two screening. The August 2018 EAS utilized this RWCDS and Incremental Development Density.

Block	No-Action				With-Action				Increments			
	DUs	Local Retail	Medical Office	Community Facility	DUs	Local Retail	Medical Office	Community Facility	DUs	Local Retail	Medical Office	Community Facility
Site 1	2	1,374	0	0	40	9,599		0		8,225	0	0
Site 2	5	0	0	0	26	6,253	0	0		6,253	0	0
TOTALS =	**7**	**1,374**	**0**	**0**	**66**	**15,852**	**0**	**0**	**59**	**14,478**	**0**	**0**

Our Level II screening analysis for pedestrians under this scenario resulted in the following conclusion:

The incremental pedestrian volumes generated on pedestrian elements beyond all intersections during the weekday midday are below the 200-trip threshold. Based on the Level 2 screening, Pedestrians screened out during the Midday peak hour (the highest hour); and therefore in accordance with the CEQR Technical Manual, no detailed pedestrian analyses are required.

Under the Proposed Rezoning, the RWCDS and Incremental Development Density looks like this.

Block	No-Action				With-Action				Increments			
	DUs	Local Retail	Medical Office	Community Facility	DUs	Local Retail	Medical Office	Community Facility	DUs	Local Retail	Medical Office	Community Facility
Site 1	2	1,374	0	0	40	9,599		0		8,225	0	0
TOTALS =	**2**	**1,374**	**0**	**0**	**40**	**9,599**	**0**	**0**	**40**	**8,225**	**0**	**0**

The new increment that would was used in the transportation analysis for the January 2019 EAS is much smaller than the August 2018 EAS. Since the August 2018 EAS screened out of traffic and found that no detailed analysis was needed for any element of traffic studies, it can be assumed that the January 2019 EAS, with a smaller RWCDS, and a smaller increment in development density would also screen out, and as such, no additional traffic analysis is required and no significant adverse impacts with regards to traffic are expected under the Proposed Actions.

Air Quality

As discussed above, Projected Development Site 2 (Block 4615, Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45) is no longer included in the proposed Rezoning Area and therefore would not be considered a Projected Site and are not included in the revised analysis. Projected Development Site 2 has an (E) designation placed on the site for requirements related to Air Quality. As the Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45 have been removed from the Rezoning Area, the proposed (E) designation would no longer apply to these lots. The revised (E) designation text would remain unchanged, however, it would only apply to Projected Development Site 1.

To ensure that there are no significant adverse impacts related to emissions from the HVAC systems associated with the With-Action development onto existing or other projected buildings of similar or greater height, certain restrictions would be required regarding fuel type and/or exhaust stack location for some of the development sites. The text of the (E) designation (E-498) would be as follows with regards to Air Quality:

- **Projected Development Site 1 (Block 4516, Lot 8 and 46**) - Any new residential/commercial development on the above-referenced property must ensure HVAC stack(s) is located at the highest tier and at least 98 feet above grade, to avoid any significant adverse air quality impacts.

Noise

A noise measurement was conducted in front of Projected Sites 1 and 2 for the August 2018 EAS. Since Projected Development Site 2 has been removed from the Rezoning Area under the proposed CPC modification, the noise measurement associated with Projected Development Site 2 no longer is required for the analysis. Below, the noise measurement and subsequent analysis demonstrate that no significant impacts with regards to noise are expected as the result of the Proposed Actions.

Noise measurement was conducted at two locations during peak vehicular travel periods, 8:00-9:00 am, 12:00-1:00 pm, and 5:00-6:30 pm. The weather condition is normal with calm wind and is considered suitable for an ambient noise measurement. A Type 1 Larson Davis LxT sound level meter with wind shield was used to conduct the noise monitoring. The meter was placed on a tripod at a height of approximately five feet above the ground, away from any reflective surfaces. The meter was calibrated prior to and following each monitoring session.

Noise measurements were conducted in front of Projected Development Site 1 on the sidewalk at:

- Location 1: middle block of Williamsbridge Road between Boston Road and Allerton Avenue (Figure 2.7-2);

Traffic volumes and vehicle classification along the adjacent roads at each location were counted concurrently during the noise measurement duration.

Based on field observation and recorded data during noise measurement, Projected Development Sites 1 is located in a relatively quiet neighborhood with light traffic. A car-wash is next to Projected Development Site 1 on Williamsbridge Road. Noise from a high-pressure water gun can be clearly heard from the measurement location 1.

In terms of *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines, existing noise levels measured at both locations are in the "marginally acceptable" category. Therefore, no window-wall attenuation is required for Projected Development Sites 1and no significant adverse impacts with regards to noise are expected.

Neighborhood Character

As this EAS has established, of the relevant technical areas specified in the *CEQR Technical Manual* that comprise neighborhood character, the Proposed Actions would not cause significant adverse impacts with regard to any of them. Moderate adverse effects that would potentially impact such a defining feature, either singly or in combination, have also not been identified for more than one technical area. Therefore, as the proposed actions would not have a significant adverse neighborhood character impact and would not result in a significant adverse impact to a defining feature of the neighborhood, further analysis is not necessary.

Construction

The August 2018 EAS submission found that construction-related activities are not expected to have any significant adverse impacts on traffic, air quality, noise, historic resources, or hazardous materials conditions as a result of the Proposed Actions. The January 2019 EAS looks at an RWCDS with a smaller increment than the August 2018 RWCDS. Under the potential CPC modification to the Proposed Actions, Lots 43, 44, 144, and 45 on Block 4516, which comprised of Projected Development Site 2, are no longer included in the Proposed Rezoning Area. Given the smaller development scenario, and smaller rezoning area, no significant adverse impacts with regards to construction are expected as a result of the Proposed Actions and no further analysis is required.

5- Conclusion

Based on the above analysis, it can be concluded that the modifications to the Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse impacts. This Technical Memorandum serves to supplement the Negative Declaration issued on August 31st, 2018 and the revised Negative Declaration issued January 25th, 2019. As indicated above, the conclusions of the August 2018 EAS and the Revised EAS and Revised Negative Declaration remain unchanged.



Project Location Map


ARNOW AVENUE
BOSTON ROAD
BRONXWOOD AVENUE
RADCLIFF AVENUE
WILLIAMSBRIDGE ROAD
COLDEN AVENUE
PAULDING AVENUE
HONE AVENUE
ALLERTON AVENUE
Legend
0 50 100 200 300 400
Feet
Projected Development Site 1
Rezoning Area
400-Foot Study Area
One- & Two-Family Residences
Multi-Family Walkup Residence
Multi-Family Elevator Residence
Mixed Residential & Commercial
Commercial Uses
Industrial / Manufacturing
Transportation / Utility
Public Facilities & Institutions
Open Space & Recreation
Parking
Vacant Land

Land Use Map



Tax Map and Rezoning Area

Projected Development Site 1

Projected Development Site 2

Rezoning Area



Original Rezoning Area-August 2018 EAS

Projected Development Site 1

Rezoning Area



CPC Potential Modification January 2019 EAS

Zoning Change Map

About AECOM
AECOM (NYSE: ACM) is a global provider of professional technical and management support services to a broad range of markets, including transportation, facilities, environmental and energy. With approximately 95,000 employees around the world, AECOM is a leader in all of the key markets that it serves. AECOM provides a blend of global reach, local knowledge, innovation, and technical excellence in delivering solutions that enhance and sustain the world's built, natural, and social environments.

AECOM
125 Broad Street
New York, NY 10004
T 212.377.8400
F 212.377.8410
www.aecom.com