Executive Summary

A. Introduction

Metro-North regional rail service is being planned for the East Bronx. By 2027 (estimated), Metro-North will bring four new stations to the borough at Hunts Point, Parkchester/Van Nest, Morris Park, and Co-Op City. The new stations are part of the Metropolitan Transportation Authority's (MTA) Penn Station Access (PSA) project, which will connect the East Bronx directly to Manhattan's Penn Station and points north in Westchester County and Connecticut. While the MTA will construct the stations and deliver train service, the MTA has looked to the New York City Department of City Planning (DCP) to convene City agencies and community members to plan for improvements around each of the four stations and to ensure the stations bring maximum benefits to the Bronx. That study, known as the Bronx Metro-North Station Area Study, officially launched in July 2018. The study has evaluated the investments necessary to facilitate safe access to the stations, schools, parks, and more. Implementing the station-area plan will support investment in much-needed amenities and services in the Bronx and support New York City's recovery from the impacts of COVID-19. Additionally, the Parkchester/Van Nest and Morris Park station areas offer unique opportunities to grow housing and jobs through land use changes that the community initially prioritized in 2014 as part of the Sustainable Communities in the Bronx study and that have subsequently been refined over the last five and a half years of community and stakeholder engagement as part of the Bronx Metro-North Station Study planning work.

The New York City Department of City Planning is proposing a series of land use actions, including zoning map amendments, zoning text amendments (including mapping a special purpose district and designating a Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH) area to ensure affordable housing is part of any future development), and changes to the City Map (collectively, the "Proposed Actions"), that would facilitate the implementation of the multi-year planning process conducted in the Parkchester, Van Nest, and Morris Park neighborhoods in the Bronx in partnership with local stakeholders, city agencies, and the MTA.

The Proposed Actions would affect an approximately 46-block area primarily along major corridors — East Tremont Avenue, White Plains Road, Bronxdale Avenue, Eastchester Road, and Stillwell Avenue — near the future Parkchester/Van Nest and Morris Park Metro-North stations in Bronx Community Districts 9, 10 and 11 (the "Affected Area") (see Figure ES-1, "Aerial View," and Figure ES-2, "Affected Area"). The approximately 28-block area closest to the future Parkchester/Van Nest station is generally bounded by Baker Avenue and Van Nest Avenue to the north, Silver Street to the east, East Tremont Avenue to the south, and St. Lawrence Avenue to the west. The approximately 18-block area closest to the future Morris Park station is generally bounded by Pelham Parkway to the north, Marconi Street to the east, Williamsbridge Road to the south, and Tenbroeck Avenue to the west.

The Proposed Actions are intended to leverage new planned Metro-North service to promote economic growth, facilitate the development of housing, including affordable housing, as well as guide investment in the public realm around stations to improve pedestrian safety and comfort. The Proposed Actions seek to accomplish the following land-use objectives:

- Allow for housing growth with permanently affordable housing and retail in appropriate locations near new Metro-North stations.
- Allow for neighborhood and commuter-serving retail opportunities, where appropriate.
- Increase the number of job-generating uses in commercial districts at the Morris Park station area by allowing for commercial office, medical office, healthcare, and life sciences growth, where appropriate.
- Focus development to promote active streetscapes along key corridors and near planned stations, including along the length of East Tremont Avenue, White Plains Road, Bronxdale Avenue, Eastchester Road, and Stillwell Avenue.
- Promote development continuity between the Parkchester/Van Nest and Morris Park station areas.
- Promote higher density mixed-use development with affordable and mixed-income housing, retail, and community facilities on larger opportunity sites.
- Encourage a mix of uses on underutilized manufacturing-zoned sites to best respond to the need for jobs, new (affordable) housing, and general retail growth to activate commercial corridors.
- Create opportunities for the creation of a new public plaza at the future Morris Park station and facilitate improved connectivity to the planned Parkchester/Van Nest station.
- Establish special zoning rules to accommodate unique development conditions and guide development on large opportunity sites.
- Establish special zoning rules to promote and incentivize the provision of public realm improvements, focused on creating a network of open space amenities and pedestrian circulation improvements, in proximity to the future Morris Park and Parkchester/Van Nest stations.

An overview of the Affected Area, the purpose and need for the Proposed Actions, and their specific components are discussed below. Appendix B, “Project Description,” includes a full list of the blocks and lots that would be affected by the Proposed Actions.



Source: New York City Department of City Planning, 2023; Metropolitan Transit Authority (MTA), 2018 & 2019; Esri, Digital Globe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community; STV Incorporated, 2023.

N

0 0.25 0.5 Mile

Affected Area

Figure ES-1

Bronx Metro-North Station Study

AERIAL VIEW



Source: New York City Department of City Planning, 2023;
Metropolitan Transit Authority (MTA), 2018 & 2019; STV Incorporated, 2023.

N

0 0.25 0.5 Mile

Affected Area

Figure ES-2

Bronx Metro-North Station Study

AFFECTED AREA

B. Required Approvals and Review Procedures

The Proposed Actions, described in more detail in Section G, "Description of Proposed Actions," include discretionary actions that are subject to review under the Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP), Section 200 of the City Charter, and City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) process,[1] as follows:

- Zoning Map Amendments to:
    - Rezone portions of existing M1-1, C8-1, C8-4, R4, R5, R6, and R6A districts and C1-1, C1-2, and C2-2 commercial overlays to R4, R6A, R6-1, R7-2, M1-1A/R7-3, R8X, C8-2, C4-3, and C4-4 districts and a C2-4 commercial overlay.

    - Modify the boundaries of the existing Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District to facilitate development and active uses that better connect the wider community to the existing special district.

    - Map the Special Eastchester – East Tremont Corridor District, largely coterminous with the Affected Area.

- Zoning Text Amendments to:
    - Establish the Special Eastchester – East Tremont Corridor District, largely coterminous with the Affected Area. The proposed special purpose district would include modifications to underlying use, bulk, parking and loading, and streetscape regulations, and establish special provisions for the M1-1A/R7-3 paired district. The special purpose district would also provide flexibility for large opportunity sites to facilitate public realm improvements around the future Metro-North stations.

    - Remove language that exclusively applies to C8-4 districts mapped within Special Planned Community Preservation District areas.

    - Establish the proposed R6-1 non-contextual medium-density zoning district.

    - Establish a new M1-1A district, which would facilitate loft building envelopes similar to contextual buildings in residence districts.

    - Modify Appendix F for the purpose of designating proposed R6A, R6-1, R7-2, R7-3, R8X, C4-3, and C4-4 districts as MIH areas, applying the MIH program to require a share of new housing to be permanently affordable where significant new housing capacity would be created.

[1] While not part of the Proposed Actions as listed here, there are potentially other discretionary actions of partnering agencies both at the City and State level, such as a revocable consent to facilitate the construction of pedestrian bridge, that would further facilitate or align with the Proposed Actions as described here.

- Modify Appendix I to extend Transit Zone 2, Borough of the Bronx, Community District 11.

- City Map Amendments to:
  - Map Block 4209, Lots 10 and 70 as street to facilitate pedestrian access to the Morris Park station.

  - Map portions of Block 4042, Lot 200 as street to facilitate the creation of a street network and improved circulation for future development of this site and access to the anticipated new Metro-North station entrance.

  - Map Block 4226, Lots 1 (portions of) and 11 as street to facilitate the proposed widening of Marconi Street to reduce traffic congestion and enhance pedestrian and vehicular safety and circulation, and map Block 4226, Lot 50 (portions of) as street to facilitate the proposed widening of Marconi Street to add a new right-turn lane to the future Bronx Psychiatric Center (BPC) Campus.

  - Map portions of Block 4226, Lots 1, 5, and 75 and Block 4411, Lot 75 as street to accommodate the proposed extension of Marconi Street to connect with Pelham Parkway.

  - De-map a portion of Unionport Road to facilitate the development of adjacent Block 3952.

CITY ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW (CEQR)

The Proposed Actions are classified as Type I, as defined under 6 NYCRR (New York Codes, Rules and Regulations) 617.4 and 43 RCNY (Rules of the City of New York) 6-15, subject to environmental review in accordance with CEQR guidelines. An Environmental Assessment Statement (EAS) was completed on December 8, 2022. A Positive Declaration, issued on December 8, 2022, established that the Proposed Actions may have a significant adverse impact on the environment, thus warranting the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

The CEQR scoping process is intended to focus the EIS on those issues that are most pertinent to the Proposed Actions. The process allows other agencies and the public a voice in framing the scope of the EIS. The scoping document sets forth the analyses and methodologies that will be utilized to prepare the EIS. During the period for scoping, those interested in reviewing the Draft Scope may do so and give their comments to the lead agency. Therefore, in accordance with City and State environmental review regulations and methodologies, the Draft Scope of Work (DSOW) to prepare the EIS was issued on December 8, 2022. The public scoping meeting was held on January 9, 2023, at 2:00 PM remotely. The public, interested agencies, and elected officials, were invited to comment on the Draft Scope through

January 19, 2023, 5:00 pm. Modifications to the DSOW were made as a result of the comments received during the scoping process and a Final Scope of Work was issued on January 19, 2024.

Publication of the DEIS and the issuance of the Notice of Completion starts the public review period. A public hearing will be held on the DEIS in conjunction with the New York City Planning Commission (CPC) hearing on the land use applications to afford all interested parties the opportunity to submit oral and written comments. The record will remain open for ten days after the public hearing to allow additional written comments on the DEIS. After the close of the public review period, a Final EIS (FEIS) will be prepared. The FEIS will respond to all substantive comments made on the DEIS, along with any revisions to the technical analyses necessary to respond to those comments. Once the Lead Agency determines the FEIS is complete, it issues a Notice of Completion and circulates the FEIS. The FEIS will then be used by the decision makers to evaluate CEQR findings, which address project impacts and proposed mitigation measures, in deciding whether to approve the requested discretionary actions, with or without modifications.

C. Background to the Proposed Actions

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND INTERAGENCY PARTICIPATION

The Bronx Metro-North Station Study publicly launched in July 2018 and first convened a Working Group to begin planning around the four planned Metro-North stations. The group was convened by then Bronx Borough President, Rubén Díaz Jr., the NYC Department of City Planning (DCP), the NYC Economic Development Corporation (EDC), and the NYC Department of Transportation (NYCDOT). Working Group members included a mix of local and state elected officials, Community Boards, community institutions and organizations that represent a large variety of community interests in the areas around each station and who understood the importance of adding new Metro-North service to the East Bronx and the need to plan for its arrival.

Starting in Fall 2018, the study team worked station-by-station to hold public workshops and small group conversations for participants to share their local expertise, hear from their neighbors, and contribute their ideas to improve the station areas. Following the workshops, the study team sponsored station-specific open houses to reflect what had been heard and solicit further feedback. Recommendations were developed based on input, ideas, and priorities gathered through a series of in-person and remote workshops, open houses, surveys, and small-group discussions from 2018 through 2022. In 2021, the study team sponsored a remote open house with online small-group sessions to share draft recommendations for each station area and continue engagement during COVID.

Over the course of the study team's conversations with the community, some major themes have become clear, including the need to improve access to jobs and facilitate the creation of new jobs; balanced growth that supports existing residents with new housing, shopping, and services; and ensuring the stations are connected to their communities. To highlight these themes the recommendations are organized under three categories:

- *Working Communities,* with a focus on growing jobs centers in the Bronx and helping to connect Bronxites to jobs in the borough, the City, and the region.
- *Vibrant Communities,* with a focus on facilitating affordable and mixed-rate housing around the station areas, addressing needed improvements to parks and open space, and ensuring that City services are prepared to address both longstanding and future growth needs, among other items.
- *Connected Communities*, with a focus on improving connections to and from the future stations, including via roadway, transit, and pedestrian and bike network improvements, among other items.

The planning process provided an opportunity for further feedback to shape the final Bronx Metro-North plan, which will memorialize the multi-year community process and serve as a roadmap for bringing the study goals and objectives to life.

D.The Bronx Metro-North Station Area History

The Bronx Metro-North Station Study includes the neighborhoods of Parkchester, Van Nest, and Morris Park located in the East Bronx.

PARKCHESTER AND NEARBY NEIGHBORHOODS

The collection of neighborhoods colloquially referred to simply as "Parkchester" take their name from the Parkchester planned community. Developed between 1938 and 1941 by the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company (commonly known as MetLife) – the same developer that would go on to develop Stuyvesant Town in Manhattan – the Parkchester development is today home to some 30,000 residents spread across a total of 168 buildings interspersed with ample open space and winding, tree-lined boulevards. The name Parkchester itself was originally a portmanteau of the two adjacent communities to the east and west of the development, known as Westchester Square and Park Versailles, respectively. By 1943, all 12,271 of the development's new apartments were occupied, forever transforming an area that had been home to a large Catholic protectorate. Shortly after construction, the development was sold to real-estate developer Harry Helmsley, after which ensued a period of decline and poor maintenance. In the mid-1970s, the Helmsleys began converting portions of Parkchester from rental to condominiums. Ultimately about half of Parkchester's units would be converted to condominiums. Following the creation of the Parkchester Preservation Company in the late 1990s, an effort led by the Community Preservation Corporation, shares for some 6,300 apartments and 80 stores were removed from the Helmsleys' control. This was followed by hundreds of millions of dollars in repairs to the community.

Westchester Square itself was originally founded by English settlers in 1654 on land originally occupied by Wampage and other Native Americans. The settlement took its name from Westchester Creek. Until 1895, the village was the town seat of the Town of Westchester, after which point it was incorporated into New York City. Like much of the Bronx, this annexation preceded the City's larger, much more feted consolidation in 1898. In 1920, the new Interborough Rapid Transit Company connected Westchester Square to the larger City, with a stop on its new elevated line opening at Westchester Square-East Tremont Avenue.

Park Versailles, for its part, was originally known as the Mapes Farm. To render the property more attractive as part of an auction for future development, one of Mapes' sons christened the property "Park Versailles." By 1920, all of the lots making up the former farm had been sold.

MORRIS PARK

Named after John Albert Morris, whose eponymous 360-acre racecourse existed over much of the extent of the current neighborhood from 1889 to 1910, development in Morris Park greatly accelerated following a fire at the former track and the division of its property into for-sale lots. In the 1940s, the neighborhood was marketed by prospective developers as "Westchester Heights." Elements of the City's civic history

are still evident today in the names of several streets that crisscross the old racecourse, such as Colden and Paulding Avenues, which harken back to mayors from the 19th century.

The neighborhood includes a diverse array of communities, including a long-established Italian American community – reflected in the various Italian flag motifs that line Morris Park Avenue – as well as more recent Hispanic, Albanian, and Yemeni communities, among many others. In 2019, the growing Yemeni community held its first Yemeni Day Parade in the neighborhood, thus establishing a new tradition and another chapter in Morris Park's tradition of welcoming various immigrant communities to the City of New York.

At the far eastern end of the Morris Park neighborhood lies the Hutchinson Metro Center and a number of important medical and educational employment centers, including Montefiore Hospital, the Albert Einstein College of Medicine, and Jacobi Hospital. Formerly home to industrial uses associated with the adjacent rail line, the Hutchinson Metro Center has over time developed as a series of isolated campuses with a variety of uses. The name "Hutchinson Metro Center" is commonly used by many in the community to refer to the area demarcated by the existing Amtrak rail line to the west, Pelham Parkway to the north, the Hutchinson River Parkway to the east, and Waters Place to the south, but itself comes from the name of a private development contained within those boundaries. In 1970, as part of a plan for the development of the Bronx Developmental Center, acclaimed architect Richard Meier designed an award-winning campus, "total-care residential facility" to accommodate 750 children with disabilities. New York Times architecture critic Ada Louis Huxtable once referred to the project as "the cynosure of the architectural world," a testament to the attention paid to the original design. In 2001, a private developer purchased the property from the State of New York. This was followed by significant modifications to the existing buildings, and significant new construction.

In the mid-2010s, Marconi Street was formally mapped within the Hutchinson Metro Center to ensure a public right-of-way up to the northern portion of the center, where a 911 emergency call center – known as the Public Safety Answering Center II(PSAC II) – was completed in 2016. The majority of development within the center, including the private medical office development known as the Hutchinson Metro Center, was developed using state overrides and as such the built form here largely exists irrespective of the existing zoning districts. An exception to this is the development known as the Metro Center Atrium, which is today home to a mixed-use development including hotel space, class-A office space, and various retail and gym uses. While the development was also built using state overrides, in 2017 a private application adjusted the zoning on the site to reflect the current built form and to facilitate the addition of non-profit hospital staff dwelling units designated for staff at Montefiore Hospital.

On the other side of the tracks, the Albert Einstein College of Medicine – formerly owned by Yeshiva University but under Montefiore Hospital since 2015 – was the first medical school built in New York City since 1897, one year before consolidation, when it opened in 1955. It was also the first private medical school in the City to establish an academic department of family medicine and the first to create an internal medicine program with an emphasis on women's health. To the north Jacobi Hospital, part of the City's Health & Hospital system, can be found. In 1964 the City of New York purchased approximately 64 acres formerly belonging to the Morris Park racecourse in order to establish a hospital and teaching

campus away from the City's denser urban core. On the southern end of the campus is the Van Etten building. Opened in 1955, the Van Etten building was originally intended to be used for the treatment of tuberculosis, but never saw use as such. Today the building is physically located on the Jacobi Health and Hospitals campus but is leased to Montefiore Hospital.

VAN NEST

The Van Nest neighborhood is located on the north side of East Tremont Avenue and the Amtrak Hell Gate rail line. About one square mile in size, the neighborhood is bounded by Bronxdale Avenue to the northeast, the Amtrak train line to the southeast, and the eastern edge of Bronx Park to the west. The Van Nest neighborhood's history has close links to the nearby railroad that forms the southern boundary of the neighborhood. The neighborhood is named after the former Van Nest train station, that was established before the presence of settlements in the area. The train station was named in honor of Reynier Van Nest, a successful saddle maker and the father of Abraham Reynier Van Nest, the director of the New York, New Haven, and Hartford Railroad, commonly known as the Consolidated. The Van Nest family came from the Netherlands in 1647 to settle in the young Dutch colony.

Before 1870, this area of the Bronx was farmland, comprising the Neill farm, Round Meadow, and the Hunt Estate. In 1888, the Morris Park Racetrack was built as the premier racetrack of the region. The Van Nest Railroad Station served as the main depot for visitors to the racetrack. In 1892, the Van Nest Land and Improvement Company surveyed and divided the farmland surrounding the racetrack into 1,700 lots for development and gave the real estate project the name "Van Nest Park." In part because the Van Nest name was so well known and in part because the area was accessible by rail, the area was settled rapidly, and the growing community adopted the Van Nest name.

The Van Nest neighborhood spread out over the rippling terrain of an old glacial moraine. Its many low-lying spots were great for collecting rainwater, prompting bespattered travelers to dub the place "Mud West." After Van Nest became part of New York City in 1895, the City built embankments across the low spots to bring all the local streets up to an even grade. This left many houses below street level, and so Mud West now became known as "the Sunken City." To this day you can still see many old houses with retrofitted front entrances cut into what originally were their second floors. The neighborhood, developed as a family community, is dominated by single-family homes of various architectural styles. Much of its architecture is in the Queen Anne, Italianate, and Art Deco styles and includes brick construction from the 1950s, and a few tenements scattered across the Van Nest neighborhood.

An important neighborhood landmark is Van Nest Park, which began as a triangle with a monument honoring World War I soldiers who hailed from the Van Nest neighborhood and who gave their lives in service of their country. The granite monument, which still stands in the center of the original park, was erected by the Van Nest Citizens' Patriotic League. The City of New York had acquired this parcel of land, bounded by White Plains Road, Unionport Road, and Mead Street in August 1913, and the land was placed under Parks' jurisdiction in 1922. In addition to the monument in honor of fallen soldiers, the park also contains playground equipment, installed after a parcel of land was added in 1938 to expand the park for

the Van Nest community. Tributes to fallen soldiers of World War II, and the Korean and Vietnam wars, were added to the facade of the monument.

AFFECTED AREA

The Affected Area is an approximately 46-block area primarily along the main corridors—East Tremont Avenue, White Plains Road, Bronxdale Avenue, Eastchester Road, and Stillwell Avenue—near the future Parkchester/Van Nest and Morris Park Metro-North stations in Bronx Community Districts 9, 10, and 11 that would be affected by the Proposed Actions. The approximately 28-block area closest to the future Parkchester/Van Nest station is generally bounded by Baker Avenue and Van Nest Avenue to the north, Silver Street to the east, East Tremont Avenue to the south, and St. Lawrence Avenue to the west. The approximately 18-block area closest to the future Morris Park station is generally bounded by Pelham Parkway to the north, Marconi Street to the east, Williamsbridge Road to the south, and Tenbroeck Avenue to the west.

East Tremont Avenue

East Tremont Avenue is a key corridor in the Bronx – one of the few that traverses the borough from east to west – and will be the primary point of access to the Parkchester/Van Nest station. The stretch of East Tremont Avenue located between St. Lawrence Street and Silver Street consists of a mix of industrial, retail, community facility, and residential uses, with industrial and retail uses predominantly to the west and a mix of retail and residential uses predominantly to the east. The area located closest to the future station, between Unionport Road and Bronxdale Avenue, consists principally of automotive and retail uses to the north, and residential and commercial uses to the south, most notably the large Parkchester community.

White Plains Road

White Plains Road runs roughly north-south between Mount Vernon, a city in Westchester County, and the Bronx neighborhood of Soundview. This approximately seven-mile-long corridor intersects East Tremont Avenue immediately west of the future Parkchester/Van Nest station. The stretch of White Plains Road between Baker Avenue and Guerlain Street is developed with a mix of public service facilities, residential uses, automotive uses, and retail. The area located south of the railroad right-of-way consists primarily of a large vacant site and residential uses with automotive uses and retail located at the intersection with East Tremont Avenue. The area north of the railroad is dominated by a public utility facility, the ConEdison Van Nest Service Center, and residential uses.

Bronxdale Avenue

Bronxdale Avenue is a corridor in the East Bronx that runs roughly northwest-southeast between Bronx Park and East Tremont Avenue. The stretch that runs between Van Nest Avenue and East Tremont Avenue is characterized by predominantly automotive and industrial uses mixed with community facility and

commercial uses. The western frontage of this section of Bronxdale Avenue is dominated by two large sites, the abovementioned ConEdison Van Nest Service Center, and a sizeable industrial building. The eastern frontage has several community facilities to the north and becomes gradually dominated by automotive uses as one moves toward East Tremont Avenue.

Eastchester Road

Together with East Tremont Avenue, Eastchester Road forms the spine of the Affected Area, connecting both station areas at Parkchester/Van Nest and Morris Park. Eastchester Road runs approximately north-south between Pelham Parkway South and Silver Street. The western frontage of Eastchester Road is dominated by Montefiore and NYC Health and Hospitals health care campuses. The eastern frontage is developed with of a mix of predominantly commercial, automotive, and light industrial uses.

Stillwell Avenue

Stillwell Avenue runs for a length of about a mile between Eastchester Road and Hutchinson River Parkway. The stretch of Stillwell Avenue located between Eastchester Road and Pelham Parkway South is dominated by automotive, commercial, and light industrial uses. The area located closest to Pelham Parkway South and east of Stillwell Avenue is different in character and has a mix of large vehicle storage sites and a residential building fronting on Pelham Parkway South.

PREVIOUS PLANNING EFFORTS AND PAST ACTIONS

Over the last ten years, local Community Boards, various City agencies including DCP and NYCDOT, and Empire State Development Corporation, in collaboration with the community, have developed plans and studies geared toward the improvement and development of the station areas and surrounding residential neighborhoods and employment centers. These studies include *Sustainable Communities in the Bronx: Leveraging Regional Rail for Access, Growth and Opportunity* (2014) and *Penn Station Access* (2021). Further, several past land use actions have been taken by DCP and other agencies within the Study Area and its immediate surroundings.

Public Safety Answering Center II (PSAC II) (2009)

PSAC II was an application (C 090070 PCX) by the New York City Police Department (NYPD), New York City Fire Department (FDNY), Department of Citywide Administrative Services (DCAS), and Department of Information Technology and Telecommunications (DOITT) to construct a second emergency communications 911 center on an approximately 8.75-acre site at 350 Marconi Street, immediately east of the Affected Area. PSAC II was proposed as a parallel operation to the existing PSAC I in Downtown Brooklyn to augment and provide redundancy to the emergency 911 response services in the City. Construction of PSAC II was completed in 2012 and the facility consists of a single office building and accessory parking garage. The facility serves as a streamlined emergency call intake and dispatch center

for all of the City's first responders and also houses command control center operations for the FDNY and the NYPD to coordinate emergency response throughout the entire City.

Sustainable Communities in the Bronx (2014)

In the fall of 2011, DCP's Bronx Office initiated the Sustainable Communities Metro-North Corridor Transit-Oriented Development Study. This study made recommendations to foster sustainable growth in the borough by expanding transit-oriented development opportunities to create housing affordable at a range of incomes, improve job access for residents, and grow the overall economy of the Bronx, strengthening its position within the City and region. Eight study areas surrounding six existing and two planned Metro-North rail stations—Morris Park and Parkchester/Van Nest—were selected for evaluation to determine strategic land use, transportation, and pedestrian realm actions to accomplish these objectives.

To achieve its goals, DCP undertook an extensive community outreach process focused on education, visioning, and implementation. As part of this process, DCP held more than 40 community/stakeholder meetings in a variety of formats. DCP's extensive site-specific analyses combined with input gathered through partners and general outreach provided the groundwork for recommendations around each station area. The study included individual area studies for each station, including Morris Park and Parkchester/Van Nest. It focused on challenges and opportunities to strengthen these areas through targeted regulatory changes and physical improvement, and offers a set of recommendations for each area developed in concert with stakeholders. Concretely, challenges and opportunities to strengthen these station areas were identified and recommendations were made in the study:

- Parkchester/Van Nest: The proposed station will help establish a new center for these neighborhoods, but currently it is characterized by inactive uses, difficult crossings, and general lack of pedestrian amenities.
    - Recommendation: Re-examine zoning along both sides of East Tremont Avenue to encourage the development of a mixed-use retail corridor and pedestrian activity, and to re-orient the community towards the corridor and proposed station area.
    - Recommendation: Implement comprehensive streetscape improvements to both sides of East Tremont Avenue which include activating rail adjacent lots and revisiting the street alignment to allow for wider sidewalks and pedestrian safety.
- Morris Park: As the home to a number of large professional institutions and planned development, Morris Park is a regional center for employment and education. The proposed station currently lacks pedestrian infrastructure and commercial uses to support the institutions' needs. The new station would help bolster the area's status as a regional employment center and be an asset to the community.
    - Recommendation: Re-examine zoning to permit retail and a range of housing options on both sides of the rail line.
    - Identify long-term improvements to pedestrian and vehicular access to improve circulation.

- Explore opportunities to brand the area through increased partnerships between institutions.

The implementation of the above recommendations culminated in the Bronx Metro-North Station Area Plan and the Proposed Actions.

1776 Eastchester Road (2017)

1776 Eastchester Road (C 170445 ZMX) was an application by 1776 Eastchester Realty LLC, Hutch 34 Industrial Street, LLC, and Hutch 35 LLC to rezone a single block—immediately east and north of the Affected Area—located near the Hutchinson Metro Center west of Marconi Street from a M1-1 district to R5, C4-2, and C4-2A districts. The applicants also sought a zoning text amendment and special permit to allow for the construction and subsequent use of non-profit hospital staff dwellings and designate an MIH area. The application facilitated the development of approximately 182 units of non-profit hospital staff housing on top of an existing parking garage.

Blondell Commons (2019)

Blondell Commons (C 170438 ZMX) was an application by Blondell Equities, LLC to rezone four blocks at the southern end of Blondell Avenue in Bronx Community District 11 from the existing R6/C1-2 and M1-1 districts to an R7A district and establish a C2-4 district on a portion of the site. The application facilitated the development of a nine-story mixed-use building with approximately 228 units of affordable housing. The application was approved by the NYC City Council on April 18, 2019.

Bronx Psychiatric Center (BPC) Land Use Improvement Project (2019)

The BPC Land Use Improvement Project is a project led by Empire State Development to redevelop a 34-acre portion of the New York State Office of Mental Health's (BPC) campus in the eastern portion of the Morris Park neighborhood. The campus is located between Marconi Street to the west and the Hutchinson River Parkway to the east. The BPS campus would be redeveloped with approximately 1.1 to 1.9 million gross square feet of commercial office space for business, professional, or medical facilities, as well as biotech and research space, educational facilities, and a hotel. Phase I of the development (1.1 million square feet) is expected to be completed in 2030. No build year has yet been identified for Phase II.

Penn Station Access (2021)

The PSA project will bring direct Metro-North service from the Bronx, Westchester, and Connecticut to Penn Station and Manhattan's west side using Amtrak's existing Hell Gate Line, four new ADA-accessible passenger rail stations in the East Bronx, and significant improvements to rail infrastructure. The four proposed new Metro-North Stations are Hunts Point, Parkchester/Van Nest, Morris Park, and Co-op City.

In the mid-1990s, a precursor to PSA was conceived as an element of then-New York State Governor Pataki's comprehensive, regional transportation initiative. In 1999, Metro-North initiated the PSA Major

Investment Study/DEIS to evaluate options for improving access between Penn Station and the Harlem, Hudson, and New Haven Lines. As part of the study, over 20 potential new station locations were considered and screened. In 2002, MTA recommended an alternative for further consideration; this decision was published in the PSA Comparative Screening Results Report (2002) and included New Haven Line service via Amtrak's Hell Gate Line with three new Metro-North stations in the East Bronx. Between 2002 and 2009, Metro-North continued PSA project planning and environmental review. In 2007, Metro-North held meetings with various project stakeholders.

As part of the continued environmental review effort, Metro-North conducted outreach in 2012 to the local communities that would potentially be affected by the PSA project, with special attention paid to those communities in the East Bronx where new stations were being proposed. Metro-North conducted some of the meetings jointly with DCP, which identified potential opportunities for transit-oriented development near the proposed stations. Based on input received from the local communities, Metro-North proposed a new station at Morris Park in 2012 (bringing the total number of stations to four).

In 2015, Amtrak, MTA, Metro-North, and Long Island Rail Road executed a Planning Phase Agreement that committed them to working cooperatively in order to progress the conceptual planning of the PSA project. The Environmental Assessment for PSA was concluded in 2021. Construction of the PSA project is expected to take approximately five years and the anticipated completion date for the project is 2027.

E. Existing Zoning

The Affected Area includes the southeast portion of Community District 11, a northern portion of Community District 9, and a small, northwestern portion of Community District 10. Much of the area's zoning has not been modified since 1961, however, there have been a few private rezonings in the area since then as outlined in the previous section.

Located immediately south of the future Parkchester/Van Nest Metro-North station, the 129-acre Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District protects the unique character of a community that has been planned and developed as a unit. This community characteristically has large landscaped open spaces and a superior relationship of buildings, open spaces, commercial uses, and pedestrian and vehicular circulation. Parkchester is a master planned community consisting of 168 buildings ranging from eight to 14 stories in height spread out over 129 acres. Parkchester was built as a self-contained apartment community and, as a result, the predominantly residential buildings generally face inward and away from the perimeter of the Parkchester development and, especially East Tremont Avenue as a major thoroughfare. Instead, the buildings are generally oriented around Parkchester's main arterial roads, Unionport Road and Metropolitan Avenue, that radiate outward from Metropolitan Oval. No demolition, new development, enlargement or alteration of landscaping or topography is permitted within the district, except by special permit of the City Planning Commission.

The Affected Area is currently mapped with M1-1, C8-1, C8-4, R4, R5, R6, and R6A zoning districts and C1-1, C1-2, C2-2, and C2-4 commercial overlays (see Figure ES-3, "Existing Zoning"). Additionally, portions of the Affected Area are located within both the New York City Coastal Zone, as well as both the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) 100-year and 500-year flood zones (See Figure ES-4, "Flood Zones and Coastal Zone").



Source: New York City Department of City Planning, 2023; STV Incorporated, 2023.

Figure ES-3

EXISTING ZONING

Bronx Metro-North Station Study



Source: New York City Department of City Planning, 2023;
Metropolitan Transit Authority (MTA), 2018; STV Incorporated, 2023.

N

0 0.25 0.5 Mile

Affected Area
NYC Coastal Zone Boundary
100-Year Flood Zone
500-Year Flood Zone

Figure ES-4

FLOOD ZONES AND COASTAL ZONE

M1-1

M1-1 zoning districts are mapped in two portions of the Affected Area. One is generally bounded by Van Nest Avenue to the north, Bronxdale Avenue to the east, East Tremont Avenue to the south, and White Plains Road to west. The other consists of approximately six full blocks and seven partial blocks with frontages on Eastchester Road and Stillwell Avenue.

M1-1 zoning districts permit commercial and manufacturing uses with a floor area ratio (FAR) of 1.0. In addition to those uses listed in Use Group 17, manufacturing uses listed in Use Group 18 are permitted if they comply with the M1 performance standards. M1-1 districts also permit certain community facility uses (Use Groups 3 and 4) to a maximum FAR of 2.40. New residential uses are not permitted. M1-1 districts have a low-density envelope, and maximum building height is determined by the Sky Exposure Plane, which begins at a height of 30 feet, or two stories, whichever is less, above the street line. One parking space for every 300 square feet of floor area is typically required for retail and office uses.

Existing uses include a mix of warehouses, light manufacturing, community facility uses such as medical office, and automotive and retail uses.

C8-1 AND C8-4

C8-1 zoning districts are mapped in two areas of the Affected Area: both frontages of East Tremont Avenue west of White Plains Road, and the eastern frontage of Bronxdale Avenue between approximately Poplar Street and Van Nest Avenue to the north. A portion of the Parkchester planned community, located approximately mid-block along East Tremont Avenue, is also zoned C8-4.

C8-1 and C8-4 districts allow a range of intensive commercial uses to a maximum FAR of 1.0 and 5.0, respectively. Both districts permit auto-oriented uses, including auto repair shops, gas stations, and car washes as well as wholesale, warehousing, and light industrial uses, in addition to most of the retail and service uses permitted in other commercial zoning districts. No new residential uses are allowed. Height and setback regulations in C8 districts are governed by a Sky Exposure Plane behind which the building must be located. In C8-1 districts, the Sky Exposure Plane begins at a height of 30 feet above the street line, and in C8-4 districts it begins 60 feet above the street line. A limited set of community facility uses is allowed at a maximum FAR of 2.4 for C8-1 districts and 6.5 for C8-4 districts. For typical retail or service uses, one parking space is required for every 300 square feet of floor area in C8-1 districts. No parking is required in C8-4 districts.

Existing uses include a mix of automotive uses such as gas stations and auto repair shops, parking structures, retail uses, and several community facility uses.

R4

Approximately 18 full and partial blocks within the Affected Area are zoned R4: several blocks bounded by Stillwell Avenue and Eastchester Road, several blocks on either side of Morris Park Avenue, as well as the area north of East Tremont Avenue and Silver Street, generally bounded by Jarrett Place and Bronxdale Avenue.

R4 districts are low-density non-contextual residence districts that allow residential uses of all types and community facility uses. Residential uses are allowed a maximum FAR of 0.75, which may be increased to 0.90 pursuant to the attic bonus, and community facility uses are permitted a maximum FAR of 2.0. All types of residences are permitted in R4 Districts, including detached, semi-detached, and multi-family buildings. The maximum residential building height is 35 feet. A minimum ten-foot front yard is required. Side yards up to eight feet are required, depending on the building type. Off-street parking is required for 100 percent of dwelling units (50 percent for income-restricted housing units (IRHU)), but no parking is required inside the Transit Zone.

Existing uses include residential uses, mostly two-family homes and small multifamily apartment homes, and a variety of commercial and community facility uses in either one-story buildings or mixed-use residential buildings along streets where commercial overlays are mapped.

R5

An R5 district is mapped on one partial block within the Affected Area. This block is generally bounded by Baker Avenue to the north, White Plains Road to the east, the railroad right-of-way to the south, and Garfield Street to the south.

R5 is a non-contextual residence district that allows residential and community facility uses, often mapped as a transition between medium- and lower-density areas. R5 districts are general residence districts that allow a variety of housing types, including low-rise attached houses, small multifamily apartment houses, and detached and semi-detached one- and two-family residences. The maximum residential FAR is 1.25 with a maximum street wall height of 30 feet and the maximum building height of 40 feet. Above a height of 30 feet, a setback of 15 feet is required from the street wall; in addition, any portion of the building that exceeds a height of 33 feet must be set back from a rear or side yard line. Detached houses must have two side yards that total at least 13 feet, each with a minimum width of five feet. Semi-detached houses require one eight-foot-wide side yard. Apartment houses require two side yards, each at least eight feet wide. Front yards must be at least ten feet deep. If the depth of a front yard exceeds ten feet, the depth of the front yard must be at least 18 feet to prevent cars parked on-site from protruding onto the sidewalk. Community facility uses are permitted at a maximum FAR of 2.0. Cars may park in the side or rear yard, in the garage or in the front yard within the side lot ribbon; parking is also allowed within the front yard when the lot is wider than 35 feet. Off-street parking is required for 85 percent of the dwelling units (42.5 percent for IRHU), but no parking is required inside the Transit Zone.

Existing uses include two-family detached homes, small multifamily apartment houses, and vacant land.

R6

Approximately 15 full and partial blocks within the Affected Area are zoned R6, most of which are located between St. Lawrence Avenue and Benson Street, along the southern frontage of East Tremont Avenue. The southeastern portion of the health care campus along the western frontage of Eastchester Road is also zoned R6.

R6 districts are medium-density non-contextual residence districts that allow residential uses of all types and community facility uses. Residential uses include single- and two-family buildings and larger multi-family apartment buildings. Community facility uses are generally permitted at a maximum FAR of 4.8. R6 has two sets of bulk regulations to choose from: height factor regulations and Quality Housing regulations.

Height factor regulations promote slender, tall buildings set far back from the street and surrounded by open space, while Quality Housing regulations promote the types of high-lot-coverage buildings found in many neighborhoods prior to the 1961 Zoning Resolution. Under height factor regulations, residential uses are allowed a maximum FAR of 2.43, with height regulated by the relationship between the FAR and the open space ratio (OSR), the percentage of total floor area that should be provided as open space. The FAR and OSR are calibrated on a sliding scale, and maximum FAR is only achievable if considerable open space is provided. Under Quality Housing regulations, the sliding scale of FAR and OSR in the height factor system is replaced by fixed maximum FARs and maximum lot coverages. On narrow streets (defined as less than 75 feet wide), residential uses are allowed a maximum of 2.2 FAR with a maximum street wall height of 45 feet, above which the building must be set back and may rise to a maximum height of 55 feet. Under the Quality Housing option, on wide streets (defined as greater than 75 feet wide) residential uses are allowed a maximum of 3.0 FAR with a maximum street wall height of 65, above which the building must be set back, and may rise to a maximum height of 75 feet.

Off-street parking is required for 70 percent of the dwelling units (Height Factor). This requirement is lowered to 50 percent of the units if the lot area is less than 10,000 square feet or if Quality Housing provisions are used. Parking requirements are lowered for IRHU and are further modified within the Transit Zone. If five spaces or fewer are required, the off-street parking requirement is waived.

Existing uses include residential uses, mostly multifamily apartment homes and mixed-use residential buildings, large hospital buildings, and vacant land. A variety of commercial and community facility uses in either one-story buildings or mixed-use residential buildings can be found along streets where commercial overlays are mapped.

R6A

An R6A district is mapped on one partial block within the Affected Area. This block is generally bounded by Pelham Parkway South to the north, Stillwell Avenue to the east, Rhinelander Avenue to the south, and Eastchester Road to the west.

R6A is a medium-density contextual district often mapped along wide streets, designed to produce Quality Housing buildings that are seven or eight stories tall. The district's bulk regulations are designed to ensure that new buildings match the scale of older buildings in medium-density residence districts. R6A districts allow residential and community facility uses up to a maximum FAR of 3.0. Bulk regulations require a street wall between 40 and 60 feet, a setback above the maximum base height of 60 feet, a maximum building height of 70 feet, and a maximum of seven stories. Off-street parking is required for 50 percent of the dwelling units in the building (25 percent for IRHU), but no parking is required inside the Transit Zone.

Existing uses include six-story multifamily elevator buildings.

C1-1, C1-2, C2-2, AND C2-4 COMMERCIAL OVERLAYS

Commercial overlays are mapped along streets in residential districts that serve local retail and service needs. C1-1 commercial overlays are mapped across a portion of a block bounded between Tenbroeck Avenue and Seminole Avenue, along the northern frontage of Morris Park Avenue. A C1-2 commercial overlay is mapped across the entire block, except its northwestern portion, bounded by East Tremont Avenue to the north, Unionport Road to the east, Guerlain Street to the south, and White Plains Road to the west. C2-2 and C2-4 commercial overlays are mapped along portions of East Tremont Avenue, Silver Street, and Williamsbridge Road. Within the Affected Area, C1-1 commercial overlays are mapped within an R4 district, while C1-2 commercial overlays are mapped within an R6 residence district. The C2-2 and C4-4 commercial overlays are mapped in R4 and R6 districts within the Affected Area.

C1-1, C1-2, C2-2, and C2-4 commercial overlays allow residential, community facility, and commercial uses. C1 commercial overlays generally permit commercial uses listed in Use Groups 5 and 6, while C2 commercial overlays also permit uses listed in Use Groups 7 through 9 and 14. When mapped within R4 and R5 districts, these commercial overlays allow local retail uses and commercial uses up to an FAR of 1.0. In R6 districts, commercial uses are permitted to a maximum FAR of 2.0. In mixed-use buildings, commercial uses are limited to one or two floors and must always be located below the residential use. Parking requirements vary by the commercial overlay's numeric suffix. As the suffix increases, the parking requirement decreases. For example, one off-street parking space is required for every 1,000 square feet for general commercial uses, as listed in PRC-B, in C2-4 commercial overlays, while a C1-1 commercial overlay generally requires one space for every 150 square feet of floor area.

Existing uses include office space, medical offices, educational facilities, neighborhood grocery stores, restaurants, and beauty parlors.

F. Purpose and Need for Proposed Actions

GENERAL

- Metro-North will be opening new stations at locations that have historically developed as marginal spaces typically occupied by auto-related uses (car repair shops, auto supply, spray booths, etc.). While these areas' historic locations at the edge of communities in part explain this pattern of land uses, the future station areas at Morris Park and Parkchester/Van Nest are not suited for a future condition with projected pedestrian flows of 3,000 to 4,000 persons per day arriving at and leaving each station area, nor are the land uses in place positioned to leverage this new service for the creation of new housing units near transit and for the strengthening of existing jobs centers and retail corridors. The establishment of new transit service in previously auto-oriented areas demands a thoughtful reorientation of permitted uses and densities to capitalize on the state's significant investment in regional rail.
- Current land use and development patterns in Parkchester, Van Nest, and Morris Park have been shaped by zoning that has been in place since 1961 which, as noted above, favored industrial — and historically automotive-focused — uses. Preceding the planned stations by over half a century, land use patterns and the zoning that facilitated them existed in a context in which passenger rail service did not exist.
- The existing zoning does not permit appropriate levels of density, nor the types of uses consistent with the community's future vision for the station areas, as identified by the previous five years of outreach with the public and area stakeholders.
- The existing zoning encourages uses that are not compatible with transit-oriented development and would create conflict between area residents, workers, and riders in the future.
- The existing zoning does not require the inclusion of affordable housing as part of new development.
- The Proposed Actions would facilitate an area-wide rezoning that would permit increased density on major streets, large sites, areas adjacent to large institutions and at new transit stations.
- The Proposed Actions would implement zoning districts with height limits, requiring new developments to be developed under Quality Housing regulations, resulting in better urban design while providing more needed housing and commercial space.
- The Proposed Actions would apply the MIH program, which would require the inclusion of permanently affordable housing in new developments. This is notable as the East Bronx has few designated MIH areas and, as such, the rezoning represents an opportunity to leverage new service toward meeting City priorities for the provision of permanently affordable housing units.
- Without a coordinated rezoning, it is likely that some property owners would seek discretionary actions. New development and conversions would occur, but without the benefit of a coordinated, overarching plan.
- The Proposed Actions would update the zoning in an approximately 46-block area across the two station areas, allowing for growth and development in appropriate locations. Also, although not

part of the proposed land use and zoning actions, coordinated planning work calls for strategic improvements to infrastructure and services, such as streetscape and pedestrian safety improvements along East Tremont Avenue and other commercial corridors, a new pedestrian plaza at Morris Park Avenue, and investments in affordable housing and workforce training, among other elements.

HOUSING

- There has been relatively little housing development within the station areas in recent years. Within the Affected Area, covering both stations, there have been no new residential buildings constructed. Zoning along East Tremont Avenue and in affected areas along Bronxdale Avenue does not currently allow for housing. This also holds for Morris Park, where the majority of the lots proposed for rezoning do not currently allow for housing, this despite continuing demand as expressed by area institutions and rising housing costs. For example, Montefiore Hospital filed an application in 2017 (1776 Eastchester Road, outlined above) to rezone an area immediately to the east of the proposed Morris Park station to allow for the construction of 181 units of non-profit hospital staff dwelling units to serve medical residents at the Albert Einstein College of Medicine. As noted by Montefiore in that application, the proposed number of dwelling units still falls short of the projected annual demand.
- There has been some modest housing construction to the north of Affected Area and the proposed Morris Park station area in a new, multi-family, 129-unit structure built within the small portion of the existing R6A district at the corner of Pelham Parkway South and Stillwell Avenue.
- In the Parkchester/Van Nest station area, new housing construction has been concentrated south of the Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District, with the lion's share of that development happening along or near the Westchester Avenue elevated rail line. In those areas along East Tremont Avenue falling within the Affected Area that allow for housing growth today, no new residential developments have occurred in recent years.
- In new developments, affordable housing is only required in an MIH area immediately to the east of the planned Morris Park station area designated as part of a rezoning approved in 2017 (the Montefiore-led rezoning noted above). However, as this property is already built out and rezoned to facilitate a non-profit hospital staff dwelling development on top of an existing parking garage, it is unlikely that any permanently affordable units would be constructed there in the foreseeable future.
- The Proposed Actions would support development of new housing in the neighborhood, including new permanently affordable housing. This housing has been identified by institutions at Morris Park as critical to their continued growth as it has become a barrier to recruit both staff and students, and by residents around the future Parkchester/Van Nest station area as desirable in creating additional activity.
- Specifically, the Proposed Actions would create opportunities for new housing along major corridors including East Tremont Avenue, Bronxdale Avenue, Eastchester Road, as well as modest growth along portions of Stillwell Avenue. Additionally, the proposed actions would allow for

residential (including affordable residential) development on underutilized land in formerly manufacturing-zoned areas.

- With the Proposed Actions, more new housing with permanently affordable housing would be allowed. If built, it would increase the supply of housing overall and reduce the already high pressure on rents and rise in overcrowded units.

JOBS

- Economic growth has largely been centered within the large institutional campuses that border the Morris Park station area but that fall outside of the Affected Area. This includes growth of the Montefiore Einstein campus and operations, as well as completed and planned growth within the Hutchinson Metro Center (i.e., the area bounded by the rail lines to the west, the Hutchinson River Parkway to the east, Pelham Parkway to the north, and Waters Place to the south). This growth includes the redevelopment of the northernmost 34 acres of the former BPC. In 2015, that campus was consolidated into new structures on the southern 40 acres of the property, after which point Empire State Development released a Request for Proposals for the redevelopment of the northern portion of the site. Those redevelopment plans call for the creation of up to 1.9 million square feet of additional commercial and research space, a hotel, staff housing and other related uses.
- Growth has largely been permitted via state zoning overrides within the Hutchinson Metro Center and does not reflect the underlying R4, R5, and M1-1 zoning districts in place in those portions of the station area. Additional growth has also taken place within the Montefiore Einstein campuses found to the west of the station area.

MANUFACTURING-ZONED AREAS

- Manufacturing districts, which allow commercial and industrial uses and no new residential uses, also have not changed in Morris Park, Parkchester, and Van Nest since 1961. Prior to 1961, many of the station areas' current manufacturing-zoned areas permitted a mix of uses that included a small amount of non-conforming residential uses within industrial districts around Morris Park.
- There has been some modest construction and new development within the existing manufacturing-zoned area near the future Morris Park station. Two vacant lots located on opposite sides of Bassett Avenue between McDonald Street and Wilkinson Avenue were recently redeveloped to open parking lots equipped with EV charging stations.
- Industrial zoning covers many blocks that contain a mix of industrial and commercial buildings but also residential homes that predate the zoning. In other areas, manufacturing-zoned blocks contain large, underutilized lots and buildings with few jobs remaining.
- The existing zoning has not kept up with economic changes. Industrial areas, including the Affected Area, do not have zoning in place that matches the needs of existing businesses and has

discouraged new development and the creation of residential and commercial spaces that would complement and support the growth of surrounding institutions.

- The combination of outdated zoning and broader economic conditions has resulted in few new buildings constructed within the Affected Area. Limited new development includes a small residential building and a Starbucks.
- Without the Proposed Actions, underutilized sites in industrial zones will remain underdeveloped and underutilized, resulting in a lost opportunity for creation of new housing and space for jobs in the context of a housing shortage and rising housing prices.
- Absent the Proposed Actions, it is likely that a few property owners would seek discretionary actions in areas close to transit for zoning amendments to alleviate zoning challenges that exist today. Therefore, it is likely that limited new development would occur, albeit in a piecemeal fashion and without the benefit of a comprehensive plan.
- In areas appropriate for economic growth, the Proposed Actions would respond to present-day economic conditions, allowing for development that meets the needs of modern businesses.
- In areas where residential uses are appropriate, updated zoning would (in some locations) better reflect the existing conditions on the ground, and in other locations, allow for provision of new housing, including permanently affordable housing.

COMMERCIAL

- While commercial corridors around the future Morris Park and Parkchester/Van Nest station areas do have active businesses, many of these businesses are auto-oriented uses that lack pedestrian-oriented ground-floor uses and intrude upon limited sidewalk space.
- At Morris Park, the existing commercial corridor along Eastchester Road includes a mix of automotive and retail establishments. However, there are no provisions in place that require these corridors to have active ground-floor uses.
- In appropriate areas close to the planned Metro-North stations, the Proposed Actions would allow for development of mixed-use buildings with multiple floors of commercial use, and for full-commercial buildings. The Proposed Actions would also require active frontages in these areas, including along the edges of the proposed plaza at Morris Park. In the case of the future Parkchester/Van Nest station area, active ground-floor uses would be required along sections of East Tremont Avenue, as well as Bronxdale Avenue and White Plains Road.

URBAN DESIGN

- Today, East Tremont Avenue is characterized by inadequate pedestrian facilities, automotive uses that render sidewalks impassible at times, particularly along the north side of East Tremont Avenue to the west of White Plains Road, and by a lack of active ground floor uses and local retail.
- At Morris Park, the portion to the east of the rail line is characterized by large, private campuses designed for automotive uses. West of the tracks, Bassett Avenue is characterized by inadequate

sidewalks and pedestrian amenities. The entire corridor, as well as much of Stillwell Avenue and portions of Eastchester Road to the south, is characterized by automotive uses that spill out onto the sidewalks and render these spaces difficult to navigate, frequently forcing pedestrians to walk in the street.

- At the future Morris Park station area, the built form is characterized by low-rise industrial and commercial structures, generally only one or two stories, surrounded to the east and west by large institutional campuses with structures rising as high as 28 stories.
- At the future Parkchester/Van Nest station area, the built form is dominated by the Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District, a master-planned community consisting of 171 buildings ranging from eight to 14 stories in height spread out over 129 acres. To the east and west of Parkchester, the area along East Tremont Avenue is typified by one- to two-story structures that back up to larger five- and six-story apartment blocks. St. Raymond Roman Catholic Church is a notable structure at the corner of Bronxdale Avenue and East Tremont Avenue. The north side of East Tremont Avenue is characterized by small, one-story structures and repair shops, gas stations, and vacant lots, as well as some active one- and two-story commercial structures to the east of Bronxdale Avenue. North of the rail line, the area is typified by the lower scale of the Van Nest neighborhood, generally consisting of two- to three-story structures with some larger apartment buildings; the large Con Edison facility; and a mix of industrial uses centered along Bronxdale Avenue north of the rail bridge.
- The Proposed Actions would require new developments to comply with new rules related to active street frontage, including along the frontages facing the planned Morris Park station plaza.
- The Proposed Actions would additionally allow for greater flexibility on large sites for distribution of floor area to ensure a quality-built form.

METRO-NORTH

- Metro-North is committed to the construction of four new ADA-accessible stations in the East Bronx, including the future Parkchester/Van Nest and Morris Park stations within the Affected Area. The Proposed Actions are needed to facilitate land uses that are suited for a future condition with projected pedestrian flows of 3,000 to 4,000 persons per day arriving at and leaving each station area and to leverage this new regional rail service for the creation of new housing units near transit and for the strengthening of existing jobs centers and retail corridors. The Proposed Actions are necessary to fully leverage the state's significant (estimated at $2.8 billion) investment in regional rail.
- In line with Metro-North's general policy for in-City stations, no parking facilities will be built at any of the planned Metro-North stations.
- The Proposed Actions would build upon Metro-North's investment by concentrating a mix of permitted uses — including office, residential, and retail — near the planned stations at Morris Park and Parkchester/Van Nest, in line with general best practices around transit-oriented development.

G.Description of the Proposed Actions

The Proposed Actions would facilitate development consistent with the goals of the Bronx Metro-North Station Study by allowing for housing growth with permanently affordable housing, creating neighborhood and commuter-serving retail opportunities, allowing the number of job-generating uses to grow at the Morris Park station area, and focusing development in a manner that promotes active streetscapes along key corridors and near the planned Metro-North stations at Parkchester/Van Nest and Morris Park. To accomplish these goals, DCP is proposing zoning text amendments, zoning map amendments and City Map changes.

The Proposed Actions would affect an approximately 46-block area primarily along the main corridors—East Tremont Avenue, White Plains Road, Bronxdale Avenue, Eastchester Road, and Stillwell Avenue—near the future Parkchester/Van Nest and Morris Park Metro-North stations in Bronx Community Districts 9, 10, and 11 referred to as the Affected Area. The approximately 28-block area closest to the future Parkchester/Van Nest station is generally bounded by Baker Avenue and Van Nest Avenue to the north, Silver Street to the east, East Tremont Avenue to the south, and St. Lawrence Avenue to the west. The approximately 18-block area closest to the future Morris Park station is generally bounded by Pelham Parkway to the north, Marconi Street to the east, Williamsbridge Road to the south, and Eastchester Road to the west.

As discussed in detail below, the Proposed Actions consist of:

- Zoning map amendments to:
    - Rezone portions of existing M1-1, C8-1, C8-4, R4, R5, R6 and R6A districts and C1-1, C1-2, and C2-2 commercial overlays to R4, R6A, R6-1, R7-2, M1-1A/R7-3, R8X, C8-2, C4-3 and C4-4 districts and a C2-4 commercial overlay.
    - Modify the boundaries of the existing Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District to facilitate development and active uses that better connect the wider community to the existing special district.
    - Map the Special Eastchester – East Tremont Corridor District, largely coterminous with the Affected Area.
- Zoning text amendments to:
    - Establish the Special Eastchester – East Tremont Corridor District largely coterminous with the Affected Area. The proposed special purpose district would include modifications to underlying use, bulk, parking and loading, and streetscape regulations, and establish special provisions for the proposed M1-1A/R7-3 district. The special purpose district would also provide flexibility for large opportunity sites to facilitate public realm improvements around the future Metro-North stations.
    - Remove language that exclusively applies to C8-4 districts mapped within Special Planned Community Preservation District Areas.
    - Establish the proposed R6-1 non-contextual medium density district.

  - Establish a new M1-1A district, which would facilitate loft building envelopes similar to contextual buildings in residence districts.
  - Modify Appendix F for the purpose of designating proposed R6A, R6-1, R7-2, R7-3, R8X, C4-3, and C4-4 districts as MIH areas, applying the MIH program to require a share of new housing to be permanently affordable where significant new housing capacity would be created.
  - Modify Appendix I to extend Transit Zone 2, Borough of the Bronx, Community District 11.
- City Map changes to:
  - Map Block 4209, Lots 10 and 70 as street to facilitate the creation of a new public plaza at the Morris Park station.
  - Map portions of Block 4042, Lot 200 as street to facilitate the creation of a street network and improved circulation for future development of this site and access to an anticipated new Metro-North station entrance.
  - Map Block 4226, Lots 1 (portions of) and 11 as street to facilitate the proposed widening of Marconi Street to reduce traffic congestion and enhance pedestrian and vehicular safety and circulation, and map Block 4226, Lot 50 (portions of) as street to facilitate the proposed widening of Marconi Street to add a new right-turn lane to the future BPC campus.
  - Map portions of Block 4226, Lots 1, 5 and 75 and Block 4411, Lot 75 as street to accommodate the proposed extension of Marconi Street to connect with Pelham Parkway.
  - De-map a portion of Unionport Road to facilitate the development of adjacent Block 3952.

These proposed changes are further illustrated on Figure ES-5, “Proposed Zoning,” Figure ES-6, “Special District,” and Figure ES-7, “Proposed Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH) Area.”



Source: New York City Department of City Planning, 2023; Metropolitan Transit Authority (MTA), 2018; STV Incorporated, 2023.

N

0 0.25 0.5 Mile

Primary Study Area/ Affected Area

C2-4 Overlay

C4-3 C8-2 R6-1 R7-2 M1-1A/R7-3

C4-4 R4 R6A R8X

Note: A Special District, largely coterminous with the Affected Area, will be created which will modify some of the underlying zoning districts. The special district would not be mapped on Projected Development 60 (Block 4203, Lots 75, 81, and 82). The proposed R6A, R6-1, R7-2, R8X, C4-3, and C4-4 zoning districts will be mapped as Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH) Areas.

Bronx Metro-North Station Study

Figure ES-5

PROPOSED ZONING



Source: New York City Department of City Planning, 2023; STV Incorporated, 2023.

N

0 0.25 0.5 Mile

Proposed Special District

Figure ES-6

Bronx Metro-North Station Study

SPECIAL DISTRICT



Source: New York City Department of City Planning, 2023;
Metropolitan Transit Authority (MTA), 2018 & 2019; STV Incorporated, 2023.

N

0 0.25 0.5 Mile

Affected Area

Mandatory Inclusionary Housing

Figure ES-7

PROPOSED MANDATORY INCLUSIONARY HOUSING (MIH) AREA

PROPOSED ZONING MAP CHANGES

Proposed Zoning Districts

Proposed R4 (Existing C8-1)

An R4 district is proposed for one partial block:

- *A triangular portion of a block bounded by Pierce Avenue to the north, Bogart Avenue to the east, Sacket Avenue to the south, and Bronxdale Avenue to the west, that is within 100 feet of Bronxdale Avenue.*

The proposed R4 non-contextual district is a low-density residence district that would allow residential uses of all types and community facility uses. Residential uses are allowed a maximum FAR of 0.75, which may be increased to 0.90 pursuant to the attic bonus, and community facility uses are permitted a maximum FAR of 2.0. All types of residences are permitted in R4 Districts, including detached, semi-detached, and multi-family buildings. The maximum residential building height is 35 feet. A minimum ten-foot front yard is required. Side yards between zero and eight feet are required, depending on the building type. Off-street parking is required for 100 percent of dwelling units (50 percent for IRHU), but no parking would be required inside the Transit Zone.

Proposed R6-1 (Existing R4, R5, R6, C8-1, and M1-1)

An R6-1 district is proposed for approximately 21 full and partial blocks:

- *An area with frontage on either Eastchester Road to the west or Stillwell Avenue to the east on those blocks generally bounded by Pelham Parkway South to the north and Seminole Street to the south.*
- *The area generally bounded by Eastchester Road to the north-west, Chesbrough Avenue to the south-east, and Williamsbridge Road to the south-west, along both frontages of Blondell Avenue.*
- *The area generally bounded by Williamsbridge Road to the north-east, the railroad right-of-way to the north-west, and Silver Street to the south-east.*
- *Two full and four partial blocks generally bounded to the northern frontage of East Tremont Avenue, located between Silver Street to the east and Bronxdale Avenue to the west, and located to the south of the railroad right-of-way.*
- *Four partial blocks generally roughly located between the railroad right-of-way to the south and Van Nest Avenue to the north, along the eastern frontage of Bronxdale Avenue.*
- *The portion of the block bounded by Baker Avenue to the north, Williamsbridge Road to the east, the railroad right-of-way to the south, and Garfield Street to the west, that is beyond 100 feet of a narrow street.*

The proposed R6-1 non-contextual district is a new medium-density residence district proposed as a part of the text amendment that would allow residential uses of all types and community facility uses. The proposed R6-1 district is designed to produce Quality Housing buildings and has bulk regulations similar

to what is allowed in an R6 district on wide streets under the MIH program. For areas mapped with MIH housing, R6-1 districts would permit a maximum FAR of 3.6 with a maximum base height of 65 feet, above which the building must be set back, and a maximum building height of 115 feet or 11 stories. A different building setback is required on wide and narrow streets. Above the maximum base height, the required building setbacks are ten feet and 15 feet, respectively. Like other residence districts, R6-1 districts would require a 30-foot rear yard for residential portions of any building. Off-street parking would be required for 50 percent of the dwelling units (25 percent for IRHU), but no parking would be required inside the Transit Zone.

Proposed R6A *(Existing R5)*

An R6A district is proposed for one partial block:

- *The portion of the block bounded by Baker Avenue to the north, Williamsbridge Road to the east, the railroad right-of-way to the south, and Garfield Street to the west, that is within 100 feet of a narrow street.*

R6A is a medium-density contextual residence district that would allow residential uses of all types and community facility uses and is designed to produce Quality Housing buildings. R6A districts permit a maximum residential FAR of 3.6, when mapped with inclusionary housing, and community facility uses to a maximum FAR of 3.0. Where inclusionary housing is mapped and on narrow streets, R6A districts permit a maximum street wall height of 65 feet, above which the building must be set back, may rise to a maximum height of 80 feet, and have a maximum of 8 stories. A building setback of ten feet is required on wide streets and 15 feet on narrow streets. Like other residence districts, the R6A district requires a 30-foot rear yard for residential portions of any building. Off-street parking is required for 50 percent of the dwelling units (25 percent for IRHU), but no parking is required inside the Transit Zone.

Proposed R7-2 (Existing R4, C8-1, and M1-1)

An R7-2 district is proposed for one full block and three partial blocks in two areas:

- *An area roughly bounded by East Tremont Avenue to the north, Beach Avenue to the east, St. Lawrence Avenue to the west, and Guerlain Street to the south, and generally with frontage on East Tremont Avenue.*
- *An area roughly bounded by the railroad right-of-way to the north, Bronxdale Avenue to the east, East Tremont Avenue to the south, and to the west approximately at a point where Elm Drive intersects with East Tremont Avenue.*
- *An area roughly bounded by Williamsbridge Road to the south-west, the railroad right-of-way to the north-west, Eastchester Road to the south-east, and Jarrett Place to the north-east.*

R7-2 is a medium-density non-contextual residence district that would allow residential uses of all types and community facility uses. R7-2 districts permit a maximum residential FAR of 4.6 when mapped with inclusionary housing and community facility uses to a maximum FAR of 6.5. Where inclusionary housing is mapped, R7-2 districts permit a maximum street wall height of 75 feet, above which the building must be set back, may rise to a maximum height of 135 feet, and have a maximum of 13 stories. A building

setback of ten feet on wide streets and of 15 feet on narrow streets is required. Like other residence districts, R7-2 districts require a 30-foot rear yard for residential portions of any building. Off-street parking is required for 50 percent of the dwelling units (15 percent for IRHU), but no parking is required inside the Transit Zone.

Proposed M1-1A/R7-3 *(Existing M1-1)*

A paired M1-1A/R7-3 district is proposed for one partial block:

- *The partial block roughly located between the railroad right-of-way to the south and Van Nest Avenue to the north, along the western frontage of Bronxdale Avenue.*

The proposed M1-1A/R7-3 district would be mapped in a MIH area. The paired district would permit residential uses of all types up to a FAR of 6.0, and community facility uses up to a maximum FAR of 5.0. Under such paired district, a maximum base height of 85 feet and total building height of 185 feet would be permitted. Off-street parking would be required for 50 percent of dwelling units in the building.

Other use and bulk regulations for commercial or manufacturing uses would follow the provisions of the proposed M1-1A district, which would be established in the special purpose district.

Proposed R8X (Existing C8-1, C8-4, and R6**)**

An R8X district is proposed for one full block and five partial blocks:

- *The block bounded by East Tremont Avenue to the north, Unionport Road to the east, Guerlain Street to the south, and White Plains Road to the west.*
- *An area roughly coterminous with the existing properties fronting on East Tremont Avenue to the north and located mid-block on the block roughly bounded by Purdy Street to the east, Metropolitan Avenue to the south, and Unionport Road to the west.*
- *An area roughly bounded by East Tremont Avenue to the north, Beach Avenue to the west, Williamsbridge Road to the east, and Guerlain Street to the south, and generally with frontage on East Tremont Avenue.*

R8X is a high-density contextual residence district that would allow residential uses of all types and community facility uses. R8X districts permit a maximum residential FAR of 7.20 on both narrow and wide streets when mapped in MIH areas and a maximum community facility FAR of 6.0. R8X districts permit a maximum street wall height of 105 feet, above which the building must be set back, may rise to a maximum height of 175 feet, and have maximum of 17 stories. A building setback of 10 feet on wide streets and of 15 feet on narrow streets is required. Like other residence districts, R8X districts require a 30-foot rear yard for residential portions of any building. Off-street parking is required for 40 percent of the dwelling units (12 percent for IRHU), but no parking is required inside the Transit Zone.

Proposed C4-3 (Existing M1-1 and R4)

An C4-3 district is proposed for approximately four partial blocks:

- *The southern portion of the triangular block bounded by Seminole Street to the north, Stillwell Avenue to the east, and Eastchester Road to the west.*

- *An area roughly bounded by Pelham Parkway South to the north, Eastchester Road to the east, the fence shared with the NYPD Bronx 49 Precinct to the south, and an internal access road running north-south between Pelham Parkway South and Seminole Avenue to the west.*
- *An area roughly coterminous with the property lines of Block 4205, Lot 40 that fronts on Eastchester Road to the east.*
- *A partial block north of Morris Park Avenue located between Seminole Avenue to the east and Tenbroeck Avenue to the west.*

C4-3 is a medium-density commercial district that allows a range of commercial uses as well as residential and community facility uses. C4-3 districts permit a maximum commercial FAR of 3.40 and a community facility FAR of 4.80. For C4-3 districts, the residence district equivalent is R6. As a result, any residences within a C4-3 district must comply with the bulk regulations of this residence district and, where inclusionary housing is mapped, with the requirements of the MIH program. Height and setback regulations for non-residential buildings in C4-3 districts are governed by a Sky Exposure Plane behind which the building must be located. In C4-3 districts, the Sky Exposure Plane begins at a height of 60 feet above the street line. C4-3 districts permit, as-of-right, a wide range of retail and commercial uses including offices, business services, larger retail establishments such as department stores, and some entertainment uses. For general commercial uses, as listed in PRC-B, off-street parking is required for every 400 square feet of floor area.

Proposed C4-4 (Existing M1-1)

A C4-4 district is proposed for five full blocks and two partial blocks:

- *An area roughly bounded by McDonald Street to the north, Bassett Avenue to the east, Eastchester Road to the south where it intersects with the railroad right-of-way, and Eastchester Road to the west.*
- *An area roughly bounded by the Metro Center Atrium complex to the north, Marconi Street to the east, Waters Place to the south, and Eastchester Road as well as Bassett Avenue to the west.*
- *An area roughly bounded by the railroad right-of-way to the north, Eastchester Road to the east and south, and Williamsbridge Road the west, generally except for those properties fronting on Williamsbridge Road.*

C4-4 is a medium-density commercial district that allows a range of commercial uses as well as residential and community facility uses. C4-4 districts permit a maximum commercial FAR of 3.40 and a community facility FAR of 6.50. For C4-4 districts, the residence district equivalent is R7-2. As a result, any residences within the C4-4 district must comply with the R7-2 bulk regulations and, where MIH is mapped, with the affordability requirements of the MIH program. Height and setback regulations for non-residential buildings in C4-4 districts are governed by a Sky Exposure Plane behind which the building must be located. In C4-4 districts, the Sky Exposure Plane begins at a height of 60 feet above the street line. C4-4 districts permit, as-of-right, a wide range of retail and commercial uses including offices, business services, larger retail establishments such as department stores, and some entertainment uses. For general commercial uses, as listed in PRC-B, off-street parking is required for every 1,000 square feet of floor area.

Proposed C8-2 (Existing C8-1 and M1-1)

An C8-2 district s is proposed for three full blocks and one partial block:

- *The block bounded by the railroad right-of-way in the north, Unionport Road in the east, East Tremont Avenue in the south, and White Plains Road in the west.*
- *The triangular block bounded by Unionport Road to the north and east, the railroad right-of-way in the south, and White Plains Road in the west.*
- *The block roughly bounded by the railroad right-of-way in the north, White Plains Road in the east, and East Tremont Avenue in the south.*
- *An area roughly bounded by the railroad right-of-way to the north, East Tremont Avenue to the south, and Unionport Road the west, and to the east approximately at a point where Elm Drive intersects with East Tremont Avenue.*

C8-2 is a commercial district generally mapped along major traffic arteries that provides for general commercial uses, including automotive and other heavy commercial services, and community facility uses. New residential uses are not permitted. C8-2 districts permit a maximum commercial FAR of 2.00 and a maximum community facility FAR of 4.80. Height and setback regulations in C8-2 districts are governed by a Sky Exposure Plane behind which the building must be located. In C8-2 districts, the Sky Exposure Plane begins at a height of 60 feet above the street line. For general commercial uses, as listed in PRC-B, one off-street parking space is required for every 400 square feet of floor area.

Proposed C2-4 Commercial Overlays

C2-4 commercial overlays would be mapped along portions of East Tremont Avenue, White Plains Road, Bronxdale Avenue, Eastchester Road, Williamsbridge Road, Morris Park Avenue, and Stillwell Avenue, within portions of the proposed R6-1, R7-2, and R8X districts as detailed below. The proposed rezoning would also replace existing C1-2 and C2-2 overlays in certain locations with new C2-4 overlays. Where a proposed C2-4 commercial overlay would replace existing C1-2 and C2-2 commercial overlays and C8-1 and C8-4 districts, the extent of the proposed C2-4 commercial overlay would be mapped to match the extent of those existing districts. The affected area is as follows:

- Five blocks generally bounded between St. Lawrence and White Plains Road, along the southern frontage of East Tremont Avenue.
- The block generally bounded by East Tremont Avenue to the north, Unionport Road to the east, Guerlain Street to the south, and White Plains Road to the west.
- The block generally bounded between the railroad right-of-way and Baker Avenue, along the western frontage of White Plains Road.
- Six blocks generally bounded between Unionport Road and Silver Street, along the northern frontage of East Tremont Avenue.
- Four blocks generally bounded between Van Nest Avenue and Poplar Street, along the eastern frontage of Bronxdale Avenue.
- The block generally bounded between Seddon Street and St. Peters Avenue, along the southern frontage of East Tremont Avenue.
- The block generally bounded between the railroad right-of-way and Van Nest Avenue, along the western frontage of Bronxdale Avenue.

- Two blocks generally bounded between the railroad right-of way and Silver Street, along the western frontage of Williamsbridge Road.
- Two blocks generally bounded between the railroad right-of-way and Eastchester Road, along the eastern frontage of Williamsbridge Road.
- The block generally bounded between Unionport Road and Purdy Street, along approximately 850 feet of the southern frontage of East Tremont Avenue.
- The block generally bounded by Eastchester Road to the north, Blondell Avenue to the east, Chesbrough Avenue to the south, and Williamsbridge to the west.
- The block generally bounded between Eastchester Road and Chesbrough Avenue, along the eastern frontage of Blondell Avenue.
- Three blocks generally bounded between Pelham Parkway South and Seminole Street, along the eastern frontage of Eastchester Road.
- Three blocks generally bounded between Pelham Parkway South and Seminole Street, along the western frontage of Stillwell Avenue.
- The triangular block generally bounded by Seminole Street, Eastchester Road and Stillwell Avenue, along the western frontage of Stillwell Avenue and the eastern frontage of Eastchester Road.
- The block generally bounded by Pelham Parkway to the north, Eastchester Road to the east, Morris Park Avenue to the south, and Seminole Avenue to west, along the frontage at the corner of Morris Park Avenue and Eastchester Road.

C2-4 commercial overlays allow local retail uses in standalone commercial buildings or on the ground floor of mixed-use buildings to a maximum FAR of 2.0. C2-4 overlays allow uses including conventional retail and services, along with some repair and entertainment uses. For general commercial uses, as listed in PRC-B, one off-street parking space is required for every 1,000 square feet of floor area.

Special Eastchester – East Tremont Corridor District

A special purpose district known as the Special Eastchester – East Tremont Corridor District would be mapped largely coterminous with the Affected Area. The proposed special purpose district is described in more detail below as part of the related action to amend the zoning text and establish the proposed special purpose district.

Zoning Map Amendment for Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District

The Proposed Actions include a zoning map amendment to modify the boundaries of the Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District. The modification would remove a portion from the existing Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District to facilitate development and active uses that provide opportunities for new housing, including affordable housing, near the future Parkchester/Van Nest station and better connect the wider community to the existing special district. This community characteristically has large landscaped open spaces and a superior relationship of buildings, open spaces, commercial uses, and pedestrian and vehicular circulation. No demolition, new development, enlargement or alteration of landscaping or topography is permitted within the district. This zoning map amendment would be confined to that portion of the Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District zoned C8-4. The affected area is mapped with a C8-4 district for a length

of approximately 850 feet along the southern frontage of East Tremont Avenue between Unionport Road and Purdy Street.

The existing use, zoning, and built form of the affected area are distinct from that of the Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District as a whole. The area affected by this zoning map amendment has no residential or neighborhood retail uses. Instead, the area is currently developed with a high-pressure steam plant that supplies Parkchester with heat and hot water, two parking structures, surface parking, and small ground-floor storefronts that are mostly vacant. While the Parkchester planned community is zoned R6 except for its shopping district on Metropolitan Avenue, the affected area is zoned C8-4. This zoning district bridges commercial and manufacturing uses and provides for automotive and other heavy commercial services along major traffic arteries. Reflective of their zoning and use, the buildings within the affected area are notably different in terms of height, building massing, and their orientation toward East Tremont Avenue as a busy thoroughfare. Therefore, the affected area's built form is notably different from the ensemble of buildings that is central to the Parkchester Special Planned Community's character which the preservation district seeks to preserve. The Special Eastchester – East Tremont Corridor District would be mapped across the affected area zoned C8-4 that would be removed from the Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District by the proposed zoning map amendment.

PROPOSED ZONING TEXT AMENDMENTS

The Department of City Planning proposes a series of text amendments to facilitate the land use objectives and the Bronx Metro-North Plan. The following is a list and description of the proposed text amendments:

Special Eastchester – East Tremont Corridor District

A special purpose district known as the Special Eastchester – East Tremont Corridor District would be mapped largely coterminous with the Affected Area. The proposed special purpose district would establish a framework around the future Morris Park and Parkchester/Van Nest stations, to

- promote the growth of housing and employment centers around transit and foster an adequate range of services and amenities for residents, workers and visitors;
- ensure a lively and attractive urban streetscape around such stations and along major corridors; and
- create a cohesive pedestrian and public realm network that would better connect future developments with future station areas and surrounding neighborhoods.

To achieve this, a series of modifications to a range of underlying zoning provisions are proposed, as follows:

Use Regulations

To create an attractive pedestrian environment and enhance commercial activity in the special purpose district, the special purpose district provisions would allow commercial uses to be located on the second floor of mixed-use developments within residence districts mapped with a commercial overlay. Absent this modification, commercial uses would be limited to one floor in a mixed-use development in such districts.

The special purpose district would also establish use regulations for the proposed M1-1A district. The proposed district, within the special purpose district, would permit community facility uses and commercial uses, including retail and service establishments without any size restrictions, and all recreation, entertainment and assembly space uses. The district would also permit light industrial or manufacturing uses subject to performance standards.

Bulk Regulations

To harmonize residential and commercial growth across the special purpose district, the bulk provisions of certain districts would be adjusted to provide more flexibility for affordable and mixed-use developments. As such, floor area, height and setback, and yard regulations would be adjusted or established as follows:

- The maximum permitted FARs and building heights would be modified in the following residence districts within MIH areas:
    - In R6A Districts, the maximum FAR would be increased from 3.6 to 3.9, and the maximum permitted building height would be increased from 85 feet to 95 feet.
    - In R6-1 Districts, the maximum FAR would be increased from 3.6 to 3.9, and the maximum permitted building height would be increased from 115 feet to 125 feet.
    - In R7-2 Districts, the maximum FAR would be increased from 4.6 to 5.0. The maximum base height would be increased from 75 feet to 85 feet, and the maximum permitted building height would be increased from 135 feet to 155 feet.
- Within the proposed C4-3 and C4-4 districts, the maximum permitted FARs would be modified as follows:
    - The residential equivalent in C4-3 districts would be modified from R6 to the proposed R6-1 district. Within a MIH area, this would increase the maximum permitted residential FAR beyond 100 feet of a wide street from 2.42 to 3.9.
    - For development sites near the future Morris Park station within a C4-4 district and located northwest of the rail line, the residential equivalent district would be modified from R7-2 to R8. As such, for the residential portion of developments in this area, the maximum FAR would be increased from 4.6 to 7.2, the maximum base height would be increased from 85 feet to 105 feet, and the maximum permitted building height would be increased from 155 feet to 215 feet.
    - For C4-3 and C4-4 districts, the maximum permitted commercial FAR would be increased from 3.4 to 4.0 to support the growth of existing and new employment centers within Morris Park.

The special purpose district would also establish bulk provisions for the proposed M1-1A District, and modify provisions for the paired M1-1A/R7-3 district:

- For M1-1A districts, the special purpose district would establish a maximum FAR of 2.0 for all permitted uses. The special purpose district would also establish loft building envelopes similar to those for contextual buildings in residence districts. For all permitted uses, the district would have a maximum base height of 45 feet and maximum building height of 65 feet. The special purpose district would also establish a minimum rear yard of ten feet below a building height of 65 feet, 15 feet, between a building height of 65 and 125 feet, and 20 feet above a height of 125 feet for commercial or manufacturing uses. For general commercial uses, off-street parking would be required for every 300 square feet of floor area.
- Within the paired M1-1A/R7-3 district, a maximum base height of 85 feet, pursuant to underlying regulations, would be increased to 95 feet, and a total building height of 185 feet would be permitted. The maximum residential FAR would be 6.0, in accordance with the provisions of R7-3 districts and the maximum permitted FAR for community facility uses would be increased from 5.0, pursuant to underlying regulations, to 6.5 in the special purpose district. For commercial and manufacturing uses, the FAR provisions of M1-1A would apply.

In addition to district-specific modifications, the special purpose district proposes the following:

- Within the special purpose district, residential growth would necessitate the provision of more services such as schools and other educational facilities. To create a more livable community and facilitate the construction of schools, a floor area exemption would be provided for such uses on large development sites.
- The special purpose district also seeks to facilitate new job centers by making commercial and research space easier to develop. To simplify and rationalize controls on the height and massing of such buildings, the special purpose district would apply the same contextual height and setback provisions for residential developments, as modified in the special district, to non-residential developments outside of C8-2 districts. Absent such modification, non-residential developments would be subject to Sky Exposure Plane regulations, which could yield unpredictable building envelopes. Such modification would not only result in a more predictable building envelope, it would also create a more practical building footprint to meet the needs of modern-day medium-scale offices and labs. Additionally, the special purpose district would require contextual bulk envelopes for portions of the Affected Area south of East Tremont Avenue that lie within the existing R6 district.
- To facilitate development on shallow lots along the rail line, the special purpose district would waive rear yard requirements where buildings abut the rail line within a C8-2 district. Absent this modification, rear yards would need to be provided on the portion of such properties abutting the rail. Such a rule, which was intended to provide sufficient separation between buildings on the same block, would unnecessarily burden development on these sites, which would not otherwise abut other buildings on the same block.

Parking and Loading Requirements

With the establishment of new transit service in previously auto-oriented areas, the special purpose district would provide a consistent framework for accessory parking for most non-residential uses, requiring one parking space per 1,000 square feet of floor area across most of the Affected Area.

Further, the special purpose district would eliminate minimum parking requirements for new housing developments. While it is expected that developers would continue to provide parking as part of new housing development in response to market needs and as parking requirements for existing housing will remain, the special purpose district would reduce existing conflicts between housing and parking on development sites.

Existing parking requirements require developers to provide parking based on the amount of proposed housing units in a development. This can result in developers building fewer housing units to save on the cost of and space devoted to parking. The elimination of parking requirements would make land and floor space that is currently required to be used for parking available for housing and would reduce the cost of building housing.

Existing parking requirements also do not reflect current trends in car ownership and public transit access. The addition of the new Metro-North stations will provide the special purpose district with greater transit access. Eliminating parking requirements would allow the market to determine the right amount of parking for new developments and allow for opportunities to create affordable housing.

Additionally, to promote the efficient use of existing parking, the special purpose district would allow permitted accessory off-street parking spaces to be made available for public use.

Through the special purpose district, loading requirements would also be made consistent across all commercial districts. The proposed modification would adjust loading requirements for all commercial districts to the requirements of a C4-4 district. As such, no loading berths would be required for most commercial uses with a floor area of 25,000 sf or less or, for office use, with a floor area of 100,000 sf or less.

Streetscape Regulations

To foster desirable architectural outcomes and establish continuity between building facades, the special purpose district would apply active ground-floor and transparency requirements along key commercial corridors. Additionally, the provisions would create street wall requirements along such corridors. Within the special purpose district, a majority of the proposed zoning districts, with the exception of the R6A district, would be non-contextual. As such, absent any special rules, no street wall regulations would apply.

Additional Provisions

For certain large sites next to the future Parkchester/Van Nest and Morris Park stations, the Proposed Actions would create future discretionary actions to facilitate the provision of public realm improvements. A mechanism would be created to allow for a floor area bonus where a network of open space amenities and pedestrian circulation improvements are provided. A separate authorization would also allow for

additional bulk modifications to facilitate developable floor space, including additional floor area generated under the bonus, to be accommodated within the permitted building envelope.

Additionally, to accommodate the creation of a station plaza for the future Morris Park station, a transfer of floor area mechanism would be created to allow the distribution of floor area across development sites proximate to this future station.

Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District

The proposed zoning text amendment to modify Section 103-10 of the Zoning Resolution seeks to remove language that exclusively applies to C8-4 districts mapped within Special Planned Community Preservation District areas.

Section 103-10 of the Zoning Resolution contains a provision that exclusively applies to C8-4 districts mapped within Special Planned Community Preservation District areas. This provision provides an exemption to the generally prohibited demolition of buildings within Special Planned Community Preservation District areas. The exemption only applies within a C8-4 district and allows for the demolition of any building that is less than 10,000 square feet and was constructed after December 31, 1955, but prior to July 18, 1974.

Four Special Planned Community Preservation District areas are established in New York City: Parkchester in the Bronx, Harlem River Houses in Manhattan, and Fresh Meadows and Sunnyside Gardens in Queens. Only the Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District is mapped with a C8-4 district.

As described above, zoning map amendments are proposed to both rezone the currently C8-4 zoned portion of the Parkchester area to a R8X district, and to remove the affected area from the Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District. The removed area would be included within the Special Eastchester – East Tremont Corridor District boundaries.

Therefore, the provision of Zoning Resolution Section 103-10 that specifically relates to C8-4 districts would no longer serve a purpose.

R6-1 District

The proposed R6-1 non-contextual district is a medium-density residence district that would allow residential uses of all types and community facility uses. The proposed R6-1 district is designed to produce Quality Housing buildings that have bulk regulations similar to what is allowed in an R6 district on wide streets under the MIH program. For areas mapped with MIH and under Quality Housing, R6-1 districts would permit a maximum of 3.6 FAR (MIH) and a lot coverage of 65 percent. The district would permit a maximum base height of 65 feet, above which the building must be set back, and a maximum building height of 115 feet or 11 stories. A different building setback would be required on wide and narrow streets. Above the maximum base height, the required building setbacks would be ten feet and 15 feet, respectively. Like other residence districts, R6-1 districts would require a 30-foot rear yard for residential

portions of any building. Off-street parking would be required for 50 percent of the dwelling units in the building (25 percent requirement for IRHU), but no parking would be required inside the Transit Zone.

M1-1A District

The proposed zoning text amendment would establish a new M1-1A district, which would permit loft building envelopes similar to contextual buildings in residence districts. The proposed district would permit community facility uses and commercial uses, including retail and service establishments without any size restrictions, and all recreation, entertainment and assembly space uses. The district would also permit light industrial or manufacturing uses subject to performance standards. All permitted uses would have a maximum FAR of 2.0. The district would establish a maximum base height of 45 feet and maximum building height of 65 feet. The district would also have a rear yard requirement of ten feet below a building height of 65 feet, 15 feet for buildings with a height between 65 and 125 feet, and 20 feet above a height of 125 feet for commercial or manufacturing uses. For general commercial uses, off-street parking would be required for every 300 square feet of floor area. Such use, bulk and parking provisions would be established in the Special Eastchester – East Tremont Corridor District.

Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH)

Amendment to Appendix F designating the proposed R6A, R6-1, R7-2, R7-3, R8X, C4-3 and C4-4 districts as MIH areas.

The proposed R6A, R6-1, R7-2, M1-1A/R7-3, R8X, C4-3 and C4-4 zoning districts would be mapped as MIH areas, requiring a share of new housing to be permanently affordable.

The MIH program requires permanently affordable housing within new residential developments, enlargements, and conversions from non-residential to residential use within the mapped designated MIH areas. The program requires permanently affordable housing set-asides for all developments over ten units or 12,500 zoning square feet within MIH areas or, as an additional option for developments below 25 units and 25,000 sf, a payment into an Affordable Housing Fund.

The MIH program includes two primary options that pair set-aside percentages with different affordability levels to reach a range of low and moderate incomes while accounting for the financial feasibility trade-off inherent between income levels and size of the affordable set-aside. Option 1 requires 25 percent of residential floor area to be for affordable housing units for households with incomes averaging 60 percent of the Area Median Income (AMI). Option 1 also includes a requirement that ten percent of residential floor area be affordable at 40 percent of AMI. Option 2 requires 30 percent of residential floor area to be for affordable to households with an average of 80 percent of AMI. An Option 3 can also be applied in conjunction with Options 1 or 2. Option 3, also known as the “Deep Affordability” option, requires that 20 percent of the residential floor area be affordable to households at 40 percent of AMI. The City Council and CPC could apply an additional Option 4, known as the “Workforce” option, for markets where moderate- or middle-income development is marginally financially feasible without subsidy. This requires a 30 percent set-aside at AMIs averaging 115 percent and does not allow public funding.

Transit Zone Extension

The Proposed Actions include an amendment to Appendix I, extending Transit Zone 2, Borough of the Bronx, Community District 11 and adding to the maps of the Transit Zone. The affected areas are as follows:

- One block generally bounded by Paulding Avenue and Bronxdale Avenue to the east and west, respectively, and along the northern frontage of Poplar Street.
- One partial block generally bounded Sackett Avenue to the north and the railroad right-of-way to the south.
- One partial block generally bounded by Bronxdale Avenue to the west and Pierce Avenue and Sackett Avenue to the north and south, respectively.
- One partial block generally bounded by Bronxdale Avenue to the west and Van Nest Avenue and Pierce Avenue to the north and south, respectively.
- One partial block generally bounded by Bronxdale Avenue to the east and Pierce Avenue and the railroad right-of-way to the north and south, respectively.
- One partial block generally bounded by East Tremont Avenue to the north for a length of approximately 600 feet westwardly from its intersection with Bronxdale Avenue.

PROPOSED CITY MAP CHANGES

The Proposed Actions include changes to the City Map to:

- Map Block 4209, Lots 10 and 70 as street to facilitate the creation of a new public plaza at the Morris Park station. For purposes of analysis, it is conservatively assumed that this specific City Map change is part of the Proposed Actions. Other means to facilitate the creation of a new publicly accessible plaza at the future Morris Park station, including the acquisition of real property by a private entity, continue to be pursued.
- Map portions of Block 4042, Lot 200 as street to facilitate the creation of a street network and improved circulation of future development of this site.
- Map Block 4226, Lots 1 and 11 as street to facilitate the proposed widening of Marconi Street to reduce traffic congestion and enhance pedestrian and vehicular safety and circulation, and map Block 4226, Lot 50 (portions of) as street to facilitate the proposed widening of Marconi Street to add a new right-turn lane to the future BPC campus.
- Map portions of Block 4226, Lots 1, 5, and 75 and Block 4411, Lot 75 as street to accommodate the proposed extension of Marconi Street to connect with Pelham Parkway.
- De-map a portion of Unionport Road to facilitate the development of adjacent Block 3952.

The proposed changes to the City Map are intended to improve neighborhood livability by facilitating public realm improvements in connection with planned private and public investments. The proposed mapping of new streets would facilitate improved circulation within a large opportunity site near the future Parkchester/Van Nest train station. The proposed mapping to extend and widen Marconi Street

would provide a direct connection between the existing office campuses at Hutchinson Metro Center and the future BPC redevelopment and Pelham Parkway to the north and reduce traffic congestion and enhance traffic safety.

H. Analysis Framework

REASONABLE WORST-CASE DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO (RWCDS)

In order to assess the possible impacts of the Proposed Actions, a reasonable worst-case development scenario (RWCDS) was developed for both predicted conditions in a ten year period ("Build Year 2033") in the absence of the Proposed Actions ("Future No-Action") with the Proposed Actions ("Future With-Action"). The incremental difference between the Future No-Action and Future With-Action conditions will serve as the basis for the impact analyses of the EIS. A ten-year period typically represents the amount of time developers would act on the proposed action for an area-wide rezoning not associated with a specific development.

To determine the Future With-Action and No-Action conditions, standard methodologies have been used following the *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines. These methodologies have been used to identify the amount and location of future development.

In projecting the amount and location of new development, several factors have been considered in identifying likely development sites; including known development proposals, past and current development trends, and the development site criteria described below. Generally, for area-wide rezonings that create a broad range of development opportunities, new development can be expected to occur on selected, rather than all, sites within the Affected Area. The first step in establishing the development scenario for the Proposed Actions was to identify those sites where new development could be reasonably expected to occur.

DEVELOPMENT SITE CRITERIA

Development sites were initially identified based on the following criteria:

- Lots utilizing less than half of the permitted FAR under the relevant zoning, or occupied by a vacant building.
- Lots located in areas where changes in use would be permitted.
- Lots located in areas where a substantial increase in permitted FAR is proposed.

- Lots with a total size greater than or equal to 5,000 square feet[2] (including potential assemblages totaling 5,000 square feet or more if assemblage seems probable),[3] unless the site is between 2,500 and 4,999 sf and is underutilized (defined as vacant or occupied by a vacant building).

Certain lots that meet these criteria have been excluded from the scenario based on the following conditions because they are very unlikely to be redeveloped as a result of the proposed rezoning

- Lots where construction activity is occurring or has recently been completed.
- The sites of schools (public and private), municipal libraries, government offices, large medical centers, and houses of worship in control of their sites with limited development potential. These facilities may meet the development site criteria, because they are built to less than half of the permitted floor area under the current zoning and are on larger lots. However, these facilities have not been redeveloped or expanded despite the ability to do so, and it is extremely unlikely that the increment of additional FAR permitted under the proposed zoning would induce redevelopment or expansion of these structures. Additionally, for government-owned properties, development and/or sale of these lots may require discretionary actions from the pertinent government agency.
- Lots containing multi-unit buildings (six or more residential units) built before 1974 are unlikely to be redeveloped as they may contain rent-stabilized units. Buildings with rent-stabilized units are difficult to legally demolish due to tenant re-location requirements. Unless there are known redevelopment plans (throughout the public review process or otherwise), these buildings are generally excluded from the analysis framework.
- Certain large commercial structures, such as multi-story office buildings, sites owned and operated by major national corporations. Although these sites may meet the criteria for being built to less than half of the proposed permitted floor area, some of them are unlikely to be redeveloped due to their current or potential profitability, the cost of demolition and redevelopment, and their location.
- Certain active uses which would have difficulty relocating to other areas because of Citywide restrictions on the location of said uses.
- Lots whose location, highly irregular shape, or highly irregular topography would preclude or greatly limit future as-of-right development. Generally, development on highly irregular lots does not produce marketable floor space.
- Lots utilized for public transportation and/or public utilities.

[2] To make a conservative assumption, a site with a lot area that is only insignificantly below the 5,000 square feet threshold was included as a projected development site.

[3] Assemblages are defined as a combination of adjacent lots, which satisfy one of the following conditions:

(1) Lots share common ownership and, when combined, meet the aforementioned qualifying site criteria.

(2) At least one of the lots, or combination of lots, meets the qualifying site criteria, and ownership of the assemblage is shared by no more than three distinct owners, with the exception of projected development site #5. Due to the recent pattern of assemblage on this block, where an additional four residential properties were brought under common ownership since 2020, it was determined reasonable to assume that the remaining lots would share common ownership by the analysis year even though the current assemblage is shared by more than three distinct owners.

PROJECTED AND POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SITES

To produce a reasonable, conservative estimate of future growth, the development sites have been divided into two categories: projected development sites and potential development sites. The projected development sites are considered more likely to be developed within the ten-year analysis period for the Proposed Actions (i.e., by the analysis year 2033) while potential sites are considered less likely to be developed over the approximately ten-year analysis period. Potential development sites were identified based on the following criteria:

- Lots whose slightly irregular shapes, topographies, or encumbrances would make development more difficult.
- Lots with 4 or more commercial tenants, which are less likely to redevelop in the foreseeable future.
- Active businesses, which may provide unique services or are prominent, successful neighborhood businesses or organizations unlikely to move.
- Lots or site assemblages that are occupied by active, second-story commercial uses.

Based on the above criteria, 96 development sites (60 projected sites and 36 potential) have been identified in the Affected Area. These projected and potential development sites are depicted in Figure ES-8a, "Parkchester/Van Nest Projected and Potential Development Sites," and Figure ES-8b, "Morris Park Projected and Potential Development Sites." Appendix B, "Project Description," contains a detailed description of these development sites, as well as the detailed RWCDS tables that identify the uses expected to occur on each of these sites under Future No Action and With Action conditions.

This EIS assesses both density-related and site-specific potential impacts from development on all projected development sites. Density-related impacts are dependent on the amount and type of development projected on a site and the resulting impacts on traffic, air quality, community facilities, and open space.

Site-specific impacts relate to individual site conditions and are not dependent on the density of projected development. Site-specific impacts include potential noise impacts from development, the effects on historic resources, and the possible presence of hazardous materials. Development is not anticipated on the potential development sites in the foreseeable future. Therefore, these sites have not been included in the density-related impact assessments. However, review of site-specific impacts for these sites will be conducted in order to ensure a conservative analysis.



Source: New York City Department of City Planning, 2023; STV Incorporated, 2023.

N

0 500 1,000 Feet

Affected Area *	*Only Parkchester / Van Nest section of Affected Area is shown; refer to Figure 8b for Morris Park section of Affected Area.
1 Projected Development Site	
A Potential Development Site	

Figure ES-8a

PARKCHESTER / VAN NEST PROJECTED & POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SITES



Source: New York City Department of City Planning, 2023; STV Incorporated, 2023.

Figure ES-8b

MORRIS PARK PROJECTED & POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SITES

Bronx Metro-North Station Study

Conceptual Analysis

A conceptual analysis is warranted if a proposed action creates new discretionary actions that are broadly applicable even when projects seeking those actions will trigger a future, separate environmental review. It is the lead agency's responsibility to consider all possible environmental impacts of the new discretionary actions at the time it creates them. The Proposed Actions would create a new discretionary action; an authorization for floor area bonus, for the City Planning Commission to consider. A conceptual analysis will be provided to understand how the new discretionary actions could be used in the future and to generically assess the potential environmental impacts that could result. However, all potential significant adverse impacts related to these future discretionary actions would be disclosed through environmental review at the time of application.

In addition, as part of the Proposed Actions portions of Block 4205, Lot 2 would be mapped with a C2-4 commercial overlay. Because the land use and development on this lot is governed by a large-scale general development plan which would require a future discretionary approval, this commercial overlay would also be analyzed conceptually.

The conceptual analysis would also consider those sites within or surrounding the affected area where an interest in future development, subject to future discretionary actions, has been expressed. These include the following: Montefiore Einstein has expressed interest in a series of land use actions affecting Block 4117, Lot 1 and Block 4120, Lots 7, 8, 12, 16, 18, 19, and 20 in order to facilitate the development of a new 425-bed high-acuity hospital pavilion and parking structure with a potential overbuild for health care. Discretionary actions to develop the New York City Health and Hospitals site currently housing NYPD Precinct 49 and FDNY EMS Battalion 20 on Block 4205, Lot 1 (portions of) will also be analyzed conceptually. Development on this site would require disposition of City-owned property and additional discretionary action.

DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO PARAMETERS

Dwelling Unit Factor

The number of projected dwelling units in residential use buildings is determined by dividing the total amount of residential floor area by 850 and rounding to the nearest whole number.

The Future without the Proposed Actions (No-Action Condition)

In the future without the Proposed Actions (No-Action), the identified projected development sites are assumed to either remain unchanged from existing conditions or become occupied by uses that are as-of-right under existing zoning and reflect current trends if they are vacant, occupied by vacant buildings, or occupied by low intensity uses that are deemed likely to support more active uses. Table ES-1, "2033 RWCDS No-Action and With-Action Land Uses," shows the No-Action conditions for the projected development sites.

As shown in Table ES-1, "2033 RWCDS No-Action and With-Action Land Uses," below, it is anticipated that, in the future without the Proposed Actions, there would be a total of approximately 2,122,010 gross square feet (gsf) of built floor area on the 60 projected development sites. Under the RWCDS, the total No-Action development would comprise approximately 239 residential units with no guarantees for affordability, 336,343 gsf of retail, restaurant and grocery store uses, 361,715 gsf of office space, 0 gsf of life sciences, 405,096 gsf of industrial and automotive uses, 229,777 gsf of community facility uses, and 2,208 accessory parking spaces. The No-Action estimated population would include approximately 637 residents and 3,189 workers on these projected development sites.

For reference, in the Existing Condition, the projected development sites in the Affected Area have an estimated total of 160 residents and 2,001 workers.

The Future with the Proposed Actions (With-Action Condition)

The Proposed Actions would allow for the development of new uses and higher densities at the projected and potential development sites. As shown in Table ES-1,"2033 RWCDS No-Action and With-Action Land Uses," under the RWCDS, the total development expected to occur on the 60 projected development sites under the With-Action condition would consist of approximately 11,287,282 gsf of floor area, including 7,291,654 gsf of residential floor area (approximately 7,713 dwelling units), a substantial proportion of which are expected to be affordable, 638,579 gsf of retail, restaurant, and grocery store uses, 216,019 gsf of office space, 1,620,625 gsf of life sciences, 0 gsf of industrial and automotive uses, and 1,520,405 gsf of community facility uses,[4] as well as 5,973 accessory parking spaces. The With-Action estimated population would include approximately 20,986 residents and 13,239 workers on these projected development sites.

The projected incremental (net) change between the No-Action and With-Action conditions that would result from the Proposed Actions would be an increase of 9,165,272 gsf of residential floor area (7,474 dwelling units), 302,236 gsf of local retail space, 1,620,625 gsf of life sciences, 1,290,628 gsf of community facility space, and 3,765 accessory parking spaces, and a net decrease 405,096 gsf of industrial and automotive uses and 145,696 gsf of office space on the projected development sites.

Based on 2020 Census data, the average household size for residential units in Bronx Community District 9 is 2.82, the average household size for residential units in Bronx Community District 10 is 2.45, and the average household size for residential units in Bronx Community District 11 is 2.71. Based on these ratios and standard ratios for estimating employment for commercial, community facility and industrial uses, Table ES-1, "2033 RWCDS No-Action and With-Action Land Uses," also provides an estimate of the number of residents and workers on the 60 project development sites in the No-Action and With-Action conditions.

Estimates of workers are based on standard rates used in several DCP neighborhood rezonings. Employee rates used are as follows: 1 employee per 25 dwelling units; 1 employee per 50 parking spaces; 1 employee

[4] For purposes of analysis, it is conservatively assumed that an educational facility would develop on two here relevant projected development sites.

per 250 sf of office; 3 employees per 1,000 sf of retail; 1 employee per 1,000 sf of auto-related and industrial uses; 1 employee per 15,000 sf of warehouse uses; 1 employee per 11.4 students in school uses; 3 employees per 1,000 sf of all other community facility uses; 1 employee per 450 sf of medical office; and 1 employee per 250 sf of life science uses. As indicated in Table ES-1, "2033 RWCDS No-Action and With-Action Land Uses," under the RWCDS, the Proposed Actions would result in a net increment of 20,349 residents and 10,050 workers.

A total of 36 sites were considered less likely to be developed by the build year and were analyzed as potential development sites (see Figures ES-8a and ES-8b). However, the analysis recognized that a number of potential development sites could be developed under the Proposed Actions in lieu of one or more of the projected sites in accommodating the development anticipated in the RWCDS. The potential development sites are therefore also analyzed for site-specific effects.

As such, the EIS analyzes the projected development sites for all technical areas of concern and also evaluate the effects of the potential developments for site-specific effects such as archaeology, shadows, hazardous materials, stationary air quality, and noise.

Table ES-1: 2033 RWCDS No-Action and With-Action Land Uses

Land Use	No-Action Conditions	With-Action Condition	No-Action to With-Action Increment
Residential			
Total Residential	*243,887 gsf* *239 units* *214,147 zsf*	*7,291,654 gsf* *7,713 units* *6,555,793 zsf*	*7,047,767 gsf* *7,474 units* *6,341,646 zsf*
Commercial			
Local Retail	336,343 gsf	638,579 gsf	302,236 gsf
Office	361,715 gsf	216,019 gsf	-145,696 gsf
Life Sciences	0 gsf	1,620,625 gsf	1,620,625 gsf
Garage	415,592 gsf	0 gsf	-415,592 gsf
Storage	129,600 gsf	0 gsf	-129,600 gsf
Total Commercial	*1,243,250 gsf* *1,059,827 zsf*	*2,475,223 gsf* *1,787,125 zsf*	*1,231,972 gsf* *727,298 zsf*
Industrial			
Warehouse	260,352 gsf	0 gsf	-260,352 gsf
Auto Related	93,633 gsf	0 gsf	-93,633 gsf
Manufacturing	51,112 gsf	0 gsf	-51,112 gsf
Total Industrial	*405,096 gsf* *344,332 zsf*	*0 gsf* *0 zsf*	*-405,096 gsf* *-344,332 zsf*
Community Facility			
Medical Office	221,577 gsf	1,301,789 gsf	1,080,212 gsf
House of Worship	8,200 gsf	34,611 gsf	26,411 gsf
Total Community Facility	*229,777 gsf* *199,579 zsf*	*1,520,405 gsf* *1,292,344 zsf*	*1,290,628 gsf* *1,092,765 zsf*
Total Floor Area	*2,122,010 gsf* *1,817,885 zsf*	*11,287,282 gsf* *9,635,263 zsf*	*9,165,272 gsf* *7,817,378 zsf*
Parking			
Parking Spaces	***2,208 spaces***	***5,973 spaces***	***3,765 spaces***
Population			
Residents	637	20,986	20,349
Workers	3,189	13,239	10,050

Source: DCP, 2023.

I. Public Review Process

The Proposed Actions described above are subject to public review under ULURP, Section 200 of the City Charter, as well as CEQR procedures. The ULURP and CEQR review processes are described below.

UNIFORM LAND USE REVIEW PROCEDURE (ULURP)

The City's ULURP, mandated by Sections 197-c and 197-d of the City Charter, is a process especially designed to allow public review of a proposed project at four levels: the Community Board, the Borough President and (if applicable) Borough Board, CPC, and the City Council. The procedure sets time limits for review at each stage to ensure a maximum total review period of approximately seven months.

The ULURP process begins with a certification by CPC that the ULURP application is complete, which includes satisfying CEQR requirements (see the discussion below). The application is then forwarded to the Community Board (in this case, Manhattan Community Board 2), which has 60 days to review and discuss the proposal, hold public hearings, and adopt recommendations regarding the application. Once this step is complete, the Borough President reviews the application for up to 30 days. CPC then has 60 days to review the application, during which time a ULURP/CEQR public hearing is held. Comments made at the DEIS public hearing (the record for commenting remains open for ten days after the hearing to receive written comments) are incorporated into a FEIS; the FEIS must be completed at least ten days before CPC makes its decision on the application. CPC may approve, approve with modifications, or deny the application.

If the ULURP application is approved, or approved with modifications, it moves to the City Council for review. The City Council does not automatically review all ULURP actions that are approved by CPC. Zoning map changes and zoning text changes (not subject to ULURP) nevertheless must be reviewed by the City Council; the Council may elect to review certain other actions. The City Council, through the Land Use Committee, has 50 days to review the application and, during this time, will hold a public hearing on the proposed project. The Council may approve, approve with modifications, or deny the application. If the Council proposes a modification to the proposed project, the ULURP review process stops for 15 days, providing time for a CPC determination on whether the modification is within the scope of the environmental review and ULURP review. If it is, then the Council may proceed with the modification; if it is not, then the Council may only vote on the project as approved by CPC. Following the Council's vote, the Mayor has five days in which to veto the Council's actions. The City Council may override a Mayoral veto within ten days.

The review of a zoning text amendment pursuant to Section 200 of the City Charter follows the same time clock as described above when coupled with a ULURP application, and is subject to the same procedures governing CPC, City Council, and Mayoral action.

NEW YORK CITY ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW (CEQR)

Pursuant to the SEQRA and its implementing regulations found at 6 NYCRR Part 617, New York City has established rules for its own environmental quality review in Executive Order 91 of 1977, as amended, and 62 RCNY Chapter 5, the Rules of Procedure for CEQR. The environmental review process provides a means for decision-makers to systematically consider environmental effects along with other aspects of project planning and design, to propose reasonable alternatives, to identify, and when practicable mitigate, significant adverse environmental effects. CEQR rules guide environmental review, as follows:

- **Establish a Lead Agency.** Under CEQR, the "lead agency" is the public entity responsible for conducting the environmental review. The lead agency is typically the entity principally responsible for carrying out, funding, or approving a proposed action. In accordance with CEQR rules (62 RCNY Section 5-03), DCP, acting as lead agency on behalf of CPC, assumed lead agency status for the Proposed Actions.
- **Determine Significance.** The lead agency's first charge is to determine whether the proposed action(s) may have a significant impact on the environment. To do so, DCP, in this case, evaluated an EAS dated December 8, 2022 for the Proposed Actions. Based on the information contained in the EAS, DCP determined that the Proposed Actions may have a significant adverse impact on the environment, as defined by statute, and issued a Positive Declaration on December 8, 2022 requiring that an EIS be prepared in conformance with all applicable laws and regulations, including SEQRA, Mayoral Executive Order No. 91 of 1977, CEQR Rules of Procedure of 1991, as well as the relevant guidelines of the *CEQR Technical Manual*.
- **Scoping.** Once the lead agency issues a Positive Declaration, it must then issue a draft scope of work for the EIS. "Scoping," or creating the scope of work, is the process of establishing the type and extent of the environmental impact analyses to be studied in the EIS. The Draft Scope of Work was prepared in accordance with SEQRA, CEQR, and the *CEQR Technical Manual*. Along with a Positive Declaration, the Draft Scope of Work was issued on December 8, 2022. CEQR requires a public scoping meeting as part of the process. A public scoping meeting was held on January 9, 2023, at 2:00 PM. The period for submitting written comments remained open until January 19, 2023. A FSOW was prepared, taking into consideration comments received during the public comment period, to direct the content and preparation of the DEIS. DCP issued the FSOW on January 19, 2024.
- **DEIS.** In accordance with the FSOW, a DEIS is prepared. The lead agency reviews all aspects of the document, calling on other City agencies to participate as appropriate. Once the lead agency is satisfied that the DEIS is complete, it issues a Notice of Completion (NOC) and circulates the DEIS for public review. The DEIS was deemed complete and the NOC was issued on January 19, 2024. When a DEIS is required, it must be deemed complete before the ULURP application can also be found complete.
- **Public Review.** Publication of the DEIS and issuance of the NOC signals the start of the public review period. During this period, which must extend for a minimum of 30 days, the public may review and comment on the DEIS either in writing or at a public hearing convened for the purposes of receiving such comments. As noted above, when the CEQR process is coordinated with another

City process that requires a public hearing, such as ULURP, the hearings may be held jointly. The lead agency must publish a notice of the hearing at least 14 days before it takes place and must accept written comments for at least ten days following the close of the hearing. All substantive comments become part of the CEQR record and are summarized and responded to in the FEIS.

- **FEIS.** After the close of the public comment period for the DEIS, the lead agency will prepare the FEIS. The FEIS incorporates relevant comments on the DEIS, in a separate chapter and in changes to the body of the text, graphics, and tables. Once the lead agency determines that the FEIS is complete, it will issue an NOC and circulate the FEIS.
- **Findings.** To document that the responsible public decision-makers have taken a hard look at the environmental consequences of a proposed action, any agency taking a discretionary action regarding a project must adopt a formal set of written findings, reflecting its conclusions about the potential for significant adverse environmental impacts of the proposed action, potential alternatives, and mitigation measures. No findings may be adopted until ten days after the NOC has been issued for the FEIS. Once each agency's findings are adopted, it may take its actions (or take "no action"). This means that the CPC must wait at least ten days after the FEIS is complete to take action on a given application.

J. Probable Impacts of The Proposed Actions

LAND USE, ZONING, AND PUBLIC POLICY

A detailed analysis was conducted based on the methodology set forth in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, and determined that the Proposed Actions would not have a significant adverse impact related to land use, zoning, or public policy. The Proposed Actions would not adversely affect land uses in the primary study area, nor would the Proposed Actions generate land uses that would be incompatible with existing zoning and land uses in the 1/4-mile secondary study area. Further, the Proposed Actions would not result in development that conflicts with adopted public policies applicable to the primary or secondary study areas.

Land Use

The new land uses allowed with the Proposed Actions would be compatible with, and supportive of, existing and planned uses in the study areas and the overall increase in residential, commercial, and community facility uses would advance important Citywide objectives related to housing and economic development. The Proposed Actions would allow a wider range of commercial uses, including retail uses and would eliminate the outdated use restrictions imposed by existing industrial zoning districts – currently, most new residential uses and many community facility uses are limited. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in any adverse land use impacts in the primary or secondary study areas.

Zoning

The zoning changes introduced by the Proposed Actions would be consistent with the City's land use, zoning, and public policy objectives for the area. The Proposed Actions would support the stated goals of the Bronx Metro-North Station Area Study, creating increased capacity for permanently affordable housing, retail opportunities, and jobs.

As described in Chapter 1, "Project Description," the existing zoning in the primary study area does not permit the full range of uses to fulfill the vision of the Bronx Metro-North Station Area Study. Residential development is currently not permitted in key locations along main corridors and areas that that can accommodate growth and density, and commercial and retail development is limited in many parts of the primary study area. The proposed zoning map and zoning text amendments reflect existing land use trends in the Rezoning Area, including new transit, and would address neighborhood and Citywide planning needs, including access to housing and jobs, affordable housing development, economic development, and better connectivity for all transportation modes. They would remove the barriers to development presented by obsolete industrial zoning.

Establishing and mapping a new Special Eastchester - East Tremont Corridor District would facilitate the growth of housing and employment centers around new transit stations and encourage a broader range of services and amenities for residents, workers, and visitors; promote a lively and attractive streetscape around new transit stations and along major transportation corridors; and create a cohesive pedestrian and public realm network to better connect future developments with the new stations and surrounding neighborhoods.

Therefore, there would be no significant adverse zoning impacts from the Proposed Actions.

Public Policy

No changes to the applicable primary or secondary study area public policies are proposed as part of the Proposed Actions. The Proposed Actions would be consistent with: 1) the goals of Westchester Square, Morris Park, and Castle Hill Business Improvement Districts (BIDs); 2) the NYC Waterfront Revitalization Program; 3) Zoning for Coastal Flood Resiliency; 4) Housing New York; 5) Vision Zero; 6) OneNYC; 7) NYC Food Retail Expansion to Support Health (FRESH) Program; 8) New York Works; 9) NYC Local Law 97; and 10) NYC Local Laws 92 and 94.

The Proposed Actions include a zoning map amendment for the purpose of removing a portion from the Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District. The Zoning Map amendment would be confined to the portion of the Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District that is zoned C8-4, a district that bridges commercial and manufacturing uses and provides for automotive and other heavy commercial services along major arteries. Reflective of their zoning and use, the buildings within this area are notably different in terms of height, massing, and orientation toward East Tremont Avenue as a busy thoroughfare. The area that would be removed from the Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District is notably different from the ensemble of buildings that is central to the

community's character which the preservation district seeks to preserve. Therefore, there would be no significant adverse public policy impacts from the Proposed Actions.

The Proposed Actions would facilitate development patterns that leverage the Penn Station Access project, which will introduce four new Metro-North stations to the East Bronx. They are also consistent with the goals of the Bronx Metro-North Station Area Study, a study recommending improvements to each of the four station areas to ensure the stations bring maximum benefits to the Borough. The Proposed Actions would change zoning designations within the primary study area in a manner intended to leverage the new planned Metro-North train service to promote economic growth; facilitate the development of housing, including affordable housing; and guide investment in the public realm around the new Metro-North train stations, encouraging safety and comfort for residents and visitors. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse impacts related to land use, zoning, or public policy.

SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS

Direct Residential Displacement

The screening-level assessment found that the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts due to direct residential displacement. The Proposed Actions could directly displace residents living in 59 dwelling units. Assuming the average household size for dwelling units (DUs) in the study area, which is 2.75 (based on the 2020 U.S. Census), this represents a potential direct displacement of 162 residents. The 59 DUs that would be displaced are located on Projected Development Sites 5, 9, 15, 16, 28, 42, 43, 52, and 55.

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual,* direct displacement of fewer than 500 residents would not typically be expected to substantially alter the socioeconomic character of a neighborhood. The potentially displaced residents represent 0.089 percent of the estimated 182,170 residents within the study area, as outlined below in this chapter; therefore, the potential direct displacement would not substantially alter the socioeconomic character of the neighborhood.

Direct Business Displacement

A preliminary assessment found that the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts due to direct business displacement. The Proposed Actions could directly displace 60 businesses on projected development sites and an estimated 650 – 880 jobs associated with those businesses by the 2033 Build Year. The 60 displaced businesses include 27 from the Other Services (except Public Administration), largely automotive services-related, six from Healthcare and Social Assistance, and six from Retail Trade. The remaining 21 businesses are from the Real Estate and Rental and Leasing, Construction, Transportation and Warehousing, Manufacturing, Accommodation and Food Service, Wholesale Trade, and Finance and Insurance sectors. The sector with the largest number of displaced

employees is Healthcare and Social Services, with up to 294 employees projected to be displaced; however, the Proposed Actions are designed to facilitate significant expansion of this sector in the Affected Area and, as a result, there would be many more new Healthcare and Social Assistance jobs than the ones potentially displaced. The sector with the second largest number of displaced employees is Other Services (except Public Administration), with up to 268 employees facing potential displacement, followed by Retail Trade, with up to 100 employees facing potential displacement. However, the Proposed Actions would also facilitate expansive growth in retail uses in the Affected Area.

While these businesses provide value to the local economy, there are alternative sources of goods, services, and employment provided within the broader neighborhood, or study area, and elsewhere in the Bronx. Therefore, the potential displacement of these businesses does not constitute a significant adverse impact on the socioeconomic conditions of the study area as defined by the *CEQR Technical Manual*.

Indirect Residential Displacement

A detailed analysis found that the Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse impacts due to indirect residential displacement. The Proposed Actions would result in an increment of 7,474 residential units and a net increase 19,608 residents, representing a 10.2 percent increase in population over the No Action condition. The Proposed Actions would change the zoning in much of the Affected Area to allow for higher density residential development, particularly around new transit stations and expanded job centers at the Morris Park academic medical institutions where it is not currently allowed. It is expected that the supply of new housing in this area will increase significantly, with 25 percent of new residential units, or just over 1,900 units, being permanently affordable.

Data from the New York State Homes and Community Renewal (HCR) Stabilized Building List and the New York City Department of Buildings determined that there are currently over 32,200 rent stabilized units in the study area, in addition to 132 public housing units in New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA) property. The detailed analysis also identified an estimated 35,460 low-income renter households in the study area, thus concluding that there are 3,123 low-income renter households living in unprotected rental DUs and thus subject to potential indirect displacement. According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, if the vulnerable population potentially subject to indirect displacement exceeds five percent of the study area population, the Proposed Actions may result in a significant change to the socioeconomic character of the study area and a potential significant adverse impact may occur. The 3,123 renter households living in unprotected rental units represent a population of 8,588, or 4.7 percent of the study area's population. While this figure is close to five percent, the mixed-income composition of the proposed new development in addition to its geographic concentration along the East Tremont Avenue / Eastchester Road corridor is likely to limit its adverse socioeconomic impacts on the broader study area. Additionally, the creation of 1,902 permanently protected affordable units as part of the Proposed Actions would account for over 60 percent of the current 3,123 renter households living in unprotected rental units. These affordable units would contribute to the stabilization of housing options in the study area and

reduce the number of vulnerable low-income renters. Based on these projections, there is no potential for significant adverse impacts due to indirect residential displacement.

Indirect Business Displacement

A preliminary assessment has found that the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts due to indirect business displacement. Concerns defined by the *CEQR Technical Manual* are whether the Proposed Actions could lead to changes in local market conditions that could lead to increases in commercial property values with the study area, making it difficult for some categories of businesses to remain in the area, and whether the Proposed Actions could lead to displacement of a use type that directly supports businesses in the study area or brings people to the area that forms a customer base for local businesses.

The Proposed Actions would facilitate approximately 1.6 million gsf of new commercial life sciences development and approximately 1.1 million gsf of incremental community facilities on the projected development sites, in addition to displacing 60 businesses and eliminating industrial uses within the Affected Area. However, the broader study area has well-established retail, commercial, and industrial districts that are some distance from the Affected Area along the East Tremont and Eastchester corridor. These existing businesses along Morris Park Avenue, White Plains Road, Lydig Avenue, and other commercial districts would therefore not be adversely impacted by this new development and may benefit from an expanded customer base due to the influx of new medical center and commercial life sciences employees, in addition to new residents.

Adverse Effects on Specific Industries

A preliminary assessment found that the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts due to adverse effects on specific industries. An analysis is warranted if a substantial number of residents or workers depend on the goods or services provided by the affected businesses or if it would result in the loss or substantial diminishment of a particularly important product or service within the industry. The Proposed Actions could lead to the potential direct displacement of six Healthcare and Social Assistance sector businesses representing almost 300 employees; however, the Proposed Actions are also designed to significantly expand the Healthcare and Social Assistance sector in the Affected Area, with up to approximately 1.3 million gsf of incremental community facility space dedicated to medical offices. The Proposed Actions would also lead to the direct displacement of 27 businesses from the Other Services (except Public Administration) sector, many providing automotive-related services. However, these businesses make up only five percent of all businesses from this sector in the study area. While the Affected Area contains the largest cluster of automotive services-related businesses in the study area, there are other clusters of automotive-related services businesses in nearby areas of the Bronx and appropriately zoned properties where displaced businesses may relocate. The products and services offered by potentially displaced businesses in the Affected Area are not essential to the viability of other businesses within or outside the study area and, therefore, the Proposed Actions would not adversely affect business conditions in any specific industry within or outside the study area.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

The Proposed Actions would result in result in a significant adverse impact on elementary schools. No significant adverse impacts on intermediate schools, high schools, public libraries, or early childhood programs would result. Detailed analyses of potential indirect impacts on public elementary, intermediate, and high schools, public libraries, and publicly funded early childhood programs were conducted for the Proposed Actions. Based on the *CEQR Technical Manual* screening methodology, detailed analyses of outpatient health care facilities and police and fire protection services are not warranted, although they are discussed qualitatively.

Public Schools

The Affected Area falls within the boundaries of two New York City Community School District (CSD) sub-districts: CSD 11, Sub-district 1 and CSD 12, Sub-district 2. Compared to the No-Action condition, the RWCDS associated with the Proposed Action would introduce a net increment of 3,575 total students, consisting of approximately 1,799 elementary school students, 804 intermediate school students, and 972 high school students spread across CSD 11, Sub-district 1 and CSD 12, Sub-district 2, with the majority of students being introduced by projected development sites within CSD 11, Sub-district 1.

In the 2033 future with the Proposed Actions, CSD 11, Sub-district 1 would experience a significant adverse impact to elementary schools and would not experience significant adverse impacts to intermediate schools. CSD 12, Sub-district 2 would not experience significant adverse impacts to either elementary or intermediate schools.

CSD 11, Sub-district 1 elementary schools would increase from a No-Action utilization rate of 86.5 percent to a rate of 103.7 percent in the With-Action condition (an increase of approximately 17.2 percent) with a deficit of 340 elementary school seats (340 project-generated students over the 100 percent utilization rate). CSD 11, Sub-district 1 intermediate schools would increase from 69.1 percent utilization in the No-Action condition to 85.5 percent utilization in the With-Action condition (an increase of 16.3 percent) with a surplus of 636 seats. As elementary schools within this sub-district would operate over capacity in the With-Action condition, with an increase of more than 100 students generated as a result of the Proposed Actions over the No-Action condition (the CEQR impact threshold), a significant adverse impact to elementary schools in CSD 11, Sub-district 1 would result. No significant adverse impact would occur to intermediate schools in CSD 11, Sub-district 1.

CSD 12, Sub-district 2 elementary and intermediate schools would continue to operate with available capacity in the future With-Action condition and would therefore not experience a significant adverse impact.

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the determination of impact significance for high schools is conducted at the borough level. In the future With-Action condition, Bronx high schools are expected to operate with available capacity (43.0 percent utilization), and, therefore, no significant adverse impacts on public high schools would result.

Libraries

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts to libraries. Four New York Public Library (NYPL) branches are located within a ¾-mile radius of the Affected Area: the Pelham Parkway – Van Nest, Morris Park, Westchester Square, and Parkchester branches. The Proposed Actions would introduce an estimated 20,349 additional residents to the libraries' combined catchment area (compared to No-Action conditions). For the Pelham Parkway – Van Nest and Parkchester branches, the catchment area population increases resulting from the Proposed Actions would be less than five percent, which would not result in a noticeable change in the delivery of library services. The Morris Park and Westchester Square Branches' catchment area populations are both expected to increase by more than five percent in the future with the Proposed Actions, which could represent a significant adverse impact on library services according to the *CEQR Technical Manual*. However, many of the residents in the catchment areas for the Morris Park and Westchester Square branch libraries also reside in the catchment areas for other nearby libraries and would also be served by these libraries in the future with the Proposed Actions. Residents in the study area would have access to the entire NYPL system through the interlibrary loan system and could have volumes delivered directly to their nearest library branch. In addition, residents would also have access to libraries near their place of work. Therefore, the population introduced by the Proposed Actions is not expected to result in a significant adverse impact on public libraries.

Early Childhood Programs

The Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact on publicly funded early childhood programs. The RWCDS for the Proposed Actions is expected to introduce approximately 2,282 low- to moderate-income units by 2033. Based on the most recent early childhood programs multipliers in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, this development would generate approximately 317 children under the age of five who could be eligible for publicly funded early childhood programs. With the addition of these children, there would be 1,749 available slots in the study area by 2033 (63.7 percent utilization), and the Proposed Actions would result in an increase in the utilization rate of approximately 6.6 percentage points over the No-Action condition.

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a significant adverse impact to early childhood programs may result, warranting consideration of mitigation, if a proposed action would increase the study area's utilization rate by at least five percentage points and the resulting utilization rate would be 100 percent or more. Though the Proposed Actions would result in a 6.6 percentage point increase in the study area early childhood program utilization rate, early childhood programs would continue to operate under capacity in the future With-Action condition, and therefore the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact to publicly funded early childhood programs.

Police, Fire, and Health Care Services

The *CEQR Technical Manual* recommends a detailed analysis of indirect impacts on police, fire, and health care services in cases where a proposed action would create a sizeable new neighborhood where none

existed before. The Proposed Actions would facilitate an area-wide rezoning that would increase density on major streets, large sites, areas adjacent to large institutions and at new transit stations. The proposed zoning changes would allow for growth in appropriate locations near new Metro-North stations, facilitating the construction of new housing (including affordable housing through MIH) as well as commercial and community facility uses. The Proposed Actions would also facilitate active streetscapes and increased connectivity within the Affected Area. The Affected Area is a developed area with several existing and well-established communities that are served by existing police, fire, and health care services. Demand for these services created by the Proposed Actions would be spread across several communities, due to the large geography of the Affected Area. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not create a neighborhood where none existed before, and a detailed analysis of indirect effects on these community facilities is not warranted.

OPEN SPACE

A detailed open space analysis for the residential study area determined that the Proposed Actions would result in a significant adverse impact related to active open space. Per the guidance of the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a proposed action may result in a significant adverse impact on open space resources if (a) there would be direct displacement/alteration of existing open space within the study area that would have a significant adverse effect on existing users; or (b) it would reduce the open space ratio and consequently result in overburdening of existing facilities or further exacerbating a deficiency in open space.

Direct Effects

The Proposed Actions would not result in the physical loss of existing public open space resources, and would not result in any significant adverse operational air quality, noise, or other environmental impacts that would affect the usefulness of any study area open space. The Proposed Actions would result in new significant adverse shadow impacts on a portion of Pelham Parkway, the Greenstreet at Sacket Avenue, and a small portion of the larger 129-acre Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District. As discussed in Chapter 6, "Shadows," the Sacket Avenue Greenstreet would not receive adequate sunlight during the growing season, potentially resulting in a significant adverse shadow impact on the Greenstreet's vegetation. However, per *2021 CEQR Technical Manual* guidance, "landscaped open areas designed to increase the aesthetic value of public spaces, which do not provide amenities for public recreation" are not considered to be publicly-accessible open space resources, and specifically cites Greenstreets as one of the examples of such spaces as they generally do not include recreational features such as benches or seating areas. The Greenstreet at Sacket Avenue does not contain any benches, seating areas, or recreational amenities. Therefore, while this would represent a significant adverse shadow impact, the shading of the Sacket Avenue Greenstreet caused by the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse direct impact to open space.

As discussed in Chapter 6, "Shadows," though incremental shadow coverage on Pelham Parkway would occur for extended durations during the March 21/September 21, May 6/August 6, and December 21 analysis days, it would continue to receive some direct sunlight on all representative analysis days. Across

the three analysis days where Pelham Parkway would receive incremental shadow, the incremental shadow would only be cast on an approximately five-acre portion of the larger 108.91-acre open space resource (of which approximately 42 acres fall within the open space study areas). Incremental shadow would not alter the public's use and enjoyment of this resource, and therefore the disclosed shadow impact would not be considered a direct open space impact on Pelham Parkway.

As also discussed in Chapter 6, "Shadows," the Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District's 129-acre area would continue to receive direct sunlight on all representative analysis days, although vegetation in the yard between 1596-1598 Unionport Road and the street and the pedestrian path between Projected Development Site 8 and 1950-1970 E Tremont Avenue may no longer receive adequate sunlight during the growing season. As such, vegetation in this area could be significantly impacted and this small portion of the larger 129-acre area may no longer be able to support a variety of plant life, as compared to the No-Action condition. However, although this significant adverse shadow impact could reduce the utility of these areas, the open spaces within the Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District would continue to be available and provide other passive or active open space uses and therefore there would not be a direct significant adverse open space impact.

Indirect Effects

As the Proposed Actions are expected to introduce approximately 20,349 residents and 10,050 workers under the Reasonable Worst-Case Development Scenario (RWCDS), compared to the No-Action condition, a detailed open space analysis for both a non-residential (¼-mile) study area and residential (½-mile) study area was conducted, pursuant to *CEQR Technical Manual* guidance. The detailed analysis determined that the Proposed Actions would result in a significant adverse indirect impact to total, passive, and active open space in the residential study area.

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the majority of the Affected Area and surrounding study areas are located in "walk gap" areas, i.e., areas that are not within walking distance of a public open space. In addition, both the non-residential and residential study areas do not currently meet the *CEQR* guidance for open space adequacy. The *CEQR Technical Manual* indicates that a decrease in the open space ratio exceeding the thresholds specified in Table 7-5 of the *CEQR Technical Manual* indicates the potential for a significant adverse impact. For areas that are extremely lacking in open space, a decrease of as little as one percent may be considered significant. An open space impact assessment also considers qualitative factors.

Non-Residential Study Area

In the future with the Proposed Actions, while the non-residential study area's passive open space ratio would decrease by more than five percent from No-Action conditions (18.4 percent), it would remain well above the City's planning goal ratio of 0.15 acres per 1,000 non-residents, at 0.68 acres per 1,000 non-residents. Therefore, non-residents in the ¼-mile study area would continue to be well-served by passive open space resources, and there would be no significant adverse impact in the non-residential study area as a result of the Proposed Actions.

Residential Study Area

Within the residential study area, the total, active and passive open space ratios would remain below the City's planning goal ratios of 2.5 acres, which includes 2.0 acres of active and 0.5 acres of passive space per 1,000 residents, respectively, in the future with the Proposed Actions. The residential study area total open space ratio would decline by 14.4 percent to 0.50 acres per 1,000 residents; the residential study area active open space ratio would decline by 14.4 percent to 0.22 acres per 1,000 residents; and the residential study area passive open space ratio would decline by 14.4 percent to 0.28 acres per 1,000 residents. As these decreases would exceed the *CEQR Technical Manual* thresholds indicating the potential for an impact, and the Affected Area and significant portions of the residential study area are within walk gap areas, the Proposed Actions would result in a significant adverse indirect impact on total, active, and passive open space in the residential study area.

Supplemental Impact Assessment

Given that the geography of the Affected Area is made up of two distinct areas centered around the planned Morris Park and Parkchester Metro-North railroad stations, and that the density of development anticipated as a result of the Proposed Actions would be concentrated around these two nodes, in consultation with NYC Parks, a supplemental indirect impact assessment was conducted for Morris Park and Parkchester neighborhood sub-districts.

Morris Park Sub-District

Non-Residential Study Area

In the future with the Proposed Actions, The passive open space ratio in the non-residential study area for the Morris Park sub-district would decrease by over five percent from No-Action conditions (21.7 percent). It would remain well above the City's planning goal ratio of 0.15 acres per 1,000 non-residents, at 0.72 acres per 1,000 non-residents. Therefore, non-residents in the ¼-mile study area for the Morris Park sub-district would continue to be well-served by passive open space resources, and there would be no significant adverse impact to daytime passive open space users in the non-residential study area as a result of the Proposed Actions.

Residential Study Area

In the future with the Proposed Actions, the total, passive, and active open space ratios for the residential study area for the Morris Park sub-district would all decrease by 16.3 percent. The total open space ratio would be 0.96, the passive ratio would be 0.61, and the active ratio would be 0.35 acres per 1,000 residents. A significant adverse impact on total and active open space would occur, since these decreases would exceed the *CEQR Technical Manual* thresholds indicating the potential for an impact, and the Affected Area and significant portions of the residential study area are within walk gap areas.

Parkchester Sub-District

Non-Residential Study Area

In the future with the Proposed Actions, though the passive open space ratio in the non-residential study area for the Parkchester sub-district would experience a decrease of over five percent from No-Action conditions (13.4 percent), it would remain above the City's planning goal ratio of 0.15 acres per 1,000 non-

residents, at 0.47 acres per 1,000 non-residents. Therefore, non-residents in the ¼-mile study area for the Parkchester sub-district would continue to be well-served by passive open space resources, and there would be no significant adverse impact to daytime passive open space users in the non-residential study area as a result of the Proposed Actions.

Residential (Half-Mile) Study Area

In the future with the Proposed Actions, the total, passive, and active open space ratios for the residential study area for the Parkchester sub-district would all decrease by 11.2 percent. The total open space ratio would be 0.23, the passive ratio would be 0.10, and the active ratio would be 0.13 acres per 1,000 residents. A significant adverse impact on total, passive, and active open space would occur, since these decreases would exceed the *CEQR Technical Manual* thresholds indicating the potential for an impact, and the Affected Area and significant portions of the residential study area are within walk gap areas.

SHADOWS

A detailed shadows analysis was conducted and concluded that development resulting from the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse shadow impacts on three sunlight-sensitive resources. The projected and potential development sites identified in the RWCDS would result in incremental shadow coverage on seven sunlight-sensitive resources. The detailed shadows analysis identified significant adverse impacts at three sunlight-sensitive resources. The analysis determined that a portion of Pelham Parkway, the Greenstreet at Sacket Avenue, and a small portion of the larger 129-acre Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District would not receive adequate sunlight during the growing season (at least the six to eight hour minimum specified in the *CEQR Technical Manual*) as a result of incremental shadow coverage, and vegetation at these resources could be significantly impacted.

HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts on Historic and Cultural Resources. A detailed analysis was conducted and determined that the Proposed Actions could result in significant adverse impacts to archaeological resources, direct and indirect effects to architectural resources, and construction-period effects.

Archaeological Resources

The Proposed Actions could result in significant adverse impacts to archaeological resources. A Phase 1A Archaeological Documentary Study of the archaeological study area was prepared in October 2023 to clarify the archaeological sensitivity of 2547 East Tremont Avenue and was submitted to LPC for review (see Appendix D). The Phase 1A Study confirmed the potential for two historical archaeological resource types to exist on a portion of the site; 19th century shaft features associated with the church on the western section of the site, and potential human remains associated with the Methodist Episcopal Church

of Westchester cemetery on the eastern section of the site. The church was built in 1818, and the cemetery was in use from approximately 1809 through 1906.

The Phase 1A study recommended additional archaeological investigation for the potentially sensitive sections of the site in the form of Phase 1B Archaeological Testing and would require the preparation of an Archaeological Work Plan in consultation with LPC before any subsurface work could be undertaken. The Archaeological Work Plan would provide details of subsurface investigations appropriate to identify both potential shaft features and human remains as part of the archaeological investigation. The Archaeological Work Plan would be submitted to and require concurrency by LPC for all potential investigations.

In order to mitigate potential significant adverse impacts on archaeological resources, additional archaeological analysis would be required on the site before it is redeveloped. While there are no mechanisms currently in place to ensure that this archaeological analysis would occur on the privately owned site subsequent to rezoning, if redevelopment would involve either federal or state funding or permitting, or if the site were to be developed through future discretionary actions that would be subject to review under CEQR, then further environmental review could be required, and historic resource issues could be addressed. Environmental review could necessitate Phase 1B archaeological testing and possibly mitigation for identified significant archaeological resources through avoidance or data recovery (e.g., Phase 2 or Phase 3 excavations). However, it is not possible to determine if a future development would involve any funding or permitting requiring additional discretionary review and if would occur as-of-right, it is not possible to preclude any potential significant adverse impacts on archaeological resources.

Architectural Resources

Direct (Physical Impacts)

The Proposed Actions would result in significant direct adverse impacts to the State/National Registers of Historic Places-eligible (S/NR-eligible) Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District as a result of the demolition of 2000 and 2040 East Tremont Avenue.

Indirect (Contextual) Impacts

Projected Development Site 8 is located within the boundaries of the S/NR-eligible Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District, which in the future with the Proposed Actions would permit the demolition and/or alteration of contributing resources (2000 East Tremont Avenue, 14 Metropolitan Oval, and 2040 East Tremont). The demolition and/or alteration of contributing resources within the eligible historic district and potential construction of new buildings on the development site has the potential to result in indirect impacts to the S/NR-eligible Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District by changing the setting of contributing resources that would not be directly affected and by constructing new mixed-use buildings with affordable housing that may not be similar to the existing character of the area.

No other projected or potential development sites would eliminate or substantially obstruct significant public views of architectural resources, as all significant elements of these historic resources would remain visible in view corridors on public streets. Additionally, no incompatible visual, audible, or atmospheric elements would be introduced by the Proposed Actions to the settings of historic resources in the With-Action condition. Lastly, the historic architectural significance of both the S/NR-eligible Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District, and the individually S/NR-eligible 1595 Unionport Road is not dependent upon, or otherwise specifically related to, the surrounding development context. Therefore, apart from the area immediately surrounding Projected Development Site 8, the historic character of the S/NR-eligible Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District, including the S/NR-eligible 1595 Unionport Road, would remain intact.

As described in Chapter 6, "Shadows," a small portion of the larger 129-acre Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District would not receive adequate sunlight during the growing season (at least the six to eight hour minimum specified in the *CEQR Technical Manual*) as a result of incremental shadow coverage, and vegetation at these resources could be significantly impacted.

Construction Impacts

Potential significant adverse impacts would occur to contributing resources in the S/NR-eligible Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District, which includes the S/NR-eligible 1595 Unionport Road and three buildings within the district identified as architecturally significant by LPC (2000 East Tremont Avenue, 14 Metropolitan Oval, and 2040 East Tremont Avenue), as a result of adjacent construction located within 90 feet of projected or potential development sites.

Buildings or structures that are listed on the State/National Registers of Historic Places (S/NR-Listed) or New York City Landmarks (NYCLs) would be afforded standard protection under the New York City Department of Buildings' (DOB's) Technical Policy and Procedure Notice (TPPN) #10/88, regulations applicable to all buildings located adjacent (within 90 feet) to construction sites; however, since the resources identified above are not S/NR-Listed or NYCLs, they are not afforded the added special protections under DOB's TPPN #10/88. Additional protective measures afforded under DOB TPPN #10/88, which include a monitoring program to reduce the likelihood of construction damage to adjacent S/NR-Listed resources or NYCLs, would only become applicable if the S/NR-eligible resources are listed or designated in the future prior to the initiation of construction. Otherwise, there is the potential for inadvertent construction damage and impacts to occur as a result of adjacent development resulting from the Proposed Actions.

URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES

A detailed analysis was conducted based on the methodology set forth in the *CEQR Technical Manual* and determined that the Proposed Actions would not have a significant adverse impact related to urban design and visual resources.

The Proposed Actions would facilitate development that is not currently permitted as-of-right in the Affected Area, which would create a notable change in the urban design character of the area. Compared to the future without the Proposed Actions, the visual appearance, and thus the pedestrian experience in the vicinity of the Affected Area would change considerably. However, this change would not constitute a significant adverse urban design impact as it would not negatively affect a pedestrian's experience. Rather, development facilitated by the Proposed Actions is expected to positively affect the urban design of the area and improve the pedestrian experience in and surrounding the Affected Area. The Proposed Actions would facilitate the construction of active lower-level uses, including retail, community facility spaces, and residential and office lobbies as well as pedestrian amenities like the proposed Morris Park Station plaza, reactivating the corridors of the Affected Area and making the area more accessible, safe, and enjoyable for pedestrians.

Development facilitated by the Proposed Actions would enhance the commercial corridors surrounding Metro-North's future Parkchester/Van Nest and Morris Park Station Areas. The Proposed Actions would enable improved connectivity to the planned stations from the surrounding neighborhoods, aligning and facilitating future comprehensive streetscape improvements, including revising the street alignment to allow for wider sidewalks and pedestrian safety elements, as well as upgrading currently difficult and dangerous crossings, improving circulation and enhancing the pedestrian experience in and around the proposed new transit stations and surrounding neighborhoods.

As described further in Chapter 2, "Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy," the Proposed Actions would generate land uses that would be compatible with the zoning and land uses of the quarter-mile secondary study area surrounding the Affected Area. The secondary study area contains a variety of building forms, ranging from low-rise residential neighborhoods to high-rise institutional campuses. Buildings that are expected to be constructed as a result of the Proposed Actions would activate the corridors of the Affected Area with pedestrian-oriented spaces and amenities. The Proposed Actions would result in development that would create continuous streetscapes for pedestrians along the corridors of the Affected Area, replacing underutilized properties with active ground-floor spaces, activating the surrounding streetscapes and improving the pedestrian experience.

Through a number of street de-mappings and mappings, as well as the boundary modifications of the existing Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District, the Proposed Actions would better connect the Affected Area to the established surrounding neighborhoods, and improve pedestrian and vehicular circulation in the areas. As detailed below, these actions would result in the expansion of Van Nest Park, and the establishment of improved access between the Parkchester Special Planned Community and the surrounding community, providing more open space resources and access to the area.

Development facilitated by the Proposed Actions would not eliminate primary or significant viewsheds of important visual resources in and around the Affected Area. In particular, no significant facades or important features of the Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District, which are S/NR-listed, St. Raymond Church and Cemetery, or significant views of other open space resources in and around the Affected Area would be obstructed by development facilitated by the Proposed Actions.

While the Proposed Actions would not result in any new development in the secondary study area, many of the projected and potential development sites located at or near the edges of the Affected Area would be visible from certain sections of the secondary study area. However, as detailed above, the Proposed Actions focus the higher density and taller buildings closer to similar existing development and around the future stations, and lower density and shorter buildings closer to similar built environments found in the surrounding residential neighborhoods. As a result, the Proposed Actions would not significantly alter the urban design or obstruct or alter view corridors of significant visual resources in the surrounding study area neighborhoods. The With-Action developments would introduce residential, commercial, and community facility uses to the Affected Area, drawing pedestrians to the area and enlivening the public realm in the Affected Area and its immediate vicinity. The anticipated new development would replace underutilized lots with new buildings containing active ground-floor spaces, which would be visible when looking towards the Affected Area from many secondary study area streets in close proximity.

As such, while the Proposed Actions would result in a notable change in the urban design of the Affected Area and would alter some views of the neighborhood from the secondary study area, these changes would not be significant or adverse, but rather, are expected to vastly improve the pedestrian experience within and surrounding the area.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts related to hazardous materials. A preliminary analysis of potential hazardous materials impacts was performed for each of the 60 projected and 36 potential development sites.

A large portion of the projected and potential development sites were either historically used or neighboring properties used for commercial and/or light manufacturing operations, including specific uses include gasoline filling stations, automobile repair, unspecified manufacturing, drycleaners, and accessory railroad infrastructure (e.g., substations, railyards, etc.). Due to various environmental conditions, the Proposed Actions may increase exposure pathways for hazardous materials. However, development of sites assigned institutional controls would require regulatory oversight, thereby ensuring that, to the maximum extent possible, that investigation, mitigation, and remediation of any hazardous materials would be completed in a safe and comprehensive manner.

In the future with the Proposed Actions, 60 projected development sites and 36 potential development sites would be assigned institutional control measures including (E) Designations. The implementation of preventative and remedial measures required under the (E) designation (E-750) would avoid the potential for significant adverse hazardous materials impacts due to the Proposed Actions. The Office of Environmental Remediation (OER) would provide regulatory oversight of the environmental scope, including investigations and remediation during the development process and prior to occupancy.

WATER AND SEWER INFRASTRUCUTRE

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts on the City's water supply, wastewater or stormwater conveyance and treatment infrastructure based on the preliminary infrastructure analysis. However, the Proposed Actions would introduce a mixture of land uses in amounts greater than the thresholds provided in the *CEQR Technical Manual* for the water supply and wastewater infrastructure; thereby warranting preliminary studies for the impacts to the water supply system and the combined sewer and stormwater (CSS) analysis. The Proposed Actions exceeds the incremental developmental thresholds set in Chapter 13 of the *CEQR Technical Manual* as follows:

- The project will generate a large demand for water (e.g., the increase in water demand will be more than one million gpd).
- The Affected Area is in a combined sewer area and would exceed the 400 residential units over the predicted No-Action scenario.

A preliminary analysis of the impacts of the Proposed Actions on the New York City water supply system is included in this chapter. The preliminary analysis includes impact study of the effect of the additional demand from the proposed actions on the City's overall capacity of the water supply. The preliminary analysis does not include the study of the water mains (diameters or pressures) that the proposed services would be tied into from the proposed site. During the connection permit process, it is expected that the New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP) will confirm that capacities of the water mains are sufficient to handle the additional demand from the Proposed Actions.

The sanitary sewage generation and its potential impact on Hunts Point Wastewater Resource Recovery Facility (WRRF) are also analyzed in this chapter. This section includes the analysis of the capacity of the Wastewater Treatment Plant but does not include the analysis of the capacities of the local combined sewers, regulators in the Affected Area. During the connection permit process, it is expected that NYCDEP will confirm that capacities of the combined sewers are sufficient to handle the additional demand from the Proposed Actions.

As per the preliminary analysis, combined sewer overflows (CSO) affected by the Proposed Actions will not have adverse impacts to the combined stormwater and sanitary system. However, additional runoff generated from the Proposed Project can be minimized into the combined sewer system by using Best Management practices identified in the section *Stormwater Best Management Practices*.

Further, the developer of the projected development sites will be responsible for submitting the water and sewer connection permit applications to NYCDEP at which time, NYCDEP will be reviewing the applications prior to construction.

Water Supply

According to the assessment of the limited existing water infrastructure, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impact on the City's water supply system. The 60 projected development sites are expected to require approximately 4,563,818 gpd, a 2,726,614 gpd incremental increase over the No-Action condition. Preliminary assessment of the impact of the Proposed Actions on the potable water

infrastructure concluded that there would be no significant adverse impact because the increment in water demand is approximately 2.7 million gallons per day (MGD) and it is expected that there would be adequate water service to meet the incremental demand, when considering that this is approximately 0.23 percent of the City's daily demand. As a result, no adverse effects are expected for the capacity of the NYC's water supply. Additionally, for each projected development site, water services connections would be confirmed during the New York City Department of Buildings (DOB) permitting process. There is no information of low pressure in the existing system, but further research will be required when water tap permits are requested by each proposed developed site in order to comply with the rules governing and restricting the use and supply of water.

Wastewater Treatment

With the Proposed Actions, development on the 60 projected development sites is expected to generate approximately 3,616,999 gpd of wastewater, an incremental increase of 2,366,639 gpd over No-Action conditions. With the Proposed Actions, wastewater from the projected development sites would continue to be treated as it is now, in the Hunts Points WRRF. This additional flow of wastewater is not expected to cause a significant adverse impact to wastewater treatment infrastructure, because this WRRF has a dry weather design flow capacity of 200 MGD and is currently receiving 132.2 MGD on average. Phase III of a multiphase project to upgrade the plant and replace facilities that are nearing the end of their useful life is underway per CEQR # 05DEP023X. Based on the average flow, the WRRF currently has an average reserve capacity of 67.8 MGD. Therefore, the Hunts Point WRRF, would continue to have a reserve in treatment capacity, even with the Proposed Actions.

Stormwater and Drainage Management

The 60 projected development sites identified in the RWCDS are located within the Hunts-Point combined sewer sewershed. Small portions of the Affected Area are located within the Soundview and Throgs Neck sub-sewersheds, with most of the projected development sites being located inside the East Bronx sub-sewershed limits. Four different CSO outfalls serve the Affected Area and Projected Development Site 29 is within the separate sewer service area. Depending on the rainfall volume and duration, the total volumes to the Hunts-Point combined sewers produced by the projected sites would range from 0.023 to 2.849 million gallons (MG). In a similar manner, the separate sewer served area would generate a total rainfall volume ranging from 0.081 to 3.004 MG. Compared to the no-build scenario discharge volumes to the combined sewer systems, the sewersheds would have an increase ranging from 0.020 to 0.869 MG, during storm events with up to 2.5 inches of rainfall. Because all projects included in the calculations of the proposed actions are located along a 2.2 mile stretch of East Tremont Avenue and Eastchester Road, this increased flow to the City's combined sewer system may be discharged as CSOs through one or more of the four identified CSOs that service the area. The potentially impacted CSO outfalls are HP-007, HP-013, HP-0014, and HP-033, all discharging to the East River or its tributaries.

Based on detention requirements of the City's stormwater rule, it is concluded that the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts to the wastewater and stormwater conveyance, and treatment infrastructure.

SOLID WASTE

The Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact on solid waste and sanitation services. The Proposed Actions would generate an increment above the No-Action condition of approximately 233 tons per week of solid waste but would not directly affect a solid waste management facility. Approximately 72 percent of the additional solid waste generated by the Proposed Actions (167.2 tons) would be handled by the New York City Department of Sanitation (DSNY), and approximately 28 percent (65.9 tons) would be handled by private carters. Overall, the uses facilitated by the Proposed Actions would be expected to generate solid waste equivalent to approximately 13.4 DSNY truck loads per week and up to six commercial carter truck loads per week. Although this would be an increase compared with conditions in the future without the Proposed Actions, the additional solid waste resulting from the Proposed Actions would be a negligible increase relative to the more than 10,000 tons of garbage and 2,000 tons of recycling handled by DSNY every day. It would also represent approximately 0.1 percent of the City's anticipated future weekly waste generation handled by DSNY by 2026, and approximately 0.09 percent of the City's anticipated future weekly commercial waste generation handled by private carters by 2025, as projected in the Solid Waste Management Plan (SWMP). As such, the Proposed Actions would not result in an increase in solid waste that would overburden available waste management capacity. The Proposed Actions would also not conflict with, or require any amendments to, the City's solid waste management objectives as stated in the SWMP. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact on solid waste and sanitation services.

ENERGY

The Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact related to energy systems. Development assumed in the With-Action condition would result in increased demand of approximately 1,259 billion British Thermal Units (BTUs) of energy per year as compared with the No-Action condition. This incremental increase in annual energy demand would represent approximately 0.72 percent of the City's forecasted annual energy requirement of 176 trillion BTUs for 2033. The Proposed Actions would generate an incremental increase in energy demand that would be considered negligible when compared with the overall demand within Consolidated Edison's (Con Edison's) New York City and Westchester County service area; therefore, the Proposed Actions are not expected to result in a significant adverse impact on energy systems.

Any new development resulting from the Proposed Actions would be required to comply with the New York City Energy Conservation Code (NYCECC), which governs performance requirements of heating, ventilation, and air condition systems, as well as the exterior building envelope of new buildings. In compliance with this code, new development must meet standards for energy conservation, which include requirements related to energy efficiency and combined thermal transmittance. In addition, should there be a voluntary utilization of higher performance standard designs on the projected development sites, there would then be a reduction in the forecast energy load, detailed below. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts related to energy are expected to occur.

TRANSPORTATION

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

Traffic

Traffic conditions were evaluated for the weekday 7:30-8:30 AM, 1-2 PM, and 4:15-5:15 PM and Saturday 2-3 PM peak hours at 56 intersections and 22 freeway segments in the traffic study area where additional traffic resulting from the Proposed Actions would be most heavily concentrated. As summarized in Table ES-2 and Table ES-3, the traffic impact analysis indicates the potential for significant adverse impacts at 38 intersections during one or more analyzed peak hours. The identification of significant adverse traffic impacts at analyzed intersections is based on criteria presented in the *CEQR Technical Manual*. Significant adverse impacts were identified to 79 lane groups at 37 intersections during the weekday AM peak hour, 63 lane groups at 29 intersections in the weekday midday peak hour, 70 lane groups at 35 intersections in the weekday PM peak hour, and at 38 lane groups at 20 intersections during the Saturday midday peak hour.

Table ES-2: Number of Impacted Intersections and Lane Groups by Peak Hour

	Peak Hour			
	Weekday AM	**Weekday Midday**	**Weekday PM**	**Saturday Midday**
Impacted Lane Groups	79	63	70	38
Impacted Intersections	37	29	35	20

Source: STV Incorporated, 2023.

Significant adverse impacts were also identified at three freeway segments in the weekday PM peak hour and one freeway segment during the Saturday midday peak hour. Chapter 21, "Mitigation Measures," discusses potential measures to mitigate these significant adverse traffic impacts.

Table ES-3: Summary of Significantly Impacted Intersections

Signalized Intersection	Peak Hour			
	Weekday AM	Weekday Midday	Weekday PM	Saturday Midday
East Tremont Avenue at Boston Road/West Farms Road	X	X	X	X
East Tremont Avenue at Devoe Avenue	X	X		
East Tremont Avenue at Morris Park Avenue	X	X	X	
East Tremont Avenue at Beach Avenue	X			
East Tremont Avenue at White Plains Road	X	X	X	X
East Tremont Avenue at Unionport Road	X	X	X	X
East Tremont Avenue at Purdy Street	X	X	X	
East Tremont Avenue at Bronxdale Avenue	X	X	X	X
East Tremont Avenue at Castle Hill Avenue	X	X	X	X
East Tremont Avenue at Seddon Street	X	X	X	
East Tremont Avenue at Overing Street		X	X	
East Tremont Avenue at Silver Street	X	X	X	X
White Plains Road at Guerlain Street	X	X	X	X
Williamsbridge Road at Pelham Parkway South Service Road	X	X	X	
Williamsbridge Road at Morris Park Avenue	X	X	X	X
Eastchester Road at Williamsbridge Road	X	X	X	X
Eastchester Road at Pelham Parkway North Service Road	X	X	X	
Eastchester Road at Pelham Parkway North Mainline	X		X	
Eastchester Road at Pelham Parkway South Mainline	X		X	
Eastchester Road at Pelham Parkway South Service Road	X		X	
Eastchester Road at Stillwell Avenue	X	X	X	X
Eastchester Road at Morris Park Avenue	X	X	X	X
Eastchester Road at Sackett Avenue	X	X	X	X
Eastchester Road at Bassett Avenue	X	X	X	X
Eastchester Road at Waters Place	X	X	X	X
Eastchester Road at Blondell Avenue	X	X	X	
Eastchester Road at Jarrett Place	X	X	X	X
Stillwell Avenue at Pelham Parkway Mainline	X			
Waters Place at Marconi Street	X	X	X	
Waters Place at Fink Avenue/Hutchinson River Parkway Exit	X	X	X	X
Waters Place at Westchester Avenue	X		X	
Bronxdale Avenue at Poplar Street	X	X	X	
Williamsbridge Road and Poplar Street	X	X	X	X
Eastchester Road at McDonald Avenue	X	X	X	X
Eastchester Road at Loomis Street	X	X	X	X
Eastchester Road and Seminole Street	X		X	X
Stillwell Avenue at McDonald Street	X		X	
Bassett Avenue at Morris Park Avenue	X		X	
Total Impacted Intersections	**37**	**29**	**35**	**20**

Source: STV Incorporated, 2023.

TRANSIT

Subway

Subway Stations

The Proposed Actions would generate a net increment of approximately 2,964 and 2,679 new subway trips during the weekday AM and PM commuter peak hours. The analysis of subway station conditions focuses on a total of four New York City Transit (NYCT) subway stations in proximity to the Affected Area where incremental demand from the Proposed Actions would exceed the 200-trip *CEQR Technical Manual* analysis threshold in one or both peak hours. These include the East 180th Street and Pelham Parkway stations on the No. 2 and 5 lines, as well as the Westchester Square and Middletown Road stations on the No. 6 line.

The results of the analysis show that all analyzed stairs and fare arrays are projected to operate at an acceptable Level of Service (LOS) C or better in both the AM and PM peak hours. Therefore, incremental demand from the Proposed Actions is not expected to result in significant adverse subway station impacts based on *CEQR Technical Manual* criteria.

Subway Line Haul

Line haul is the volume of transit riders passing a defined point on a given transit route. Line haul is typically measured in the peak direction at the point where the trains carry the greatest number of passengers during the peak hour (the maximum load point) on each subway route. The Affected Area is served by three MTA NYCT subway routes, including the 2, 5, and 6 lines. The Proposed Actions are expected to generate 200 or more new subway trips on the southbound No. 2, No. 5, and No. 6 lines in the AM peak hour and on the northbound No. 2, No. 5, and No. 6 lines in the PM peak hour.

Incremental demand on the No. 2 line as a result of the Proposed Actions would increase ridership by an average of 4.7 southbound trips per car in the AM and 4.1 northbound trips in the PM. Incremental demand on the No. 5 line as a result of the Proposed Actions would increase ridership by an average of 3.6 southbound trips per car in the AM and 3.0 northbound trips in the PM. Incremental demand on the No. 6 line as a result of the Proposed Actions would increase ridership by an average of 4.2 southbound trips per car in the AM and 3.6 northbound trips in the PM. Although all three train lines in the AM peak hour and the No. 2 line in the PM peak hour are projected to operate over guideline in the peak direction, they would not be considered significantly adversely impacted based on *CEQR Technical Manual* impact criteria.

Bus

The Affected Area is served by a total of fourteen MTA NYCT bus routes—the local Bx4, Bx4A, Bx8, Bx12, Bx21, Bx22, Bx24, Bx31, Bx36, Bx39, Bx40, and Bx42, as well as the Select Bus Service (SBS) on the Bx12 and the express BxM10. The Proposed Actions would generate a total of approximately 3,148 and 2,626 incremental bus trips on these routes during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, respectively. A preliminary screening assessment concluded that new demand from the Proposed Actions would exceed

the 50-trip *CEQR Technical Manual* analysis threshold in the AM and/or PM peak hour at the maximum load points along the Bx4A, Bx12, Bx12-SBS, Bx21, Bx31, Bx39, Bx40, Bx42 and BxM10 routes.

Based on projected levels of bus service in the No-Action condition, the Proposed Actions would result in a capacity shortfall on southbound Bx4A, north- and southbound on the Bx21 and Bx31, east- and westbound Bx40, eastbound Bx42, and southbound BxM10 in the AM peak hour. In the PM peak hour, there would be a capacity shortfall on northbound Bx4A, southbound Bx21, northbound Bx31, east- and westbound Bx40 and Bx42, and north- and southbound BxM10. Therefore, these six bus lines would be significantly adversely impacted based on *CEQR Technical Manual* criteria (refer to Table ES-4). As described in Chapter 21, "Mitigation Measures," the significant impacts to bus service could be mitigated by increasing the number of buses in each peak hour to meet the incremental demand. The general policy of the MTA is to provide additional bus service where demand warrants, taking into account financial and operational constraints.

Table ES-4: Summary of Significant Local Bus Impacts

Peak Hour	Route	Direction	Additional Peak Hour Buses Needed
AM	Bx4A	Southbound	2
	Bx21	Northbound	13
		Southbound	8
	Bx31	Northbound	4
		Southbound	7
	Bx40	Eastbound	4
		Westbound	6
	Bx42	Eastbound	3
	BxM10	Southbound	1
PM	Bx4A	Northbound	1
	Bx21	Southbound	10
	Bx31	Northbound	9
	Bx40	Eastbound	2
		Westbound	2
	Bx42	Eastbound	3
		Westbound	1
	BxM10	Northbound	2
		Southbound	1

PEDESTRIANS

The Proposed Actions would generate a net increment of approximately 6,301 walk-only trips in the weekday AM peak hour, 7,270 in the midday peak hour, 6,992 in the PM peak hour, and 7,968 in the Saturday midday peak hour. Persons en route to and from subway station entrances and bus stops would

add approximately 7,713, 6,703, 6,753 and 6,891 additional pedestrian trips to Affected Area sidewalks and crosswalks during these same periods, respectively.

Peak hour pedestrian conditions were evaluated at 100 pedestrian elements where new trips generated by projected developments are expected to be most concentrated. These elements—28 sidewalks, 39 corner areas, and 33 crosswalks—are primarily located in the immediate vicinity of the major projected development sites and along corridors connecting the Affected Area to nearby subway station entrances. As shown in Table ES-5, "Summary of Significant Pedestrian Impacts," 14 sidewalks and 11 crosswalks would be significantly adversely impacted by the Proposed Actions in one or more of the analyzed peak hours, and there would be no significant impacts to any corner areas. Chapter 21, "Mitigation Measures," discusses potential measures to mitigate these significant adverse pedestrian impacts.

Table ES-5: Summary of Significant Pedestrian Impacts

Corridor/Intersection	Impacted Element	Peak Hour			
		AM	Midday	PM	Saturday
Westchester Avenue between Westchester Square and Lane Avenue	North Sidewalk	X	X	X	X
East Tremont Avenue between Unionport Road and Bronxdale Avenue	North Sidewalk	X	X	X	X
East Tremont Avenue between Unionport Road and Purdy Street	South Sidewalk	X	X	X	X
Bronxdale Avenue Between East Tremont Avenue and Van Nest Avenue	West Sidewalk	X	X	X	X
Eastchester Road between Blondell Avenue and Sackett Avenue	Northeast Sidewalk	X	X		X
Eastchester Road between Waters Place and Blondell Avenue	Southeast Sidewalk	X			
Waters Place between Eastchester Road and Marconi Street	North Sidewalk	X	X	X	
Eastchester Road between Bassett Avenue and Loomis Street	East Sidewalk	X	X	X	X
Eastchester Road between Morris Park Avenue and Wilkinson Avenue	East Sidewalk	X	X	X	X
Eastchester Road between Morris Park Avenue and Stillwell Avenue	West Sidewalk	X	X	X	X
Eastchester Road Between Stillwell Avenue and Pelham Parkway South	West Sidewalk	X	X	X	X
Stillwell Avenue between McDonald Street and Wilkinson Avenue	East Sidewalk	X	X	X	X
Eastchester Road between McDonald Street and Rhinelander Avenue	East Sidewalk	X	X	X	X
Morris Park Avenue Between East 180th Street and Adams Avenue	West Sidewalk	X	X	X	X
White Plains Road at East Tremont Avenue	South Crosswalk				X
Bronxdale Avenue at East Tremont Avenue	West Crosswalk	X	X	X	
Williamsbridge Road at Eastchester Road	West Crosswalk	X	X		
Eastchester Road at Waters Place	North Crosswalk	X	X	X	X
Eastchester Road at Waters Place	East Crosswalk	X	X	X	X
Eastchester Road at Morris Park Avenue	North Crosswalk	X	X	X	X
Eastchester Road at Morris Park Avenue	East Crosswalk			X	X
Eastchester Road at Morris Park Avenue	South Crosswalk			X	
Eastchester Road at Morris Park Avenue	West Crosswalk			X	X
Eastchester Road at Stillwell Avenue	North Crosswalk		X	X	X
Eastchester Road at Stillwell Avenue	South Crosswalk	X	X	X	X

Source: STV Incorporated, 2023.

Vehicular and Pedestrian Safety

The City's Vision Zero initiative seeks to eliminate all deaths from traffic crashes, regardless of whether on foot, bicycle, or inside a motor vehicle. In this effort, NYCDOT and NYPD developed a set of five plans, each of which analyzes the unique conditions of one New York City borough and recommends actions to address the borough's specific challenges to pedestrian safety. These plans pinpoint the conditions and characteristics of pedestrian fatalities and severe injuries; they also identify priority corridors, intersections, and areas that disproportionately account for pedestrian fatalities and severe injuries, prioritizing them for safety interventions. The plans outline a series of recommended actions comprised of engineering, enforcement, and education measures that intend to alter the physical and behavioral conditions on City streets that can lead to pedestrian fatality and injury. The Affected Area includes Eastchester Road at Waters Place, which has been identified as a NYCDOT Vision Zero Priority Intersection. East Tremont Avenue, Eastchester Road, and White Plains Road are Vision Zero Priority Corridors.

Crash data for the traffic and pedestrian study area intersections were obtained from the NYCDOT for the three-year reporting period between January 1, 2017, and December 31, 2019. During the three-year reporting period, a total of 2,884 crashes occurred, of which 182 were pedestrian-related crashes, and 32 were bicycle-related crashes. A high crash location is defined by the *CEQR Technical Manual* as a location identified along a Vision Zero corridor/intersection or with five or more pedestrian/bicyclist injury crashes in any consecutive 12 months of the most recent 3-year period for which data is available. Three intersections in the traffic study area would be considered high-crash intersections, the Eastchester Road intersections with Waters Place and with Williamsbridge Road, as well as the intersection of Waters Place and Fink Avenue. These intersections are listed in Table ES-6, "Summary of High Crash Locations 2017-2019."

Table ES-6: Summary of High Crash Locations 2017-2019

Intersection	Pedestrian Injury Crashes			Bicycle Injury Crashes			Total Crashes (Reportable + Non-Reportable)		
	2017	2018	2019	2017	2018	2019	2017	2018	2019
Eastchester Rd / Waters Pl	2	3	6	0	0	1	25	26	19
Eastchester Rd / Williamsbridge Rd	1	4	2	0	0	1	11	14	23
Waters Place / Fink Avenue	1	2	6	1	1	0	31	28	36

Source: STV Incorporated, 2023.

PARKING

The parking analyses document changes in the parking supply and utilization within a ¼-mile and ½-mile of the Affected Area under both No-Action and With-Action conditions. Under the With-Action conditions, it is assumed that a total of 5,973 parking spaces would be provided on the Affected Area. The total anticipated project-generated weekday demand of approximately 5,830 vehicles during the day and 3,797 during the overnight would exceed on-site supply and excess demand would have to be accommodated in the parking study area surrounding the Affected Area. During the weekday midday period, this excess demand would result in a shortfall of 2,134 spaces within the ¼-mile radius of the Affected Area. During the overnight period, excess demand would result in a shortfall of 1,446 spaces in the study area. In addition, the total anticipated project-generated Saturday demand of approximately 4,352 vehicles during the day would exceed on-site supply and the excess demand would have to be accommodated in the parking study area surrounding the Affected Area. During the Saturday midday period, the excess demand would also result in a shortfall of 1,289 spaces in the study area. As a result, the Affected Area is expected to result in a significant parking shortfall per *CEQR Technical Manual* guidance. While the shortfall of parking spaces is considered significant, per the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a significant shortfall is not considered a significant adverse impact.

AIR QUALITY

The air quality analysis includes the assessment of emissions from mobile sources, Heating, Venilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC) and hot water systems, industrial sources, existing major or large emission sources, and parking facilities.

The mobile source analyses determined that Proposed Action-generated traffic resulting in concentrations of CO and fine particulate matter less than ten microns in diameter (PM_{10}) at the analyzed intersections would not result in any violations of National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Further, the 8-hour CO incremental concentrations and the 24-hour and annual incremental $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations were predicted to be below the City's *de minimis* criteria.

The stationary source analyses determined that there would be no potential significant adverse air quality impacts from fossil fuel-fired heat and hot water systems at the projected and potential development sites. At certain sites, an (E) Designation (E-750) would be mapped in connection with the Proposed

Actions to ensure that future developments would not result in any significant adverse air quality impacts from fossil fuel-fired heat and hot water systems emissions.

The analysis of existing light industrial/manufacturing uses in the surrounding study area determined that emissions of air toxic compounds would not result in any potential significant adverse air quality impacts. An analysis of the cumulative health risk impacts of existing industrial sources on projected and potential development sites was also performed. Maximum concentration levels at projected and potential development sites were found to be below the applicable health risk criteria. Large and major emissions sources within 1,000 feet of a projected or potential development site were also analyzed, and the analysis concluded that these sources would not result in significant adverse air quality impacts on any projected or potential development sites.

The parking facilities assumed to be developed as part of the Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse air quality impacts.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND CLIMATE CHANGE

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse greenhouse gas emission or climate change impacts. The assessment of GHG emissions estimates that the building energy and vehicle uses associated with the Proposed Actions would result in up to approximately 134,309 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO_2e) emissions per year. It also found that the Proposed Actions are consistent with the applicable citywide GHG emissions reduction and climate change goals, and that there would be no significant adverse GHG emission or climate change impacts.

The Proposed Actions involve zoning changes that would primarily affect privately owned properties. Decisions regarding construction and building design for those sites, which would affect energy use and GHG emissions, would be made by the property developers in accordance with the City's building code requirements in effect at the time. The City is addressing Citywide building energy efficiency and other GHG-related design questions through its ongoing long-term GHG policy development and implementation process.

Development sites on City-owned properties may have specific energy efficiency requirements that are beyond the code requirements (e.g., if developers apply for affordable housing construction funding) that would be implemented under contractual agreements with HPD or other government funding agencies. Development at these sites would meet sustainable design requirements, which would result in lower GHG emissions—these features would be specified and required through land disposition and/or funding agreements or other legally binding agreements between the City and developer(s).

The Proposed Actions would be consistent with the City's emissions reduction goals, as defined in the *CEQR Technical Manual*. The Proposed Actions would support other GHG goals by virtue of its density and location in an area that will be well-served by transit, its proximity to Manhattan and the Bronx, and through requirements to utilize natural gas in new developments (i.e., natural gas would be required to address the air quality [E] Designations). As compared to the No-Action condition, the Proposed Actions

would provide opportunities for increased residential density, including affordable housing, and space for new jobs in an area that will be well-served by transit through the proposed Parkchester/Van Nest and Morris Park Metro-North stations. These changes could potentially result in less GHG emissions associated with auto use and suburban sprawl, and also serve to lessen the pressure of rising rents in the area by increasing the supply of housing, including a substantial amount of affordable housing.

Regarding resilience to potential climate conditions, the City's long-term process for addressing coastal flooding risk in the Affected Area will be addressed by complying with Appendix G of the New York City Building Code. The Proposed Actions would not adversely affect other resources (including ecological systems, public access, visual quality, water-dependent uses, infrastructure, and adjacent properties) due to climate change. The Proposed Actions would help catalyze new development along the Amtrak train rail in this area of the Bronx, some of which would be required to meet Appendix G requirements through strategies, such as elevation, dry flood-proofing, and/or wet flood-proofing to provide coastal protection in the parts of the Affected Area located within the NYC Coastal Zone, the 100-year flood zone, or the 500-year flood zone. The Proposed Actions would not adversely affect other resources (including ecological systems, public access, visual quality, water-dependent uses, infrastructure, and adjacent properties) due to climate change.

NOISE

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse noise impacts.

The Proposed Actions would not generate sufficient traffic to have the potential to cause a significant adverse noise impact. At all noise receptor locations, the maximum noise level increase would be below 3 A-weighted sound level (dBA) between No-Action and With-Action conditions. Therefore, the noise analysis concludes that the traffic generated by the Proposed Actions would not have the potential to produce significant increases to noise levels at any sensitive receptors within the Affected Area.

The Proposed Actions would introduce new sensitive receptors at projected and potential development sites with the Affected Area. Ambient noise levels adjacent to the projected and potential development sites were examined to determine if building noise attenuation requirements for maintaining interior noise levels would be necessary due to increase in traffic and train activity from the existing and planned Metro-North Railroad service. That assessment finds that noise levels would range between the "marginally unacceptable" and "clearly unacceptable" exterior noise exposure categories, resulting in a noise attenuation requirement range of 28 to 37 dBA to ensure noise levels within the projected and potential development sites would comply with all applicable requirements. As a result, the Proposed Actions includes (E) designations for all but three of the projected and potential development sites. The window/wall attenuation levels required under the (E) designations would avoid the potential for significant adverse noise impacts due to the Proposed Actions; refer to Appendix H, "Noise," for the proposed (E) designations.

PUBLIC HEALTH

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse public health impacts. As described in the relevant analyses of this EIS, the Proposed Actions would not result in unmitigated significant adverse impacts in the following technical areas that contribute to public health: water quality, hazardous materials, air quality, or operational noise. The Proposed Actions could result in unmitigated construction noise impacts as defined by *CEQR Technical Manual.*

The analysis presented in Chapter 19, "Construction," found that predicted noise levels due to construction-related activities would result in noise levels that may exceed the impact criteria during two or more consecutive years at receptors within and in the vicinity of the Affected Area. As such, a public health assessment for construction noise was conducted, and it was determined that the impacts related to construction noise would not generate a significant adverse public health impact.

NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts to neighborhood character. Development facilitated by the Proposed Actions would re-orient the community towards the corridor and Metro-North's future Parkchester/Van Nest and Morris Park Station Areas. The Proposed Actions would enable improved connectivity to the planned stations from the surrounding neighborhoods through the implementation of comprehensive streetscape improvements, including revising the street alignment to allow for wider sidewalks and pedestrian safety elements, as well as upgrading currently difficult and dangerous crossings, improving circulation, and enhancing the pedestrian experience in and around the proposed new transit stations and surrounding neighborhoods. These improvements would change the primary study area from a transitional border area between several neighborhoods, primarily defined by industrial uses near the existing railroad right-of-way (ROW), to an area that draws together several types of varying neighborhoods to two mixed-use, pedestrian-focused neighborhoods centered on transit access.

In the No-Action condition, development is expected to occur in a piecemeal manner and without the benefit of a comprehensive plan to coordinate appropriate densities and urban design controls across the neighborhood. In contrast, the Proposed Actions would provide for sufficient predictability, flexibility, and variety for building envelopes that account for the unique conditions in the study area with appropriate transitions between lower and medium density adjacencies and the promotion of residential and economic development. While the character of this area of the Bronx has changed throughout the years and will continue to change with or without the Proposed Actions, the Proposed Actions would encourage predictable development patterns that meet current affordable housing needs and prepare the area for a future as an economic hub of the Bronx, facilitated by commercial, life sciences, and medical development.

The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts related to community facilities, open space, shadows, historic and cultural resources, and transportation. However, none of these impacts, on

their own or in tandem with one another would result in a significant adverse impact to neighborhood character. Rather the Proposed Actions would serve to enhance neighborhood character, allowing for a gradual transition of the primary study area from an interstitial industrial area to a mixed-use, pedestrian-focused neighborhood anchored by two new Metro-North Stations. These changes would be considerate of the surrounding context of the secondary study area, allowing for contextual development based on the primary study area's surroundings, thereby permitting greater connectivity between neighborhoods while also preserving the defining features of each neighborhood. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse neighborhood character impacts.

CONSTRUCTION

The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse construction impacts related to traffic, noise, and architectural resources.

Transportation

Construction travel demand is expected to peak in the first quarter of 2028 and was selected as a reasonable worst-case analysis period for assessing potential cumulative transportation impacts from operational trips from completed portions of the project and construction trips associated with construction activities. Construction of the Proposed Actions are expected to result in significant adverse traffic impacts, as described below. No significant adverse impacts to parking, transit, or pedestrian conditions are anticipated.

Traffic

During construction, traffic would be generated by construction workers commuting via autos and by trucks making deliveries to projected development sites. The results of a detailed traffic analysis for 2028 (Q1) show that the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts at eight intersections during the construction 6-7 AM peak hour and 23 intersections during the construction 3-4 PM peak hour. Measures to address these impacts are described in Chapter 21, "Mitigation."

Transit

The construction sites are located in an area that is well served by public transportation, with a total of seven subway stations and 14 bus routes located in the vicinity of the Affected Area. In 2028 (Q1), transit conditions during the 6-7 AM and 3-4 PM construction peak hours are expected to be generally better than during the analyzed operational peak hours with full build-out of the Proposed Actions in 2033. No subway station impacts are expected during construction as the Proposed Actions are not expected to result in any significant subway station impacts. The Proposed Actions' significant adverse bus impact would also be less likely to occur during construction than with full build-out of the Proposed Actions in 2033 as incremental demand would be lower during construction and would not occur during the peak hours of commuter demand. It is expected that the mitigation measures identified for 2033 operational

transit impacts in Chapter 21, "Mitigation," would also be effective at mitigating any potential impacts from construction transit trips during the 2028 (Q1) construction periods.

Pedestrians

In 2028 (Q1), pedestrian trips by construction workers would be widely distributed among the twenty projected development sites that would be under construction in this period and would primarily occur outside of the weekday AM and PM commuter peak periods and weekday midday peak period when area pedestrian facilities typically experience their greatest demand. Pedestrian conditions during the 6-7 AM and 3-4 PM construction peak hours are expected to be generally better than during the analyzed operational peak hours with full build-out of the Proposed Actions in 2033. The Proposed Actions' significant adverse sidewalk, corner area and crosswalk impacts would therefore be less likely to occur during this construction period than with full build-out of the Proposed Actions in 2033. It is expected that mitigation measures identified for 2033 operational pedestrian impacts in Chapter 21, "Mitigation," would also be effective at mitigating any potential impacts from construction pedestrian trips during the 2028 (Q1) construction period.

Parking

Based on the extent of available on-street parking spaces within ¼-mile of the Affected Area, projected construction worker parking demand during the 2028 (Q1) cumulative construction and operational parking demand could potentially contribute to a shortfall in the weekday midday. The shortfall would not be considered significant under *CEQR Technical Manual* criteria given the availability of alternative modes of transportation near the Affected Area. Therefore, significant parking shortfall during construction are not anticipated.

Air Quality

Measures required to reduce pollutant emissions during construction include all applicable laws, regulations, and the City's building codes as well as New York City Local Law 77. These include dust suppression measures, idling restriction, and the use of ultra-low sulfur diesel (ULSD) fuel and best available tailpipe reduction technologies. With the implementation of these emission reduction measures, the dispersion modeling analysis of construction-related air emissions for both on-site and on-road sources determined that particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10}), annual-average nitrogen dioxide (NO_2), and carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations would be below their corresponding *de minimis* thresholds or National Air Quality Ambient Standards (NAAQS), respectively. Therefore, construction under the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse air quality impacts.

Noise and Vibration

Noise

Based on the projected construction predicted at each development site, construction-generated noise is expected to exceed the *CEQR Technical Manual* noise impact thresholds as well as result in

"objectionable" and "very objectionable" noise level increases at some receptors. One peak construction period per year was analyzed at each development site from 2025 to 2033. Receptors where noise level increases were predicted to exceed the construction noise evaluation thresholds for extended durations were identified.

The noise analysis results show that the predicted noise levels due to construction could exceed the impact criteria throughout the Affected Area, including at projected development sites that are completed and occupied while other nearby or adjacent projects are under construction. Construction could produce noise levels that would be noticeable and potentially intrusive during the most noise-intensive construction activities. While the highest levels of construction noise would not persist throughout construction, and noise levels would fluctuate resulting in noise increases that would be intermittent, these locations would experience construction noise levels whose magnitude and duration could constitute significant adverse impacts.

At locations predicted to experience an exceedance of the noise impact threshold criteria, the exceedances would be due principally to noise generated by on-site construction activities (rather than construction-related traffic). The noise analysis examined the reasonable worst-case peak hourly noise levels resulting from construction in an analyzed month and is therefore conservative in predicting increases in noise levels. Typically, the loudest hourly noise level during each month of construction would not persist throughout the entire month. This analysis is based on RWCDS conceptual site plans and construction schedules, with the possibility that the actual construction may be of less magnitude, or that construction on multiple projected development sites may not overlap, in which case construction noise would be less than the analysis predicts.

Vibration

The buildings of most concern with regard to the potential for structural or architectural damage due to vibration are historic buildings and structures immediately adjacent to the Projected Development Sites. Vibration levels at these buildings and structures within 52.4 feet of a Projected Development Site may exceed the 0.50 in/sec PPV during impact pile driving. Because these historic buildings and structures would be within 90 feet of the projected development sites, vibration monitoring would be required per DOB TPPN #10/88 regulations, and construction means and methods would need to be altered as necessary to avoid generating vibration exceeding the 0.50 inches/second threshold.

For non-historic buildings and other structures immediately adjacent to projected development sites, vibration levels within 21 feet of pile driving may result in PPV levels between 0.50 and 2.0 in/sec, which is generally considered acceptable for a non-historic building or structure.

In terms of potential vibration levels that would be perceptible and annoying, the equipment that would have the most potential for producing levels that exceed the 65 VdB limit is also the impact pile driver. For typical conditions, it would have the potential to produce perceptible vibration levels (i.e., vibration levels exceeding 65 VdB) at receptor locations within a distance of approximately 500 feet depending on soil conditions. However, the operation would only occur for limited periods of time, typically four months or less at a particular location and therefore would not result in any significant adverse impacts.

Consequently, there is no potential for significant adverse vibration impacts under the Proposed Actions.

Historic and Cultural Resources

The Proposed Actions would result in direct and indirect significant adverse impacts to the S/NR-eligible Parkchester Apartment Complex. In addition, the Proposed Actions may result in construction-related impacts to contributing properties located within the boundaries of the S/NR-eligible Parkchester Apartment Complex if the proper vibration protection measures are not used during construction.

As described in greater detail Chapter 7, "Historic and Cultural Resources," the Proposed Actions may also result in significant adverse impacts to archaeological resources. A Phase 1A Study confirmed the potential for two historical archaeological resource types to exist on a portion of Projected Development Site 19; 19th century shaft features associated with the existing church on the western section of the site, and potential human remains associated with the Methodist Episcopal Church of Westchester cemetery on the eastern section of the site. The Phase 1A study recommends additional archaeological investigation for the potentially sensitive sections of the site in the form of Phase 1B Archaeological Testing. While there are no mechanisms currently in place to ensure that this archaeological analysis would occur on the privately owned site subsequent to rezoning, if redevelopment would involve either federal or state funding or permitting, or if the site were to be developed through future discretionary actions that would be subject to review under CEQR, then further environmental review could be required, and historic resource issues could be addressed. Environmental review could necessitate Phase 1B archaeological testing and possibly mitigation for identified significant archaeological resources through avoidance or data recovery (e.g., Phase 2 or Phase 3 excavations). If future development does not entail federal or state funding or permitting and occurs as-of-right, the Proposed Actions could result in significant adverse impacts to archaeological resources.

K. Mitigation

The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts related to community facilities (elementary school), open space, shadows, historic and cultural resources (architectural and archaeological resources), transportation (traffic, transit, and pedestrians), and construction (traffic, architectural resources, and noise), and result in a parking shortfall. Mitigation measures being proposed to address those impacts, where feasible and/or practical, are discussed below. If no possible mitigation can be identified, an unavoidable significant adverse impact would result.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Public Schools

The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts on elementary schools. The Proposed Actions would introduce a net increment of 3,574 total students, consisting of approximately 1,798

elementary school students, 804 intermediate school students, and 972 high school students spread across CSD 11, Sub-district 1 and CSD 12, Sub-district 2, with the majority of students being introduced by projected development sites within CSD 11, Sub-district 1. In the 2033 future with the Proposed Actions, CSD 11, Sub-district 1 would experience significant adverse impacts to elementary schools, with an increase in the utilization rate from 86.5 to 103.7 percent and a deficit of 340 elementary school seats upon the completion of 661 residential units. CSD 12, Sub-district 2 would not experience significant adverse impacts to either elementary or intermediate schools.

To eliminate this impact in CSD 11, Sub-district 1, the following mitigation measures could be applied in conjunction with the City's monitoring of capacity: a) restructure or reprogram existing school space under the Department of Education's control in order to make available more capacity in existing school buildings located within CSD 11, Sub-district 1; b) relocate administrative functions to another site, thereby freeing up space for classrooms; and/or c) create additional capacity in the area by constructing a new school(s), building additional capacity at existing schools, or leasing additional school space constructed as part of projected development within CSD 11, Sub-district 1. These preliminary mitigation options will continue to be explored between the DEIS and FEIS.

OPEN SPACE

Indirect Effects

The Proposed Actions would result in a significant adverse indirect impact to total, passive, and active open space in the residential (½-mile) study area.

Possible measures that could mitigate the Proposed Actions' significant adverse open space impact in the residential study area may include: expanding existing parks; creating new open space on publicly owned sites; pursuing opportunities to encourage owners of large privately-owned sites to create new open space as part of their redevelopment; making playgrounds accessible to the community after school hours through the Schoolyards to Playgrounds program, establishing new pedestrian plazas in streets through the City's Plaza Program, and/or improving existing parks to allow for more diverse programming and enhanced usability. These potential mitigation measures are currently being explored in coordination with the lead agency, DCP, and the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) and will be refined between the DEIS and FEIS.

Although many of the potential mitigation measures listed above could substantially increase the amount and usability of open space resources for the additional population introduced by the Proposed Actions, opportunities to create new publicly accessible open space resources in sufficient amounts (i.e., approximately ten acres) within the study area to fully mitigate the identified significant adverse open space impact are very limited. As a consequence, the Proposed Actions' significant adverse open space impact may not be completely eliminated and, as a result, an unavoidable significant adverse open space impact would occur.

SHADOWS

The Proposed Actions would result in new significant adverse shadow impacts on three sunlight-sensitive resources: a portion of Pelham Parkway, the Greenstreet at Sacket Avenue, and a small portion of the larger 129-acre Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District. For all three identified resources, the analysis determined that they would not receive adequate sunlight during the growing season (at least the six to eight hour minimum specified in the *CEQR Technical Manual*) as a result of incremental shadow coverage, and vegetation at these resources could therefore be significantly impacted.

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, possible measures that could mitigate significant adverse shadow impacts on open spaces may include relocating sunlight-sensitive features within an open space to avoid sunlight loss; relocating, replacing, or monitoring vegetation for a set period of time; undertaking additional maintenance to reduce the likelihood of species loss; or providing for replacement facilities on another nearby site. Other potential mitigation strategies include the redesign or reorientation of the open space site plan to provide for replacement facilities, vegetation, or other features. Where the affected open space is a city park, it is appropriate for the lead agency to coordinate mitigation options with NYC Parks. The *CEQR Technical Manual* guidance also discusses strategies to reduce or eliminate shadow impacts, including modifications to the height, shape, size, or orientation of a proposed development that creates the significant adverse shadow impact. DCP, as lead agency, will explore potential mitigation measures in coordination with NYC Parks between the DEIS and FEIS. Absent the identification and implementation of feasible mitigation measures that would mitigate the shadow impacts to the greatest extent practicable, the Proposed Actions would result in unmitigated significant adverse shadows impacts.

HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

The Proposed Actions would result in direct and indirect significant adverse impacts to both architectural and archaeological resources, as described below.

Architectural Resources

The Proposed Actions would result in a significant adverse impact to architectural resources as a result of demolition, shadows, and adjacent construction. The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse direct impacts to the S/NR-eligible Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District as a result of the demolition and/or modification of contributing resources to the historic district (2000, 2020, and 2040 East Tremont Avenue). The significant adverse impacts as a result of demolition would be unavoidable, as the contributing buildings are privately owned and could be demolished and modified to allow for developments constructed as-of-right under the Proposed Actions.

In addition, potential significant adverse impacts would occur to contributing resources in the S/NR-eligible Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District, including the S/NR-eligible 1595 Unionport Road, as a result of adjacent construction located within 90 feet of projected or potential

development sites. The S/NR-eligible Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District, including the S/NR-eligible 1595 Unionport Road, could experience construction-related damage, as neither the district nor the individual landmark are S/NR-listed or designated NYCL and would therefore, not be afforded the added special protections under DOB requirements, potentially resulting in an unavoidable impact.

Archaeological Resources

The Proposed Actions would result in construction activity on the project site that the Phase 1A Archaeological Study concluded was potentially sensitive for 19th century historic archaeological resources and human remains. In order to mitigate significant adverse impact on archaeological resources, additional archaeological analysis would be required on the site before it is redeveloped. While there are no mechanisms currently in place to ensure that this archaeological analysis would occur on the privately owned site subsequent to the rezoning, if redevelopment would involve either federal or state funding or permitting, then further environmental review could be required, and historic resource issues could be addressed. Environmental review could necessitate Phase 1B archaeological testing and possibly mitigation for identified significant resources through avoidance or data recovery. If future development does not entail federal or state funding and occurs as-of-right, the proposed action would result in significant adverse impacts on archaeological resources and there would be no mechanism available to require archaeological analysis to determine the presence of archaeological resources; therefore, these impacts would be unmitigated.

TRANSPORTATION

Traffic

The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse traffic impacts at 38 study area intersections during one or more analyzed peak hours; specifically, 79 lane groups at 37 intersections during the weekday AM peak hour, 63 lane groups at 29 intersections in the weekday midday peak hour, 70 lane groups at 35 intersections in the weekday PM peak hour, and 38 lane groups at 20 intersections during the Saturday midday peak hour. Potential mitigation measures include traffic engineering improvements such as signal timing changes and modifications to curbside parking regulations, and the construction of a new bridge on Marconi Street. The traffic engineering improvements and the construction of the new Marconi Bridge are subject to review and approval by DOT. If DOT determines that an identified traffic engineering improvement is infeasible, and no alternative and equivalent measure is identified, then that impact would remain unmitigated and would constitute an unavoidable adverse impact. In addition, absent construction of the Marconi Bridge, there could be different or additional unmitigated locations constituting additional unavoidable adverse impacts.

Table ES-7, “Summary of Lane Groups/Intersections with Significant Adverse Traffic Impacts,” lists that significant adverse impacts would be fully mitigated at 13 lane groups at nine intersections during the

weekday AM peak hour, 13 lane groups at nine intersections during the midday peak hour, 14 lane groups at ten intersections during the PM peak hour, and 13 lane groups at ten intersections during the Saturday midday peak hour. Table ES-8, "Lane Groups with Unmitigated Significant Adverse Traffic Impacts," provides a more detailed summary of the intersections and lane groups that would have unmitigated significant adverse traffic impacts. In total, impacts to one or more approach movements would remain unmitigated in one or more peak hours at 30 intersections.

Table ES-7: Summary of Lane Groups/Intersections with Significant Adverse Traffic Impacts

Peak Hour	Lane Groups/ Intersections Analyzed	Lane Groups/ Intersections with No Significant Impacts	Lane Groups/ Intersections with Significant Impacts	Mitigated Lane Groups/ Intersections	Unmitigated Lane Groups/ Intersections
Weekday AM	252/59	173/22	79/37	13/9	66/28
Weekday Midday	250/59	188/30	63/29	13/9	50/20
Weekday PM	251/59	182/24	70/35	14/10	56/25
Saturday Midday	250/59	213/39	38/20	13/10	25/10

Note: The small difference in number of lane groups analyzed between time periods is due to the presence of de-facto left-turn/right-turn lanes in certain time periods

Source: STV Incorporated, 2023.

Table ES-8: Lane Groups with Unmitigated Significant Adverse Traffic Impacts

Signalized Intersections	Peak Hour			
	Weekday AM	Weekday Midday	Weekday PM	Saturday Midday
East Tremont Avenue at Boston Road/West Farms Road	WB-L, NE-LTR, SW-LTR, NB-LR, NB-R	WB-L, NE-LTR, SW-LTR, NB-LR	WB-L, WB-TR, NE-LTR, SW-LTR, NB-LR, NB-R	WB-L, NE-LTR, SW-LTR
East Tremont Avenue at Devoe Avenue	WB-L, WB-TR	WB-T	--	--
East Tremont Avenue at Morris Park Avenue	EB-L, WB-LTR	--	EB-L, WB-LTR	--
East Tremont Avenue at White Plains Road	EB-L, WB-LTR, NB-L, NB-TR, SB-T	EB-L, WB-LTR, NB-TR	EB-L, WB-LTR, NB-L, NB-TR, SB-T	EB-L, WB-LTR, NB-TR
East Tremont Avenue at Unionport Road	EB-LTR, WB-LTR, NB -L, NB-TR, SB-T	EB-LTR, WB-LTR, NB-TR	WB-LTR	--
East Tremont Avenue at Purdy Street	WB-LTR	--	WB-LTR	--
East Tremont Avenue at Bronxdale Avenue	EB-LT, SB-L, SB-R	EB-LT, SB-L, SB-R	EB-LT, SB-L, SB-R	--
East Tremont Avenue at Castle Hill Avenue	EB-T, WB-L, WB-TR, NB-R	EB-T, WB-L, WB-TR, NB-R	WB-L, WB-TR, NB-R	EB-T, WB-L, WB-TR, NB-R
East Tremont Avenue at Overing Street	--	WB-T	NB-LR	--
East Tremont Avenue at Silver Street	EB-L, SB-R	EB-L, SB-R	EB-L, SB-R	EB-L, SB-R
Williamsbridge Road at Pelham Parkway South Service Road	NB-TR	--	NB-TR	--
Williamsbridge Road at Morris Park Avenue	NB-TR, SB-TR, EB-TR	NB-TR, SB-TR, EB-TR	NB-TR, SB-TR	SB-TR
Williamsbridge Road at Eastchester Road	NB-LTR, SB-LTR	NB-LTR, SB-LTR	NB-LTR, SB-LTR	NB-LTR, SB-LTR
Eastchester Road at Pelham Parkway North	WB-L, SB-T	--	WB-L, SB-T	--
Eastchester Road at Pelham Parkway South	SB-LT	--	SB-LT	--
Eastchester Road at Pelham Parkway South Service Road	EB-TR, SB-LT	--	NB-TR, SB-LT	--
Eastchester Road at Stillwell Avenue	NB-LT, NB-R	NB-LT, NB-R	NB-LT, NB-R	NB-LT, NB-R
Eastchester Road at Morris Park Avenue	NB-L, NB-TR, SB-LTR, EB-L, EB-R	NB-L, SB-LTR, EB-L, EB-R	NB-L, NB-TR, SB-LTR, EB-L, EB-R	SB-LTR, EB-L, EB-R
Eastchester Road at Sackett Avenue	NB-L, NB-T, SB-TR	NB-L, NB-T, SB-TR	--	--
Eastchester Road at Bassett Avenue	NB-TR, SB-T	NB-TR, SB-T	NB-TR, SB-T	NB-TR
Eastchester Road at Waters Place	NB-T, NB-R, SB-L, WB-L	NB-T, NB-R, SB-L, SB-T, WB-L	NB-T, NB-R, SB-L, WB-L	NB-T, NB-R, SB-L, WB-L
Eastchester Road at Blondell Avenue	WB-LTR, NB-LT, SB-TR	WB-LTR, NB-LT, SB-TR	WB-LTR, SB-TR	--
Stillwell Avenue at Pelham Parkway	WB-TR	--	WB-TR	--
Waters Place at Marconi Street	WB-T, WB-R	--	WB-T	--
Waters Place at Fink Avenue/Hutchinson River Parkway Off-Ramp	SB-TR, WB-R	SB-TR	--	--
White Plains Road at Unionport Road	--	--	WB-LR, SE-LR	--
Bronxdale Avenue at Poplar Street	NB-L	NB-L	NB-L	--
Williamsbridge Road at Poplar Street	EB-LT	EB-LT	--	--
Eastchester Road at Loomis Street	--	NB-LT	NB-LT	--
Stillwell Avenue at McDonald Street	EB-LTR	--	EB-LTR	--
Bassett Avenue at Morris Park Avenue	EB-LR	--	EB-LR	--

Source: STV Incorporated, 2023.

Transit

Bus

The Proposed Actions would result in a capacity shortfall on the southbound Bx4A, north- and southbound on the Bx21 and Bx31, east- and westbound Bx40, eastbound Bx42, and southbound BxM10 in the AM peak hour. In the PM peak hour, there would be a capacity shortfall on northbound Bx4A, southbound Bx21, northbound Bx31, east- and westbound Bx40 and Bx42, and north- and southbound BxM10. The significant adverse impacts to bus service could be fully mitigated by the addition of a total of 32 standard buses on the Bx21 and Bx31, 15 articulated buses on the Bx4A, Bx40, and Bx42, and one over-the-road motorcoach on the BxM10 in the AM peak hour and by the addition of 19 standard buses, nine articulated buses, and three over-the-road motorcoaches on the same routes, respectively, in the PM peak hour. The general policy of NYCT is to provide additional bus service where demand warrants, taking into account financial and operational constraints.

Pedestrians

Incremental demand from the Proposed Actions would significantly adversely impact 14 sidewalks and 11 crosswalks in one or more analyzed peak hours. There would be no significant impacts to any corner areas in any period. Recommended measures to mitigate pedestrian impact consist of the relocation/removal of impediments to sidewalk flow, the widening the paved sidewalk area, the widening of crosswalks. These measures would fully mitigate the impacts to three sidewalks and seven crosswalks, and would improve pedestrian conditions in the pedestrian network. Implementation of the proposed mitigation measures would be subject to review and approval by DOT, as well as DPR for street tree removal/relocation. Absent the identification and implementation of additional feasible mitigation measures that would mitigate the pedestrian impacts to the greatest extent practicable, the Proposed Actions would result in unmitigated significant adverse pedestrian impacts.

CONSTRUCTION

Transportation

As described in Chapter 19, “Construction,” construction-related traffic would have significant adverse impacts at eight intersections during the weekday construction 6-7 AM peak hour and 23 intersections during the weekday construction PM peak hour (3-4 PM). Most significant adverse impacts would be mitigated with the implementation of recommended mitigation measures, but unmitigated significant adverse impacts remain at three intersections during the construction AM peak hour and 11 intersections during the construction PM peak hour. No basic intersection improvement measures could mitigate the significant adverse construction-related impacts at these 12 total intersections. Further measures to address these impacts will be explored with the relevant agencies between the DEIS and FEIS. If no

additional practicable mitigation is identified, these impacts would constitute unavoidable significant adverse traffic impacts as a result of the Proposed Action.

Historic and Cultural Resources

Architectural Resources

Potential significant adverse impacts would occur to contributing resources in the S/NR-eligible Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District, including the S/NR-eligible 1595 Unionport Road, as a result of adjacent construction located within 90 feet of projected or potential development sites. The S/NR-eligible Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District, including the S/NR-eligible 1595 Unionport Road, could experience construction-related damage, as neither the district nor the individual landmark are S/NR-listed or designated NYCL and would therefore not be afforded the added special protections under DOB requirements, potentially resulting in an unavoidable impact.

Noise

As described in Chapter 19, "Construction," the Proposed Actions would have the potential to result in significant adverse construction noise impacts throughout the Affected Area. Because the analysis is based on construction phases, it does not capture the natural daily and hourly variability of construction noise at each receptor. The level of noise produced by construction fluctuates throughout the days and months of the construction phases, while the construction noise analysis is based on the worst-case time periods only, which is conservative. The noise analysis results show that the predicted noise levels could exceed the impact criteria throughout the Affected Area. The analysis is based on RWCDS conceptual site plans and construction schedules, with the possibility that the actual construction may be of less magnitude, or that construction on multiple projected development sites may not overlap, in which case construction noise would be less than the analysis predicts.

Specific noise control measures would be incorporated in noise mitigation plan(s) required under the NYC Noise Control Code. These measures could include a variety of source and path controls. These mitigations will be further explored between the DEIS and FEIS. If no practicable or feasible mitigation is identified, these impacts would constitute unavoidable significant adverse traffic impacts as a result of the Proposed Action.

L. Alternatives

NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE

The No-Action Alternative examines future conditions within the Affected Area but assumes the absence of the Proposed Actions (i.e., none of the discretionary approvals proposed as part of the Proposed Actions would be adopted). In the No-Action Alternative, existing zoning would remain in the area

affected by the Proposed Actions. It is anticipated that the Affected Area would experience growth under the No-Action Alternative by 2033. In the No-Action Alternative, it is anticipated that new development would occur on 12 of the 60 projected development sites identified under the RWCDS. In total on the 60 projected development sites, there would be 243,887 gsf of market-rate residential floor area (239 DUs), 1,243,250 gsf of commercial uses, 405,096 gsf of industrial uses, 229,777 gsf of community facility uses, and 2,208 accessory parking spaces in the 2033 No-Action Alternative. The significant adverse impacts related to community facilities, open space, shadows, historic and cultural resources, transportation, and construction that would occur with the Proposed Actions would not occur with the No-Action Alternative.

In the No-Action Alternative, there would be no change to zoning, MIH, or the City Map within the Affected Area. The substantial amount of affordable housing expected under the Proposed Actions would not be provided. In addition, as compared to the Proposed Actions, the benefits associated with improved economic activity, opportunities for high quality, permanent affordable housing, and enhanced pedestrian conditions and vibrant commercial corridor around two new Metro-North stations would not to be realized.

NO UNMITIGATED SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS ALTERNATIVE

The No Unmitigated Significant Adverse Impacts Alternative examines a scenario in which the density and other components of the Proposed Actions are changed specifically to avoid the unmitigated significant adverse impacts associated with the Proposed Actions. There is the potential for the Proposed Actions to result in unmitigated significant adverse impacts related to community facilities and services (elementary schools), open space, shadows, historic and cultural resources (archaeological and architectural), transportation (traffic and pedestrians), and construction (transportation, architectural resources, and noise).

This alternative considers development that would not result in any significant adverse impacts that could not be fully mitigated. However, to eliminate all unmitigated significant adverse impacts, the Proposed Actions would have to be modified to a point where the principal goals and objectives of the Proposed Actions would not be fully realized.

M. Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

As described in Chapter 21, “Mitigation Measures,” the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts with respect to community facilities (elementary schools), open space, shadows, historic and cultural resources (architectural and archaeological resources), transportation (traffic, transit, and pedestrians), and construction (traffic, architectural resources, and noise). To the extent practicable, mitigation has been proposed for these identified significant adverse impacts. However, in some instances, no practicable mitigation has been identified to fully mitigate significant adverse impacts, and there are no reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Actions that would meet the Proposed Actions’ purpose and need, eliminate potential impacts, and not cause other or similar significant adverse impacts.

In other cases, mitigation has been proposed, but absent a commitment to implement the mitigation, the impacts may not be eliminated.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Public Schools

The Proposed Actions would result in a significant adverse impact on elementary and intermediate schools.

Compared to the No-Action condition, the Reasonable Worst-Case Development Scenario (RWCDS) associated with the Proposed Actions would introduce a net increment of 3,575 total students, consisting of approximately 1,799 elementary school students, 804 intermediate school students, and 972 high school students spread across CSD 11, Sub-district 1 and CSD 12, Sub-district 2, with the majority of students being introduced by projected development sites within CSD 11, Sub-district 1. In the 2033 future with the Proposed Actions, CSD 11, Sub-district 1 would experience significant adverse impacts to elementary schools, while CSD 12, Sub-district 2 would not experience significant adverse impacts to either elementary or intermediate schools.

To eliminate these impacts in CSD 11, Sub-district 1, the following mitigation measures could be applied in conjunction with the City's monitoring of capacity: a) restructure or reprogram existing school space under the Department of Education's control in order to make available more capacity in existing school buildings located within CSD 11, Sub-district 1; b) relocate administrative functions to another site, thereby freeing up space for classrooms; and/or c) create additional capacity in the area by constructing a new school(s), building additional capacity at existing schools, or leasing additional school space constructed as part of projected development within CSD 11, Sub-district 1. These preliminary mitigation options will continue to be explored between the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). Absent the implementation of these mitigation measures, the Proposed Actions would result in an unmitigated significant adverse impact on elementary schools.

OPEN SPACE

The Proposed Actions would result in a significant adverse indirect open space impact to total, passive, and active open space in the residential (½-mile) study area.

Possible measures that could mitigate the Proposed Actions' significant adverse open space impact in the residential study area may include: expanding existing parks; creating new open space on publicly-owned sites; pursuing opportunities to encourage owners of large privately-owned sites to create new open space as part of their redevelopment; making playgrounds accessible to the community after school hours through the Schoolyards to Playgrounds program, establishing new pedestrian plazas in streets through

the City's Plaza Program, and/or improving existing parks to allow for more diverse programming and enhanced usability. These potential mitigation measures are currently being explored in coordination with the lead agency, DCP, and the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) and will be refined between the DEIS and FEIS. Although many of the potential mitigation measures listed above could substantially increase the amount and usability of open space resources for the additional population introduced by the Proposed Actions, opportunities to create new publicly accessible open space resources in sufficient amounts (i.e., approximately 10 acres) within the study area to fully mitigate the identified significant adverse open space impacts are limited. As a consequence, the Proposed Actions' significant adverse open space impact would not be completely eliminated and, as a result, unavoidable significant adverse indirect open space impacts would occur.

SHADOWS

The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse shadow impacts on three sunlight-sensitive resources: a portion of Pelham Parkway, the Greenstreet at Sacket Avenue, and a small portion of the larger 129-acre Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District. For all three identified resources, the analysis determined that they would not receive adequate sunlight during the growing season (at least the six to eight hour minimum specified in the *CEQR Technical Manual*) as a result of incremental shadow coverage, and vegetation at these resources could therefore be significantly impacted.

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, possible measures that could mitigate significant adverse shadow impacts on open spaces may include relocating sunlight-sensitive features within an open space to avoid sunlight loss; relocating, replacing, or monitoring vegetation for a set period of time; undertaking additional maintenance to reduce the likelihood of species loss; or providing for replacement facilities on another nearby site. Other potential mitigation strategies include the redesign or reorientation of the open space to provide for replacement facilities, vegetation, or other features. The *CEQR Technical Manual* guidance also discusses strategies to reduce or eliminate shadows impact, including modifications to the height, shape, size, or orientation of a proposed development that creates the significant adverse shadow impact. Measures to reduce or eliminate the Proposed Actions' shadow impacts will be explored in coordination with NYC Parks between the DEIS and FEIS. Absent the identification and implementation of feasible and practicable mitigation measures that would mitigate the shadow impacts, the Proposed Actions would result in unmitigated significant adverse shadows impacts on the identified resources.

HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

The Proposed Actions would result in direct and indirect significant adverse impacts to both architectural and archaeological resources.

Architectural Resources

The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse direct impacts to the Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District which is eligible for listing in the State/National Registers of Historic Places (S/NR-eligible), as a result of the demolition and/or modification of contributing resources to the historic district (2000 East Tremont Avenue, 14 Metropolitan Oval, and 2040 East Tremont Avenue,). The significant adverse impacts as a result of demolition would be unavoidable, as the contributing buildings are privately owned and could be demolished and modified to allow for developments constructed as-of-right under the Proposed Actions.

In addition, potential significant adverse impacts would occur to contributing resources in the S/NR-eligible Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District, including the S/NR-eligible 1595 Unionport Road, as a result of adjacent construction located within 90 feet of projected or potential development sites. The S/NR-eligible Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District, including the S/NR-eligible 1595 Unionport Road, could experience construction-related damage, as neither the district nor the individual landmark are S/NR-listed or designated New York City Landmarks (NYCL) and would, therefore, not be afforded the added special protections under New York City Department of Buildings (DOB) requirements, potentially resulting in an unavoidable impact.

Archaeological Resources

The Proposed Actions would result in construction activity on the project site that the Phase 1A Archaeological Study concluded was potentially sensitive for 19th century historic archaeological resources and human remains. In order to mitigate significant adverse impact on archaeological resources, additional archaeological analysis would be required on the site before it is redeveloped. While there are no mechanisms currently in place to ensure that this archaeological analysis would occur on the privately owned site subsequent to the rezoning, if redevelopment would involve either federal or state funding or permitting, then further environmental review could be required, and historic resource issues could be addressed. Environmental review could necessitate Phase 1B archaeological testing and possibly mitigation for identified significant resources through avoidance or data recovery. If future development does not entail federal or state funding and occurs as-of-right, the proposed action would result in significant adverse impacts on archaeological resources and there would be no mechanism available to require archaeological analysis to determine the presence of archaeological resources; therefore, these impacts would be unmitigated.

TRANSPORTATION

Traffic

The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse traffic impacts at 38 study area intersections during one or more analyzed peak hours; specifically, 79 lane groups at 37 intersections during the weekday AM peak hour, 63 lane groups at 29 intersections in the weekday midday peak hour, 70 lane

groups at 35 intersections in the weekday PM peak hour, and 38 lane groups at 20 intersections during the Saturday midday peak hour.

Significant adverse impacts would not be fully mitigated at 66 lane groups at 28 intersections during the weekday AM peak hour, 50 lane groups at 20 intersections during the midday peak hour, 56 lane groups at 25 intersections during the PM peak hour, and 25 lane groups at ten intersections during the Saturday midday peak hour. In total, impacts to one or more approach movements would remain unmitigated in one or more peak hours at up to 30 study intersections.

The proposed mitigation measures include traffic engineering improvements such as signal timing changes and modifications to curbside parking regulations, and the construction of a new bridge on Marconi Street. The traffic engineering improvements and the construction of the new Marconi Bridge are subject to review and approval by DOT. If DOT determines that an identified traffic engineering improvements are deemed infeasible, and no alternative and equivalent measure is identified, then that impact would remain unmitigated and would constitute an unavoidable adverse impact. In addition, absent construction of the Marconi Bridge, there could be different or additional unmitigated locations constituting additional unavoidable adverse impacts.

Pedestrians

Incremental demand from the Proposed Actions would significantly adversely impact 14 sidewalks and 11 crosswalks in one or more analyzed peak hours. There would be no significant impacts to any corner areas in any period. Recommended measures to mitigate pedestrian impact consist of the relocation/removal of impediments to sidewalk flow, the widening the paved sidewalk area, and the widening of crosswalks. These measures would fully mitigate the impacts to three sidewalks and seven crosswalks. Implementation of the proposed mitigation measures would be subject to review and approval by DOT, as well as NYC Parks if a street tree is to be removed. If DOT or NYC Parks determines that an identified pedestrian improvement is infeasible, and no alternative and equivalent measure is identified, then that impact would remain unmitigated and would constitute an unavoidable adverse impact.

Practicable mitigation measures could not be identified for significant adverse impacts at nine, nine, eight and nine sidewalks during the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday midday peak hours. Practicable mitigation measures could not be identified for significant adverse impacts at three, two, one, and one crosswalks during the same peak hours, respectively; these impacts would remain unmitigated and would constitute unavoidable adverse impacts.

CONSTRUCTION

Transportation

Construction-related traffic would have significant adverse impacts at eight intersections during the weekday construction 6-7 AM peak hour and 23 intersections during the weekday construction PM peak hour (3-4 PM). Most significant adverse impacts would be mitigated with the implementation of recommended mitigation measures, but unmitigated significant adverse impacts remain at three intersections during the construction AM peak hour and 11 intersections during the construction PM peak hour. No basic intersection improvement measures could mitigate the significant adverse construction-related impacts at these 12 total intersections and therefore these constitute unavoidable adverse impacts. In addition, if DOT determines that an identified improvement is infeasible, and no alternative and equivalent measure is identified, then that impact would remain unmitigated and would constitute an unavoidable adverse impact.

Historic and Cultural Resources

Architectural Resources

Potential significant adverse impacts would occur to contributing resources in the S/NR-eligible Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District, including the S/NR-eligible 1595 Unionport Road, as a result of adjacent construction located within 90 feet of projected or potential development sites. The S/NR-eligible Parkchester Special Planned Community Preservation District, including the S/NR-eligible 1595 Unionport Road, could experience construction-related damage, as neither the district nor the individual landmark are S/NR-listed or designated New York City Landmarks (NYCL) and would therefore, not be afforded the added special protections under New York City Department of Buildings (DOB) requirements, potentially resulting in an unavoidable impact.

Noise

The Proposed Actions would have the potential to result in significant adverse construction noise impacts throughout the Affected Area. Because the analysis is based on construction phases, it does not capture the natural daily and hourly variability of construction noise at each receptor. The level of noise produced by construction fluctuates throughout the days and months of the construction phases, while the construction noise analysis is based on the worst-case time periods only, which is conservative. The noise analysis results show that the predicted noise levels could exceed the *CEQR Technical Manual* impact criteria throughout the Affected Area. The analysis is based on RWCDS conceptual site plans and construction schedules, with the possibility that the actual construction may be of less magnitude, or that construction on multiple projected development sites may not overlap, in which case construction noise would be less than the analysis predicts.

Specific noise control measures would be incorporated in noise mitigation plan(s) required under the NYC Noise Control Code. These measures could include a variety of source and path controls. These

mitigations will be further explored between the DEIS and FEIS. If no practicable or feasible mitigation is identified, these impacts would constitute unavoidable significant adverse traffic impacts as a result of the Proposed Actions.

N. Growth Inducing Aspects of the Proposed Actions

The term "growth-inducing aspects" generally refers to the "secondary" impacts of a proposed action that trigger further development outside the directly affected area. The *City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manual* indicates that an analysis of the growth-inducing aspects of a proposed action is appropriate when the project: (1) adds substantial new land use, residents, or new employment that would induce additional development of a similar kind or of support uses, such as retail establishments to serve new residential uses; and/or (2) introduces or greatly expands infrastructure capacity (e.g., sewers, central water supply).

The goal of the Proposed Actions, as noted in Chapter 1, "Project Description," is to facilitate the implementation of a multi-year planning process conducted in the Parkchester, Van Nest and Morris Park neighborhoods of the Bronx in partnership with local stakeholders, City agencies, and the MTA. The Proposed Actions would change zoning designations within the Affected Area in a manner that is intended to leverage new planned Metro-North service to promote economic growth, facilitate the development of housing—including affordable housing—and guide investment in the public realm around stations, encouraging safety and comfort. The Proposed Actions would support the development of permanently affordable housing and retail by rezoning largely manufacturing districts to medium- and high-density residential and commercial districts, as well as strategically mapping commercial overlays to activate commercial corridors.

As detailed in Chapter 1, "Project Description," a RWCDS was developed to assess the possible effects of the Proposed Actions. The total development expected to occur by the analysis year of 2033 on the 60 projected development sites identified in the RWCDS under the With-Action condition would consist of approximately 7,713 residential units, 2,475,223 sf of commercial uses, 1,520,405 sf of community facility uses, as well as 5,973 accessory parking spaces. The incremental change between the No-Action and With-Action conditions that would result from the Proposed Actions would be a net increase of 7,474 residential units, 1,231,973 sf of commercial space, 1,290,628 sf of community facility space, and 3,765 accessory parking spaces, as well as a net reduction of 405,096 sf of industrial space. The environmental consequences of this growth are the subject of Chapters 2 through 19 of this EIS.

The projected increase in residential population from the Proposed Actions is likely to increase the demand for neighborhood services in the Affected Area, ranging from community facilities to local goods and services retail. This would enhance the growth of local commercial corridors in the Affected Area. However, the Proposed Actions take this potential growth into account as part of the RWCDS under the assumed commercial, retail, and community facility components. The Proposed Actions could also lead to additional growth in the City and State economies, primarily due to the employment and fiscal effects

during construction on the projected and/or potential development sites and operation of these developments after their completion. However, the secondary growth would be expected to occur incrementally throughout the region and is not expected to result in any significant impacts in any particular area or at any particular site.

The Proposed Actions would result in more intensive land uses within the Affected Area. However, it is not anticipated that the Proposed Actions would generate significant secondary impacts resulting in substantial new development in nearby areas. As stated in Chapter 3, "Socioeconomic Conditions," the Proposed Actions would not add a new economic activity or add to a concentration of a particular sector of the local economy enough to significantly alter or accelerate existing economic patterns. The study area has well-established residential and commercial uses and markets such that the Proposed Actions would not add a new economic activity or add to a concentration of a particular sector of the local economy enough to significantly alter or accelerate existing economic patterns and that would induce additional development outside the Affected Area. Moreover, the Proposed Actions do not include the introduction of new infrastructure or an expansion of infrastructure capacity that would result in indirect development. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not induce significant new growth in the surrounding area.

O. Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources

Resources, both natural and man-made, would be expended in the construction and operation of developments projected to occur as a result of the Proposed Actions. These resources include the building materials used in construction; energy in the form of gas and electricity consumed during construction and operation of project-generated development by various mechanical and processing systems; and the human effort (time and labor) required to develop, construct, and operate various components of project-generated development. These are considered irretrievably committed because their reuse for some other purpose would be highly unlikely.

The projected and/or potential development under the Proposed Actions also constitutes a long-term commitment of land resources, thereby rendering land use for other purposes highly unlikely in the foreseeable future. However, the land use change that would occur as a result of the Proposed Actions would be compatible in terms of use and scale with existing conditions and trends in the area as a whole. None of the projected or potential development sites possess any natural resource values, and the sites are in large part developed or have been previously developed. It is noted that funds committed to the design, construction/renovation, and operation of projected or potential developments under the Proposed Actions would not be available for other projects. However, this is not a significant adverse fiscal impact or a significant adverse impact on City resources.

In addition, the public services provided in connection with the projected and/or potential developments under the Proposed Actions (e.g., police and fire protection, public education, open space, and other City resources) also constitute resource commitments that might otherwise be used for other programs or

projects. However, the Proposed Actions would enliven the area and produce economic growth that would generate substantial tax revenues providing a new source of public funds that would offset these expenditures.

The commitments of resources and materials are weighed against the benefits of the Proposed Actions. The Proposed Actions would promote new residential development with significant amounts of permanently affordable housing and preserve existing affordability, encourage mixed-use development on key corridors, enhance and revitalize major thoroughfares through new economic development, and protect neighborhood character by ensuring predictable future development.

P. Conceptual Analysis

DEVELOPMENT FACILITATED BY C2-4 COMMERCIAL OVERLAY MAPPING

As part of the Proposed Actions portions of Block 4205, Lot 2 would be mapped with a C2-4 commercial overlay. Because the land use and development on this lot is governed by a Large-Scale General Development plan, which would require modification via a future discretionary approval to permit new development pursuant to the C2-4 commercial overlay, the potential impact of this commercial overlay is analyzed conceptually.

Given the information available at this time, there would be no impacts related to Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy; Socioeconomic Conditions; Community Facilities and Services; Open Space (direct impacts); Historic and Cultural Resources (architectural); Hazardous Materials; Water and Sewer Infrastructure; Solid Waste and Sanitation Services; Energy; Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change; or Noise. The following analyses may meet the thresholds for detailed analyses or require additional review beyond an initial assessment to determine the possibility for significant adverse impacts when more information is known about this project: Open Space (indirect impacts); Shadows; Historic and Cultural Resources (archaeological); Urban Design and Visual Resources; Transportation; Air Quality; Public Health; Neighborhood Character; and Construction.

CPC AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FLOOR AREA BONUS AND BULK MODIFICATIONS

The Proposed Actions would establish new City Planning Commission authorizations for floor area bonus and bulk modifications (new discretionary actions applicable within the proposed Special District). One of these discretionary actions would provide a floor area bonus when certain public realm improvements are realized near the future Parkchester/Van Nest and Morris Park stations. To accommodate this bonus floor area within the permitted building envelope, height relief would be provided through another authorization. Block 4226, Lots 409 and 418 are projected development sites near the future Parkchester/Van Nest and Morris Park stations that are reasonably assumed to pursue the new authorizations in the future.

Given the information available at this time, there would be no impacts related to Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy; Socioeconomic Conditions; Community Facilities and Services; Open Space; Historic and Cultural Resources; Hazardous Materials; Water and Sewer Infrastructure; Solid Waste and Sanitation Services; Energy; Transportation (traffic, transit, pedestrians); Air Quality (mobile source); Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change; or Noise. The following analyses may meet the thresholds for detailed analyses or require additional review beyond an initial assessment to determine the possibility for significant adverse impacts when more information is known about this project: Shadows; Urban Design and Visual Resources; Transportation (parking); Air Quality (stationary source); Public Health; Neighborhood Character; and Construction.

NEW YORK CITY HEALTH AND HOSPITALS SITE REDEVELOPMENT

The conceptual analysis also considers those sites within or surrounding the affected area where an interest in future development, subject to future discretionary actions, has been expressed. Discretionary actions to develop the New York City Health and Hospitals site currently housing New York City Police Precinct 49 and Fire Department of New York EMS Battalion 20 on Block 4205, Lot 1 (portions of) is analyzed conceptually because development on this site would require disposition of City-owned property and additional discretionary actions. New York City Health and Hospitals Site Redevelopment considers a potential zoning map change and text amendment to the Special Eastchester – East Tremont Corridor District to include a portion of Block 4205, Lot 1, along Eastchester Road between Rhinelander Avenue and the intersection with Stillwell Avenue.

Given the information available at this time, there would be no impacts related to Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy; Socioeconomic Conditions; Community Facilities and Service (police, fire, emergency services, and healthcare facilities); Open Space (direct impacts); Historic and Cultural Resources (architectural); Hazardous Materials; Water and Sewer Infrastructure; Solid Waste and Sanitation Services; Energy; or Noise. The following analyses may meet the thresholds for detailed analyses or require additional review beyond an initial assessment to determine the possibility for significant adverse impacts when more information is known about this project: Community Facilities (public schools, early childhood care centers, and libraries); Open Space (indirect impacts); Shadows; Historic and Cultural Resources (archaeological); Urban Design and Visual Resources; Transportation; Air Quality; Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change; Public Health; Neighborhood Character; and Construction.

MONTEFIORE EINSTEIN CAMPUS DEVELOPMENT

The conceptual analysis also considers those sites within or surrounding the affected area where an interest in future development, subject to future discretionary actions, has been expressed. Montefiore Einstein has expressed interest in a series of land use actions affecting Block 4117, Lot 1 and Block 4120, Lots 7, 8, 12, 16, 18, 19, and 20 in order to facilitate the development of a new 425-bed high-acuity hospital pavilion and parking structure with a potential overbuild for health care.

Given the information available at this time, there would be no impacts to Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy; Socioeconomic Conditions; Community Facilities and Services; Open Space (direct impacts); Historic and Cultural Resources (architectural); Hazardous Materials; Water and Sewer Infrastructure; Solid Waste and Sanitation Services; or Energy. The following analyses may meet the thresholds for detailed analyses or require additional review beyond an initial assessment to determine the possibility for significant adverse impacts when more information is known about this project: Open Space (indirect impacts); Shadows; Historic and Cultural Resources (archaeological); Urban Design and Visual Resources; Transportation; Air Quality; Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change; Noise; Public Health; Neighborhood Character; and Construction.

CUMULATIVE ASSESSMENT

In a future where the Proposed Actions have been implemented and each of the conceptual projects are also pursued, the impacts of the Proposed Actions identified in this EIS related to Community Facilities (primary schools); Open Space (indirect impacts); Shadows; Historic and Cultural Resources; Transportation; and Construction would still occur.

The potential for the conceptual projects to cumulatively worsen any of these identified impacts would need to be further assessed as part of the environmental review for each such project. However, it can be assumed that, in the event that these projects are constructed within the same time period, these projects would have the potential to exacerbate the impacts identified in the DEIS as a result of the Proposed Actions.

Based on the limited information currently available, there would be no impacts related to Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy; Socioeconomic Conditions (direct residential, direct business, indirect business, and adverse impacts on specific industries); Community Facilities and Services (libraries, police, fire, emergency services, and healthcare facilities); Open Space (direct impacts); Historic and Cultural Resources (architectural); Hazardous Materials; Water and Sewer Infrastructure, Solid Waste and Sanitation Services; or Energy. A conservative assessment of these conceptual projects indicates that there may be potential for the conceptual projects, taken together with the Proposed Actions, to cumulatively result in potential impacts related to: Socioeconomic Conditions (indirect residential); Community Facilities (public schools and early childhood centers); Open Space (indirect impacts); Shadows; Historic and Cultural Resources (archaeological); Urban Design and Visual Resources; Transportation; Air Quality; Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change; Noise; Public Health; Neighborhood Character; and Construction.

Specifically, there is the potential for cumulative indirect residential displacement with the implementation of the New York City Health and Hospitals Site Redevelopment, following the implementation of the Proposed Actions. The potential for cumulative impacts to early childhood centers may arise with the implementation of the New York City Health and Hospitals Site Redevelopment, following the implementation of the Proposed Actions. The potential for stationary Air Quality cumulative effects would require additional consideration of building heights and locations to determine potential

cumulative effects. Cumulative mobile source noise impacts may be identified with the implementation of the Montefiore Einstein Campus Development. Finally, the potential for transportation and construction-period noise may be issues with the implementation of all of the conceptual projects, though given the limited duration of significant construction-period noise impacts, and the difference in geographic locations, the construction-period noise impacts are not expected to be cumulatively significant.