



DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING  
CITY OF NEW YORK

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND REVIEW DIVISION

Daniel R. Garodnick, *Director*  
Department of City Planning

March 14, 2025

**NOTICE OF COMPLETION AND NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY  
OF A DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**Jamaica Neighborhood Plan**

**Project Identification**

CEQR No. 24DCP132Q  
ULURP Nos. 250171 HAQ, 250172 ZMQ,  
N250173 ZRQ, 250187MMQ

**Lead Agency**

City Planning Commission  
120 Broadway, 31<sup>st</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10271

SEQRA Classification: Type I

**Contact Person**

Stephanie Shellooe, AICP, Director (212) 720-3328  
Environmental Assessment and Review Division  
New York City Department of City Planning

---

Pursuant to City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR), Mayoral Executive Order No. 91 of 1977, CEQR Rules of Procedure of 1991 and the regulations of Article 8 of the State Environmental Conservation Law, State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) as found in 6 NYCRR Part 617, a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) has been prepared for the action described below. Copies of the DEIS are available for public inspection at the office of the undersigned as well as online via the Jamaica Neighborhood Plan project page on ZAP: <https://zap.planning.nyc.gov/projects/2023Q0381>. To view the Jamaica Neighborhood Plan DEIS and Appendices, navigate to the project page in ZAP and select Public Documents, then "DEIS\_24DCP132Q". The proposal involves actions by the City Planning Commission (CPC) and the New York City Council pursuant to Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP). Advance notice will be given of the time and place of the hearing. Written comments on the DEIS are requested and would be received and considered by the Lead Agency until the 10th calendar day following the close of the public hearing.

**A. INTRODUCTION**

The New York City Department of City Planning (DCP), together with the New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development (HPD), New York City Department of Transportation (DOT), and New York City Economic Development Corporation (EDC), is proposing a series of land use actions (the "Proposed Actions") to support and facilitate implementation of the Jamaica Neighborhood Plan, which is the subject of an ongoing community planning process to meet the long-term vision of Jamaica and its

surrounding neighborhoods as more prosperous, resilient and thriving. The Proposed Actions would affect an approximately 230-block area (“the Project Area”) focused around Downtown Jamaica (also commonly referred to as Jamaica Center), the industrial districts to the south and east, and portions of Jamaica’s key corridors including Hillside Avenue, Jamaica Avenue, Liberty Avenue, Sutphin Boulevard, Guy R. Brewer Boulevard, and Merrick Boulevard. The Project Area is generally bounded by Hillside Avenue to the north, the Van Wyck Expressway Service Road to the west, 109th Avenue, 115th Avenue, and 116th Avenue to the south; and 191st Street and Farmers Boulevard to the east. The majority of the Project Area is located in Queens Community District 12, with a portion along Hillside Avenue and Queens Boulevard located in Community District 8.

The Proposed Actions are intended to support the long-term vision and goals of the Jamaica Neighborhood Plan, which aims to create a more prosperous neighborhood that promotes affordability, celebrates inclusivity and diversity, and supports investment activity and business opportunities. The Proposed Actions, along with continued planning efforts to coordinate programs, services, and policies for Jamaica’s long-term future, are being proposed in response to the need for investment and community-driven solutions in a neighborhood that is experiencing continued growth. Jamaica is also impacted by citywide challenges including the housing crisis that New York City is currently grappling with. The Jamaica Neighborhood Plan, which officially launched in May 2023, is an ongoing initiative that is shaped by the Jamaica Steering Committee, local residents, local cultural institutions, local groups, organizations, and civics, local elected officials, property owners, and city agencies.

Within the Project Area, the Proposed Actions are anticipated to facilitate new residential, commercial, community facility, and industrial development. Overall, the Proposed Actions are expected to result in a net (incremental) increase of approximately 12,319 dwelling units (DU), including approximately 2,500 – 3,744<sup>1</sup> permanently income-restricted homes, 1,476,220 gross square feet (gsf) of commercial space, 836,034 gsf of community facility space, 24,818 gsf of industrial space, and 1,994,252 gsf of warehouse space and a net decrease of approximately 24,193 gsf of auto-related uses and 72 accessory parking spaces, over the span of 15 years, compared to No-Action conditions.

The Proposed Actions seek to accomplish the following land use objectives:

- Expand housing opportunities by requiring permanently income restricted housing through the Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (“MIH”) program in new developments to support the neighborhood diversity and further the city’s equity and Fair Housing goals;
- Reinforce the area as a regional business district by strengthening the existing economic ecosystem while also promoting the development of new job-generating uses through increased industrial and commercial density;
- Strengthen the quality of the streetscape to promote safety, pedestrian experience, and opportunities for publicly accessible open space for existing and future residents; and
- Support a comprehensive neighborhood plan by aligning a zoning framework with capital investments, infrastructure needs, and services to meet both current demands and future residents.

## **B. REQUIRED APPROVALS**

The Proposed Actions include discretionary actions that are subject to review under ULURP, Section 200 of the City Charter, and City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) process, as follows:

- Zoning Map Amendment to:
  - Rezone portions of existing R3-2, R3A, R4, R4-1, R5, R5B, R5D, R6, R6A, R7A, R7X, C4-3A, C4-4A, C4-5X, C6-2, C6-3, M1-1, M1-2, and M1-4 districts to R6A, R6D, R7A, R7X, R8A, R8X, C4-4, C4-4D, C6-2, C6-3, C6-3A, C6-4, M1-2A, M2-3A, M3-2A, M1-2A/R7-2,

---

<sup>1</sup> A minimum percentage of housing created would be permanently affordable under Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH). The number of affordable units would be determined by a number of factors, including the MIH option ultimately selected for the Proposed Actions. The number of affordable units shown here is approximate and based on a percentage of floor area under the RWCDs, which is assumed to be MIH Option 1 (25 percent of residential floor area), MIH Option 2 (30 percent of residential floor area), or MIH Option 3 (20 percent of residential floor area).

M1-2A/R7A, M1-3A/R7X, M1-6A/R9A, and M1-8A/R9X.

- Replace or eliminate portions of existing C1-2, C1-3, C1-4 and C2-3 overlays mapped throughout the Project Area with C2-4 overlays and map new C2-4 overlays.
- Modify the boundaries of the Special Downtown Jamaica District (“DJ” or “Special District”) to an area generally coterminous with the Project Area.
- Zoning Text Amendments to:
  - Modify and expand the Special District’s use, bulk, parking and loading, and streetscape regulations in Zoning Resolution (ZR) Article XI, Chapter 5. The proposed modifications would establish specific urban design regulations related to bulk and street wall rules, particularly in areas where a mix of residential, commercial, and manufacturing uses would be permitted. In addition, the text of the ZR would be amended to:
  - Define some areas wherein C6-3 zoning districts have a residence equivalent to R9-1 residence districts.
  - Amend Appendix F of the ZR to apply the MIH program to proposed R6A, R6D, R7A, R7X, R8A, R8X, C4-4D, C6-2, C6-3, C6-3 (R9-1), C6-3A, C6-4, M1-2A/R7-2, M1-2A/R7A, M1-3A/R7X, M1-6A/R9A, and M1-8A/R9X districts.
  - Create new paired districts including M1-2A/R7A, M1-2A/R7-2, M1-3A/R7X, M1-6A/R9A, and M1-8A/R9X mixed-use districts.
- Designation of Urban Development Action Areas (UDAA), Approval of an Urban Development Action Area Project (UDAAP), and Disposition of City-Owned Properties
  - Designation of UDAAs, project approval of a UDAAP, and disposition of the City-owned property for parcels owned and managed by HPD on Block 10150, Lots 6, 7, 8, 10, 51, 52, 54, and 57, and Block 12152, Lots 8, 9, 10, and 11.
- City Map Amendments
  - DOT and EDC are seeking the following changes to the City Map within the area generally bounded by 144th Place to the west, 91st Avenue to the north, Archer Avenue to the south, and 147th Street to the east. The proposed action would facilitate the construction of two pedestrian plazas proposed as part of the Station Plaza Enhancement Project.
    - i. Revise the currently mapped “Public Place” boundary on Block 9986 to encompass portions of (p/o) Lots 70 and 73 and revise the street lines to eliminate street area within Lots 20, 70, 73, and 75 corresponding to the proposed pedestrian plaza;
    - ii. Eliminate a mapped “Public Place” on Block 9988 and restore street lines mapped prior to the 2007 Station Plaza City Map amendment on Block 9988; and
    - iii. Revise the currently mapped “Public Place” boundary on Block 9994 to match the existing extents of Lot 38 corresponding to the proposed pedestrian plaza and adjusting existing street lines along Archer Avenue.

In addition, while not included in the current Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP) application associated with the Proposed Actions, a future City Map amendment is analyzed in this environmental review to present a conservative assessment. The future discretionary action would be an amendment to the City Map to demap a portion of the previously mapped Atlantic Avenue widening, generally bounded by Sanders Place to the west and Liberty Avenue to the southeast, and associated disposition actions. Redevelopment of Projected Development Sites 14, 19, 20, and 21 have been included in the environmental analysis that could be facilitated by future discretionary action. In addition, potential future discretionary action may be necessary to develop City-owned portions of a site located in an area generally bounded by Liberty Avenue to the north, 150th Street to the west, Tuskegee Airmen Way to the south and LIRR tracks to the west. Redevelopment of the entirety of Projected Development Site 48 has been included in the environmental analysis that could be facilitated by future discretionary action to present a conservative assessment.

In connection with approval of the Proposed Actions, an (E) designation would be established on the

majority of projected and potential development sites to avoid potential for significant adverse impacts related to hazardous materials, air quality and noise. The details of these environmental restrictions are provided in the related technical chapters.

## **C. BACKGROUND TO THE PROPOSED ACTIONS**

### **COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND INTERAGENCY PARTICIPATION**

The Jamaica Neighborhood Study was publicly launched in May 2023. At the beginning of the planning process, a Steering Committee was formed and convened monthly to shape ongoing progress and advise on issues and opportunities throughout the neighborhood planning process. The Committee, convened by Council Member Williams, includes approximately 40 representatives from local organizations, businesses, institutions, and elected officials. Council Member Williams also formed an executive committee to bring together local and state elected officials who represent Jamaica to deepen their understanding of local concerns and equip them to better advocate for these issues in their respective roles.

The planning process actively provided opportunities for community members, local organizations, and other local stakeholders to engage early in the process. Over the summer of 2023, the study team engaged in broad outreach to share information on the Neighborhood Planning process and learn what the community loved about the neighborhood and what they wanted to see in the future. This broad outreach included tabling at 11 events and a survey which received approximately 1,128 responses. At a public open house and workshop on September 30, 2023, the project team shared data and information on existing conditions for Jamaica and held a workshop with the community to create a vision and goals to guide the project.

Over the fall and winter of 2023, the study team held two rounds of working group meetings on six topics: housing, public health and safety, transportation and connectivity, open space and public space, economic opportunity, job training and education, and arts, culture, and entertainment. These meetings provided an opportunity for community members and City agencies to learn from each other. City agencies shared existing programs, services and policies that could address existing challenges while community members highlighted specific neighborhood issues and shared potential solutions.

Over the winter into March 2024, the study team organized additional events to broaden the perspectives included in the neighborhood plan. These events included a youth summit that brought together 76 students from seven different high schools in Jamaica to provide their perspectives on issues they experience going to school, living in, or traveling through Jamaica. There were also listening sessions with the Bengali community and digital opportunities through the JamaicaPlan.nyc website. In February, the study team convened a Working Group Summit to present the Plan's initial draft strategies and zoning concepts. The presentation was followed by a workshop with community members to assess how the draft strategies could further the goals established earlier in the process. Next, the project team held a week-long event at the Queens Central Library to continue sharing the draft strategies and invited community members to refine the draft strategies while working with City agencies to refine the zoning concepts. As the planning process progresses, the project team will continue to provide community members with a range of opportunities to participate.

## **JAMAICA NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN AREA HISTORY**

### ***PROJECT AREA HISTORY***

#### ***The Early History of Jamaica***

The area was historically home to the Jameco or Yamecah Indigenous People. Jamaica's early economic history started with the Indigenous people where it is believed that Jamaica Avenue was an ancient trail for Indigenous tribes to trade materials. It is said that around 1655, settlers coming from Europe paid the Jameco/Yamecah with a small amount of weapons and supplies to take control of an area within the land the Jameco/Yamecah were occupying. The Dutch generally called this area "Rustdorp". It is widely believed that the English, after taking control of the land from the Dutch around 1664, named the area

Jamaica after the Jameco Indigenous People. For many years after, Jamaica was primarily farmland and certain areas served as a trading post for farmers in the area. These farms also contributed to the history of slavery during this time period.

#### Evolution of Jamaica's Infrastructure and Economic Status

Around the late 1800s and early 1900s, Jamaica began seeing several transportation infrastructure projects including the development of an elevated rapid transit line, electric streetcar routes, also known as electric trolleys, which were later replaced by existing bus routes, and the development of major bus terminals. Additionally, the previous two Jamaica rails were being redeveloped to what would become the existing Jamaica LIRR station. With increased transportation access and options, Jamaica's population grew rapidly. At the same time, The Jamaica Savings Bank, recognized as the oldest banking institution in Jamaica, established its headquarters in downtown Jamaica and continued to prosper due to its success. In general, Downtown Jamaica was a major commercial center for Queens and much of Long Island during this time period with brands like Macy's and other popular retailers, and entertainment venues like the Lowes Valencia theatre and La Casina nightclub. The 1969 Draft Plan for New York City described Jamaica as the largest retail center in Queens and the "third largest in the metropolitan region." Through the 1960s, Downtown Jamaica was an important business center and attracted investment in new homes and apartments. While the neighborhood was experiencing prosperity, it was still experiencing the effects of redlining which marked areas south of the LIRR tracks as "unfavorable".

However, due to a number of factors, the commercial center began to decline in the late 1900s. Queens and Long Island became increasingly auto-oriented through the 1960's and 1970's. More shopping options became available in neighboring Long Island and other Queens neighborhoods like Rego Park which diverted spending away from businesses in Jamaica. South Jamaica also grappled with the cocaine and heroin epidemics which destroyed the lives of many in the community. Due to economic decline, stores began to leave the neighborhood, including the infamous closure of the Macy's that was originally located along Jamaica Avenue.

In response to this downward trend, revitalization efforts began in the late 1960s with the formation of the Greater Jamaica Development Corporation (GJDC), which was founded to spur public and private investments in the area. Infrastructure and development projects slowly gained traction like the removal of the Jamaica Avenue "elevated subway" and its replacement by the Archer Avenue subway extension. The Jamaica Center for Arts and Learning was also established on Jamaica Avenue to support efforts to activate the commercial center. Jamaica was also targeted for Urban Renewal efforts to create a new federal office building housing the Social Security Administration, new federal and state courthouses, a new campus for York College, and new residential developments.

In recent years, additional major investments have included the 2006 AirTrain light rail, a \$387 million renovation project to connect Jamaica Station to the AirTrain terminal and renovate platforms and waiting areas, and the nation's largest and most modern laboratory for the U.S. Food and Drug Administration. In September 2007, the New York City Council adopted DCP's Downtown Jamaica Plan (C 070314 (A) ZMQ et al), which included a comprehensive set of land use actions designed to foster development in Downtown Jamaica while protecting the character of mid- and low-density neighborhoods surrounding the downtown core. In 2014-2015, the City of New York undertook the Jamaica Planning Initiative, bringing together community residents, nonprofit and faith-based organizations, private firms, industry experts, policymakers, and city government leaders to discuss one mission—strengthening Jamaica. The initiative culminated in the creation of the Jamaica NOW Neighborhood Action Plan, a \$153 million strategic economic development investment

#### ***NEIGHBORHOOD CONTEXT***

The Project Area comprises an approximately 712-acre area covering over 230 city blocks centered around Downtown Jamaica, a large portion of its surrounding industrial districts, and several of Jamaica's major road corridors. The Project Area is generally bounded by Hillside Avenue to the north, the Van Wyck Expressway Service Road to the west, 109th Avenue, 115th Avenue, and 116th Avenue to the south, and 191st Street and Farmers Boulevard to the east. Almost the entirety of the Project Area is located in Queens Community District 12, with a small portion along Hillside Avenue and Queens Boulevard located in Community District 8.



Jamaica features some of the highest levels of transit accessibility in Queens, with the LIRR, JFK AirTrain, E, F, J, and Z subway lines, and over 30 bus routes providing access to the Project Area. Downtown Jamaica is home to a rail hub at Archer Avenue and Sutphin Boulevard (LIRR, JFK AirTrain, and E, J and Z subway lines), the Jamaica Center subway station (terminus for the E, J, and Z subway lines), as well as bus hubs at Archer Avenue and Parsons Boulevard and Merrick Boulevard between Jamaica Avenue and 89th Avenue.<sup>2</sup> Along Hillside Avenue, the F train is served by stations at Sutphin Boulevard, Parsons Boulevard, 169th Street, and 179th Street. The Jamaica-Van Wyck E train station is across the Van Wyck Expressway from the Project Area's western boundary, and the Briarwood F train station at Main Street and Queens Boulevard is a short walk from the Project Area's northwestern boundary. Outside of these nodes, the rest of the Project Area is primarily served by buses, with major corridors along Merrick Boulevard, Liberty Avenue, Guy R. Brewer Boulevard, Sutphin Boulevard, and Jamaica Avenue.

Along with Downtown Flushing and Long Island City, Downtown Jamaica serves as one of Queens' three primary central business districts and South Queens' primary commercial and transportation hub. Over the past two decades, Jamaica's status as an employment center has diminished, with a 13 percent decline in private sector employment and a significant loss of industry in its manufacturing districts.

Due to its large size and varied built environment, the Project Area is described below across a series of subareas. The Project Area is comprised of the core of Downtown Jamaica ("Downtown Jamaica Core"), the manufacturing, commercial, and institutional areas south of Downtown ("Downtown Jamaica South"), the manufacturing districts east of Downtown Jamaica ("East Jamaica Manufacturing Districts"), and key corridors in Jamaica ("Jamaica Major Corridors") including Hillside Avenue, Jamaica Avenue, Liberty Avenue, Sutphin Boulevard, Guy R. Brewer Boulevard and Merrick Boulevard.

## **PROJECT AREA**

### *Downtown Jamaica Core*

Downtown Jamaica Core, which includes the Jamaica Center Central Business District ("CBD"), is located north of the LIRR tracks and bordered generally by Archer Avenue to the south, Hillside Avenue to the north, Merrick Boulevard to the east, and Sutphin Boulevard to the west. The area is mainly characterized by a mix of retail, institutional, and office uses with housing located throughout this area. Jamaica Avenue serves as a major commercial and cultural corridor, home to small businesses, major retailers, office spaces, performing arts centers, Rufus King Park which is an 11.5-acre city park that includes the historic Rufus King Manor House and notable landmarked structures. Commercial activity generally extends from Jamaica Avenue into side streets like Sutphin Boulevard, Parsons Boulevard, and 165th Street, connecting to Hillside Avenue.

This area has a range of housing types including single- and two-family houses and medium to high density apartment buildings. Prior to the 2007 rezoning, housing was typically in areas adjacent to the major corridors like Jamaica Avenue, Sutphin Boulevard, Parson Boulevard, etc. However, following the 2007 rezoning, Downtown Jamaica's core has seen over 1,000 new units developed, most of which are on large lots within a short walk of the transit hub at Archer Avenue and Sutphin Boulevard and the Jamaica Center E train station. Approximately half of the units have been developed pursuant to the Voluntary Inclusionary Housing ("VIH") program, while commercial development has been limited to ground floor retail uses.

Major institutional uses within the Downtown Jamaica Core include Federal, State, and City government facilities including the Civil Court and Surrogate's Court along Sutphin Boulevard, the Queens Family Court on Jamaica Avenue at 153rd Street, the Queens Central Library on Merrick Boulevard, and the United States Postal Service Jamaica Post Office.

### *Downtown Jamaica South*

Downtown Jamaica South is located just south of the LIRR tracks and bordered generally by the LIRR tracks, Sutphin Boulevard, Liberty Avenue and 158th Street. The area is currently characterized by a mix of retail, light industrial uses, warehouses, and automotive uses, with housing throughout the area.

Sutphin Boulevard serves as the primary local commercial corridor, extending south to Liberty Ave. This

---

<sup>2</sup> This bus hub is scheduled to close and temporarily relocate to a parking lot on 168<sup>th</sup> Street between Jamaica Avenue and 90<sup>th</sup> Avenue. A permanent location has not been identified.

portion of Sutphin Boulevard features ground floor retail often paired with a floor of housing above. Retail along this corridor includes personal service businesses, such as nail and hair salons and barbershops, food and drink establishments, and small bodegas and grocery stores. The areas east of Sutphin Boulevard towards 158th Street include a number of industrial uses, including two concrete batching facilities along 95th Avenue, and food processors, and active wholesalers and warehouses. There are also other auto uses such as vehicle salvages, vehicle storage, paratransit lots and a car wash facility. These uses directly surround a number of existing one- and two-family homes that were built in the early 1900s followed by the development of industrial uses throughout the 1900s.

This section of Liberty Avenue serves as a major light industrial corridor with low scale buildings that typically have uses such as masonry and auto uses such as repair, retail and recycling of auto parts, and a gas station, and self-storage.

#### *East Jamaica Manufacturing Districts*

To the east of York College and south of the LIRR tracks is an industrial area with businesses such as warehouses, automotive products dealers and repair shops, construction supply companies, and food wholesalers. Adjacent to these industrial zones are existing one- and two-family residential homes, many constructed throughout the 1900s, often situated near automotive uses, vacant lots, and parking areas. At the southwestern edge of the Project Area, land use is primarily residential, with a mix of one- and two-family detached and semi-detached homes and several walkup apartment buildings.

At the southeastern edge of the Project Area, the Montauk line of the LIRR branches off to the south along 180th Street from the main line. On either side of these rail tracks are industrial uses including warehousing, distribution, manufacturing, and construction--related businesses. Industrial uses along Liberty Avenue near 177th Street include three concrete batching plants that are within about a block of the existing residential neighborhood south of Liberty Avenue.

To the east of the LIRR Montauk line tracks is the residential neighborhood of St. Albans. The portion of this neighborhood within the Project Area is almost entirely residential. It is comprised mainly of single-family detached houses with some two-family houses, as well as a few blocks of small walk-up apartment buildings.

#### *Jamaica and Key Major Corridors*

##### *Hillside Avenue*

Hillside Avenue is located in the northern portion of the Project Area and extends west to east from the Van Wyck Expressway to 172nd Street in Jamaica. The avenue is characterized by diverse small businesses, such as restaurants, grocery stores, retail shops, and service-oriented establishments. Additionally, clusters of auto businesses, including car dealerships, gas stations, car rental agencies, and repair shops are located throughout the area. There are residential uses along the avenue, featuring a mix of one- and two- family buildings, older low-rise structures with storefronts and housing above, older multifamily buildings, and newer developments. Notable features include the 169th Street subway station, several bus lines traversing the avenue, and numerous schools situated directly on Hillside Avenue or within close proximity.

##### *Jamaica Avenue*

Jamaica Avenue is located at the center of the Project Area and extends from the Van Wyck Expressway to 168th Street. This area is also known as the central business district. The avenue serves as a vital economic, cultural, and social corridor for the neighborhood. There is a wide range of commercial uses including large retailers, small businesses, and office buildings. Jamaica Avenue also serves as a major transit hub, connecting numerous bus routes and nearby train and rail routes that serve a wide range of transit users. Key features along Jamaica Avenue include Rufus King Park, an 11.5-acre park located on the north side of Jamaica Avenue between 150th and 153rd Streets and features handball courts, paved walkways, landscaping, a playground and benches. It also includes a historic resource, the Rufus King House, which is accessible to the public for tours.

##### *Guy R. Brewer Boulevard*

South of Jamaica Avenue in the Downtown Core, 163rd Street becomes Guy R. Brewer Boulevard, which

## **Jamaica Neighborhood Plan**

CEQR No. 24DCP132Q

Page 8

runs through the York College campus and the South Jamaica neighborhood to the south. Guy R. Brewer Boulevard is the area's main retail strip. It is lined with mixed-use buildings with storefronts on the ground floor and residential use above and a number of community facilities and houses of worship. Immediately south of the LIRR tracks is York College, which is part of the City University of New York (CUNY) system. The York College campus includes several academic buildings, a performing arts center, a health and physical education building, athletic fields, and a U.S. Food and Drug Administration Laboratory. The campus also includes three cemeteries as well as a church that is being rebuilt as a childcare center. At the southeastern corner of the campus are two large vacant lots.

### **Merrick Boulevard**

Merrick Boulevard runs north-south through the Project Area. The northern portion of Merrick Boulevard is lined with commercial, light-industrial, and institutional uses. South of the LIRR tracks to 109th Avenue, Merrick Boulevard consists of mostly automotive and open storage uses. These include repair shops, gas stations, and car dealerships. Further south, Merrick Boulevard is characterized primarily by community facility uses, including many houses of worship and medical facilities, and retail use.

Outside of Merrick Boulevard the neighborhood consists mostly of one- and two- family detached and semi-detached houses with vacant lots interspersed. This area is served by Detective Keith Williams Playground, which extends approximately four blocks south of Liberty Avenue between 172nd and 173rd Streets.

### ***HPD Parcels***

The Project Area includes City-owned parcels managed by HPD on Block 10150, Lots 6, 7, 8, 10, 51, 52, 54, and 57, Block 12152, Lots 8, 9, 10, and 11. HPD proposes UDAA designation, UDAAAP and disposition of these parcels for affordable housing. The lots, which are generally vacant and underutilized, are proposed for two scattered site projects.

The combined lots are approximately 33,000 sf. The lots on Block 10150 are located along Guy R. Brewer Boulevard and Union Hall Street, midblock between 108th Avenue and 109th Avenue. The lots are currently zoned R4 and R5D. Under the Proposed Actions these lots would be rezoned to R6D and R7A in an MIH area, within the proposed Special District boundary. These lots are proposed for development under HPD's Neighborhood Construction Program (NCP). The lots on Block 12152 are located along Union Hall Street, midblock between 109th Avenue and 110th Avenue. Those lots are proposed for redevelopment under HPD's Open Door homeownership program. The lots that are currently zoned R4 would be rezoned to R6D in an MIH area, within the proposed Special District Boundary.

## ***PREVIOUS PLANNING EFFORTS AND PAST ACTIONS***

### ***Jamaica Plan (2007)***

A large geography of the Project Area was subject to the 2007 Downtown Jamaica Plan (C 0470314A ZMQ, N 070315A ZRQ) (the "2007 Jamaica Plan"). The area affected by the 2007 actions covered around 368 blocks and is generally bounded by the Van Wyck Expressway service road to the west, 87th Road and Highland Avenue to the north, 189th, 190th, 191st Streets and Farmers Boulevard to the east, and Waltham Street, 105th, 108th, 109th, Sayres, and 110th Avenues to the south.

The 2007 Jamaica Plan consisted of several land use actions, including zoning map and text amendments, an urban renewal plan and designation, disposition of property within the Jamaica Gateway Urban Renewal Plan, the disposition of city-owned property and an amendment to the City Map. The 2007 Jamaica Plan was intended to support Jamaica's downtown business district, expand housing and economic opportunities along the area's major thoroughfares and preserve intact blocks in neighboring low-rise residential communities.

The objectives of the 2007 Jamaica Plan included the following:

- Preserve lower density residential neighborhoods by mapping zones that more appropriately reflect one- and two- family residential communities, as well as other lower density areas where a mix of densities exist.
- Create opportunities for new housing development in Downtown Jamaica and along the area's wide streets that can better accommodate development at higher densities.



## **Jamaica Neighborhood Plan**

CEQR No. 24DCP132Q

Page 9

- Create a special district to strengthen and revitalize Downtown Jamaica and foster new transit-oriented development at densities appropriate for this unique regional center.
- Support business, institutional, and industrial opportunities by increasing potential densities in certain industrial areas to set the stage for new redevelopment and expansion opportunities.

In conjunction with the Jamaica Plan was the Station Plaza Enhancements (C\_070078\_MMQ), which proposed City Map changes to a section of the Project Area, which consisted of:

- The realignment of Archer Avenue between 144th Place and 147th Place;
- The establishment of Public Places between 144th Place and 147th Place;
- The adjustment of grades necessitated thereby; and,
- Acquisition or disposition of real property related thereto.

### *Jamaica Gateway Urban Renewal Area (2007)*

The northwestern section of the Project Area contains the Jamaica Gateway Urban Renewal Area (JGURA), which was established in 2007 (C 070316 HUQ) and remains in effect for 40 years from the date of initial approval. It includes the three blocks bounded by Archer Avenue, Sutphin Boulevard, 94th Avenue, Liverpool Street, 95th Avenue, 148th Street, 94th Avenue and 150th Street, which were under multiple ownership and comprised vacant and underutilized parcels. The JGURA was established to support the redevelopment and transformation of the greater area through actions proposed as part of the 2007 Jamaica Plan. The urban renewal designation and plan was enacted to facilitate the necessary acquisition to foster redevelopment.

As described above, the 2007 Jamaica Plan included approximately 368 blocks and proposed to enhance Jamaica's residential, commercial, and industrial areas by expanding the downtown context westward to connect Sutphin and Parsons Boulevard transit centers, by providing new opportunities for economic growth, guiding new residential and mixed-use development away from side streets towards transit-oriented locations and offering incentives for the provision of affordable housing.

### *St. Albans-Hollis Rezoning (2007)*

A section of the Project Area was subject to an area-wide rezoning sponsored by DCP known as the St. Albans-Hollis Rezoning in 2007 at the request of Community Board 12, local civic associations, and the local City Councilman's office (C 070472 ZMQ). This rezoning focused on the residential character of St. Albans and Hollis, while also allowing for appropriately scaled new development along Merrick Boulevard, Linden Boulevard, Farmers Boulevard and Hollis Avenue, the communities' main transportation and retail corridors.

The area affected by the St. Albans-Hollis rezoning is in the eastern portion of Community District 12 and is bounded by Merrick Boulevard to the west and south, Springfield Boulevard and Francis Lewis Boulevard to the east, and 99th Avenue to the north.

### *South Jamaica Rezoning (2011)*

A section of the Project Area was subject to an area-wide rezoning sponsored by DCP known as the South Jamaica Rezoning (C 110145 ZMQ, N 110146 ZRQ) in 2011. The recommendations were the result of extensive outreach and consultation with the "One Block at a Time" civic organization, the South Jamaica Steering Committee, Community Board 12, local elected officials and local community organizations. That rezoning focused on character of the South Jamaica community while allowing opportunities for moderate growth along the area's main corridors of Rockaway, Sutphin, Guy R. Brewer, Merrick and Farmers Boulevards. In conjunction with the zoning map amendments, and in response to community needs and interests, a text amendment (N 110146 ZRQ) was included to facilitate and encourage full-line food stores in southeast Queens by extending the applicable area of the Food Retail Expansion to Support Health (FRESH) program to Community District 12's commercial corridors.

The area affected by the South Jamaica Rezoning covers approximately 538 blocks in southeast Queens in Community District 12. The area is generally bounded by Liberty Avenue, 108th Avenue and South Road to the north; Merrick Boulevard, Nellis Street and Springfield Boulevard to the east; North Conduit to the south; and Van Wyck Expressway to the west.

*Jamaica NOW Action Plan (2014)*

In the spring of 2014, the Mayor’s Office, EDC, and other city agencies in partnership with the Queens Borough President initiated the Jamaica Planning Initiative. The initiative resulted in the Jamaica NOW Action Plan, released in February 2015. The plan made recommendations to increase quality jobs and small business support, promote commercial growth and economic development, and improve livability. The area generally covered by the plan is bounded by Union Turnpike to the north, 188th Street and Farmers Boulevard to the east, Linden Boulevard to the south, and the Van Wyck Expressway to the west.

To achieve these goals, the initiative conducted a nine-month community engagement process and gathered recommendations from more than 30 meetings and two public conferences with Jamaica residents, businesses, community leaders, and elected officials.

*Jamaica Downtown Revitalization Initiative Strategic Investment Plan (2017)*

Led by New York State’s Regional Economic Development Council, Downtown Jamaica was identified as one of the ten communities that were identified to participate in the Downtown Revitalization Initiative (DRI), a \$100 million program to improve the vitality of urban centers across the state. The program allocated \$10 million to support the implementation of investment projects in the area and created a longer-term strategy that will attract additional public and private investment.

The plan’s three primary goals were to expand career opportunities and strengthen career pathways, activate Downtown through programming and marketing, and connect major centers of activity. To achieve these goals, the plan identified multiple priority projects to be allocated for DRI funding:

- Development of a co-working space for the Greater Downtown Jamaica Development Corporation;
- Delivery of high-speed broadband to the area;
- Expansion of workforce programs and targeted career prep at Edison High School;
- Physical improvements to the Jamaica Center and the two LIRR underpasses;
- Establishment of the Jamaica Arts Corridor through Jamaica Avenue improvements; and
- Creation of a Downtown Arts and Events multi-year grant fund for art installations and cultural events.

*Recent Citywide Efforts (2020-2024)*

DCP adopted two citywide text amendments known as City of Yes for Economic Opportunity (“COYEO”) and City of Yes for Housing Opportunity (“CHO”) that have implications for the Jamaica Neighborhood Plan. The proposed changes through both COYEO and CHO have been incorporated into the Jamaica Neighborhood Plan zoning framework and land use changes.

COYEO was approved by the City Planning Commission on March 6, 2024 and adopted by the City Council on June 6, 2024. This text amendment supports businesses and job growth by ensuring a wider range of businesses can use existing commercial space. The proposal makes zoning flexible enough for empty storefronts to be activated by businesses that serve the City’s neighborhoods. Additionally, COYEO creates a range of new Manufacturing Districts designed to enable greater opportunities for job intensive growth. Changes were made to the Special Downtown Jamaica District to align with COYEOs broader goals. These included replacing the special purpose district’s ground floor rules with a comprehensive suite of improved streetscape regulations.

CHO was approved by the City Planning Commission on September 25, 2024, and adopted by the City Council on December 5, 2024. This text amendment expands housing options through zoning reforms that would address the housing crisis. Key components included: updates to the Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH) program; the introduction of the Universal Affordability Preference (UAP) program which provides a preferential FAR that is available for affordable housing developments located outside of MIH applicable areas; and modifications to parking requirements that balances between housing development and the need for parking in some parts of the city. These modifications, in addition to low-density zoning reforms such as allowing Accessory Dwelling Units and modest apartment buildings, aim to enable a little more housing in every neighborhood. Changes were made to the Special Downtown Jamaica District to align with CHOs broader goals. These included replacing the Voluntary Inclusionary Housing program

with the Universal Affordability Preference and replacing the special purpose district's residential parking requirements with the underlying requirements.

*Historic Districts and Landmarks*

The Project Area is home to 16 landmarked buildings and sites which include:

- Queens General Court House (located at 88-11 Sutphin Boulevard) - This building was designated a landmark on October 26, 2010. It was built between 1937 and 1939 to consolidate various court facilities in Jamaica and continues to serve as a courthouse today.
- (Former) Jamaica Savings Bank (located at 146-21 Jamaica Avenue) - This building was designated a landmark on October 26, 2010. It was built in 1939 for the oldest banking institution in Jamaica, Queens and founded by a consortium of local citizens. It currently serves as the site for a Capital One full-service bank.
- Rufus King House (located within Rufus King Park in downtown Jamaica) - This was designated a landmark on April 19, 1966. Portions of the house were built around 1730 with newer portions built in 1750 and 1806. Historically, this house was associated with the King Family and currently serves as a historic house museum dedicated to preserving and interpreting King's legacy and early American life in Jamaica.
- First Reformed Church of Jamaica (located at 153-10 Jamaica Avenue) - This church was designated a landmark on January 30, 1996. It was built between 1858-59 as the third church constructed on this site for this congregation and continues to serve as a church today.
- Grace Episcopal Church and Graveyard (located at 155-03 Jamaica Avenue) - This church and graveyard was designated a landmark on May 25, 1967. It was built between 1861-1862 as the third church constructed on this site. The graveyard was built approximately around 1734. This site continues to serve as a church today.
- Prospect Cemetery (located by 159th Street at Beaver Road) - This cemetery was established before or around 1668 and is one of the few remaining colonial cemeteries in Queens. It currently serves as a historic cemetery.
- St. Monica's Church (located at 94-20 160th Street) - The church was designated a landmark on March 13, 1979. It was built between 1856-57. It is currently the York College Child and Family Center, a childcare and early education program for children of York College students, faculty, and staff.
- (Former) Jamaica Savings Bank (located at 161-02 Jamaica Avenue) - The former bank was designated a landmark on February 12, 2008. The branch was built between 1897-98 as the bank continued to grow in the area. It is currently the site of a Jollibee.
- The Register/Jamaica Arts Center (located at 161-04 Jamaica Avenue) - This building was designated a landmark on November 12, 1974. It was built in 1898 as the Office of the Register (Queens Register of Titles and Deeds Building) and currently serves as the Jamaica Center for Arts and Learning, a performing and visual arts center.
- Sidewalk Clock (located by 161-11 Jamaica Avenue) - The clock was designated a landmark on August 25, 1981. The clock was introduced around the 1860s and is one of the few that exist in New York today.
- La Casina (also known as La Casino – located at 90-33 160th Street) - This building was designated a landmark on January 30, 1996. The building was built in 1933 and was a former nightclub and restaurant. It currently serves as a dentist office.
- (Former) Suffolk Title and Guarantee Company Building (located at 90-04 161st Street) - This building was designated a landmark on March 6, 2001. The building was built in 1929 as the Suffolk Title and Guarantee Company. The building currently serves as office space.
- Jamaica Chamber of Commerce (located at 89-31 161st Street) - This building was designated a landmark on October 26, 2010. The building was built between 1928-1929 for the Jamaica

Chamber of Commerce. The building currently serves as office space.

- Loew’s Valencia Theatre (located at 165-11 Jamaica Avenue) - This building was designated a landmark on May 25, 1999. The theatre was built in 1928 as a major movie palace. The theatre currently serves as the Tabernacle of Prayer for All People.
- (Former) Jamaica Highschool (located at 162-02 Hillside Avenue) - The building was designated a landmark on June 25, 2013. The building was built between 1895-96 as a combined grammar and high school. When the grammar school left, the school was renamed Jamaica High School which later moved to a larger location. The building is currently the Jamaica Learning Center.
- J. Kurtz & Sons Store (located at 162-24 Jamaica Avenue) - The building was designated a landmark on November 24, 1981. The store was built in 1931 as a retail store for the furniture chain of J. Kurtz & Sons. The building currently serves a mix of retail and office uses.

## **EXISTING ZONING**

The Project Area includes the northern portion of Community District 12 and a small portion of Community District 8 along its southern boundary on Hillside Avenue. A large portion of the Project Area was rezoned during the 2007 Jamaica Plan, which also established the Special Downtown Jamaica District (“DJ” or “Special District”).

The Project Area is comprised of R3-2, R3A, R4, R4-1, R5B, R5D, R6, R6A, C4-3A, M1-1, M1-2, M1-4 zoning districts and the Special District contains R6A, R7A, R7X, C4-4A, C4-5X, C6-2, C6-3, C6-4, and M1-4 zoning districts. Commercial districts mapped as overlays include C1-2, C1-3, C1-4, C2-3, and C2-4. Existing zoning districts are discussed below.

### ***M1-1 (OUTSIDE DJ)***

Approximately 27 full and partial blocks along multiple non-contiguous areas within the Project Area are mapped M1-1, generally bounded by the Van Wyck Expressway to the west, 91st Avenue to the north, Archer Avenue to the south, and 139th Street to the east; two blocks generally bounded by Van Wyck Expressway to the west, 94th Avenue to the north, 95th Avenue to the south, and 138th Place to the east; a block bounded by 147th Place to the west, 95th Avenue to the north, 97th Avenue to the south, and 148th Street to the east; and several blocks along Archer Avenue and the LIRR tracks generally bounded by 158th Street to the west, 107th Avenue to the southwest, 112th Avenue to the southeast, and Hollis Avenue to the east.

M1-1 districts are low-density manufacturing zoning districts that allow commercial and light manufacturing uses. M1-1 zoning districts have a floor area ratio (“FAR”) of 1.0 for industrial and commercial uses and 2.4 for community facility uses. M1-1 districts have a base height limit of 30 feet, above which a structure must fit within a sloping sky exposure plane. One parking space is generally required for every 300 sf of commercial and for every 1,000 sf of industrial. No new residential uses are permitted.

Land uses within the M1-1 districts in the Project Area include vacant land, open storage, parking garages, warehousing and distribution, building supply and various light industrial uses, gas stations and auto repair businesses, self-storage, commercial offices, hotels, retail, non-conforming residential uses, and fitness facilities. A few community facility uses such as medical office and houses of worship are also located within these M1-1 districts.

### ***M1-2 (OUTSIDE DJ) AND M1-4 (WITHIN AND OUTSIDE DJ)***

Approximately seven full and partial blocks within the Project Area are zoned M1-2 in an area generally bounded by 179th Place to the west, Jamaica Avenue to the north, the LIRR tracks to the south, and Hollis Avenue to the east. M1-4 is mapped in approximately 20 full and partial blocks within the Project Area, including portions within the Special District, in an area generally bounded by 148th Street to the west, Archer Avenue to the north, Tuskegee Airmen Way to the south, and 158th Street to the east. M1-4 districts are also mapped along 157th Street between Tuskegee Airmen Way to the north and 107th Avenue to the

M1-2 and M1-4 districts are low-density manufacturing zoning districts that allow a wide range of commercial and light manufacturing uses. M1-2 and M1-4 districts allow industrial and commercial uses at a maximum FAR of 2.0, which includes uses such as offices, repair shops, and wholesale service facilities. Self-storage facilities and hotels are only allowed by special permit in most cases. M1-2 allows community facility uses at a maximum FAR of 4.8 while M1-4 allows community facility uses at a maximum FAR of 6.5. Residential uses are not permitted. Heights in M1-2 and M1-4 districts are governed by a sloping Sky Exposure Plane, which begins at the base height of 60 feet. Above this height, the building must be located entirely beyond the sloping plane. One parking space is generally required for every 300 sf of commercial use and for every 1,000 sf of industrial use in M1-2 districts, while M1-4 districts have no parking requirements. However, some of these rules are modified in the special purpose district, as described below.

Land uses within the M1-2 and M1-4 districts in the Project Area include warehouses/storage for light industrial uses, auto-related businesses (such as auto repair shops), gas stations, self-storage facilities, hotels, retail, entertainment, and fitness/recreational facilities. There is also a considerable number of vacant lots.

#### *C4-3A (OUTSIDE DJ)*

Approximately five full and partial blocks within the Project Area are zoned C4-3A in an area generally bounded by 138th Street and the Van Wyck Expressway to the west, 86th Avenue to the north, Hillside Avenue to the south, and 139th Street to the east.

C4-3A districts are medium-density contextual commercial districts that allow for a wide range of commercial uses including retail and department stores, entertainment uses, and offices. Residential and community facility uses are allowed.

Residential buildings or portions thereof follow the regulations of R6A districts for FAR and height and setback. The district allows for a maximum residential FAR of 3.0, which can be increased to 3.9 for qualifying affordable housing or senior housing sites. C4-3A districts permit a maximum commercial and community facility FAR of 3.0. Buildings have a minimum base height of 40 feet and can rise to a maximum base height of 65 feet. Above the maximum base height, setbacks are required. Buildings can then rise to a maximum height of 75 feet for standard developments and 95 feet for qualifying affordable housing or senior housing sites.

In the Outer Transit Zone, parking is required for 25 percent of standard residences, while no parking is required for qualifying affordable or senior housing. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for 50 percent of standard residences, 25 percent of qualifying affordable housing, and 10 percent of qualifying senior housing. Waivers are available for small lots in both areas. Parking is required for commercial and some community facility uses, though waivers are available for small lots and mixed buildings.

Existing land uses within the C4-3A districts in the Project Area include offices, storefronts, and other commercial uses.

#### *C4-4A (WITHIN DJ)*

Approximately 12 full and partial blocks are zoned C4-4A within the Special District in two non-contiguous areas: (1) in an area generally bounded by 139th Street to the west, Archer Avenue to the south, and 144th Place to the south; and (2) on blocks fronting along Sutphin Boulevard between Hillside Avenue to the north and Jamaica Avenue to the south, as well as in an area generally bounded by Sutphin Boulevard to the west, a line approximately 150 feet north of Jamaica Avenue, Jamaica Avenue to the south, and 150th Street to the east.

C4-4A is a medium-density contextual commercial district that allows for a wide range of commercial uses including retail and department stores, entertainment uses, and office. Residential and community facility uses are allowed. Residential buildings or portions thereof follow the regulations of R7A districts for FAR and height and setback. The district allows for a maximum residential FAR of 4.0, which can be increased to 5.01 for qualifying affordable or senior housing sites. C4-4A districts permit a maximum commercial



and community facility FAR of 4.0. Buildings have a minimum base height of 40 feet and can rise to a maximum base height of 75 feet for standard developments and 85 feet for qualifying affordable housing sites. Above the maximum base height, setbacks are required. Buildings can then rise to a maximum height of 85 feet for standard developments and 115 feet for qualifying affordable or senior housing sites.

In the Outer Transit Zone, parking is required for 15 percent of standard residences, while no parking is required for qualifying affordable or senior housing. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for 50 percent of standard residences, 12 percent of qualifying affordable housing, and 10 percent of qualifying senior housing. Waivers are available for small lots in both areas. Parking is required for commercial and some community facility uses, though waivers are available for small lots and mixed buildings.

Existing land uses within the C4-4A districts in the Project Area include offices, storefronts, and other commercial uses.

#### *C4-5X (WITHIN DJ)*

Approximately 24 full and partial blocks are zoned C4-5X within three non-contiguous areas in the Special District: (1) two blocks are generally bounded by 138th Place to the east, 94th Avenue to the north, 95th Avenue to the south, and Liverpool Street to the east; (2) three blocks in another area generally bounded by Waltham Street to the west, 95th Avenue to the north, Liberty Avenue to the south, and 147th Place to the east; and (3) several blocks in an area generally bounded by Grace Court to the west, 89th Avenue to the northwest, Hillside Avenue to the northeast, on a line approximately 150 feet north of Jamaica Avenue to the south, and 168th Street to the east.

C4-5X districts are medium-density contextual commercial districts that allow for a wide range of commercial uses including retail and department stores, entertainment uses, and offices. Residential and community facility uses are allowed. Residential buildings or portions thereof follow the regulations of R7X districts for FAR and height and setback. The district allows for a maximum residential FAR of 5.0, which can be increased to 6.0 for qualifying affordable or senior housing sites. The district permits a maximum commercial FAR of 4.0 and community facility FAR of 5.0. Buildings have a minimum base height of 40 feet and can rise to a maximum base height of 95 feet for standard developments and 105 feet for qualifying affordable or senior housing sites. Above the maximum base height, setbacks are required. Buildings can then rise to a maximum height of 125 feet for standard developments and 145 feet for qualifying affordable or senior housing sites.

In the Outer Transit Zone, parking is required for 15 percent of standard residences, while no parking is required for qualifying affordable or senior housing. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for 50 percent of standard residences, 25 percent of qualifying affordable housing, and 10 percent of qualifying senior housing. Waivers are available for small lots in both areas. Parking is required for commercial and some community facility uses, though waivers are available for small lots and mixed buildings.

Existing land uses within the C4-5X districts in the Project Area include offices, storefronts, and other commercial uses, along with some residential buildings. Within DJ, use regulations in C4-5X districts are modified to permit public parking garages with a capacity of 150 spaces or less as-of-right.

#### *C6-2 (WITHIN DJ)*

Approximately eight full and partial blocks within two areas of the Project Area are zoned C6-2 within the Special District. Several blocks are bounded by 146th Street to the west, Jamaica Avenue to the north, Archer Avenue to the south, and 147th Place to the east; along with an area generally bounded by 164th Street to the west, a line approximately 150 feet north of Jamaica Avenue to the north, a line approximately 200 feet south of Jamaica Avenue to the south, and 168th street to the east.

C6-2 are high-density non-contextual commercial districts that allow for a wide range of commercial uses including retail and department stores, entertainment uses, and offices. Residential and community facility uses are also allowed. The maximum commercial FAR is 6.0 and the maximum community facility FAR is 6.5. Residential buildings or portions thereof follow the regulations of R8 districts for FAR and height and setback. On narrow streets, these allow standard residences a maximum FAR of 6.02 and a maximum height

of 115 feet, while qualifying affordable or senior housing receives a maximum FAR of 7.2 and a maximum height of 145 feet. On wide streets, these allow standard residences a maximum FAR of 7.2 and a maximum height of 135 feet, while qualifying affordable or senior housing receives a maximum FAR of 8.64 and a maximum height of 175 feet. Commercial and community facility uses follow sky exposure plane regulations. However, some of these rules are modified in the special purpose district, as described below.

In the Outer Transit Zone, parking is required for 12 percent of standard residences, while no parking is required for qualifying affordable or senior housing. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for 40 percent of standard residences, 12 percent of qualifying affordable housing, and 10 percent of qualifying senior housing. Waivers are available for small lots in both areas. No parking is required for commercial or community facility uses.

Existing uses within C6-2 districts in the Project Area include retail storefronts, residential and commercial mixed-use buildings, parking lots, and some vacant land.

#### *C6-3 (WITHIN DJ)*

Approximately 21 full and partial blocks within the Project Area are zoned C6-3 in two areas within the Special District. C6-3 is generally mapped in three blocks generally bounded by Liverpool Street to the west, 94th Avenue to the north, Sutphin Boulevard to the west, and 97th Avenue to the south, as well as in an area generally bounded by 147th Place to the west, Jamaica Avenue to the northwest, a line approximately 150 feet north of Jamaica Avenue to the northeast, Archer Avenue to the south, and 164th Street to the east.

C6-3 are high-density non-contextual commercial districts that allow for a wide range of commercial uses including retail and department stores, entertainment uses, offices, and hotels. Residential and community facility uses are also allowed. The maximum commercial FAR is 6.0 and the maximum community facility FAR is 10.0. Residential buildings or portions thereof follow the regulations of R9 districts for FAR and height and setback. These allow standard residences a maximum FAR of 7.52 and qualifying affordable or senior housing receives a maximum FAR of 9.02. All uses can follow tower regulations. However, some of these rules are modified in the special purpose district, as described below.

In the Outer Transit Zone, parking is required for 12 percent of standard residences, while no parking is required for qualifying affordable or senior housing. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for 40 percent of standard residences, 12 percent of qualifying affordable housing, and 10 percent of qualifying senior housing. Waivers are available for small lots in both areas. No parking is required for commercial or community facility uses.

Existing uses within C6-3 districts in the Project Area include storefronts, offices, transportation and utility uses, parking lots, some light industrial uses, vacant land, and mixed-use residential and commercial buildings.

#### *C6-4 (WITHIN DJ)*

Approximately three full and partial blocks within the Project Area are zoned C6-4 within the Special District, in an area generally bounded by Sutphin Boulevard to the west, Archer Avenue to the north, 95th Avenue to the south, and 150th Street to the east.

C6-4 are high-density non-contextual commercial districts that allow for a wide range of commercial uses including retail and department stores, entertainment uses, and offices. Residential and community facility uses are also allowed. The maximum commercial and community facility FAR is 10.0. Residential buildings or portions thereof follow the regulations of R10 districts for FAR and height and setback. These allow standard residences a maximum FAR of 10.0 and qualifying affordable or senior housing receives a maximum FAR of 12.0. All uses can follow tower regulations. However, some of these rules are modified in the special purpose district, as described below.

In the Outer Transit Zone, parking is required for 12 percent of standard residences, while no parking is required for qualifying affordable or senior housing. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for 40 percent of standard residences, 12 percent of qualifying affordable housing, and 10 percent of qualifying senior housing. Waivers are available for small lots in both areas. No parking is required for commercial or community facility uses.

## **Jamaica Neighborhood Plan**

CEQR No. 24DCP132Q

Page 16

Existing uses within C6-4 districts in the Project Area include transportation and utility uses, some parking lots, and mostly vacant land.

### ***R3-2 (OUTSIDE DJ)***

R3-2 districts extend 11 partial blocks in two areas within the Project Area. Several blocks along Guy R. Brewer Boulevard between 110th Avenue to the north and Bedell Street to the south, and an area generally bounded by a line approximately 100 feet west of 172nd Street to the west, a line approximately 130 feet north of 111st Avenue to the north, 111st Avenue to the south, and 172nd Street to the east.

R3-2 Districts are low-density districts that provide residences of all types, and also permit most community facility uses. The maximum FAR for standard residences is generally 0.75, with some exception for large single-family homes, and 1.0 on lots that meet the criteria for qualifying residential sites. Community facilities are permitted at an FAR of 1.0. Front yards with a depth of 15 feet are required but may be modified depending on building type as well as specific contexts. The height and setback regulations for single- and two-family residences are governed by a pitched-roof envelope with a maximum perimeter wall height of 25 feet, and maximum overall height limit of 35 feet. Multifamily residences on both standard lots and qualifying residential sites are governed by a flat-roofed envelope where the maximum base and overall height limit is 35 feet.

In the Outer Transit Zone, parking is required for 35 percent of standard residences, while no parking is required for qualifying affordable or senior housing. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for 50 percent of standard residences, 50 percent of qualifying affordable housing, and 10 percent of qualifying senior housing. Waivers are available for small lots in both areas. Parking is required for some community facility uses, though waivers are available for small lots and mixed buildings.

Existing uses in the Project Area include mostly single-family residences, community facility uses and some parking facilities.

### ***R3A (OUTSIDE DJ)***

Approximately two partial blocks within the Project Area are zoned R3A, in an area generally bounded by a line approximately 100 feet east of Guy R. Brewer Boulevard to the west, 110th Road to the north, Mathias Avenue to the south, and 164th Street to the east.

R3A Districts are low-density districts that provide for single- and two-family detached and zero lot line homes as well as all types of residences on lots that meet the criteria for qualifying residential sites. R3A districts also permit most community facility uses. The maximum FAR for standard residences is generally 0.75, with some exceptions for large single-family homes, and 1.0 for qualifying residential sites. Community facilities are permitted at an FAR of 1.0. Front yards with a depth of 10 feet and side yards with a minimum of 5 feet are generally required for residences but may be modified depending on building type as well as specific contexts. The height and setback regulations for standard residences are governed by a pitched-roof envelope with a maximum perimeter wall height of 25 feet, and maximum overall height limit of 35 feet. Qualifying residential sites are governed by a flat-roofed envelope where the maximum base and overall height limit is 35 feet.

In the Outer Transit Zone, parking is required for 50 percent of standard residences, while no parking is required for qualifying affordable or senior housing. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for 100 percent of standard residences, 50 percent of qualifying affordable housing, and 10 percent of qualifying senior housing. Waivers are available for small lots in both areas. Parking is required for some community facility uses, though waivers are available for small lots and mixed buildings.

Existing uses in the Project Area include residential uses, mostly single- and two-family homes and a variety of community facility uses including schools and libraries.

### ***R4 (OUTSIDE DJ)***

Approximately five full and partial blocks in multiple areas within the Project Area are mapped R4, in an area generally bounded by a line approximately 100 feet west of Brisbin Street to the west, 102nd Avenue to the north, Liberty Avenue to the south, and Allendale Street to the east, as well as an area generally bounded by Union Hall Street to the west, 109th Avenue to the north, 110th Avenue to the south, and a line approximately 100 feet east of Guy R. Brewer Boulevard to the east.

R4 Districts are low-density districts that provide residences of all types, and also permit most community facility uses. The maximum FAR for standard residences is generally 1.0, and 1.5 for lots that meet the criteria for qualifying residential sites. Community facilities are permitted at an FAR of 2.0. Front yards with a depth of 10 feet are required but may be modified depending on building type as well as specific contexts. The height and setback regulations for single- and two-family residences are governed by a pitched-roof envelope with a maximum perimeter wall height of 25 feet, and maximum overall height limit of 35 feet. Multifamily residences on standard lots are governed by a flat-roofed envelope where the maximum base and overall height limit is 35 feet, while those on qualifying residential sites have an envelope with a 35-foot maximum base height and, after setback, a 45-foot maximum overall height limit.

In the Outer Transit Zone, parking is required for 35 percent of standard residences, while no parking is required for qualifying affordable or senior housing. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for 50 percent of standard residences, 50 percent of qualifying affordable housing, and 10 percent of qualifying senior housing. Waivers are available for small lots in both areas. Parking is required for some community facility uses, though waivers are available for small lots and mixed buildings.

Existing uses in the Project Area 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.

#### *R4-1 (OUTSIDE DJ)*

One partial block within the Project Area is zoned R4-1, in an area generally bounded by 166th Street to the west, Hendrickson Place to the north, 108th Avenue to the south, and a line approximately 100 feet west of Merrick Boulevard to the east.

R4-1 Districts are low-density districts that provide for single- and two-family detached, semi-detached, and zero lot line homes as well as all types of residences on lots that meet the criteria for qualifying residential sites. R4-1 districts also permit most community facility uses. The maximum FAR for standard residences is generally 1.0, and 1.5 for qualifying residential sites. Community facilities are permitted at an FAR of 2.0. Front yards with a depth of 10 feet and side yards with a minimum of 5 feet are generally required for residences but may be modified depending on building type as well as specific contexts. The height and setback regulations for standard residences are governed by a pitched-roof envelope with a maximum perimeter wall height of 25 feet, and maximum overall height limit of 35 feet. Qualifying residential sites are governed by a flat-roofed envelope with a 35-foot maximum base height and, after setback, a 45-foot maximum overall height limit.

In the Outer Transit Zone, parking is required for 50 percent of standard residences, while no parking is required for qualifying affordable or senior housing. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for 100 percent of standard residences, 50 percent of qualifying affordable housing, and 10 percent of qualifying senior housing. Waivers are available for small lots in both areas. Parking is required for some community facility uses, though waivers are available for small lots and mixed buildings.

Existing uses in the Project Area include residential uses, mostly two-family homes and small multifamily apartment homes.

#### *R5 (OUTSIDE DJ)*

R5 districts are mapped on approximately four blocks in three areas within the Project Area generally bounded by 147th Place to the west, 97th Avenue to the north, a line approximately 100 feet north of Liberty Avenue to the south, and 148th Street to the west, in an area generally bounded by 162nd Street to the west, a line approximately 100 feet north of 87th Road to the north, a line approximately 100 feet north of Hillside Avenue to the south, and 164th Street to the east; and in an area generally bounded by a line approximately 130 feet east of Dillon Street to the west, Claude Avenue to the north, Mathias Avenue to the south, and Guy R. Brewer Boulevard to the east.

R5 Districts are low-density districts that provide residences of all types and also permit most community facility uses. The maximum FAR for standard residences is generally 1.5, and 2.0 for lots that meet the criteria for qualifying residential sites. Community facilities are permitted at an FAR of 2.0. Front yards with a depth of 10 feet are required but may be modified depending on building type as well as specific

contexts. The height and setback regulations for all residences are governed by a flat-roofed envelope. Residences on a standard lot have an envelope with a 35-foot maximum base height and, after setback, a 45-foot maximum overall height, while those on qualifying residential sites have an envelope with a 45-foot maximum base height and, after setback, a 55-foot maximum overall height limit.

In the Outer Transit Zone, parking is required for 35 percent of standard residences, while no parking is required for qualifying affordable or senior housing. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for 50 percent of standard residences, 25 percent of qualifying affordable housing, and 10 percent of qualifying senior housing. Waivers are available for small lots in both areas. Parking is required for some community facility uses, though waivers are available for small lots and mixed buildings.

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

***R5B (OUTSIDE DJ)***

Approximately nine full and partial blocks in two areas of the Project Area are zoned R5B; in an area generally bounded by 168th Place to the west, Liberty Avenue to the north, a line approximately 100 feet south of Liberty Avenue to the south, and 172nd Street to the east; and in an area generally along Merrick Boulevard between Linden Boulevard to the north and 116th Avenue to the south. Existing uses in the Project Area mostly include multifamily residences, parking lots, and some transportation and utility uses.

R5B Districts are low-density districts that provide residences of all types and also permit most community facility uses. The maximum FAR for standard residences is generally 1.5, and 2.0 for lots that meet the criteria for qualifying residential sites. Community facilities are permitted at an FAR of 2.0. Front yards with a depth of 5 feet are required but may be modified depending on building type as well as specific contexts. The height and setback regulations for all residences are governed by a flat-roofed envelope. Residences on a standard lot have an envelope with a 35-foot maximum base height and overall height, while those on qualifying residential sites have an envelope with a 45-foot maximum base height and, after setback, a 55-foot maximum overall height limit.

In the Outer Transit Zone, parking is required for 25 percent of standard residences, while no parking is required for qualifying affordable or senior housing. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for 50 percent of standard residences, 25 percent of qualifying affordable housing, and 10 percent of qualifying senior housing. Waivers are available for small lots in both areas. Parking is required for some community facility uses, though waivers are available for small lots and mixed buildings.

Existing uses in the Project Area mostly include multifamily residences, parking lots, and some transportation and utility uses.

***R5D (OUTSIDE DJ)***

Approximately 45 full and partial blocks in multiple areas within the Project Area are mapped in an area generally bounded by a line approximately 100 feet west of Sutphin Boulevard to the west, Tuskegee Airmen Way to the north, 109th Avenue to the south, and a line approximately 100 feet east of Sutphin Boulevard to the east; and in an area along Guy R. Brewer Boulevard generally bounded by 160th Street to the northwest, Tuskegee Airmen Way to the north, 109th Avenue to the south and 165th Street to the east; and an area generally along Merrick Boulevard between Liberty Avenue to the north and Linden Boulevard to the south. Existing uses in the Project Area include mostly single-family residences, vacant land, some parking lots, and community facility uses.

R5D Districts are low-density districts that provide residences of all types and also permit most community facility uses. The maximum FAR is 2.0 for both residences and community facilities. Front yards with a depth of 5 feet are required but may be modified depending on building type as well as specific contexts. The height and setback regulations for all residences are governed by a flat-roofed envelope. Residences on a standard lot have an envelope with a 45-foot maximum base height and overall height, while those on lots that meet the criteria for qualifying residential sites have an envelope with a 45-foot maximum base height and, after setback, a 55-foot maximum overall height limit.

In the Outer Transit Zone, parking is required for 25 percent of standard residences, while no parking is required for qualifying affordable or senior housing. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required



for 50 percent of standard residences, 25 percent of qualifying affordable housing, and 10 percent of qualifying senior housing. Waivers are available for small lots in both areas. Parking is required for some community facility uses, though waivers are available for small lots and mixed buildings.

Existing uses in the Project Area include mostly single-family residences, vacant land, some parking lots, and community facility uses.

***R6 (OUTSIDE DJ)***

Two blocks within the Project Area are zoned R6, the first bounded by 150th Street to the west, 88th Avenue to the north, 89th Avenue to the south, and 153rd Street to the east, and the second bounded by 159th Street to the west, LIRR tracks to the north, Liberty Avenue to the south, and 160th Street to the east.

R6 districts are medium-density non-contextual residential districts that allow residential uses of all types and community facility uses. Land uses within the R6 district are generally residential with some community facilities located throughout. Residential uses include single- and two-family buildings and larger multi-family apartment buildings.

The maximum residential FAR is 3.0 for standard residences for properties located within 100 feet of a wide street and 2.2 for all other properties. Community facility uses are permitted at a maximum FAR of 4.8. Qualifying affordable or senior housing has a maximum FAR of 3.9. For standard developments, buildings have a maximum base height of 65 feet along a wide street and 45 feet along a narrow street. The maximum permitted height is 75 feet along a wide street and 55 feet along a narrow street after a 10 to 15 feet setback. For qualifying affordable or senior housing sites, buildings have a maximum base height of 65 feet and may rise to a maximum height of 95 feet along a wide street and 85 feet along a narrow street after a 10 to 15 feet setback. For larger or irregular sites (defined as eligible sites), this maximum height can be increased.

In the Outer Transit Zone, parking is required for 25 percent of standard residences, while no parking is required for qualifying affordable or senior housing. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for 50 percent of standard residences, 25 percent of qualifying affordable housing, and 10 percent of qualifying senior housing. Waivers are available for small lots in both areas. Parking is required for some community facility uses, though waivers are available for small lots and mixed buildings.

Existing uses in the Project Area 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 (OUTSIDE AND WITHIN DJ)***

Approximately 40 blocks in multiple areas within the Project Area are mapped R6A, including portions within the Special District. R6A is mapped in an area generally along Jamaica Avenue bounded by the Van Wyck Expressway to the west and 146th Street to the east; an area generally bounded by 139th Street to the west, a line approximately 100 feet north of Hillside Avenue to the north, a line approximately 100 feet south of Hillside Avenue to the south, and 146th Street to the east; an area generally along Liberty Avenue, bounded by the Van Wyck Expressway to the west, and 148th Street to the east; an area generally bounded by a line approximately 100 feet west of Sutphin Boulevard to the west, Liberty Avenue to the north, Tuskegee Airmen Way to the south, and a line approximately 150 feet east of Sutphin Boulevard to the east; in an area generally bounded by 167th Street to the west, a line approximately 100 feet north of Hillside Avenue to the north, Hillside Avenue to the south, and 172nd Street to the west; and in an area generally bounded by a line approximately 100 feet west of 168th Street to the west, 89th Avenue to the north, 90th Avenue to the south, and 168th Street to the east.

R6A districts are medium-density contextual districts that allow all types of residential and community facility uses. Standard residences are allowed up to an FAR of 3.0, which can be increased to 3.90 for qualifying affordable or senior housing sites. Community facility uses are permitted at a maximum FAR of 3.0. Buildings have a minimum base height of 40 feet and a maximum base height of 65 feet. Above the maximum base height, setbacks are required. Buildings can then rise to a maximum height of 75 feet for standard developments and 95 feet for qualifying affordable or senior housing sites.

In the Outer Transit Zone, parking is required for 25 percent of standard residences, while no parking is required for qualifying affordable or senior housing. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for 50 percent of standard residences, 25 percent of qualifying affordable housing, and 10 percent of qualifying senior housing. Waivers are available for small lots in both areas. Parking is required for some community facility uses, though waivers are available for small lots and mixed buildings.

Existing uses in the Project Area 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.

*R7A (WITHIN DJ)*

Approximately 25 full and partial blocks in multiple areas within the Project Area are mapped R7A within the Special District in an area generally bounded by 146th Street to the west, a line approximately 100 feet north of Hillside Avenue to the north, Hillside Avenue to the south, and 167th Street to the east; in an area generally bounded by a line approximately 120 feet west of 148th Street to the west, Hillside Avenue to the north, 90th Road to the south, Grace Court to the southeast, and Parsons Boulevard to the east; and in an area generally bounded by Parsons Boulevard to the west, Hillside Avenue to the north, 89th Avenue to the south, and a line approximately 100 feet east of 163rd Street to the east.

R7A is a medium-density contextual residential district that would allow residential uses of all types and community facility uses. Standard residences are allowed an FAR of 4.0, which can be increased to 5.01 for qualifying affordable or senior housing sites. Community facility uses are permitted at a maximum FAR of 4.0. Buildings have a minimum base height of 40 feet. For standard developments, buildings have a maximum base height of 75 feet and may rise to a maximum height of 85 feet. For qualifying affordable or senior housing sites, buildings have a maximum base height of 85 and may rise to a maximum height of 115 feet. Above the maximum base height, setbacks are required.

In the Outer Transit Zone, parking is required for 15 percent of standard residences, while no parking is required for qualifying affordable or senior housing. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for 50 percent of standard residences, 12 percent of qualifying affordable housing, and 10 percent of qualifying senior housing. Waivers are available for small lots in both areas. Parking is required for some community facility uses, though waivers are available for small lots and mixed buildings.

Existing Land uses in the Project Area include single- and multifamily residences, mixed-use residential and community facility uses, and vacant land.

*R7X (WITHIN DJ)*

One partial block within the Project Area is mapped R7X within the Special District in an area generally bounded by 167th Street to the west, Hillside Avenue to the north, a line approximately 100 feet south of Hillside Avenue to the south, and 168th Street to the east.

R7X is a medium-density contextual residential district that would allow residential uses of all types and community facility uses. Standard residences are allowed an FAR of 5.0, which can be increased to 6.0 for qualifying affordable or senior housing sites. Community facility uses are permitted at a maximum FAR of 5.0. Buildings have a minimum base height of 60 feet. For standard developments, buildings have a maximum base height of 95 feet and may rise to a maximum height of 125 feet. For qualifying affordable or senior housing sites, buildings have a maximum base height of 105 feet and may rise to a maximum height of 145 feet. Above the maximum base height, setbacks are required.

In the Outer Transit Zone, parking is required for 15 percent of standard residences, while no parking is required for qualifying affordable or senior housing. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for 50 percent of standard residences, 12 percent of qualifying affordable housing, and 10 percent of qualifying senior housing. Waivers are available for small lots in both areas. Parking is required for some community facility uses, though waivers are available for small lots and mixed buildings.

Existing uses in the Project Area include single- and multifamily residences, mixed-use residential and community facility uses, and some vacant land.

***C1-2, C1-3, C1-4, C2-3, AND C2-4 COMMERCIAL OVERLAYS***

Commercial overlays are mapped along streets that serve local retail and service needs and are found within residential districts. A C1-2 commercial overlay is mapped on one block over an R7A zoning district; C1-3 commercial overlays are mapped across eight blocks over R5D and R7A zoning districts; C1-4 commercial overlays are mapped across seven blocks over R4 and R5D zoning districts; C2-3 commercial overlays are mapped across 20 blocks over R3-2, R5B, R5D, R6A, and R7A zoning districts; while C2-4 commercial overlay is mapped across 72 blocks over R5B, R5D, R6A, R7A, and R7X zoning districts within the Project Area.

C1-2, C1-3, C1-4, C2-3, and C2-4 commercial overlays allow residential uses, community facility uses, and a range of commercial uses (including retail/service, offices, entertainment, and small production uses). When mapped over R3, R4, and R5 districts, these allow between 1.0 and 2.0 FAR of commercial use. In R6 and R7 districts, a maximum FAR of 2.0 is permitted for commercial uses. In mixed-use buildings, commercial uses are limited to one or two floors and must always be located below the residential use. Parking is required for commercial and some community facility uses, with lower requirements in zoning districts with higher numeric suffixes, though waivers are available for small lots and mixed buildings.

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

***SPECIAL DOWNTOWN JAMAICA DISTRICT REGULATIONS***

The special purpose district modifies regulations for use, bulk and parking in some districts and areas, as described below:

***Use Regulations***

- Permits public parking garages as of right with a capacity of 150 spaces or less in C4-5X, C6 and M1-4 districts.
- Permits wholesale establishments without size limits in C6-4 districts.
- Modifies the use regulations in M1-4 districts by permitting as of right all community facilities without sleeping accommodations (III B) and retail/service uses (VI) of any size. In addition, it permits only the infrastructure (IV B), storage (IX), and production (X) uses allowed in Mixed-Use Districts and these and some listed heavy service uses (VI) must be located in enclosed buildings.
- Allows eating and drinking establishments to locate above residences in C4 and C6 districts.
- Establishes “Tier C” ground floor streetscape requirements on key streets including Jamaica Avenue, Archer Avenue, and Sutphin Boulevard. In addition, it limits as of right curb cuts on these frontages.

***Bulk Regulations***

- Establishes maximum floor area ratios for all permitted non-residential uses in C6-2 (6.0 FAR), C6-3 (8.0 FAR), C6-4 (12.0 FAR), and M1-4 (2.0 FAR). In addition, it only permits floor area bonuses for mass transit station improvements.
- Sets the minimum base height in C4 and C6 districts to 40 feet and sets the maximum building height in C6-2 and C6-3 districts to 250 feet and to 290 feet in C6-4 districts.
- Removes rear yard requirements along railroad rights-of-way and in C6-4 districts.
- Requires sidewalk widenings on specified frontages, particularly concentrated on Archer Avenue and 94th Avenue.
- Requires street walls on the street line on specified frontage (generally the Tier C frontages noted above).

***Parking regulations***

- Applies the non-residential parking requirements of C4-4 districts in C4, C6, and M1 districts, with modifications that require lower amounts of parking for offices (Use Group VII) and entertainment uses (Use Group VIII), and limits access to small lot waiver provisions

- Allows greater amounts of permitted parking in C4, C6 and M1 districts.
- In MIH areas, the underlying parking requirements generally apply.

## **D. PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTIONS**

Jamaica is a community celebrated for its rich historical and cultural significance, serving as a major local and regional transportation hub. It is recognized as one of Queens' three regional business districts, which includes one of the city's 21 industrial business zones (IBZs). The neighborhood offers a diverse range of housing options, from single- and two- family homes to low-rise town homes and high-rise apartment buildings. Jamaica has long been home to many multigenerational residents.

While Jamaica has many strengths and assets, the area has experienced steady population growth over the years, leading to increased demand for housing, jobs and other improvements. However, the economic and housing sectors have struggled to keep pace with this growth. Several challenges have significantly impacted the neighborhood, including the 2007-2008 financial crisis which hindered potential development following the 2007 rezoning. Then came the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 where Jamaica was among one of the 10 hardest hit neighborhoods in Queens. As the neighborhood continues to recover from the economic impacts of the pandemic, the importance of flexibility in zoning regulations has been underscored. Businesses small and large are reevaluating how they use space, where to locate, and how they function in the face of changing consumer preferences and economic conditions. A growing challenge that the city is currently grappling with is the housing crisis. The city faces a historic housing shortage, with a rental vacancy rate of just 1.41 percent—the lowest since 1968.

DCP, together with other City agencies, is developing a plan to achieve shared goals through land use actions, expanded programs and services, and capital investments. The Proposed Actions would support community-based goals of expanding opportunities for affordable housing and supporting job growth, driven by engagement with local Community Boards, elected officials, nonprofits, advocacy groups, residents, businesses, property owners, and various stakeholders.

In addition, while not part of the proposed land use and zoning actions, the ongoing Neighborhood Planning process includes developing infrastructure and community investments. These capital projects, programs and services are envisioned to support the existing community while accommodating long term future growth. Although these components are being coordinated alongside the Proposed Actions, they are not dependent on each other. As such, the additional components such as infrastructure and community investments are not part of a coordinated environmental review. Moreover, there are components of the Plan which are not yet known to a sufficient level to be included in this analysis.

The Proposed Actions seek to accomplish the following land use objectives:

- Expand housing opportunities by requiring permanently income-restricted housing through the MIH program in new developments to support the neighborhood diversity and further the city's equity and Fair Housing goals;
- Reinforce the area as a regional business district by strengthening the existing economic ecosystem while also promoting the development of new job-generating uses through increased industrial and commercial density;
- Strengthen the quality of the streetscape by improving safety along key corridors, enhancing the pedestrian experience along the sidewalk, and finding opportunities for publicly accessible open space for existing and future residents; and
- Support a comprehensive neighborhood plan by aligning a zoning framework with capital investments, infrastructure needs, and services, to meet both current demands and future residents.

A general overview of the land use actions, and more specific objectives is discussed in more detail below.

## **OVERVIEW**

The Proposed Actions seek to take an intentional and comprehensive approach to zoning and land use actions that takes past planning work, existing conditions, lived experiences and future growth into

consideration. The Proposed Actions would strengthen the existing zoning to reinforce the neighborhood's range of uses including residential, commercial, retail, light-industrial, arts-related, community facilities, and new open space. Due to Jamaica's size, this section is organized to broadly discuss land use objectives in the Downtown Jamaica Core area, the Jamaica Major Corridors, and Downtown Jamaica South to better articulate area focused goals.

### *DOWNTOWN JAMAICA*

Since the 2007 rezoning, over 1,000 new units have been created in the Downtown Jamaica core, primarily developed on large lots near key transit hubs like Archer Avenue and Sutphin Boulevard and the Jamaica Center E train station. Commercial development here has been limited to ground floor retail. The Special Downtown Jamaica District (DJ) regulations allow for lower maximum FARs compared to identical zoning districts outside the district, restricting the number of housing units and affordable housing options in the area.

To support existing and future growth, the Proposed Actions include modifications to increase the special district's FARs in line with those permitted in identical districts outside DJ. Through a zoning map amendment, the proposed higher density districts would unlock additional floor area for housing development on a wider range of sites and increase the number of income-restricted housing in combination with MIH.

### *JAMAICA MAJOR CORRIDORS*

Jamaica's major corridors such as Hillside Avenue play crucial roles as local commercial hubs for surrounding areas. However, residents, shoppers, and workers often encounter streetscape challenges including limited open space and infrastructure to address climate change impacts, and street designs that compromise pedestrian safety. Additionally, while many corridors outside the Downtown Jamaica core were rezoned in 2007, there has been limited development in these areas. The Proposed Actions would foster transit-oriented development along key corridors with access to major transportation options. Increased density would be concentrated near subway stations (particularly on Hillside Avenue). Areas further away from stations and along major bus routes (e.g., along Liberty Avenue and Sutphin Boulevard between one-half mile to one mile from subway stations and along Merrick Boulevard's bus corridor, respectively) would have density distributed across the area. MIH would be included in this area ensuring that all future developments along these corridors provide opportunities for income-restricted housing.

### *DOWNTOWN JAMAICA SOUTH*

The areas south of the LIRR tracks have experienced limited development, mostly consisting of uses that do not generate many jobs for the area. In the manufacturing districts south of the major Jamaica LIRR station, the Plan seeks to better integrate and balance industries near residential growth while emphasizing industrial preservation and expansion within the IBZ. This will be achieved through a mixed-use district that will support the transitions into the manufacturing districts that are within the IBZ.

Much of the public realm in the manufacturing districts south of the transit hub do not support an adequate experience for pedestrians. To address this, the Plan would explore strategies to promote improvements to sidewalk conditions, expand the urban canopy, and activate ground floor uses while encouraging the development of modern industrial spaces.

The following describes the Proposed Actions' land use objectives noted above:

**Expand housing opportunities by requiring permanently income-restricted housing through the MIH program in new developments to support neighborhood diversity and further the city's equity and Fair Housing goals.**

The area-wide 2007 Jamaica rezoning established the Inclusionary Housing Designated Areas (IHDA) program in a large part of downtown Jamaica. The IHDA program is an affordable housing program enacted in 2004 which enables a development to receive a density bonus in return for the new construction, substantial rehabilitation, or preservation of permanently affordable housing. As the name implies, this program is an optional program available to developers. Approximately half of all the new units developed post 2007 rezoning were income-restricted apartments in developments that used the IHDA program.



Since then, DCP has expanded its tools to create more opportunities for affordable housing and removed the IHDA program. This includes the MIH program, enacted in 2016, which has been recently mapped at several new developments across Jamaica. MIH is a mandatory program that allows for a larger range of affordability options than the IHDA program, which produces income-restricted apartments at only 80 percent of Area Median Income (AMI). An update to the MIH program in late 2024 through CHO allows Option 3 to be a standalone option. Option 3 requires 20 percent of residential floor area to be used for income-restricted housing units averaging at 40 percent AMI or lower. This standalone MIH Option will be available to the Jamaica Neighborhood Plan and can be an option to provide deeper affordable housing that goes beyond what is offered by other MIH options or voluntary programs available outside of MIH areas such as UAP, which has an affordability requirement of 60 percent AMI. Without this zoning action, providing affordable housing would be voluntary rather than mandatory in Jamaica.

The Proposed Actions would map MIH across downtown Jamaica to address the critical need for affordable housing. Under this program, permanently income-restricted units would be required in any new residential development, which is not required by zoning today.

**Reinforce the area as a regional business district by strengthening the existing economic ecosystem, while also promoting the development of new job-generating uses through increased industrial and commercial density.**

Before the 1961 ZR, many flexible industrial building typologies were built, commonly in a loft-like style, which resulted in the construction of highly adaptable space that could accommodate a range of tenants. In these loft-style structures, co-location of production, wholesale, office, and retail uses often occurred in the same building or even on the same floor—resulting in a supply of multipurpose space that could accommodate and respond to the needs of growing businesses. Jamaica benefits from some of these historic industrial loft buildings north of the LIRR tracks along Jamaica Avenue.

By the late 1950s, globalization and technological advances in production had started to catalyze NYC's transition away from a manufacturing-based economy. As a result, the 1961 ZR subjected new construction buildings in M districts to single-story or low-density FAR, infeasible sky exposure plane requirements, high yard requirements, and high parking requirements that assumed predominant car commuting. In many instances, the 1961 ZR prohibited new construction versions of the flexible loft-like buildings that populated the city historically. This zoning has caused M districts in Jamaica, today subject to 2.0 FAR allowances and significant physical envelope challenges, to retain a primarily low-density profile and to discourage new business investment. As part of COYEO, DCP established new M district zoning tools to enable modern loft-like buildings to support and grow businesses in the city's industrial areas. Buildings that can be adaptable and meet the needs of a range of business types and sizes—as the city's loft buildings have historically—would ensure economic resilience for the city in the face of future disruptions and changing economic trends.

Current zoning in key parts of the Project Area allows industrial and some commercial uses and prohibits new residential uses. New non-residential development has generally been dis-incentivized by the existing zoning's relatively low permitted densities coupled with high parking, loading and other requirements. The combination of outdated zoning and broader economic and demographic shifts has resulted in few new buildings constructed within the proposed Project Area in the last few decades other than hotels and self-storage facilities. This has led to existing buildings in certain areas being reused and converted for traditional distribution/warehousing and other light, moderate, and heavier industrial uses. This trend has not led to widespread property reinvestment.

While the Proposed Actions envision non-residential uses mixing with residential uses in some areas, other areas have been designated to remain exclusively for non-residential uses to support existing, unique business and use ecology or key heavier industrial functions.

The Proposed Actions seek to strengthen and promote these areas by maintaining them for industrial, commercial and community facility uses and increasing the allowable density for job-generating uses and removing onerous requirements, like required accessory parking and loading, that are barriers to redevelopment and enlargements.

The manufacturing districts east of Downtown Jamaica have experienced minimal development in the past two decades, with the vast majority of additional floorspace comprised of self-storage uses. In these

districts, growth is inhibited by the current manufacturing zoning districts, which provide low FAR allowances and include regulations that do not meet the needs of firms in emerging industries. These areas would be maintained as an employment hub with a strong industrial sectoral component but provide zoning conditions that would encourage modern mixed-use and flex developments that meet the needs of modern industrial businesses. The Proposed Actions would focus heavier and lighter-industrial uses to select areas while increasing bulk flexibility while ensuring prospective firms have flexibility to create developments that meet their needs. The proposed strategy would also right-size zoning conditions on the existing industrial lofts along Jamaica Avenue, while providing further density opportunities to promote jobs-focused growth.

Without an area-wide rezoning, the Project Area's existing manufacturing zoning designation is likely to see little change or investment, maintaining an area that is dominated by a range of low-density automobile services, construction supply services, commercial waste, and storage uses. Due to these uses' relatively low employment density, private sector employment in these areas would continue to decline or remain stable. The Project Area's commercial districts would continue to see retail comprise a dominant share of the local employment footprint, owing to Jamaica's status as South Queens' primary retail hub. Growth in other commercial uses would remain limited.

**Strengthen the quality of the streetscape to promote safety, pedestrian experience, and opportunities for publicly accessible open space for existing and future residents.**

The existing zoning in much of the Project Area discourages redevelopment, which also discourages several shared and interconnected goals and objectives including brownfield remediation, street activation and pedestrian safety, job-creation, new home production, etc. Zoning changes to allow medium- to higher-density residential and non-residential development and a greater variety of uses would promote mixed-use development with housing, commercial, light-industrial and arts-related uses, and community facilities near world class transit.

Allowing residential at medium to higher densities in key places would help encourage the redevelopment and remediation of sites that have been contaminated by former industrial uses. The remediation of these brownfield sites would support the overall cleanup of the surrounding area that has been the focus of many in the community for decades. In addition, the Proposed Actions would help promote a neighborhood where residents and workers are encouraged to activate streetscapes and public spaces.

The Proposed Actions aim to enhance public realm conditions, encourage walkability, activate streetscape, offer firms greater flexibility, and improve the quality of life for local residents and workers alike. This includes updates to the special district regulations to enhance the pedestrian experience.

The Proposed Actions would also create opportunities for new light-industrial, commercial, arts-related or community facility uses. The actions would support these opportunities in both new mixed-use buildings in select areas of the Project Area and, more directly, in portions of the Project Area being reserved exclusively for non-residential activity. Throughout the Project Area, the proposed zoning would allow a wider range of uses and flexibility for evolving business and land use types along with promoting space for civic, arts and cultural organizations. The Proposed Actions would support the mixed-use character of the neighborhood and support the generation of new job opportunities in close proximity to regional and local transit.

**Support a comprehensive neighborhood plan by aligning a zoning framework with capital investments, infrastructure needs, and services to meet both current demands and future residents.**

The Proposed Actions would be coordinated along with a set of investments including capital projects, programs and services to further goals for the Jamaica Neighborhood Plan. The Plan recognizes that zoning is just one tool with a limited scope in addressing the neighborhood's diverse challenges. The Neighborhood Planning process collaborates with various agencies to ensure coordinated efforts in planning for Jamaica's long-term future. The Plan will explore an economic and workforce development strategy to enhance opportunities for existing businesses to expand, create job training opportunities for in-demand sectors, and explore new industries for the future of the neighborhood. The Plan will also explore transportation, public space and public realm improvements to increase pedestrian accessibility and streetscape quality; and infrastructure improvements to ensure adequate capacity for essential services to accommodate new growth.

## **E. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTIONS**

The Proposed Actions would facilitate development consistent with the vision and goals set in partnership with local stakeholders, elected officials, and City agencies by expanding opportunities for new housing, promoting job growth, diversifying Jamaica's employment base, and improving the public realm.

The Proposed Actions would affect an approximately 230 block area in Jamaica, with a focus on Downtown Jamaica, adjacent manufacturing districts to the south and east of downtown, and key corridors including Hillside Avenue, Jamaica Avenue, Sutphin Boulevard, and Guy R. Brewer Boulevard.

The Proposed Actions consist of the following discretionary approvals:

- Zoning Map Amendments to:
  - Rezone portions of existing R3-2, R3A, R4, R4-1, R5, RB, R5D, R6, R6A, R7A, R7X, C4-3A, C4-4A, C4-5X, C6-2, C6-3, M1-1, M1-2, and M1-4 districts to R6A, R6D, R7A, R7X, R8A, R8X, C4-4, C4-4D, C6-2, C6-3, C6-3A C6-4, M1-4A, M2-3A, M3-2A, M1-2A/R7A, M1-2A/R7-2, M1-3A/R7X, M1-6A/R9A, and M1-8A/R9X;
  - Replace or eliminate portions of existing C1-2, C1-3, C1-4, and C2-3 overlays mapped throughout the Project Area with C2-4 overlays and map new C2-4 overlays; and
  - Modify the boundaries of the Special Downtown Jamaica District to an area generally coterminous with the Project Area.
- Zoning Text Amendments to:
  - Modify the Special Downtown Jamaica District's use, bulk, parking and loading, and streetscape regulations in ZR Article XI, Chapter 5. The proposed modifications would establish specific urban design regulations related to bulk and street wall rules, particularly in areas where a mix of residential, commercial, and manufacturing uses would be permitted. In addition, the text of the ZR would be amended to:
    - Define some areas wherein C6-3 zoning districts have a residence equivalent to R9-1 residence districts.
  - Modify Appendix F for the purpose of establishing proposed R6A, R6D, R7A, R7X, R8A, R8X, C4-4D, C6-2, C6-3, C6-3 (R9-1), C6-3A, C6-4, M1-2A/R7A, M1-2A/R7-2, M1-3A/R7X, M1-6A/R9A, and M1-8A/R9X districts as MIH areas.
  - Create new paired districts including M1-2A/R7A, M1-2A/R7-2, M1-3A/R7X, M1-6A/R9A, and M1-8A/R9X mixed-use districts.
- Designation of Urban Development Action Areas (UDAA), Approval of an Urban Development Action Area Project (UDAAP), and Disposition of City-Owned Properties
  - Designation of UDAA's, project approval of an UDAAP, and disposition of City-owned property for parcels owned and managed by HPD on Block 10150, Lots 6, 7, 8, 10, 51, 52, 54, and 57, and Block 12152, Lots 8, 9, 10, and 11.
- City Map Amendments:
  - DOT and EDC are seeking the following changes to the City Map within the area, generally bounded by 144<sup>th</sup> Place to the west, 91<sup>st</sup> Avenue to the north, Archer Avenue to the south, and 147<sup>th</sup> Street to the east. The proposed action would facilitate the construction of two pedestrian plazas proposed as part of the Station Plaza Enhancement Project.
    - Revise the currently mapped "Public Place" boundary on Block 9986 to encompass portions of (p/o) Lots 70 and 73 and revise the street lines to eliminate street area within Lots 20, 70, 73, and 75 corresponding to the proposed pedestrian plaza;
    - Eliminate a mapped "Public Place" on Block 9988 and restore street lines mapped prior to the 2007 Station Plaza City Map amendment on Block 9988; and
    - Revise the currently mapped "Public Place" boundary on Block 9994 to match the

existing extents of Lot 38 corresponding to the proposed pedestrian plaza and adjusting existing street lines along Archer Avenue.

While not included in the current Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP) application associated with the Proposed Actions, a future City Map amendment is analyzed in this environmental review to present a conservative assessment. The future discretionary action would be an amendment to the City Map to demap a portion of the Atlantic Avenue widening, generally bounded by Sanders Place to the west and Liberty Avenue to the southeast and disposition actions. Redevelopment of Projected Development Sites 14, 19, 20, 21, and 106 have been included in the environmental analysis that could be facilitated by future discretionary action.

In addition, potential future discretionary action may be necessary to develop City-owned portions of a site located in an area generally bounded by Liberty Avenue to the north, 150<sup>th</sup> Street to the west, Tuskegee Airmen Way to the south and LIRR tracks to the west. Redevelopment of the entirety of Projected Development Site 48 has been included in the environmental analysis that could be facilitated by future discretionary action to present a conservative assessment.

In connection with approval of the Proposed Actions, an (E) designation would be established on the majority of projected and potential development sites to avoid potential for significant adverse impacts related to hazardous materials, air quality and noise. The details of these environmental restrictions are provided in the related technical chapters.

## **PROPOSED ZONING MAP AMENDMENTS**

The Proposed Actions would change the zoning in an approximately 230-block area of Jamaica, as discussed in detail below. The Proposed Actions include Zoning Map Amendments to:

- Rezone portions of existing R3-2, R3A, R4, R4-1, R5, R5B, R5D, R6, R6A, R7A, R7X, C4-3A, C4-4A, C4-5X, C6-2, M1-1, M1-2, and M1-4 districts to R6A, R6D, R7A, R7X, R8A, R8X, C4-4, C4-4D, C6-2, C6-3, C6-3A, C6-4, M1-4A, M2-3A, M3-2A, M1-2A/R7A, M1-2A/R7-2, M1-3A/R7X, M1-6A/R9A, and M1-8A/R9X districts.
- Replace or eliminate portions of existing C1-2, C1-3, C1-4, and C2-3 overlays mapped throughout the Project Area with C2-4 overlays and map new C2-4 overlays.
- Modify the boundaries of the Special Downtown Jamaica District to an area generally coterminous with the Project Area. The Special District regulations seek to provide a flexible range of uses to promote economic growth, support a high-quality public realm through streetscape and ground floor use regulations, and ensure high-quality design outcomes through additional bulk regulations. See the “Proposed Zoning Text Amendments” section for more information.

### ***PROPOSED R6A (EXISTING M1-1 R3-2, R4-1, R5 AND R5D DISTRICTS)***

R6A zoning districts are proposed for approximately eight blocks:

- An area generally bounded by 147<sup>th</sup> Place to the west, a line approximately 200 feet north of 97<sup>th</sup> Avenue to the north, a line approximately 200 feet south of 97<sup>th</sup> Avenue to the south, and 148<sup>th</sup> Street to the east; and
- An area generally bounded by 162<sup>nd</sup> Street to the west, a line approximately 100 feet north of 87<sup>th</sup> Road to the north, a line approximately 100 feet north of Hillside Avenue to the south, and 164<sup>th</sup> Street to the east.
- An area generally bounded by 166<sup>th</sup> Street to the west, Hendrickson Place to the north, 108<sup>th</sup> Road to the south, and a line approximately 100 feet west of Merrick Boulevard to the east.
- An area generally bounded by a line approximately 100 feet west of 172<sup>nd</sup> Street to the west, a line approximately 200 feet north of 110<sup>th</sup> Avenue to the north, 110<sup>th</sup> Avenue to the south, and 172<sup>nd</sup> Street to the east.
- An area generally bounded by a line approximately 100 feet west of 172<sup>nd</sup> Street to the west, a line approximately 130 feet north of 111<sup>st</sup> Avenue to the north, 111<sup>st</sup> Avenue to the south, and 172<sup>nd</sup>

Street to the east.

R6A is a medium-density contextual residential district that would allow residential uses of all types and community facility uses. In Mandatory Inclusionary Housing areas, R6A districts permit a maximum residential FAR of 3.9 and an FAR for community facility up to 3.0. R6A (MIH) districts permit a maximum base height of 65 feet, above which the building must be set back at least 15 feet on narrow streets and 10 feet on wide streets, before rising to a maximum height of 95 feet.

In the Outer Transit Zone, parking is required for 25 percent of standard residences, while no parking is required for qualifying affordable or senior housing. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for 50 percent of standard residences, 25 percent of qualifying affordable housing, and 10 percent of qualifying senior housing. Waivers are available for small lots in both areas. Parking is required for some community facility uses, though waivers are available for small lots and mixed buildings.

***PROPOSED R6D (EXISTING R3A, R4, AND R5D DISTRICTS)***

R6D zoning districts are proposed for approximately two blocks:

- An area generally bounded by Union Hall Street to the west, 109<sup>th</sup> Avenue to the north, 110<sup>th</sup> Avenue to the south, and a line approximately 100 feet to the east of Union Hall Street to the east.
- An area generally bounded by a line 100 feet east of Guy R. Brewer Boulevard to the west, 110<sup>th</sup> Road to the north, Mathias Avenue to the south, and 164<sup>th</sup> Road to the east.

R6D is a medium-density contextual residential district that would allow residential uses of all types and community facility uses. In Mandatory Inclusionary Housing areas, R6D permits residential uses to a maximum FAR of 3.0 and community facility uses up to an FAR of 2.5. Base heights are limited to 55 feet, above which the building must set back at least 15 feet on narrow streets and 10 feet on wide streets, before rising to a maximum height of 75 feet.

In the Outer Transit Zone, parking is required for 25 percent of standard residences, while no parking is required for qualifying affordable or senior housing. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for 50 percent of standard residences, 25 percent of qualifying affordable housing, and 10 percent of qualifying senior housing. Waivers are available for small lots in both areas. Parking is required for some community facility uses, though waivers are available for small lots and mixed buildings.

***PROPOSED R7A (EXISTING M1-1, R3-2, R4, R5, R5B, R5D, AND R6A DISTRICTS)***

R7A districts are proposed for approximately 69 blocks:

- An area generally bounded by the Van Wyck Expressway to the west, a line approximately 100 feet south of Hillside Avenue to the north, a line approximately 100 feet south of Jamaica Avenue to the southwest, a line approximately 100 feet north of Jamaica Avenue to the southeast, and a line approximately 100 feet east of Queens Boulevard to the east;
- An area generally bounded by the Van Wyck Expressway to the west, 94<sup>th</sup> Avenue to the north, 138<sup>th</sup> Place to the east, and 95<sup>th</sup> Avenue to the south;
- An area generally bounded by a line approximately 100 feet west of Sutphin Boulevard to the west, Tuskegee Airmen Way to the north, 109<sup>th</sup> Avenue to the south, and a line approximately 100 feet east of Sutphin Boulevard to the east;
- An area generally bounded by 160<sup>th</sup> Street to the west, Tuskegee Airmen Way to the north, a line approximately 100 feet south of Tuskegee Airmen Way to the south, and Union Hall Street to the east;
- An area generally bounded by a line approximately 100 feet east of Guy R. Brewer Boulevard to the west, Tuskegee Airmen Way to the north, a line approximately 150 feet south of Tuskegee Airmen Way to the south, and a line approximately 100 feet east of 165<sup>th</sup> Street to east;
- An area generally bounded by a line approximately 115 feet to the west of Guy R. Brewer Boulevard to the west, a line approximately 100 feet south of Tuskegee Airmen Way to the north, 116<sup>th</sup> Avenue to the south, and a line approximately 100 feet to the east of Guy R. Brewer Boulevard to the east; and



- An area along Merrick Boulevard generally bounded by Liberty Avenue to the north and 116th Avenue to the south.

R7A is a medium-density contextual residential district that would allow residential uses of all types and community facility uses. In Mandatory Inclusionary Housing areas, R7A districts permit a maximum residential FAR of 5.01 and an FAR for community facility up to 4.0. R7A (MIH) districts permit a maximum base height of 85 feet, above which the building must be set back at least 15 feet on narrow streets and 10 feet on wide streets, before rising to a maximum height of 115 feet.

In the Outer Transit Zone, parking is required for 15 percent of standard residences, while no parking is required for qualifying affordable or senior housing. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for 50 percent of standard residences, 12 percent of qualifying affordable housing, and 10 percent of qualifying senior housing. Waivers are available for small lots in both areas. Parking is required for some community facility uses, though waivers are available for small lots and mixed buildings.

***PROPOSED R7X (EXISTING R4, R6, R6A, AND R7A DISTRICTS)***

R7X zoning districts are proposed for approximately 47 blocks:

- An area generally along Liberty Avenue, bounded by the Van Wyck Expressway to the west, and 148th Street to the east;
- An area generally bounded by a line approximately 100 feet west of Sutphin Boulevard to the west, a line approximately 100 feet south of Liberty Avenue to the north, Tuskegee Airmen Way to the south, and a line approximately 150 feet east of Sutphin Boulevard to the east;
- An area generally along Jamaica Avenue bounded by the Van Wyck Expressway to the west and 146th Street to the east;
- An area generally bounded by a line approximately 120 feet west of 148th Street to the west, a line approximately 100 feet south of Hillside Avenue to the north, 90th Road to the south, Grace Court to the southeast, and a line approximately 100 feet west of Parsons Boulevard to the east; and
- An area generally bounded by a line approximately 100 feet east of Parsons Boulevard to the west, a line approximately 100 feet south of Hillside Avenue to the north, 89th Avenue to the south, and a line approximately 100 feet east of 163rd Street to the east.

R7X is a medium-density contextual residential district that would allow residential uses of all types and community facility uses. In Mandatory Inclusionary Housing areas, R7X districts permit a maximum residential FAR of 6.0 and an FAR for community facility up to 5.0. R7X (MIH) districts permit a maximum base height of 105 feet, above which the building must be set back at least 15 feet on narrow streets and 10 feet on wide streets, before rising to a maximum height of 145 feet.

In the Outer Transit Zone, parking is required for 15 percent of standard residences, while no parking is required for qualifying affordable or senior housing. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for 50 percent of standard residences, 12 percent of qualifying affordable housing, and 10 percent of qualifying senior housing. Waivers are available for small lots in both areas. Parking is required for some community facility uses, though waivers are available for small lots and mixed buildings.

***PROPOSED R8A (EXISTING M1-4 AND R6A DISTRICTS)***

R8A zoning districts are proposed for one block:

- An area generally bounded by 148th Street to the west, 97th Avenue to the north, Liberty Avenue to the south, and 150th Street to the east.

R8A is a medium-density contextual residential district that would allow residential uses of all types and community facility uses. In Mandatory Inclusionary Housing areas, R8A districts permit a maximum residential FAR of 7.2 and an FAR for community facility up to 6.5. R8A (MIH) districts permit a maximum base height of 105 feet, above which the building must be set back at least 15 feet on narrow streets and 10 feet on wide streets, before rising to a maximum height of 145 feet.

In the Outer Transit Zone, parking is required for 12 percent of standard residences, while no parking is required for qualifying affordable or senior housing. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required

for 40 percent of standard residences, 12 percent of qualifying affordable housing, and 10 percent of qualifying senior housing. Waivers are available for small lots in both areas. Parking is required for some community facility uses, though waivers are available for small lots and mixed buildings.

***PROPOSED R8X (EXISTING R6A DISTRICT)***

R8X zoning districts are proposed for approximately three blocks:

- An area generally bounded by a line approximately 100 feet west of Sutphin Boulevard to the west, Liberty Avenue to the northwest, a line approximately 100 feet north of Sutphin Boulevard to the northeast, a line approximately 100 feet south of Sutphin Boulevard to the south, and 148th Street to the east.

R8X is a medium-density contextual residential district that would allow residential uses of all types and community facility uses. In Mandatory Inclusionary Housing areas, R8X districts permit a maximum residential FAR of 7.2 and an FAR for community facilities up to 6.0. R8X (MIH) districts permit a maximum base height of 105 feet, above which the building must be set back at least 15 feet on narrow streets and 10 feet on wide streets, before rising to a maximum height of 175 feet.

In the Outer Transit Zone, parking is required for 12 percent of standard residences, while no parking is required for qualifying affordable or senior housing. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for 40 percent of standard residences, 12 percent of qualifying affordable housing, and 10 percent of qualifying senior housing. Waivers are available for small lots in both areas. Parking is required for some community facility uses, though waivers are available for small lots and mixed buildings.

***PROPOSED C4-4 (EXISTING R6 DISTRICT)***

C4-4 zoning district is proposed to cover one block:

- An area bounded by 159th Street to the west, LIRR tracks to the north, Liberty Avenue to the south, and 160th Street to the east.

C4-4 is a 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 3.4 and a community facility FAR of 6.5. C4-4 districts permit general retail and commercial uses. For C4-4 districts, the residential district equivalent is an R7-2 district and residences must comply with the R7-2 bulk regulations. In Mandatory Inclusionary Housing areas, the district permits a maximum residential FAR of 5.01. C4-4 (MIH) districts permit a maximum base height of 85 feet, above which setbacks are required, before rising to a maximum height of 105 feet on narrow streets and 115 feet on wide streets. For larger or irregular sites (defined as eligible sites), this maximum height can be increased.

In the Outer Transit Zone, parking is required for 12 percent of standard residences, while no parking is required for qualifying affordable or senior housing. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for 40 percent of standard residences, 12 percent of qualifying affordable housing, and 10 percent of qualifying senior housing. Waivers are available for small lots in both areas. Parking is required for commercial and some community facility uses, though waivers are available for small lots and mixed buildings.

***PROPOSED C4-4D (EXISTING C4-3A, C4-4A, C4-5X, R6A, R7A, AND R7X DISTRICTS)***

C4-4D zoning districts are proposed for approximately 49 blocks:

- An area generally bounded by 138th Street and the Van Wyck Expressway to the west, 86th Avenue to the north, Hillside Avenue to the south, and 139th Street to the east;
- An area along Hillside Avenue, that extends approximately 100 feet midblock to the north and south, bounded by 138th Street to the west and a line approximately 300 feet west of Kingston Place to the east;
- An area generally along Sutphin Boulevard, bounded by 88th Avenue to the north, and a line 100 feet north of Jamaica Avenue to the south; and
- An area generally bounded by Parsons Boulevard to the west, Hillside Avenue to the north, a line 100 feet north of Jamaica Avenue to the south, and 169th Street to the east.

C4-4D is a medium-density contextual commercial district that allows commercial uses as well as residential and community facility uses. C4-4D districts permit a commercial FAR of up to 3.4 and a community facility FAR of up to 6.5. For C4-4D districts, the residential district equivalent is an R8A district and residences must comply with the R8A bulk regulations. In Mandatory Inclusionary Housing areas, the district permits a maximum residential FAR of 7.2. C4-4D (MIH) districts permit a maximum base height of 105 feet, above which setbacks are required, before rising to a maximum height of 145 feet.

In the Outer Transit Zone, parking is required for 12 percent of standard residences, while no parking is required for qualifying affordable or senior housing. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for 40 percent of standard residences, 12 percent of qualifying affordable housing, and 10 percent of qualifying senior housing. Waivers are available for small lots in both areas. Parking is required for commercial and some community facility uses, though waivers are available for small lots and mixed buildings.

*PROPOSED C6-2 (EXISTING C4-4A DISTRICT)*

C6-2 zoning districts are proposed for approximately two blocks:

- An area generally bounded by Sutphin Boulevard to the west, 88th Avenue to the north, 90th Avenue to the south, and 148th Street to the east.

C6-2 is a high-density non-contextual commercial district that allows a range of commercial uses as well as residential and community facility uses. C6-2 districts permit a maximum commercial FAR of 6.0 and a community facility FAR of 6.5. For C6-2 districts, the residential district equivalent is an R8 district and residences must comply with the R8 bulk regulations. In Mandatory Inclusionary Housing areas, the district permits a maximum residential FAR of 7.2. C6-2 (MIH) districts permit a maximum base height of 105 feet, above which setbacks are required, before rising to a maximum height of 145 feet. For larger or irregular sites (defined as eligible sites), this maximum height can be increased

In the Outer Transit Zone, parking is required for 12 percent of standard residences, while no parking is required for qualifying affordable or senior housing. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for 40 percent of standard residences, 12 percent of qualifying affordable housing, and 10 percent of qualifying senior housing. Waivers are available for small lots in both areas. No parking is required for commercial or community facility uses.

*PROPOSED C6-3 (EXISTING C4-4A, C4-5X, C6-2, AND R6A DISTRICTS)*

C6-3 zoning districts are proposed for approximately 12 blocks:

- An area generally bounded by 138th Place to the west, 94th Avenue to the north, 95th Avenue to the south and Liverpool Street to the east;
- An area generally bounded by 139th Street to the west, a line approximately 200 feet north of Archer Avenue to the north, Archer Avenue to the south, and 114th Place to the east;
- An area generally bounded by 146th Street to the west, a line approximately 100 feet north of Jamaica Avenue to the north, Jamaica Avenue to the south, and 150th Street to the east; and
- An area generally bounded by 164th Street to the west, a line approximately 100 feet north of Jamaica Avenue to the north, a line approximately 200 feet south of Jamaica Avenue to the southwest, Jamaica Avenue to the southeast, and 168th Place to the east.

C6-3 is a high-density non-contextual commercial district that allows a range of commercial uses as well as residential and community facility uses. C6-3 districts permit a maximum commercial FAR of 6.0 and a community facility FAR of 10.0. For C6-3 districts, the residential district equivalent is an R9 district and residences must comply with the R9 bulk regulations. In Mandatory Inclusionary Housing areas, the district permits a maximum residential FAR of 9.02. C6-3 (MIH) districts permit a maximum base height of 135 feet, above which setbacks are required, before tower regulations apply.

In the Outer Transit Zone, parking is required for 12 percent of standard residences, while no parking is required for qualifying affordable or senior housing. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for 40 percent of standard residences, 12 percent of qualifying affordable housing, and 10 percent of qualifying senior housing. Waivers are available for small lots in both areas. No parking is required for

commercial or community facility uses.

***PROPOSED C6-3A (EXISTING C4-5X DISTRICT)***

C6-3A districts are proposed for approximately two blocks:

- An area generally bounded by Grace Court to the west, 89th Avenue to the north, 90th Road to the south, and Parsons Boulevard to the east.

C6-3A is a high-density commercial district that allows a range of commercial uses as well as residential and community facility uses. C6-3A districts permit a maximum commercial FAR of 6.0 and a community facility FAR of 7.5.

For C6-3A districts, the residential district equivalent is an R9A district and residences must comply with the R9A bulk regulations. In Mandatory Inclusionary Housing areas, the district permits a maximum residential FAR of 9.02. C6-3A (MIH) districts permit a maximum street wall height of 135 feet, above which setbacks are required, before rising to a maximum height of 185 feet.

In the Outer Transit Zone, parking is required for 12 percent of standard residences, while no parking is required for qualifying affordable or senior housing. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for 40 percent of standard residences, 12 percent of qualifying affordable housing, and 10 percent of qualifying senior housing. Waivers are available for small lots in both areas. No parking is required for commercial or community facility uses.

***PROPOSED C6-4 (EXISTING C4-4A, C6-2, C6-3, M1-4, AND R6A DISTRICTS)***

C6-4 zoning districts are proposed to cover 19 blocks:

- An area bounded by Liverpool Street to the west, 94th Avenue to the north, 95th Avenue to the south, and Sutphin Boulevard to the east;
- An area generally bounded by 144th Place to the west, Jamaica Avenue to the north, Archer Avenue to the south, and 150th Street to the east;
- An area generally bounded by 148th Street to the west, Archer Avenue to the north, 95th Avenue to the south, and 150th Street to the east;
- An area generally bounded by 150th Street to the west, Jamaica Avenue to the north, a line approximately 100 feet south of Archer Avenue to the south, and 153rd Street to the east; and
- An area generally bounded by 153rd Street to the west, 90th Road to the north, Archer Avenue to the south, and 160th Street to the east.

C6-4 is a high-density non-contextual commercial district that allows a range of commercial uses as well as residential and community facility uses. C6-4 districts permit a maximum commercial FAR of 10.0 and a community facility FAR of 10.0.

For C6-4 districts, the residential district equivalent is an R10 district and residences must comply with the R10 bulk regulations. In Mandatory Inclusionary Housing areas, C6-4 districts permit a maximum residential FAR of 12.0. C6-4 (MIH) districts permit a maximum street wall height of 155 feet, above which setbacks are required, before tower regulations apply.

In the Outer Transit Zone, parking is required for 12 percent of standard residences, while no parking is required for qualifying affordable or senior housing. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for 40 percent of standard residences, 12 percent of qualifying affordable housing, and 10 percent of qualifying senior housing. Waivers are available for small lots in both areas. No parking is required for commercial or community facility uses.

***PROPOSED M1-2A (EXISTING M1-4 DISTRICT)***

M1-2A zoning districts are proposed for approximately 18 blocks:

- An area generally bounded by a line approximately 50 feet west of 148th Street to the west, Liberty Avenue to the north, Tuskegee Airmen Way to the southwest, 107th Avenue to the southeast, and a line approximately 200 feet east of 157th Street to the east;

- An area generally bounded by 165th Street to the west, Liberty Avenue to the north, Merrick Boulevard to the east; and 107th Avenue to the south;
- An area generally bounded by 173rd Street to the west, Liberty Avenue to the northwest, southernly line of the LIRR to the northeast, 180th Street to the east, a line approximately 100 feet north of 103rd Road to the southwest, and a line approximately 100 north of 105th Avenue to the southeast; and
- An area generally bounded by 180th Street to the west, Liberty Avenue to the north, Dunkirk Street to the west, and Ilion Avenue to the south.

M1-2A is a medium-density manufacturing district that supports a mix of commercial, manufacturing and community facility uses. M1-2A districts permit a maximum FAR for all permitted uses of 3.0. M1-2A districts permit a maximum base height of 65 feet and have a maximum building height of 95 feet. Above the maximum base height, setbacks are required.

Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required, though waivers are available for small lots and mixed buildings.

***PROPOSED M2-3A (EXISTING M1-1 AND M1-2 DISTRICTS)***

M2-3A zoning districts are proposed for approximately 19 blocks:

- A sliver area along Archer Avenue between 158th Street to the west and 165th Street to the east;
- An area generally bounded by 165th Street to the west, the LIRR to the north, Liberty Avenue to the south, and 177th Street to the east; and
- An area generally bounded by 179th Place to the west, Jamaica Avenue to the north, the LIRR to the south, and Hollis Avenue to the east.

M2-3A is a medium-density manufacturing district that supports a mix of commercial, manufacturing and community facility uses. M2-3A districts permit a maximum FAR of 4.0 for qualifying industrial and commercial uses and an FAR of 3.25 for all other permitted uses. M2-3A districts permit a maximum base height of 95 feet and have a maximum building height of 125 feet. Above the maximum base height, setbacks are required.

Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required, though waivers are available for small lots and mixed buildings.

***PROPOSED M3-2A (EXISTING M1-1 DISTRICT)***

M3-2A zoning districts are proposed for approximately two blocks:

- An area generally bounded by 177th Street to the west, the LIRR to the north, 99th Avenue to the east, the southernly line of the LIRR tracks to the southwest and Liberty Avenue to the south.

M3-2A is a medium-density manufacturing district intended for areas defined primarily by industrial use. M3-2A districts permit a maximum FAR of 3.0 for qualifying industrial and commercial uses and an FAR of 1.0 for other permitted uses, such as offices and services. M3-2A districts permit a maximum base height of 65 feet and have a maximum building height of 95 feet. Above the maximum base height, setbacks are required.

Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required, though waivers are available for small lots and mixed buildings.

***PROPOSED M1-2A/R7-2 (EXISTING M1-4 DISTRICTS)***

M1-2A/R7-2 zoning districts are proposed for approximately six blocks:

- An area generally bounded by 150th Street to the west, Archer Avenue to the north, a line approximately 100 feet north of Liberty Avenue to the southwest, Liberty Avenue to the southeast, and a line approximately 300 feet east of 158th Street to the east.

M1-2A/R7-2 is a mixed-use district that pairs M1-2A, a medium-density manufacturing district that



supports a mix of commercial, manufacturing and industrial uses, with R7-2, a medium-density residence district. Paired zoning districts like this have special regulations that enable residential and certain industrial uses to be located either side-by-side or within the same building. In Mandatory Inclusionary Housing Areas, M1-2A/R7-2 districts permit a maximum residential FAR of 5.01 and 3.0 FAR for all other permitted uses. The district permits a maximum base height of 85 feet and a maximum building height of 155 feet, with a 25 percent penthouse allowance. Above the maximum base height, setbacks are required

In the Outer Transit Zone, parking is required for 12 percent of standard residences, while no parking is required for qualifying affordable or senior housing. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for 40 percent of standard residences, 12 percent of qualifying affordable housing, and 10 percent of qualifying senior housing. Parking is required for some community facility uses. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for manufacturing and commercial uses. Waivers are available for small lots and mixed buildings.

#### *PROPOSED M1-2A/R7A (EXISTING M1-1 DISTRICTS)*

M1-2A/R7A zoning districts are proposed for approximately two blocks:

- An area generally bounded by Van Wyck Expressway to the west, 91st Avenue to the north, Archer Avenue to the south, and 139th Street to the east.

M1-2A/R7A is a mixed-use district that pairs M1-2A, a medium-density manufacturing district that supports a mix of commercial, manufacturing and community facility uses, with R7A, a medium-density contextual residence district. Paired zoning districts like this have special regulations that enable residential and certain industrial uses to be located either side-by-side or within the same building. In Mandatory Inclusionary Housing Areas, M1-2A/R7A districts permit a maximum residential FAR of 5.01 and 3.0 FAR for all other permitted uses. The district permits a maximum base height of 85 feet and a maximum building height of 115 feet. Above the maximum base height, setbacks are required.

In the Outer Transit Zone, parking is required for 15 percent of standard residences, while no parking is required for qualifying affordable or senior housing. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for 50 percent of standard residences, 12 percent of qualifying affordable housing, and 10 percent of qualifying senior housing. Waivers are available for small lots in both areas. Parking is required for some community facility uses. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for manufacturing and commercial uses. Waivers are available for small lots and mixed buildings.

#### *PROPOSED M1-3A/R7X (EXISTING M1-1 AND M1-4 DISTRICTS)*

M1-3A/R7X zoning districts are proposed for approximately four blocks:

- An area generally bounded by 147th Place to the west, 95th Avenue to the north, a line approximately 150 feet south of 95th Avenue to the south, and 148th Street to the east;
- An area generally bounded by 150th Street to the west, a line approximately 100 feet north of Liberty Avenue to the north, and 157th Street to the east; and
- An area generally bounded by a line approximately 235 feet east of 148th Street to the west, 97th Avenue to the north, a line approximately 100 feet south of 97th Avenue to the south, and 150th Street to the east.

M1-3A/R7X is a mixed-use district that pairs M1-3A, a medium-density manufacturing district that supports a mix of commercial, manufacturing and community facility uses, with R7X, a medium-density contextual residence district. Paired zoning districts like this have special regulations that enable residential and certain industrial uses to be located either side-by-side or within the same building. In Mandatory Inclusionary Housing Areas, M1-3A/R7X districts permit a maximum residential FAR of 6.0 and 4.0 FAR for all other permitted uses. The district permits a maximum base height of 105 feet and a maximum building height of 145 feet. Above the maximum base height, setbacks are required.

In the Outer Transit Zone, parking is required for 15 percent of standard residences, while no parking is required for qualifying affordable or senior housing. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for 50 percent of standard residences, 12 percent of qualifying affordable housing, and 10 percent of qualifying senior housing. Waivers are available for small lots in both areas. Parking is required for some

## **Jamaica Neighborhood Plan**

CEQR No. 24DCP132Q

Page 35

community facility uses. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for manufacturing and commercial uses. Waivers are available for small lots and mixed buildings.

### ***PROPOSED M1-6A/R9A (EXISTING M1-4 DISTRICT)***

M1-6A/R9A zoning districts are proposed for approximately two blocks:

- An area generally bounded by 148th Street to the west, a line approximately 200 feet north of 97th Avenue to the north, 97th Avenue to the south, and 150th Street to the east.

M1-6A/R9A is a mixed-use district that pairs M1-6A, a high-density manufacturing district that supports a mix of commercial, manufacturing and community facility uses, with R9A, a high-density contextual residence district. Paired zoning districts like this have special regulations that enable residential and certain industrial uses to be located either side-by-side or within the same building. In Mandatory Inclusionary Housing Areas, M1-6A/R9A districts permit a maximum residential FAR of 9.02 and 8.0 FAR for all other permitted uses. The district permits a maximum base height of 155 feet and a maximum building height of 245 feet. Above the maximum base height, setbacks are required.

In the Outer Transit Zone, parking is required for 12 percent of standard residences, while no parking is required for qualifying affordable or senior housing. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for 40 percent of standard residences, 12 percent of qualifying affordable housing, and 10 percent of qualifying senior housing. Waivers are available for small lots in both areas. Parking is required for some community facility uses. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for manufacturing and commercial uses. Waivers are available for small lots and mixed buildings.

### ***PROPOSED M1-8A/R9X (EXISTING M1-4 DISTRICT)***

M1-8A/R9X zoning districts are proposed for approximately two blocks:

- An area generally bounded by 148th Street to the west, 95th Avenue to the north, a line approximately 200 feet north of 97th Avenue to the north, and 150th Street to the east.

M1-8A/R9X is a mixed-use district that pairs M1-8A, a high-density manufacturing district that supports a mix of commercial, manufacturing, and community facility uses, with R9X, a high-density contextual residence district. Paired zoning districts like this have special regulations that enable residential and certain industrial uses to be located either side-by-side or within the same building. In Mandatory Inclusionary Housing Areas, M1-8A/R9X districts permit a maximum residential FAR of 10.8 and 12.0 FAR for all other permitted uses. The district permits a maximum base height of 155 feet above which tower regulations apply. Above the maximum base height, setbacks are required.

In the Outer Transit Zone, parking is required for 12 percent of standard residences, while no parking is required for qualifying affordable or senior housing. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for 40 percent of standard residences, 12 percent of qualifying affordable housing, and 10 percent of qualifying senior housing. Waivers are available for small lots in both areas. Parking is required for some community facility uses. Beyond the Greater Transit Zone, parking is required for manufacturing and commercial uses. Waivers are available for small lots and mixed buildings.

### ***PROPOSED C2-4 COMMERCIAL OVERLAY (EXISTING C1-2, C1-3, C1-4, AND C2-3 COMMERCIAL OVERLAYS)***

C2-4 commercial overlays are proposed for approximately 36 blocks:

- Areas mapped over existing R3-2, R5B, R5D, R6A, and R7A zoning districts that are proposed to be rezoned to R6B, R6A, R7A, R7X, and R8X zoning districts.

C2-4 commercial overlays allow residential uses, community facility uses, and commercial uses. Commercial uses are permitted up to 2.0 FAR.

Parking is required for commercial and some community facility uses, though waivers are available for small lots and mixed buildings.

### ***SPECIAL DOWNTOWN JAMAICA DISTRICT (DJ)***

The special purpose district known as the Special Downtown Jamaica District, which is currently mapped

within the Project Area, would be modified as part of the Proposed Actions. Modifications to the special district's regulations are described in more detail below as part of the related zoning text amendment action.

## **PROPOSED ZONING TEXT AMENDMENTS**

The Department of City Planning proposes a series of text amendments to facilitate the Jamaica Neighborhood Plan's land use objectives. The following is a list and description of the proposed text amendments:

### *SPECIAL DOWNTOWN JAMAICA DISTRICT (DJ)*

The Special Downtown Jamaica District (DJ), which is currently mapped within the Project Area, would be modified as part of the Proposed Actions. The proposed special purpose district would establish a framework to:

- Strengthen Downtown Jamaica and its nearby major corridors by promoting the establishment of mixed-use, transit-oriented growth hubs;
- Encourage the development of new housing that would include affordable housing;
- Improve the quality of development in Downtown Jamaica by requiring the provision of specified public amenities in appropriate locations;
- Encourage designs of new buildings that support the neighborhood's character.
- Enhance the pedestrian environment by encouraging active ground floor uses and better designed streetscapes;
- Support industrial growth in manufacturing districts that are appropriate near certain residential districts.

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

#### *Use Regulations*

To improve conditions where industrial businesses are close to residential areas, the Special DJ District would require certain uses within a specific distance of homes to be fully enclosed within the M1-2A and M2A districts. This includes uses from Use Groups IV(B), IX, and X, as well as select uses from Use Group VI.

Additionally, the Special DJ District would change the use restrictions for M2-3A districts by removing the size limits on retail and food stores. Currently, M2-3A districts cap retail spaces at 10,000 square feet and food stores at 30,000 square feet.

#### *Streetscape and Bulk Regulations*

To enhance the streetscape and maintain a strong, cohesive commercial character along key commercial streets, the Special DJ District would expand Tier B and Tier C frameworks to areas where they do not currently exist. Additionally, it would adjust existing Tier B and Tier C frameworks to align with the future vision for these streets.

The Special DJ District would also require buildings with frontages along Jamaica Avenue to be built 100 percent at the street line up to at least their minimum required street wall height, and for all other frontages across the Project Area, apply the current underlying rule. This would help maintain Jamaica Avenue's strong street wall context.

In addition, due to several block frontages along key commercial corridors measuring over 100 feet in length, new developments with more than 100 feet of frontage would be required to provide recesses, projections or other features that articulate the façade. In the absence of the special purpose district, larger developments with frontages along key commercial corridors could have a sheer, continuous wall up to the minimum base height with minimal articulation.

#### *Open Space Incentive*

In order to create opportunities for publicly accessible open space, the Special DJ District would include a

CPC authorization to allow developments in higher density districts to access the Zoning Resolution's floor area bonus for on-site public plazas. The public plaza program in ZR Section 37-70 allows bonuses at these densities, but the current Special DJ District does not allow the bonus to be used.

#### *Floor Area Regulations*

On zoning lots greater than 20,000 square feet, the Special DJ District would permit up to 150,000 square feet of floor area for schools, as defined by the Special DJ District and under certain conditions, to be exempted. This exemption would apply to qualifying school developments pursuant to a letter of agreement with the New York City School Construction Authority and subject to the jurisdiction of the NYC Department of Education. The Special DJ District would also create a CPC authorization that would allow for modified bulk when using the floor area exemption for schools under certain conditions throughout the Project Area.

#### *Parking and Loading*

The Special DJ District currently allows for accessory group parking facilities of up to 300 spaces as of right with allowances for the Commissioner of the NYC Department of Buildings to allow additional spaces. The Proposed Actions would remove this allowance and instead follow the underlying regulations for accessory group parking facilities.

#### **NEW RESIDENTIAL, MANUFACTURING AND MIXED-USE DISTRICTS**

The Proposed Actions would establish new paired districts including M1-2A/R7A, M1-2A/R7-2, M1-3A/R7X, M1-6A/R9A, and M1-8A/R9X mixed-use districts. These districts' use and bulk regulations are described in detail in the "Proposed Zoning Map Amendments" section above.

#### **MANDATORY INCLUSIONARY HOUSING**

The Proposed Actions include an amendment to Appendix F to establish an MIH area within the proposed R6A, R6D, R7A, R7X, R8A, R8X, C4-4D, C6-2, C6-3, C6-3 (R9-1), C6-3A, C6-4, M1-2A/R7A, M1-2A/R7-2, M1-3A/R7X, M1-6A/R9A, and M1-8A/R9X districts of the Special DJ District.

Mapping these districts as MIH Areas would require a share of new housing to be permanently affordable where significant new housing capacity would be created. The MIH program requires permanently affordable housing within new residential developments, enlargements, and conversions from non-residential to residential use within the mapped MIH Areas. The program requires permanently affordable housing set asides for all developments over 10 units or 12,500 zoning sf (zsf) within the 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 three 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 tradeoff inherent between income levels and size of the affordable set-aside. Option 1 requires 25 percent of residential floor area to be affordable for households with incomes averaging 60 percent of the Area Median Income ("AMI"). Option 1 also includes a requirement that 10 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 for households with incomes 80 percent of AMI. Option 3 requires that 20 percent of the residential floor area be affordable to households with incomes averaging 40 percent AMI. Options 1, 2, and 3 cannot be targeted to residents with incomes above 130 percent AMI. Option 4, for markets where moderate- or middle-income development is marginally financially feasible without subsidy, requires a 30 percent set-aside at AMIs averaging 115 percent and does not allow public funding or income bands above 135 percent AMI. Option 4 cannot be mapped as a standalone option and can only be applied alongside Options 1, 2, or 3.

#### **PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT AREAS (UDAA), APPROVAL OF AN URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACTION AREA PROJECTS (UDAAP), AND DISPOSITION OF CITY-OWNED PROPERTIES**

The Proposed Actions include the designation of UDAAs, project approval of UDAAPs and disposition of City-owned sites under HPD jurisdiction. Block 10150, Lots 6, 7, 8, 10, 51, 52, 54, and 57, Block 12152, Lots 8, 9, 10, and 11.

**SCATTERED SITE PROJECT 1**

- UDAA/UDAAP: Development Site 1 (Block 10150, Lots 6, 7, 8, 10) located at 108-41-108-51 Union Hall Street, Development Site 2 (Block 10150 Lots 51, 22) located at 108-32 – 108-34 Guy R Brewer Boulevard, Development Site 3 (Block 10150, Lot 54) located at 108-38 Guy R Brewer Boulevard, and Development Site 4 (Block 10150, Lot 57) located at 108-44 Guy R Brewer Boulevard consist of underutilized property which tends to impair or arrest the sound development of the surrounding community, with or without tangible physical blight. Incentives are needed in order to induce the correction of these substandard, insanitary, and blighting conditions. The project activities would protect and promote health and safety and would promote sound growth and development. The development sites are therefore eligible to be an Urban Development Action Area and the proposed project is therefore eligible to be an Urban Development Action Area Project pursuant to Article 16 of the General Municipal Law.

**SCATTERED SITE PROJECT 2**

- UDAA/UDAAP: Development Site 5 (Block 12152, Lots 8, 9, 10, 11) located at 109-43 –109-47 Union Hall Street consists of underutilized property which tends to impair or arrest the sound development of the surrounding community, with or without tangible physical blight. Incentives are needed in order to induce the correction of these substandard, insanitary, and blighting conditions. The project activities would protect and promote health and safety and would promote sound growth and development. The development sites are therefore eligible to be an Urban Development Action Area and the proposed project is therefore eligible to be an Urban Development Action Area Project pursuant to Article 16 of the General Municipal Law.

**PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CITY-OWNED PROPERTY**

Disposition of City Property: UDAA/UDAAP Development Site 1 (Block 10150, Lots 6, 7, 8, 10) located at 108-41-108-51 Union Hall Street, Development Site 2 (Block 10150 Lots 51, 22) located at 108-32 – 108-34 Guy R Brewer Boulevard, Development Site 3 (Block 10150, Lot 54) located at 108-38 Guy R Brewer Boulevard, Development Site 4 (Block 10150, Lot 57) located at 108-44 Guy R Brewer Boulevard, and Development Site 5 (Block 12152, Lots 8, 9, 10, 11) located at 109-43 –109-47 Union Hall Street, are proposed for disposition to a sponsor to be selected by HPD.

**PROPOSED CITY MAP AMENDMENTS**

The Proposed Actions include amendments to the City Map. DOT and NYCEDC are proposing several changes to the City Map to modify the existing mapping of “Public Place” on Blocks 9986, 9988, 9994, and the northern streetlines on Archer Avenue between 144th Place and 147th Place. The amendments to the City Map would include:

- Revising the currently mapped “Public Place” boundary on Block 9986 to encompass portions of (p/o) Lots 70 and 73 and revising the street lines to eliminate street area within Lots 20, 70, 73, and 75 corresponding to the proposed pedestrian plaza;
- Eliminating a mapped “Public Place” on Block 9988 and restoring street lines mapped prior to the 2007 Station Plaza City Map amendment on Block 9988; and
- Revising the currently mapped “Public Place” boundary on Block 9994 to match the existing extents of Lot 38 corresponding to the proposed pedestrian plaza and adjusting existing street lines along Archer Avenue.

The City Map amendments are necessary to facilitate the construction of the two pedestrian plazas at the northeast corner of the Archer Avenue and Sutphin Boulevard intersection and at the northwest corner of Archer Avenue and 146th Street, totaling approximately 0.45 acres. Additionally, since the pedestrian plaza on Block 9998 and certain Archer Avenue widenings are no longer anticipated, a change in the City Map is necessary to ensure consistencies between the City Map and the proposed Station Plaza Enhancement Project.



## **F. ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK FOR ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

### **REASONABLE WORST-CASE DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO**

In order to assess the possible impacts of the Proposed Actions, a reasonable worst-case development scenario (RWCDs) was developed for both the current (Future No-Action) and proposed zoning (Future With-Action) conditions for a 15-year period (build year 2040). The incremental difference between the Future No-Action and Future With-Action conditions will serve as the basis for the impact analyses of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). While neighborhood plans are typically analyzed across a 10-year period, the Jamaica Plan's analysis framework utilizes a 15-year period to provide a more comprehensive picture of how a plan of this scale impacts long-term development conditions.

To determine the Future No-Action and With-Action conditions, standard methodologies have been used following the *CEQR Technical Manual* guidance employing reasonable assumptions. 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 rezoning 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 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 of 7,500 sf or larger (may include potential assemblages totaling 7,500 sf, respectively, if assemblage seems probable<sup>3</sup>); unless the site is underutilized, per the definition below. While other neighborhood planning efforts typically consider a 5,000 sf minimum lot/assemblage size threshold, the development site criteria considered 7,500 sf based on development patterns and trends over the past 15 years. Recent development has been focused on larger sites adjacent to major transit assets.
- Lots constructed to less than or equal to half of the maximum allowable FAR under the proposed actions; and
- Lots between 2,000 to 7,500 sf were also considered if determined to be underutilized.
  - Underutilized lots which are defined as vacant or occupied by a vacant building, which is a building with only a single occupied floor, or lots constructed to less than or equal to half of the maximum allowable FAR under the Proposed Actions.

Certain lots that meet these criteria have been excluded from consideration as development sites based on the following conditions because they are very unlikely to be redeveloped as a result of the Proposed Actions.

- Lots where construction activity is occurring or has recently been completed.
- Long-standing institutional uses such as schools (public and private), municipal libraries, government offices, parks and playgrounds, and designated landmarks. 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

---

<sup>3</sup> Assemblages are defined as a combination of adjacent lots, which satisfy one of the following conditions: (1) the lots share common ownership and, when combined, meet the aforementioned soft site criteria; or (2) at least one of the lots, or combination of lots, meets the aforementioned soft site criteria, and ownership of the assemblage is shared by no more than three distinct owners.

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.

- Multi-unit buildings (i.e., existing individual buildings with 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 (via proposals to DCP, permits filed to the Department of Buildings, or otherwise), these buildings are generally excluded from the analysis framework.
- Buildings in manufacturing districts on lots smaller than 20,000 sf. Although these sites may meet the development site criteria, historic development trends suggest that they are unlikely to redevelop due to limited profitability potential given their relatively small lot sizes.
- Certain buildings with more than two commercial tenants. 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.
- Lots whose location, highly irregular shape, or highly irregular topography would preclude or greatly limit future as-of-right development, including lots split by disparate zoning districts. Generally, development on highly irregular lots does not produce marketable floor space.
- Lots utilized for public transportation and/or public utilities.

#### *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 15-year analysis period for the Proposed Actions (i.e., by the analysis year 2040) while potential sites are considered less likely to be developed over the approximately 15-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 two or more commercial tenants that were not excluded altogether, 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 that are unlikely to move.

Based on the above criteria, 217 development sites (103 projected and 114 potential) have been identified in the Project Area. These projected and potential development sites are depicted in the DEIS, and the detailed RWCDs tables provided in DEIS Appendix A “Detailed RWCDs Tables”, identify the uses expected to occur on each of these sites under No-Action and With-Action conditions.

The 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, socioeconomic conditions, 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 effects on historic resources, urban design conditions, shadows, 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.

## **CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS**

Under the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), 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 impact 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 and height modification with the provision of publicly accessible open space, for the City Planning Commission to consider. A Conceptual analysis is 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 the application.

### ***DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO PARAMETERS***

In general, sites are assumed to be built to the maximum allowable FAR permitted by the Proposed Actions. Certain sites did not utilize the maximum allowable residential FARs due to a combination irregular lot conditions, constraints in building construction methodologies, and building forms likely to be achieved with public financing.

#### ***Dwelling Unit Factor***

The number of projected dwelling units in residential use buildings is determined by dividing the total amount of residential gross floor area by 850 and rounding to the nearest whole number. In specific cases, average dwelling unit sizes of 1,000 sf were assumed to reflect more reasonable development assumptions for sites likely to use Tower Regulations without public financing.

### **FUTURE WITHOUT THE PROPOSED ACTIONS (NO-ACTION CONDITION)**

In the future without the Proposed Actions (No-Action condition), 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 1 shows the No-Action conditions for the projected development sites.

As shown in Table 1 below, it is anticipated that, in the future without the Proposed Actions, there would be a total of approximately 4,929,986 gsf of built floor area on the 103 projected development sites. Under the RWCDs, the total No-Action development would comprise approximately 3,402 residential units, 872,205 gsf of retail, supermarket, and office uses, 550,776 gsf of industrial and warehouse uses, 24,193 gsf of automotive uses, 126,590 gsf of community facility uses, and 1,337 accessory parking spaces. The No-Action estimated population would include approximately 10,682 residents and 3,146 workers on these 103 projected development sites.

- In the No-Action scenario, new housing growth that utilizes the recently adopted City of Yes for Housing Opportunity (CHO) zoning text amendment is anticipated to be concentrated in larger lots in higher-density zoning districts, especially on larger-sized lots within the downtown core proximate to transit.
- Outside the core, areas along major corridors would likely continue to see relatively limited new housing growth as the existing zoning does not provide enough of a density incentive to induce redevelopment of existing structures under current and anticipated market conditions. Demolition, responsible disposal and carting, and remediation costs paired with high costs of materials and labor (and other variables) inhibit the redevelopment of existing structures, especially those with successful businesses or multiple leases, etc.
- New commercial growth would be limited, with the majority of new development providing additional ground-floor retail uses.
- It is expected that the Project Area's manufacturing districts would remain comprised of a mix of uses that primarily serve the city's construction industry, provide auto services, and serve as last-mile logistics/self-storage sites without an updated land use paradigm to provide development

incentives and flexibility.

## 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. It is anticipated that the Proposed Actions would facilitate the following outcomes:

- An updated zoning framework would permit and expand housing production in certain areas that previously only allowed manufacturing uses.
- With increases to permitted densities in both the core of Downtown Jamaica as well as Jamaica's major corridors, the Proposed Actions would induce development on sites that were seen as less favorable in the years after the 2007 rezoning.
- The increases in permitted floorspace and enhanced flexibility for permitted commercial and manufacturing uses would induce growth in employment-generating development, including a diversity of uses that have not previously been developed.
- The Project Area's primary commercial corridors would be repurposed to attract regionally serving retail and office uses near transit nodes, attracting shoppers and employees from throughout South Queens.

As shown in Table 1, under the RWCDS, the total development expected to occur on the 103 projected development sites under the With-Action condition would consist of approximately 21,472,426 gsf of floor area, including 15,591,532 gsf of residential floor area (approximately 15,721 DUs), a substantial proportion of which are expected to be affordable pursuant to MIH and city-based programs, 2,348,425 gsf of commercial uses, 2,569,846 gsf of industrial, warehouse, and automotive uses, 962,624 gsf of community facility uses, and 1,265 accessory non-residential parking spaces. The With-Action estimated population would include approximately 49,530 residents and 10,174 workers on these projected development sites.

Additionally, Table 1 shows the projected incremental (net) change between the No-Action and With-Action conditions that would result from the Proposed Actions on the projected development sites would be an increase of 12,235,310 gsf of residential floor area, 1,476,220 gsf of retail, office, and other commercial space, 836,034 gsf of community facility space, a net increase of 2,019,070 gsf of industrial/warehouse uses, a net decrease 24,193 gsf of automotive uses, and a net reduction of 380 accessory parking spaces.

**Table 1: Comparison of No-Action and With-Action Development Scenarios for Project Area (RWCDS for Projected Development Sites)**

Land Use	No-Action Condition	With-Action Condition	Increment
<b>Residential</b>			
Residential GSF	3,356,222	15,591,532	12,235,310
Total DUs	3,402	15,721	12,319
<i>Affordable DUs at 20%</i>	693	3,193	2,500
<i>Affordable DUs at 25%</i>	866	3,991	3,125
<i>Affordable DUs at 30%</i>	1,036	4,780	3,744
<b>Commercial</b>			
Local Retail GSF	489,029	1,047,124	558,095
Destination Retail GSF	168,918	217,182	48,264
Supermarket GSF	28,059	28,059	0
Office GSF	155,954	1,056,060	900,106
Other Commercial GSF	30,245	0	-30,245
<b>TOTAL COMMERCIAL GSF</b>	<b>872,205</b>	<b>2,348,425</b>	<b>1,476,220</b>
<b>Community Facility</b>			
Medical Office GSF	0	215,672	215,672
House of Worship GSF	74,836	95,038	20,202
Community Center GSF	12,610	492,987	480,377

Other CF GSF	39,144	158,927	119,783
<b>TOTAL CF GSF</b>	<b>126,590</b>	<b>962,624</b>	<b>836,034</b>
<b>Industrial</b>			
Warehouse GSF	161,713	2,155,965	1,994,252
Auto-related GSF	24,193	0	-24,193
Industrial GSF	389,063	413,881	24,818
<b>TOTAL INDUSTRIAL GSF</b>	<b>574,969</b>	<b>2,569,846</b>	<b>1,994,877</b>
<b>Parking</b>			
Parking Spaces	1,337	1,265	- 72
<b>Population</b>			
Residents <sup>1</sup>	10,682	49,530	38,848
Workers <sup>2</sup>	3,146	10,174	7,028

**Notes:**

(1) Population estimates assume 3.16 persons per household based on the average household size from the 2020 Decennial Census for Neighborhood Tabulation Area (“NTA”) QN1201; 2.79 persons per household based on the average household size from NTA QN0805; 3.25 persons per household based on average household size from NTA QN1202; 2.65 persons per household based on average household size from NTA QN0804; 3.34 persons per household based on average household size from NTA QN1203; and 3.21 persons per household based on average household size from NTA QN 1205.

(2) Estimate of workers calculated as follows: 1 employee per 25 DUs; 1 employee per 333 sf of local retail, supermarket, and other commercial space; 1 employee per 875 sf of destination retail space; 1 employee per 250 sf of office space; 1 employee per 400 sf of medical office space; 1 employee per 1,000 sf of other community facility space; 1 employee per 1,000 sf of industrial/auto-related space; and 1 employee per 15,000 sf of warehouse space.

Based on 2020 Census data, the average household size for residential units in Neighborhood Tabulation Area (“NTA”) QN1201 is 3.16, NTA QN0805 is 2.79, NTA QN1202 is 3.25, NTA QN0804 is 2.65, NTA QN1203 is 3.34 and QN1205 is 3.21. Based on these ratios and standard ratios for estimating employment for commercial, community facility and industrial uses, Table 1 also provides an estimate of the number of residents and workers on the 103 projected development sites in the With-Action condition as well as the incremental increase in population compared to No-Action conditions. As indicated in the table, under the RWCDs, the Proposed Actions would result in a net increment of approximately 38,848 residents and 7,028 workers, compared to the No-Action.

A total of 114 sites were considered less likely to be developed within the foreseeable future and were thus considered potential development sites. As noted earlier, the potential sites are deemed less likely to be developed because they did not closely meet the criteria listed above. However, as discussed above, 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 in the EIS for site-specific effects.

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

## G. PUBLIC REVIEW PROCESS FOR THE PROPOSED ACTIONS

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

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(s), 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 10 days after the hearing to receive written comments) are incorporated into a Final EIS; the Final EIS must be completed at least 10 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 10 days.

### *NEW YORK CITY ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW*

Pursuant to the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) and its implementing regulations found at 6 NYCRR Part 617, New York City 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:

- *Establishing a Lead Agency:* Under CEQR, the “lead agency” is the public entity responsible for conducting the environmental review. Usually, the lead agency is the entity principally responsible for carrying out, funding, or approving a proposed action. CPC is the lead agency for the Proposed Actions.
- *Determination of Significance:* The lead agency's first charge is to determine whether a proposed action may have a significant adverse impact on the environment. To do so, it must prepare an EAS. The Proposed Actions were the subject of an EAS that was issued on June 11, 2024. Based on the information contained in the EAS, the lead agency (CPC) determined that the Proposed Actions may have a significant adverse effect on the environment and issued a Positive Declaration on June 11, 2024, requiring preparation of an EIS.
- *Scoping:* Once the lead agency has issued 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 focusing the environmental impact analyses on the key issues to be studied. The Draft Scope of Work for the Proposed Actions was issued on June 11, 2024. CEQR requires a public scoping meeting as part of the process. A scoping meeting was held for the Proposed Actions and EIS Draft Scope of Work on July 11, 2024. Agencies and the public were given through 5:00PM, July 22, 2024, to review and comment on the Draft Scope of Work. Modifications to the Draft Scope of Work were made as a result of public and interested agency input during the scoping process. The Final Scope of Work for the project was issued on March 14, 2025.
- *Draft Environmental Impact Statement:* The DEIS was prepared in accordance with the Final Scope of Work, and followed methodologies and criteria for determining significant adverse impacts in the 2021 *CEQR Technical Manual*. The lead agency reviewed all aspects of the document, calling on other City and state agencies to participate in where the agency's expertise is relevant. 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 NOC was issued on March 14, 2025.
- *Public Review:* Publication of the DEIS and issuance of the Notice of Completion signal the start of the public review period. During this time (a period of not less than 30 days), the public has the

opportunity to review and comment on the DEIS either in writing or at the public hearing convened for the purpose of receiving such comments. Where the CEQR process is coordinated with another City process that requires a public hearing, such as the CPC ULURP process, joint hearings may be held. 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 10 days following the close of the hearing. All substantive comments received at the hearing become part of the CEQR record and must be summarized and responded to in the FEIS.

- *Final Environmental Impact Statement:* After the close of the public comment period on the DEIS, the lead agency FEIS will be prepared. The FEIS must incorporate relevant comments on the DEIS, either in a separate chapter or in changes to the body of the text, graphics, and tables. Once the lead agency determines that the FEIS is complete, it issues an NOC and circulates the FEIS.
- *Findings:* The lead agency will adopt a formal set of written findings based on the FEIS, reflecting its conclusions about the significant adverse environmental impacts of the proposed action, potential alternatives, and potential mitigation measures. The findings may not be adopted until at least 10 days after the Notice of Completion has been issued for the FEIS. Once findings are adopted, the lead agency may take its actions. This means that CPC must wait at least 10 days after the FEIS is complete to act on a given application.

## **H. PRINCIPAL CONCLUSIONS OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS**

The environmental assessment summarized below analyzes existing conditions and the potential for project-generated significant adverse impacts based on guidelines provided in the 2021 *CEQR Technical Manual*.

### **LAND USE, ZONING, AND PUBLIC POLICY**

No significant adverse impacts on land use, zoning, or public policy are anticipated in the future with the Proposed Actions in the primary or secondary study areas in the 2040 analysis year. The Proposed Actions would not directly displace any land uses so as to adversely affect surrounding land uses, nor generate land uses that would be incompatible with existing zoning and land uses in the surrounding area. The Proposed Actions would introduce opportunities for new housing, including affordable housing, thereby expanding housing supply and providing more housing choices for current and future residents. The Proposed Actions would also create new areas of commercial activity in order to expand the variety and types of retail, other commercial uses, and community facilities found today, and to bring jobs and new neighborhood services to the area. Higher-density development and a greater variety of land uses would ensure that existing and new residents and workers support greater diversity of retail, services, commercial uses and industrial uses.

Furthermore, the Proposed Actions would not result in development that conflicts with adopted public policies. Rather, the Proposed Actions would be consistent with the public policies outlined in various public policy initiatives, such as Housing our Neighbors, Where We Live NYC, OneNYC, Get Stuff Built, City of Yes, Jamaica Plan, Jamaica Gateway Urban Renewal Area, Jamaica NOW Action Plan, Jamaica Downtown Revitalization Initiative Strategic Investment Plan, and Jamaica Neighborhood Plan.

With the proposed zoning changes, increased residential use would be allowed throughout most of the primary study area, expanding the City's housing supply to help meet the housing needs of current and future residents, and increasing the supply of affordable housing. The Proposed Actions would also create opportunities for new non-residential space, including commercial, community facility, and light industrial space. The Proposed Actions would promote these opportunities in new mixed-use buildings throughout the primary study area. The Proposed Actions would allow for the development of new uses and higher densities at the projected and potential development sites. It is anticipated that the Proposed Actions would facilitate the following outcomes:

- An updated zoning framework would permit and expand housing production in certain areas that previously only allowed manufacturing uses.
- With increases to permitted densities in both the core of Downtown Jamaica as well as Jamaica's major corridors, the Proposed Actions would induce development on sites that were seen as less favorable in the years after the 2007 rezoning.

- The increases in permitted floor space and enhanced flexibility for permitted commercial and manufacturing uses would induce growth in employment-generating development, including a diversity of uses that have not previously been developed.
- The Project Area's primary commercial corridors would be repurposed to attract regionally serving retail and office uses near transit nodes, attracting shoppers and employees from throughout South Queens.

## **SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS**

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts with respect to socioeconomic conditions related to direct or indirect residential displacement, direct or indirect business displacement or adverse effects to specific industries.

### ***DIRECT RESIDENTIAL DISPLACEMENT***

The screening-level assessment found that the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts due to direct residential displacement. Under the RWCDs, the Proposed Actions could directly displace an estimated 90 residents living in 29 DUs by 2040.<sup>4</sup> The 29 DUs that could be directly displaced are located on Projected Development Sites 19, 21, 22, 26, 45, 62, 87, 91, and 93.

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 directly displaced residents represent less than 0.04 percent of the estimated residents within the socioeconomic study area; therefore, this potential direct displacement would not substantially alter the socioeconomic character of the neighborhood.

### ***DIRECT BUSINESS DISPLACEMENT***

The preliminary assessment found that the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts due to direct business displacement. Under the RWCDs, projected development generated by the Proposed Actions by the 2040 Analysis Year would potentially directly displace an estimated 174 private sector businesses on projected development sites and an estimated 1,847 jobs associated with those businesses. The potentially displaced businesses are across twelve sectors including Construction, Manufacturing, Wholesale Trade, Retail Trade, Transportation and Warehousing, Financing and Insurance, Administrative and Support, Waste Management and Remediation Services, Education Services, Health Care and Social Assistance, Accommodation and Food Services, Management Companies and Administrative Services, and Other Services. While these businesses provide value to the local economy, there are alternative sources of goods and services, and employment provided within the broader neighborhood, study area, and elsewhere in Queens and the larger city. Therefore, the potential direct 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*. The Proposed Actions are intended to reinforce the area as a regional business district by strengthening the existing economic ecosystem while also promoting the development of new job-generating uses through increased industrial and commercial density.

Although the Proposed Actions could result in the potential direct displacement of industrial businesses within the Jamaica/Richmond Hill Industrial Business Zone (IBZ), the proposed zoning changes would maintain manufacturing zoning districts (M1-2A, M2-3A, and M3-2A) within the portions of the Project Area included within the IBZ. The Proposed Actions are intended to emphasize industrial preservation and expansion within the Jamaica/Richmond Hill IBZ and would reinforce the larger Project Area as a regional business district and create job-generating industries. The Proposed Actions would retain manufacturing zoning (M1-2A, M2-3A, and M3-2A districts) within the IBZ and the proposed M districts would increase

---

<sup>4</sup> The estimate of potential direct displacement associated with the RWCDs assumes that approximately 7 DUs could be displaced from projected development sites in the future without the Proposed Actions (the No-Action condition). The residents that are assumed to be potentially displaced in the No-Action are not considered displaced in the future with the Proposed Actions (the With Action condition). For the purposes of CEQR analysis, displacement that could be expected to occur absent the Proposed Actions is not attributed to the Proposed Actions.

the allowable density and provide additional capacity and flexibility for economic growth and investment. These areas would remain exclusively for non-residential uses to support existing, unique business and use ecology or key heavier industrial functions. The proposed M1-2A and M2-3A would permit industrial, commercial and community facility uses and the proposed M3-2A district would allow for industrial and limited commercial uses. Residential uses would continue to not be permitted in the proposed M1-2A, M2-3A, and M3-2A districts. The Proposed Actions would be in line with the goals of the Jamaica/Richmond Hill IBZ to encourage the retention and growth of industrial and commercial uses, development of new job-generating uses, and provide expanded business services for industrial and manufacturing businesses.

#### **INDIRECT RESIDENTIAL DISPLACEMENT**

A detailed assessment 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 12,319 DUs above the No-Action condition and a net increase of 38,848 residents, with most new development (10,127 DUs) in Subarea A, which comprises Downtown Jamaica and encompasses most of the Project Area (or directly affected areas). Subarea A comprises an area generally bounded by Hillside Avenue to the north, the Van Wyck Expressway to the west, Tuskegee Airmen Way and Liberty Avenue to the south, and Hollis Avenue and 186th Street to the east.

The preliminary assessment found that the overall average household income of new population in the With-Action condition would be higher than the average household income of the existing populations for the overall study area as well as each of the identified subareas. For the overall 0.5-mile socioeconomic study area and Subarea A, which comprises Downtown Jamaica, more detailed analyses were required to determine whether the Proposed Actions could result in a significant adverse displacement impact.

The detailed analysis identified approximately 26,742 low-income renter households in the socioeconomic study area and an estimated 10,015 low-income renter households in Subarea A. Data from the New York State Homes and Community Renewal (HCR) Stabilized Building List and New York City's Primary Land Use Tax Lot Output (PLUTO) data determined that there are currently more than 2,800 rent stabilized units without income-restriction in the study area, in addition to more than 10,200 income-restricted housing units. Using *CEQR Technical Manual* assessment methods, the detailed indirect residential displacement analysis determined there are 14,713 low-income renter households living in unprotected rental DUs and thus are vulnerable to potential indirect displacement. These households account for a population of 45,905, or 18.7 percent of the total population in the study area. Within Subarea A, the detailed indirect residential displacement analysis determined there are 1,628 low-income renter households living in unprotected rental DUs and thus are vulnerable to potential indirect displacement that account for 6.7 percent of the population (5,144 low-income residents in Subarea A).

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 significant change to the socioeconomic character of the study area and a potential significant adverse impact may occur. While this proportion is larger than five percent in both the study area and within Subarea A, the *CEQR Technical Manual* also states that, if it is determined that a project, because of its mixed-income composition, would not cause dramatic changes in the local real estate market, it may not affect rents for some or all of the vulnerable households. The analysis found that in Subarea A and the larger study area occupancy rates are high and market rate rents are already unaffordable to low-income households. The Proposed Actions are expected to introduce more affordable housing than in the future without the Proposed Actions, potentially slowing trends of increasing rents and maintaining a more diverse mix of incomes within the study area and subareas as compared to the No-Action condition. Since the mixed-income composition of the new population would not cause substantial changes in the real estate market, the Proposed Actions are not expected to result in significant indirect displacement of vulnerable renters in unprotected units.

#### **INDIRECT BUSINESS DISPLACEMENT**

A preliminary assessment found that the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts due to indirect business displacement. Concerns identified by the *CEQR Technical Manual* are whether the Proposed Actions could lead to increases in commercial property values in 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 form a customer base for local businesses.

The Proposed Actions would facilitate new residential, commercial, community facility, and industrial development including a net increase of nearly 1.48 million gsf of commercial space, 836,034 gsf of community facility space, 24,818 gsf of industrial space, and nearly 2.0 million gsf of warehouse space, over the span of 15 years, as compared to No-Action conditions. The broader study area has well-established retail, commercial and industrial districts. The Proposed Actions are not expected add to a concentration of a particular sector of the local economy substantial enough to significantly alter or accelerate existing economic patterns.

The Proposed Actions would allow current land uses to continue to exist in the study area, but at higher densities. Residential, retail, and commercial uses would be spread throughout the Project Area, and the study area's well-established retail and office markets, particularly in downtown Jamaica, would not be disrupted by the incremental increases in activity introduced by the Proposed Actions. Current trends indicate that the study area is already adding residential uses while maintaining strong commercial office and retail sectors. The retail and commercial markets would likely grow to accommodate increases in residents associated with the incremental 12,319 new DUs introduced by the Proposed Actions, but these shifts would be paired with similar increases in allowable density for retail and commercial establishments. Increases in manufacturing and industrial space would primarily occur in the Jamaica/Richmond IBZ, helping to stymie declines in the industry and drawing in new investment to an area that is zoned to protect and retain manufacturing work. Any workers displaced by the Proposed Actions would be replaced by workers associated with new commercial, retail and industrial growth on the projected development sites. Further, the Proposed Actions would not directly or indirectly displace uses that provide critical support to businesses in the study area, or that bring people into the area that form a substantial portion of the customer base for local businesses. As such, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts due to indirect business displacement, and no further assessment is warranted.

#### ***ADVERSE EFFECTS ON SPECIFIC INDUSTRIES***

A preliminary assessment found that the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts on specific industries. An analysis is warranted when a substantial number of residents or workers depends 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 are intended to reinforce the Project Area as a regional business district by strengthening the existing economic ecosystem, while promoting the development of new job-generating uses through increased industrial and commercial density.

The Proposed Actions would not significantly affect the business conditions in any industry or any category of business within or outside of the study area. By 2040, the Proposed Actions could directly displace an estimated 174 businesses, and 1,847 employees in several economic sectors. The businesses that could be directly displaced do not represent a critical mass of businesses within any City industry, category of business, or category of employment. Although these businesses are valuable individually and collectively to the City's economy, the goods and services offered by potentially displaced uses can be found elsewhere within the socioeconomic study area, within a broader trade area, and within the City as a whole. The products and services offered by potentially displaced businesses are not essential to the viability of other businesses within or outside of the study area. The Proposed Actions would not result in significant indirect business displacement, and therefore, would not indirectly substantially reduce employment or have an impact on the economic viability of any specific industry or category of business.

While the Proposed Actions envision non-residential uses mixing with residential uses in some areas, other areas have been designated to remain exclusively for non-residential uses to support existing, unique business and use ecology or key heavier industrial functions. The Proposed Actions seek to strengthen and promote these areas by maintaining them for industrial, commercial and community facility uses and increasing the allowable density for job-generating uses and removing onerous requirements, like required accessory parking and loading, which are barriers to redevelopment and enlargements. The Proposed Actions would concentrate heavier and lighter-industrial uses to select areas while increasing bulk



flexibility to ensuring prospective firms have flexibility to create developments that meet their needs. The proposed strategy would also right-size zoning conditions on the existing industrial lots along Jamaica Avenue, while providing further density opportunities to promote jobs-focused growth.

## **COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES**

Pursuant to *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines, 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. As described in the following analysis and summarized below, the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts on elementary schools. No significant adverse impacts on intermediate schools, high schools, or publicly funded early childhood programs would result.

### *Public Schools*

The Project Area falls within the boundaries of four New York City Community School District (CSD) sub-districts: Sub-districts 1 and 2 of CSD 28 and Sub-districts 2 and 3 of CSD 29. Compared to the No-Action condition, the RWCDS associated with the Proposed Actions would introduce a net increment of approximately 5,061 total students, consisting of approximately 2,822 elementary school students, 1,007 intermediate school students, and 1,232 high school students. Many of the new students would be introduced to CSD 28, Sub-district 2.

In the 2040 future with the Proposed Actions, elementary schools in Sub-districts 1 and 2 of CSD 28 would experience significant adverse impacts. The utilization of CSD 28, Sub-district 1 elementary schools would increase from a No-Action utilization rate of approximately 84.0 percent to a With-Action utilization rate of approximately 103.7 percent (an increase of approximately 19.7 percent) with a deficit of approximately 226 elementary school seats (i.e., 226 project-generated students over the 100 percent utilization rate). The utilization of CSD 28, Sub-district 2 elementary schools would increase from a No-Action utilization rate of approximately 94.0 percent to a With-Action utilization rate of approximately 107.3 percent (an increase of approximately 13.3 percent) with a deficit of approximately 793 elementary school seats (i.e., 793 project-generated students over the 100 percent utilization rate). As elementary schools within these two sub-districts 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), significant adverse impacts to elementary schools in Sub-districts 1 and 2 of CSD 28 would result.

Elementary schools in Sub-districts 2 and 3 of CSD 29 would continue to operate with available capacities in the future With-Action condition, and therefore would not experience significant adverse impacts.

Intermediate schools in Sub-districts 1 and 2 of CSD 28 and Sub-districts 2 and 3 of CSD 29 would continue to operate with available capacities in the future With-Action condition, and therefore would not experience significant adverse impacts.

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the impact determination for high schools is conducted at the borough level. In the 2040 future with the Proposed Actions, Queens high schools are expected to operate with available capacity (approximate 85.1 percent With-Action utilization), and, therefore, no significant adverse impacts on public high schools would result because of the Proposed Actions.

### *Libraries*

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts to public libraries. Five Queens Borough Public Library (QBPL) branches are located within a 0.75-mile radius of the Project Area: the Briarwood branch, the Central Library branch, the South Jamaica branch, the St. Albans branch, and the Baisley Park branch. The Proposed Actions are expected to introduce an estimated approximately 38,847 additional residents to the libraries' combined catchment area (compared to the No-Action condition). For the St. Albans and Baisley Park 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 at these two branches. The catchment area population of the Briarwood, Central Library, and South Jamaica branch libraries are all expected to increase by more than five percent in the

future with the Proposed Actions, which may represent a significant adverse impact on library services at these three library branches according to the *CEQR Technical Manual*. However, because portions of the catchment areas for the Central Library and South Jamaica branches overlap (i.e., the southern portion of the Central Library branch overlaps with the northern portion of the South Jamaica branch), many of the additional residents introduced into these two catchment areas would reside within 0.75 miles of both the Central Library and South Jamaica branches. 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. Residents also have access to the full catalogue of NYPL e-books through the SimplyE app or through Overdrive/Libby and Cloud Library. In addition, residents would also have access to libraries near their places of work. Therefore, the additional residential 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. Under the RWCDS, this would result in the incremental addition of approximately 2,500 affordable units under the Proposed Actions. Based on the relevant multiplier presented in Table 6-1a of the *CEQR Technical Manual*, these additional approximately 2,500 affordable units would generate approximately 350 children under age five eligible for publicly funded early childhood programs. With the addition of these eligible children, there would be approximately 279 available slots in the study area by 2040 (approximately 97.7 percent utilization), and the Proposed Actions would result in an increase in the utilization rate of approximately 2.9 percentage points over the No-Action condition.

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a significant adverse impact to early childhood programs could result if a proposed action results in: (1) a collective utilization rate greater than 100 percent in the With-Action condition; and (2) the demand constitutes an increase of five percent or more in the collective utilization rate of early childhood programs in the study area between the No-Action and With-Action conditions. The Proposed Actions would result in an approximate 97.7 percent utilization rate (a 2.9-percent increase over the No-Action condition). Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact to early childhood programs, per *CEQR Technical Manual* guidance.

#### *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, and areas adjacent to large institutions and transit stations. The proposed zoning changes would allow for growth in appropriate locations near existing institutions and public transportation networks, 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 Project Area. The Project 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 Project 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**

Based on the *CEQR Technical Manual* methodology, the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse direct and indirect impacts on 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 Grace Episcopal Church Cemetery, Discovery Community Garden, Merrick Boulevard Greenstreet Northern and Southern Segments, as well as Archie Spigner Park, as discussed in the “Shadows” section below.

**INDIRECT EFFECTS**

According to the 2021 *CEQR Technical Manual*, parts of the Project 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, while the non-residential study area exceeds the CEQR guidance for open space adequacy, the residential study area falls short of the City’s planning goals. As the Proposed Actions are expected to introduce approximately 38,848 residents and 7,028 workers under the RWCDs, compared to the No-Action condition, a detailed open space analysis for both a non-residential (0.25-mile) study area and residential (0.5-mile) study area was conducted, pursuant to the 2021 *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.

*Non-Residential (Quarter-Mile) 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 (14.42 percent), it would remain well above the City’s planning goal ratio of 0.15 acres per 1,000 non-residents, at 0.57 acres per 1,000 non-residents. Therefore, non-residents in the 0.25-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 (Half-Mile) Study Area*

Within the residential study area, the total, active and passive open space ratios in the future with the Proposed Actions 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. The residential study area total open space ratio would decline by 12.07 percent to 0.62 acres per 1,000 residents; the residential study area active open space ratio would decline by 12.07 percent to 0.29 acres per 1,000 residents; and the residential study area passive open space ratio would decline by 12.07 percent to 0.33 acres per 1,000 residents. As these decreases would exceed the 2021 *CEQR Technical Manual* thresholds indicating the potential for an impact, and the Project 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.

**SHADOWS**

A detailed shadows analysis concluded that development resulting from the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse shadow impacts on nine sunlight-sensitive resources. The 103 projected and 114 potential development sites identified in the reasonable worst case development scenario (RWCDs) would result in incremental shadow coverage on 20 open space resources and six historic resources. The detailed shadows analysis identified significant adverse shadow impacts at six open space resources (Archer Avenue Greenstreet, Grace Episcopal Church Cemetery, Discovery Community Garden, both the northern and southern segments of the Merrick Boulevard Greenstreet, and Archie Spigner Park) and three historic resources (First Presbyterian Church, Saint Joseph Catholic Church, and Grace Episcopal Church). The analysis determined that Archie Spigner Park and Discovery Community Garden would experience significant incremental shadow coverage, duration, and/or periods of complete sunlight loss that would have the potential to affect open space utilization or enjoyment. The analysis determined that in addition to these two open space resources, Archer Avenue Greenstreet, Grace Episcopal Church Cemetery, and both segments of the Merrick Boulevard Greenstreet 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, and these resources would therefore be significantly impacted.

Additionally, the analysis determined that incremental shadow coverage would result in a reduction in direct sunlight exposure for sunlight-sensitive features at First Presbyterian Church, Saint Joseph Catholic Church, and Grace Episcopal Church, which could affect the public’s enjoyment or appreciation of those features.

**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 effects to architectural resources, and construction-period effects.

### *ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES*

The Proposed Actions could result in significant adverse impacts related to archaeological resources. The Phase IA Archaeological Assessment conducted for the Proposed Actions concludes that eight lots in the Project Area are potentially sensitive for archaeological resources, and recommends that, should the sites be developed, archaeological testing be conducted prior to construction.

Projected Development Site 64 would be redeveloped under both No-Action and With-Action conditions, and as such, potential archaeological resources on the site would be disturbed irrespective of the Proposed Actions. However, the remaining seven lots identified in the Phase IA study as being potentially archaeologically sensitive would only be redeveloped in the future with the Proposed Actions (Block 9754, Lots 1, 7, and 34; Block 10095, Lot 32; Block 10109, Lots 31 and 44; and Block 10115, Lot 53). As such, the Proposed Actions would result in new in-ground disturbances on these seven lots. As all seven lots are currently privately owned, there are no mechanisms in place to require developers to conduct archaeological testing or require the preservation or documentation of archaeological resources, should they exist, in the future with the Proposed Actions. Therefore, significant adverse impact to archaeological resources may occur.

### *ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES*

The Proposed actions could result in significant adverse architectural impacts as a result of demolition, shadows and adjacent construction.

#### *Direct (Physical) Impacts*

Historic resources can be directly affected by physical destruction, demolition, damage, alteration, or neglect of all or part of a historic resource. For example, alterations, such as the addition of a new wing to a historic building or replacement of the resource's entrance, could result in significant adverse impacts, depending on the design. Direct effects also include changes to an architectural resource that cause it to become a different visual entity, such as a new location, design, materials, or architectural features.

Projected Development Site 4 contains the S/NR-eligible Trainmen's Building at 144-15 Archer Avenue (Resource #19). This site is expected to be redeveloped in both the future without and with the Proposed Actions. Therefore, as the demolition of the Trainmen's Building, a S/NR-eligible historic architectural resource, would occur irrespective of the Proposed Actions, it does not constitute a significant adverse historic resources impact pursuant to CEQR.

In the future with the Proposed Actions, it is expected that the Grace Episcopal Church Memorial Hall (Resource #6) on Projected Development Site 63, which is included as part of the S/NR-listed Grace Church complex (with Resource #5) and is privately owned, would be demolished in order to make way for a larger residential building and house of worship, as well as medical office and community center space, per the reasonable worst case development scenario for the Proposed Actions. This demolition would therefore result in a significant adverse historic resources impact.

#### *Indirect (Contextual) Impacts*

Contextual impacts may occur to architectural resources under certain conditions. According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, possible impacts to architectural resources may include isolation of the property from, or alteration of, its setting or visual relationships with the streetscape. This includes changes to the resource's visual prominence so that it no longer conforms to the streetscape in terms of height, footprint, or setback; is no longer part of an open setting; or can no longer be seen as part of a significant view corridor. Significant indirect impacts can occur if a project would cause a change in the quality of a property that qualifies it for listing on the S/NR or for designation as a NYCL.

Although the Proposed Actions could facilitate development that would alter the context and setting of surrounding historic architectural resources, these expected changes would not result in significant adverse indirect impacts to any of these resources. Many of the projected and potential development sites would be redeveloped with buildings that would be visible adjacent to or in the background when looking at historic architectural resources in the Project Area and study area; however, this would not cause adverse impacts



to any of these resources. Much of the areas in the vicinity of these historic architectural resources are densely developed neighborhoods with multiple existing and expected mid- and high-rise buildings that form the backdrop of these historic architectural resources. New development facilitated by the Proposed Actions would not negatively change the visual settings of these historic architectural resources so as to affect those characteristics that make them eligible for listing on the S/NR and/or designation as NYCLs.

In the future with the Proposed Actions, no incompatible visual, audible, or atmospheric elements would be introduced to any historic architectural resource's setting. The Proposed Actions would not alter the relationship of any identified historic architectural resources to the streetscape, as all streets in the Project Area and study area in proximity to historic architectural resources would remain open and all historic architectural resources' relationships to the streets would remain unchanged in the future with the Proposed Actions. Development facilitated by the Proposed Actions would not eliminate or screen significant public views of any historic architectural resources, which would remain visible in view corridors on adjacent public streets and sidewalks. The main facades and significant ornamental features of all identified historic architectural resources would continue to be unobstructed and visible from adjacent public streets and sidewalks in the future with the Proposed Actions.

Overall, the Proposed Actions would not result in development that would diminish the qualities that make the identified historic architectural resources eligible for listing on the S/NR and/or designation as NYCLs. As such, the Proposed Actions would not have the potential to result in any significant adverse indirect or contextual impacts on historic architectural resources in the Project Area or surrounding 400-foot study area.

#### *Construction Impacts*

Any designated NYCLs or S/NR-listed historic resources located within 90 linear feet of a projected or potential new construction site are subject to the protections of the New York City Department of Building's (DOB's) *Technical Policy and Procedure Notice (TPPN) #10/88*. Therefore, development resulting from the Proposed Actions would not cause any significant adverse construction-related impacts to NYCL-designated or S/NR-listed historic resources.

However, there are four projected and five potential development sites in the Project Area where development resulting from the Proposed Actions could possibly result in construction-related impacts to non-designated historic resources located in close proximity (i.e., within 90 feet), as discussed in the "Construction" section below.

### **URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES**

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts related to urban design or visual resources. The Proposed Actions would facilitate development that is not currently permitted as-of-right in the Project 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, within the Project Area would change considerably. However, this change would not constitute a significant adverse urban design impact because it would not negatively affect a pedestrian's experience of the area. Rather, development facilitated by the Proposed Actions is expected to positively affect the urban design of the area, improving the pedestrian experience in and surrounding the Project Area by enhancing public realm conditions, encouraging walkability, and activating streetscapes in the Project Area. Among other things, the Proposed Actions would allow for a wider range of uses, mandate streetscape improvements and ground floor design standards to enhance the pedestrian experience, and implement bulk controls to promote better urban design outcomes that respond to local context.

The Proposed Actions would strengthen the existing zoning of the Project Area to reinforce the neighborhood's range of uses including residential, commercial, retail, light-industrial, arts-related programs, community facilities, and new open space. The Proposed Actions would generate a significant number of income-restricted housing units in an area with a strong demand for such housing options. The Proposed Actions would reinforce the area as a regional business district by strengthening the existing economic ecosystem while also promoting the development of new job-generating uses through increased industrial and commercial density. The Proposed Actions would also strengthen the quality of the streetscape in the Project Area by improving pedestrian safety with better street design along key corridors, enhancing the pedestrian experience along the sidewalk through streetscape and transparency requirements,



replacing underutilized properties with active uses, and finding opportunities for publicly accessible open space for existing and future residents. The new land uses generated by the Proposed Actions would support the existing residential populations of the Project Area as well as adjacent neighborhoods in the secondary study area.

As detailed above, the Proposed Actions would permit taller buildings throughout much of the Project Area. In the vicinity of the Jamaica Downtown Core and Jamaica LIRR Station, many projected and potential development sites would be redeveloped with buildings rising up to 215 feet tall. Several others are expected to be redeveloped with buildings that would rise higher, including Projected Development Site 3 (No-Action 95 feet and With-Action 232 feet), Projected Development Sites 8, 18, 29, and Potential Development Site AJ (No-Action zero feet to 34 feet and With-Action 235 feet), and Projected Development Site 5 (No-Action 13.5 feet and With-Action 255 feet). However, these taller building heights would not result in significant adverse urban design impacts in the area. As detailed above, the Project Area and immediately surrounding area have recently experienced a trend of taller construction, including the 24-story (247-foot-tall) to 29-story (325-foot-tall) towers along Archer Avenue and 94<sup>th</sup> Avenue in close proximity to the projected and potential development sites listed above. The tall buildings facilitated by the Proposed Actions would be in keeping with these established trends, and would not result in any significant adverse impacts to the pedestrian experience in the Project Area or secondary study area.

In the future with the Proposed Actions, the reasonable worst case development scenario (RWCDs) assumes that the State/National Registers of Historic Places (S/NR)-listed Grace Episcopal Church Memorial Hall on Projected Development Site 63 would be demolished in order to make way for a larger residential building and house of worship, as well as medical office and community center space. This would result in a significant adverse historic resources impact. Grace Episcopal Church Memorial Hall is a notable visual resource in the Project Area, but it is not a defining feature of the neighborhood. Therefore, the demolition of this important but not neighborhood-defining visual resource in the Project Area as a result of the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse visual resources impact.

Development facilitated by the Proposed Actions would not eliminate any primary or significant viewsheds of important visual resources in and around the Project Area. No other significant facades or important features of historic resources, open spaces, or other notable visual resources in and around the Project Area would be obstructed by development facilitated by the Proposed Actions. Although the Proposed Actions could facilitate development that would alter the context and setting of surrounding historic architectural resources, these expected changes would not result in significant adverse impacts to any of these resources.

Although 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 Project Area would be visible from certain sections of the secondary study area. However, the Proposed Actions would orient density in a manner that directs the highest density in the Downtown Jamaica Core in close proximity to major transit options such as the Jamaica Long Island Rail-road station and E, J, and Z subway stops as well as along the major corridors of the Project Area, which are all wide streets. The Proposed Actions would allow a wider range of uses and flexibility for evolving businesses and land use types along with promoting space for civic, arts, and cultural organizations, thus supporting the mixed-use character of the Project Area and its surroundings. The anticipated new development would contain a mix of active ground-floor spaces, promoting pedestrian activity and movement which would be visible when looking towards the Project Area from many secondary study area streets in proximity.

As such, while the Proposed Actions would result in a notable change in the urban design of the Project Area and would alter some views of the neighborhood from the secondary study area, these changes would not be 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 103 projected and 114 potential development sites. The hazardous materials assessment found that a total of 207 of the projected and potential development sites have some associated concern regarding environmental conditions.

Throughout its developed history, the Project Area has been composed of a mix of residential, commercial, and industrial properties. By the late 1800s and early 1900s, Jamaica was developed with significant transportation infrastructure including the subway, electric trolley lines, the existing Long Island Rail Road (LIRR) lines and Jamaica Station. Following development of Jamaica as a major transportation center, development of the Project Area for commercial and industrial operations was prevalent by the 1920s. This development was concentrated along primary thoroughfares, such as Hillside Avenue, Jamaica Avenue, Archer Avenue and Liberty Avenue. These operations included light manufacturing, dry cleaners, automotive repair, waste disposal and recycling, and gasoline fill stations. Along the periphery of the commercial and manufacturing areas residential properties filled in the remainder of the Project Area.

In the future with the Proposed Actions, 98 projected development sites and 109 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-842) would avoid the potential for significant adverse hazardous materials impacts due to the Proposed Actions. The OER would provide regulatory oversight of the environmental scope, including investigations and remediation during the development process and prior to occupancy.

In summary, 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, to the maximum extent possible, that investigation, mitigation, and remediation of any hazardous materials would be completed in a safe and comprehensive manner.

## **WATER AND SEWER INFRASTRUCTURE**

### ***WATER SUPPLY***

A preliminary assessment was conducted based on the methodology set forth in the 2021 *CEQR Technical Manual*, and as discussed below, determined that the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact related to local water supply or wastewater and stormwater conveyance and treatment infrastructure.

### ***WASTEWATER TREATMENT***

In the future with the Proposed Actions, wastewater from the projected development sites would continue to be treated by the Jamaica Wastewater Resource Recovery Facility (WRRF), which has a design flow capacity of 100 mgd. Under the RWCDs, development on the 103 projected development sites is expected to generate a total of approximately 5.7 mgd of sanitary sewage, an increase of approximately 4.4 mgd over the No-Action condition. With an existing average dry weather flow of 84 mgd to the Jamaica WRRF and the addition of approximately 5.1 mgd on the 103 projected development sites in the 2040 With-Action condition (compared to the No-Action condition), the Jamaica WRRF facility would continue to have sufficient capacity. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts to wastewater treatment would occur as a result of the Proposed Actions.

### ***STORMWATER AND DRAINAGE MANAGEMENT***

The 103 projected development sites identified in the RWCDs are located within 3 sub-catchment areas of the Jamaica WRRF plant: the 150<sup>th</sup> Street Sub-catchment Area, the 167<sup>th</sup> Street Sub-catchment Area, and the Brinkerhoff Avenue Sub-catchment Area. All projected development sites are located within areas served by a separate sewer system, which means that sanitary sewage is sent to WRRFs and stormwater is sent untreated through separate sewers and outfalls to the nearest waterway.

Depending on rainfall volume and duration, the total volumes to the 150<sup>th</sup> Street, 167<sup>th</sup> Street, and Brinkerhoff Avenue sewer systems would range from 0.81 to 4.15 million gallons, 0.06 to 0.32 million gallons, and 0.03 to 0.18 million gallons, respectively. Compared to existing volumes to the separate sewer system from the 103 projected development sites, sub-catchment area 150<sup>th</sup> Street flows would increase by 0.75 to 3.84 million gallons, sub-catchment area 167<sup>th</sup> Street flows would increase by 0.06 to 0.31 million gallons, and sub-catchment area Brinkerhoff Avenue flows would increase by 0.03 to 0.17 million gallons during storm events with up to 2.5 inches of rainfall. Runoff volumes for direct drainage into Thurston Basin, within Jamaica Bay from the 150<sup>th</sup> Street, 167<sup>th</sup> Street, and Brinkerhoff Avenue sub-catchment areas,

would range from 0.00 to 3.87 million gallons, 0.00 to 0.59 million gallons, and 0.00 to 0.39 million gallons, respectively. Compared to existing volumes, runoff from the 150<sup>th</sup> Street sub-catchment area would increase by 0.00 to 0.10 million gallons, 167<sup>th</sup> Street sub-catchment area runoff would increase by 0.00 to 0.07 million gallons, and runoff from the Brinkerhoff sub-catchment area would increase by 0.00 to 0.01 million gallons.

Best management practices (BMPs) would be implemented in conjunction with development facilitated by the Proposed Actions, consistent with the City's site connection requirements, and the Unified Stormwater Rule. Based on this information, the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact related to wastewater or stormwater conveyance and treatment infrastructure.

## **SOLID WASTE AND SANITATION SERVICES**

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 365 tons per week of solid waste. Approximately 72.5 percent of the additional solid waste generated by the Proposed Actions (265 tons) would be handled by the New York City Department of Sanitation (DSNY), and approximately 27.5 percent (100 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 21.2 DSNY truck loads per week and up to 8.4 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 represent approximately 0.2 percent of the City's anticipated future weekly waste generation handled by DSNY by 2026, and approximately 0.1 percent of the City's anticipated future weekly commercial waste generation handled by private carters by 2025, as projected in the 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 not directly affect a solid waste management facility. 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 future with the Proposed Actions (the With-Action condition), would result in increased demand of approximately 3,185 billion British Thermal Units (BTUs) of energy per year as compared with future conditions without the Proposed Actions (the No-Action condition). This incremental increase in annual energy demand would represent approximately 1.5 percent of the City's forecasted annual energy requirement of 207 trillion BTU for 2040. 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 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 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**

A detailed transportation analysis was conducted and concludes that the Proposed Actions would result, as detailed below, in significant adverse impacts to: a) vehicular traffic at 67 intersections, b) four escalators at one station, c) bus line haul conditions on five bus routes, and d) pedestrians at 26 sidewalks, 8 corner areas, and 21 crosswalks.

Traffic conditions were evaluated for the weekday 7:30–8:30 a.m., 1:30–2:30 p.m. (midday), 4:45–5:45 p.m., and Saturday 1:45–2:45 p.m. peak hours at 75 intersections in the traffic study area where additional traffic resulting from the Proposed Actions would be most heavily concentrated. As summarized in **Tables 2 and 3**, the traffic impact analysis indicates the potential for significant adverse impacts at 67 intersections (56 signalized and 11 unsignalized) during one or more analyzed peak hours. Significant adverse impacts were identified to 162 lane groups at 64 intersections during the weekday AM peak hour, 116 lane groups at 57 intersections in the midday peak hour, 170 lane groups at 65 intersections in the PM peak hour, and 113 lane groups at 55 intersections during the Saturday peak hour. The “Mitigation” section discusses potential measures to mitigate these significant adverse traffic impacts.

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

	Peak Hour			
	Weekday AM	Weekday Midday	Weekday PM	Saturday Midday
Impacted Lane Groups	162	116	170	113
Impacted Intersections	64	57	65	55

**Jamaica Neighborhood Plan**

CEQR No. 24DCP132Q

Page 58

**Table 3: Summary of Significantly Impacted Intersections**

Intersections	With-Action Impacted Locations			
	AM	MD	PM	SAT
<b>Signalized Intersections</b>				
1. Hillside Ave & Van Wyck Serv. Rd SB	X	X	X	X
2. Hillside Ave & Van Wyck Serv. Rd NB	X	X	X	X
3. Hillside Ave & Queens Blvd	X	X	X	X
4. Hillside Ave & 139th St	X		X	X
5. Hillside Ave & 143rd St	X		X	
6. Hillside Ave & 144th St	X	X	X	X
7. Hillside Ave & 146th St	X		X	
8. Hillside Ave & Sutphin Blvd	X	X	X	X
9. Hillside Ave & 148th St	X	X	X	X
10. Hillside Ave & 150th St	X	X	X	X
11. Hillside Ave & 153rd St	X	X	X	X
12. Hillside Ave & Parson Blvd	X	X	X	X
13. Hillside Ave & 162nd St	X	X	X	X
14. Hillside Ave & 163rd St	X	X	X	X
15. Hillside Ave & 164th St	X		X	
16. Hillside Ave & 166th St/Merrick Blvd	X	X	X	X
17. Hillside Ave & 167th St	X	X	X	X
18. Hillside Ave & 168th St	X	X	X	X
19. Hillside Ave & 169th St/Homelawn St	X	X	X	X
20. 89th Ave & Sutphin Blvd	X	X	X	X
21. 89th Ave & 150th St	X	X	X	X
22. 89th Ave & 153rd St	X	X	X	X
23. Jamaica Ave & Van Wyck Serv. Rd SB	X	X	X	X
24. Jamaica Ave & Van Wyck Serv. Rd NB	X		X	X
26. Jamaica Ave & Queens Blvd	X	X	X	X
27. Jamaica Ave & 139th St			X	
28. Jamaica Ave & 143rd St	X	X	X	X
29. Jamaica Ave & 144th St			X	
30. Jamaica Ave & 150th St	X	X	X	X
31. Jamaica Ave & 164th St	X	X	X	X
32. Jamaica Ave & 168th St	X	X	X	X
36. Archer Ave & 150th St	X	X	X	X

**Note:**

X - denotes intersection significantly impacted in peak hour.



**Jamaica Neighborhood Plan**

CEQR No. 24DCP132Q

Page 59

**Table 3: (continued)**

Intersections	With-Action Impacted Locations			
	AM	MD	PM	SAT
<b>Signalized Intersections</b>				
37. Archer Ave & 153rd St	X	X	X	X
38. Archer Ave & Merrick Blvd		X		
39. Archer/93rd Ave & 168th St	X			
42. Atlantic Ave & Van Wyck Serv. Rd SB				
43. Atlantic Ave & Van Wyck Serv. Rd NB	X	X	X	X
44. 94th Ave & 143rd St	X	X	X	X
45. 94th Ave & Sutphin Blvd	X	X	X	X
47. 94th Ave & 150th St	X	X	X	X
51. 95th Ave & Sutphin Blvd	X	X	X	X
57. Liberty Ave & Van Wyck Serv. Rd SB	X	X	X	X
58. Liberty Ave & Van Wyck Serv. Rd NB	X	X	X	X
59. Liberty Ave & Remington St	X		X	
60. Liberty Ave & Inwood St	X	X	X	X
61. Liberty Ave & Waltham St	X	X	X	X
62. Liberty Ave & Sutphin Blvd	X	X	X	X
63. Liberty Ave & 148th St	X	X	X	X
64. Liberty Ave & 150th St	X	X	X	X
67. Liberty Ave & 160th St	X	X	X	X
68. Liberty Ave & Guy R Brewer Blvd	X	X	X	X
69. Liberty Ave & 165th St	X	X	X	X
70. Liberty Ave & Merrick Blvd	X	X	X	
71. Liberty Ave & 168th St	X	X	X	X
72. Liberty Ave & 170th St	X	X	X	X
73. Tuskegee Aimen Way & 148th/150th St	X	X	X	X
74. Tuskegee Aimen Way & Guy R Brewer Blvd	X	X	X	
<b>Unsignalized Intersections</b>				
25. Jamaica Ave & 138th St	X	X	X	X
33. 91st Ave & 146th Pl	X	X	X	X
34. Archer Ave & 146th Pl	X	X	X	X
35. Archer Ave & 148th St				
40. 93rd Ave & 182nd St				
41. Douglas Ave & 168th St	X	X	X	
46. 94th Ave & 148th St	X	X	X	X
48. 94th Ave/157th St & Beaver Rd	X	X	X	X
49. 95th Ave & 138th Pl				
50. 95th Ave & Brisbin St				
52. 95th Ave & 148th St				
53. 95th Ave & 149th St	X	X	X	X
54. 95th Ave & 150th St	X	X	X	X
55. 97th Ave & 148th St				
56. 97th Ave & 149th St				
65. Liberty Ave & Tuckerton St	X	X	X	X
66. Liberty Ave & 157th St	X	X	X	X
75. Shore Ave & Sutphin Blvd	X		X	
<b>Total Impacted Intersections</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>55</b>

**Note:**

X - denotes intersection significantly impacted in peak hour.

SubwaySubway Stations

The Proposed Actions would generate a net increment of approximately 4,723 and 4,714 new subway trips during the weekday AM and PM commuter peak hours, respectively. The analysis of subway station conditions focuses on four Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) New York City Transit (NYCT) subway stations in proximity to the Project 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 following stations, two of which are served by F trains operating on the Queens Boulevard Line, and two of which are served by the E, J, and Z trains operating on the Archer Avenue Line:

- Parsons Boulevard (F)
- Sutphin Boulevard (F)
- Sutphin Boulevard-Archer Avenue-JFK Airport (E/J/Z)
- Jamaica Center-Parsons/Archer (E/J/Z)

As summarized in **Table 4**, in the With-Action condition, a total of four escalators at the Sutphin Boulevard-Archer Avenue-JFK Airport (E/J/Z) station would be significantly adversely impacted by project-generated demand in at least one peak hour.

**Table 4: Summary of Significant Subway Station Impacts**

Subway Station	Station Element	Impacted Time Period
Sutphin Boulevard-Archer Avenue-JFK Airport (E/J/Z)	Escalator ESC 432X	AM/PM
	Escalator ESC 433X	AM/PM
	Escalator E434	PM
	Escalator E435	AM

Subway Line Haul

The Project Area is served by four NYCT subway routes within a quarter mile – E, F, J, and Z. The peak direction of travel is typically Manhattan-bound (southbound) in the AM peak hour and Queens-bound (northbound) in the PM peak hour.

In the With Action condition, no subway route operating at or over capacity would experience an average incremental increase of five or more passengers/car (the *CEQR Technical Manual* impact threshold) in the peak direction through their maximum load points in either of the weekday AM and PM peak hours. Therefore, the Proposed Actions are not expected to result in significant adverse subway line haul impacts.

Bus

The Project Area is served by a total of 40 local bus routes, 25 operated by NYCT and 15 operated by MTA Bus Company. It is estimated that the Proposed Actions would generate a net total of approximately 2,867 and 2,777 incremental bus trips on these routes during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, respectively. Additional bus trips were considered for sites not within walking distance to subway or rail stations. Incremental demand is expected to meet or exceed the 50-trip (per direction) *CEQR Technical Manual* analysis threshold in the AM and/or PM peak hour at the maximum load points along eight routes—the Q4, Q5, Q25, Q44 SBS, Q60, Q65, Q85, and Q111. Based on projected levels of bus service in the No-Action condition, the Proposed Actions would result in a capacity shortfall on the westbound Q5 (local), northbound Q65 (local), and northbound Q65 (LTD) buses in the AM peak hour as well as on the eastbound Q4 (local), westbound Q5 (local), and southbound Q44 SBS buses in the PM peak hour. Therefore, these five bus lines would be significantly adversely impacted based on *CEQR Technical Manual* criteria.

**Table 5: Summary of Significant Bus Line Haul Impacts**

Route	Direction	Impacted Time Period
-------	-----------	----------------------

Q4 (Local)	EB	PM
Q5 (Local)	WB	AM/PM
Q44 SBS	SB	PM
Q65 (Local)	NB	AM
Q65 (LTD)	NB	AM

### *PEDESTRIANS*

The Proposed Actions would generate a net increment of approximately 9,741 walk-only trips in the weekday AM peak hour, 13,103 in the weekday midday, 15,626 in the weekday PM, and 16,478 in the Saturday peak hours. Persons en route to and from subway station entrances and bus stops would add 7,941, 5,450, 7,819, and 8,184 additional pedestrian trips to Project Area sidewalks and crosswalks during these same periods, respectively. Peak hour pedestrian conditions were evaluated at a total of 225 pedestrian elements where new trips generated by projected developments are expected to be the most concentrated. These elements—77 sidewalks, 52 crosswalks, and 96 corners—are primarily located in the vicinity of major projected development sites and corridors connecting these sites to area subway station entrances and bus routes. As shown in **Table 6**, based on *CEQR Technical Manual* criteria, 26 sidewalks, 21 crosswalks, and eight corner areas would be significantly adversely impacted by the Proposed Actions in one or more of the analyzed peak hours. The “Mitigation” section discusses potential measures to mitigate these significant adverse pedestrian impacts.

**Table 6: Summary of Significant Pedestrian Impact**

Corridor/Intersection	Impacted Elements	Peak Hour			
		AM	MD	PM	SAT
144th St & Hillside Ave	NE Corner		X		
Parsons Blvd & Hillside Ave	NE Corner		X		
Parsons Blvd & Hillside Ave	NW Corner		X		
Sutphin Blvd & 94th Ave	SW Corner	X		X	X
Sutphin Blvd & 97th Ave	SW Corner			X	
160th St & Liberty Ave	NW Corner	X		X	X
150th St & Tuskegee Airmen Way	NE Corner		X	X	X
160th St & Tuskegee Airmen Way	NW Corner		X		
Hillside Ave & 144th St	East Crosswalk		X		
Hillside Ave & Sutphin Blvd	East Crosswalk		X	X	X
Hillside Ave & 150th St	East Crosswalk	X	X	X	X
Hillside Ave & Parsons Blvd	East Crosswalk	X	X		
88th Ave & Parsons Blvd	East Crosswalk	X	X	X	
91st Ave & Sutphin Blvd	West Crosswalk			X	
Archer Ave & Sutphin Blvd	North Crosswalk		X	X	X
Archer Ave & Sutphin Blvd	East Crosswalk	X	X	X	X
Archer Ave & Sutphin Blvd	West Crosswalk	X	X	X	X
Archer Ave & 150th St	West Crosswalk	X	X	X	X
94th Ave & Sutphin Blvd	South Crosswalk	X		X	X
94th Ave & Sutphin Blvd	West Crosswalk	X	X	X	X
94th Ave & 150th St	West Crosswalk	X	X	X	X
95th Ave & Sutphin Blvd	West Crosswalk	X		X	X
Liberty Ave & 150th St	North Crosswalk		X		X
Liberty Ave & 150th St	East Crosswalk	X	X	X	X
Liberty Ave & 150th St	South Crosswalk		X		X
Liberty Ave & 158th St	North Crosswalk				X
Liberty Ave & 160th St	North Crosswalk				X
Liberty Ave & 160th St	West Crosswalk				X
Tuskegee Airmen Way & 150th St	East Crosswalk		X	X	X
144th Street between Hillside Avenue and 88th Avenue	East Sidewalk		X		
Hillside Avenue between 150th Street and Parsons Blvd	North Sidewalk	X	X	X	X
Parsons Blvd between Hillside Avenue and 88th Avenue	East Sidewalk	X	X	X	
Parsons Blvd between Hillside Avenue and 87th Rd	West Sidewalk	X	X		
Parsons Blvd between 88th Ave and 89th Ave	East Sidewalk	X	X		

**Table 6: Summary of Significant Pedestrian Impact (continued)**

Corridor/Intersection	Impacted Elements	Peak Hour			
		AM	MD	PM	SAT
Sutphin Blvd between 91st Ave and Archer Ave	West Sidewalk	X	X	X	X
Sutphin Blvd between Archer Ave and 94th Ave	East Sidewalk	X	X	X	X
Archer Ave between Sutphin Blvd and 150th St	South Sidewalk	X	X	X	X
Sutphin Blvd between Archer Ave and 94th Ave	West Sidewalk	X	X	X	X
150th St between Archer Ave and 94th Ave	East Sidewalk	X	X	X	X
150th St between Archer Ave and 94th Ave	West Sidewalk				X
158th Street between Archer Ave and Liberty Ave	East Sidewalk	X	X	X	X
160th St between Archer Ave and Liberty Ave	West Sidewalk	X	X	X	X
Sutphin Blvd between 94th Ave and 95th Ave	West Sidewalk	X		X	
150th St between 94th Ave and Beaver Rd	East Sidewalk		X	X	X
94th Ave between 150th St and Beaver Rd	South Sidewalk			X	
94th Ave between 148th St and 150th St	South Sidewalk	X	X	X	X
150th St between 95th Ave and 97th Ave	West Sidewalk	X	X	X	X
Sutphin Blvd between 97th Ave and 101st Ave	West Sidewalk	X	X	X	X
Liberty Ave between 148th St and 150th St	South Sidewalk		X	X	X
150th St between 97th Ave and Liberty Ave	West Sidewalk	X	X	X	X
Liberty Ave between Tuckerton St and 157th St	North Sidewalk	X	X	X	X
Liberty Ave between Tuckerton St and 160th St	South Sidewalk	X	X	X	X
Liberty Ave between 158th St and 160th St	North Sidewalk		X	X	X
Liberty Ave between 157th St and 158th St	North Sidewalk	X	X	X	X
160th St between Liberty Ave and Tuskegee Airmen Way	West Sidewalk		X	X	X

#### VEHICULAR AND PEDESTRIAN SAFETY

Under the *Vision Zero Queens Pedestrian Safety Action Plan*, much of the northeast zone of the Project Area is located within a “Priority Area,” where safety issues were found to occur systematically at an area-wide level. Hillside Avenue, 89<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Jamaica Avenue, Archer Avenue, Liberty Avenue, Sutphin Boulevard, 160<sup>th</sup> Street, Guy R Brewer Boulevard, Merrick Boulevard, and Queens Boulevard are identified as Priority Corridors. The intersections of Sutphin Boulevard at Archer Avenue, Sutphin Boulevard at Liberty Avenue, 160<sup>th</sup> Street at Liberty Avenue, Guy R Brewer Boulevard at Tuskegee Airmen Way, 163<sup>rd</sup> Street at 89<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 164<sup>th</sup> Street at Jamaica Avenue, Merrick Boulevard at Archer Avenue, 168<sup>th</sup> Street at 89<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 168<sup>th</sup> Street at Archer Avenue, Homelawn Street at Highland Avenue, 170<sup>th</sup> Street at Jamaica Avenue, and 173<sup>rd</sup> Street at Jamaica Avenue were identified as Priority Intersections.

Crash data for intersections in the traffic and pedestrian study areas were obtained from the New York City Department of Transportation (DOT) for the three-year period between January 1, 2017, and December 31, 2019. During this period, a total of 5,053 reportable and non-reportable crashes, 794 pedestrian/bicyclist-related injury crashes, and 20 fatalities occurred at intersections within quarter-mile of the Project Area.

Under *CEQR Technical Manual* guidance, high crash locations are defined as those along a Vision Zero priority intersection or locations where five or more pedestrian/bicyclist injury crashes have occurred in any consecutive 12 months of the most recent three-year period for which data are available. In addition, any location along a Vision Zero priority corridor with three or more pedestrian/bicyclist injury crashes in any consecutive 12 months of the most recent three-year period for which data is available should be identified as a high crash location. A review of the crash data identified 44 intersections within a quarter-mile of the Project Area as high crash locations. Of the 44 intersections, 20 intersections were selected for a qualitative assessment for street user safety, which are shown in **Table 7**.



**Table 7: High Crash Locations**

Intersection	Total Pedestrian/Bicycle Injury Crashes			Total Crashes (Reportable +Non-Reportable)		
	2017	2018	2019	2017	2018	2019
Sutphin Boulevard & Archer Avenue	7	4	3	14	17	16
Sutphin Boulevard & 94 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	2	1	3	4	7	20
Sutphin Boulevard & 95 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	2	2	3	4	4	5
Sutphin Boulevard & Liberty Avenue	0	4	1	13	19	13
Hillside Avenue & Queens Boulevard	2	0	3	12	11	15
Hillside Avenue & 148 <sup>th</sup> Street	4	1	0	8	6	4
Hillside Avenue & 150 <sup>th</sup> Street	2	4	0	3	14	4
Hillside Avenue & Parsons Boulevard	3	3	4	16	17	15
Hillside Avenue & Merrick Boulevard/166 <sup>th</sup> Street	3	1	0	6	7	7
Hillside Avenue & Homelawn Street/169 <sup>th</sup> Street	9	3	3	14	22	13
89 <sup>th</sup> Avenue & 153 <sup>rd</sup> Street	1	5	0	2	9	0
Jamaica Avenue & Van Wyck Expressway	3	7	3	12	24	19
Jamaica Avenue & 164 <sup>th</sup> Street	0	2	2	3	6	4
Archer Avenue & 160 <sup>th</sup> Street	1	8	4	8	12	7
Archer Avenue & Merrick Boulevard	0	2	3	4	9	13
Archer Avenue & 93 <sup>rd</sup> Avenue/168 <sup>th</sup> Street	0	5	4	1	8	14
Liberty Avenue & Waltham Street	0	1	3	2	4	7
Liberty Avenue & 160 <sup>th</sup> Street	2	2	2	5	12	12
Liberty Avenue & Guy R Brewer Boulevard	2	5	3	11	18	19
Liberty Avenue & 170 <sup>th</sup> Street	2	3	0	6	12	5

## PARKING

The parking analysis documents the effects to parking within the study area as a result of the projected development sites. The Proposed Actions would include 1,265 parking spaces at projected development sites in the With Action condition compared to 1,337 parking spaces in the No-Action condition (an incremental decrease of 72 parking spaces). Parking demand generated by the various commercial, retail, light industrial, and community facility uses that would be developed under the Proposed Actions would peak during the midday hour, whereas residential parking demand would peak during the overnight period. Overall, development associated with the Proposed Actions would generate a peak parking demand of approximately 6,805 spaces in the weekday evening period and 8,777 spaces in the overnight period. The total parking demand under the Proposed Actions' RWCDs would not be accommodated by provided on-site parking and excess demand would seek parking availability within a quarter-mile radius of the Project Area. These projected demand as well as any demand displaced from existing parking facilities on projected development sites would have seek available on-street and off-street parking within a quarter mile of the Project Area. Further, some drivers destined for the Project Area would potentially have to travel a greater distance (e.g., between 0.25 and 0.50-mile) to find available parking. As the Project Area is primarily located within Zone 2, any potential deficit in parking would not be considered a significant adverse impact based on 2021 *CEQR Technical Manual* criteria due to the magnitude of available alternative modes of transportation. Therefore, the Proposed Actions are not expected to result in significant adverse parking impacts.

## AIR QUALITY

The analyses conclude that the Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse air quality impacts on sensitive uses in the surrounding community, and the Proposed Actions would not be adversely affected by existing stationary sources of air emissions in the rezoning area. However, there is potential for significant adverse impact related to mobile source air quality. A summary of the general findings is presented below.

The mobile source analyses determined that concentrations of CO and PM<sub>2.5</sub> due to project-generated traffic

at intersections would not result in any violations of National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), and furthermore, CO concentrations were predicted to be below CEQR *de minimis* criteria. The results show that the daily (24-hour) PM<sub>2.5</sub> increments are predicted to be below the *de minimis* criterion at five of the six intersections analyzed. However, at one of the intersection sites analyzed, the maximum 24-hr incremental PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration is predicted to exceed the *de minimis* criterion. In addition, at each of the intersection sites analyzed, the maximum annual incremental PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration is predicted to exceed the *de minimis* criterion. These exceedances would be considered a significant adverse mobile source air quality impact. Between the Draft and Final EIS, additional review and evaluation will be performed which may determine that the identified impacts related to mobile source 24-hour and annual average PM<sub>2.5</sub> increments will be reduced or avoided. Refined modeling using additional traffic periods will be performed to determine 24-hour average impacts from mobile sources at the affected intersection. Additional modeling of PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations (Grid Analysis) will be performed using more refined or comprehensive analysis procedures to determine the magnitude and extent of neighborhood-scale PM<sub>2.5</sub> impacts from mobile sources. Other updates may include the use of newer vehicle emissions model data and projections. It is anticipated that these additional measures will reduce PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations below the 24-hour and annual *de minimis* criterion thresholds.

The parking facilities assumed to be developed as a result of the Proposed Actions were analyzed for potential air quality effects. The analysis found that these parking facilities would not be expected to result in any significant adverse air quality impacts.

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-842) 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. For the City-owned parcels, restrictions would be necessary to ensure that emissions from fossil fuel-fired heat and hot water systems would not result in any significant adverse air quality impacts. These restrictions would be set forth in a Land Disposition Agreement (LDA) or other similar institutional control to ensure that the developer(s) satisfy these restrictions.

The analysis of existing sources associated with manufacturing and processing uses in the surrounding study area determined that emissions of air toxic compounds would not result in any potential significant adverse air quality impacts on the Proposed Project. An analysis of the cumulative impacts of existing industrial sources on projected and potential development sites was performed. Maximum concentration levels at projected and potential development sites were found to be below the applicable health risk criteria. For development sites with anticipated industrial uses, an (E) Designation (E-842) would be mapped in connection with the Proposed Actions to ensure that there are no potential significant adverse impacts associated with air toxic compounds associated with these uses.

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.

## **GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND CLIMATE CHANGE**

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions and climate change. It is estimated that the reasonable worst-case development scenario (RWCDs) associated with the Proposed Actions would result in approximately 195,456 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e) of annual emissions from building operations and approximately 121,185 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions from mobile sources. This represents approximately 0.62 percent of New York City's 2023 annual total GHG emissions of 51.22 million metric tons.

The Proposed Actions would advance New York City's GHG reduction goals by virtue of their nature and location. By revitalizing and reinforcing the Project Area, which is served by eight New York City Transit (NYCT) subway stations or station complexes, 40 NYCT local and select bus services, as well as the Jamaica LIRR station and JFK Airport Air Train Shuttle stations, the Proposed Actions support transit-oriented development in New York City. Further, the new buildings facilitated by the Proposed Actions, which would replace existing structures or vacant lots, would be subject to the New York City Energy Conservation Code (NYCECC), which governs performance requirements of heating, ventilation, and air

conditioning systems, as well as the exterior building envelope of new buildings. In compliance with this code, new development resulting from the Proposed Actions must meet standards for energy efficiency. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would be consistent with the applicable City's emissions reduction goals of transit-oriented development and construction of new resource- and energy-efficient buildings.

The Project Area is located beyond the 100- and 500-year flood zones, and therefore is not susceptible to storm surge and coastal flooding. It is also located beyond the 100- and 500-year projections developed by the New York City Panel on Climate Change (NPCC) for the 2020s and 2050s. Accordingly, an assessment of the effects of climate change on the Proposed Actions is not warranted.

## **NOISE**

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts related to noise. A noise assessment was undertaken to determine the levels of noise attenuation that may be needed to achieve interior noise levels that are acceptable and in accordance with 2021 *CEQR Technical Manual* guidance. The *CEQR Technical Manual* has noise attenuation values for buildings where vehicular traffic is the dominant noise source based on exterior  $L_{10(1)}$  noise levels for the purposes of achieving interior noise levels of 45 dBA or lower for residential and community facility uses and 50 dBA or lower for commercial office uses. When railways are the dominant noise source based on exterior  $L_{dn}$  noise levels for the purposes of achieving interior noise levels of 40 dBA or lower for residential uses. The With Action Condition  $L_{10(1)}$  noise levels were determined by adjusting the existing noise measurements to account for future increases in traffic with the Proposed Actions based on the Noise Passenger Car Equivalent (PCE) proportional analysis results, including the noise contribution from vehicular traffic on adjacent roadways, and by calculating the cumulative noise level in the future condition based on the playground noise and future vehicular traffic noise on adjacent roadways.

Based on the projected noise levels, up to 35 dBA window/wall attenuation would be required at all projected/potential development sites to achieve acceptable interior noise levels per the *CEQR Technical Manual* noise exposure guideline at residential and community facility uses. The requirement for this level of attenuation as well as the requirement for an alternate means of ventilation will be included in an (E) designation (E-842) for all privately-held projected and potential development sites. For City-owned parcels/sites the requirement for attenuation as well as the requirement for an alternate means of ventilation will be required through a Land Disposition Agreement (LDA) or a similar institutional control. Therefore, there would be no significant adverse noise impact with respect to building attenuation.

## **PUBLIC HEALTH**

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse public health impacts. As described in the preceding chapters of this EIS, the Proposed Actions would not result in unmitigated significant adverse impacts in the following technical areas that contribute to public health: operational noise, water quality, stationary source air quality, or hazardous materials.

However, the Proposed Actions could potentially result in unmitigated significant adverse mobile source air quality and construction air quality and noise impacts. The mobile source analyses determined that at one of the intersection sites analyzed, the maximum 24-hr incremental  $PM_{2.5}$  concentration is predicted to potentially exceed the *de minimis* criterion. In addition, at each of the intersection sites analyzed, the maximum annual incremental  $PM_{2.5}$  concentration is predicted to potentially exceed the *de minimis* criterion. Between the Draft and Final EIS, additional review and evaluation will be performed which is expected to determine that the identified potential impacts related to mobile source 24-hour and annual average  $PM_{2.5}$  increments will be avoided. Refined modeling using additional traffic periods will be performed to determine 24-hour average impacts from mobile sources at the affected intersection. Additional modeling of  $PM_{2.5}$  concentrations (Grid Analysis) will be performed using more refined or comprehensive analysis procedures to determine the magnitude and extent of neighborhood-scale  $PM_{2.5}$  impacts from mobile sources. Other updates may include the use of newer vehicle emissions model data and projections. It is anticipated that these additional measures will reduce  $PM_{2.5}$  concentrations below the 24-hour and annual *de minimis* criterion thresholds, and the identified impacts related to mobile source would likely be avoided. In addition, at each of the affected intersection locations, the Proposed Actions would not contribute to or exacerbate a violation of the  $PM_{2.5}$  24-hour or annual average National Ambient

Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) even with the very conservative assumptions relating to traffic, vehicle emissions, meteorology, and background PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration levels used in this analysis. Therefore, the exceedances of the PM<sub>2.5</sub> *de minimis* criterion on a 24-hour or annual basis would not constitute a significant adverse impact on public health.

In terms of construction air quality, the conservative analysis conducted for the Proposed Actions shows there could be the potential for an exceedance of the annual *de minimis* threshold for one representative projected development site out of the four sites analyzed. The exceedance of the *de minimis* threshold could be considered a significant adverse air quality impact. However, due to the temporary nature of construction activities and the modeled impacts predicted to be lower than NAAQS, the temporary exceedance of the *de minimis* criterion does not indicate adverse public health impacts. Between the Draft and Final EIS, additional review and evaluation will be performed to determine whether the identified impacts related to annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> increments could be avoided. This may include a refinement of assumptions in terms of construction equipment usage and the use of newer construction equipment with lower particulate emissions, as applicable.

In terms of construction noise, the construction analysis determined that there are areas surrounding each of the analyzed development sites where construction noise would result in a significant adverse impact. However, while during some periods of construction the Proposed Actions could potentially result in significant adverse impacts related to noise, the predicted overall changes in noise levels would not be large enough to significantly affect public health. Therefore, no significant adverse public health impacts related to construction noise are expected as a result of the Proposed Actions.

## **NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER**

The Proposed Actions would alter neighborhood character in the primary study area but would not result in a significant adverse impact on neighborhood character. The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts to land use, zoning, and public policy; socioeconomic conditions; urban design and visual resources; or noise. Although the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts with respect to open space, historic and cultural resources, shadows, and transportation (traffic, transit, and pedestrians), these impacts would not result in a significant adverse impact to defining elements of neighborhood character.

Jamaica is a community celebrated for its rich historical and cultural significance, serving as a major local and regional transportation hub. It is recognized as one of Queens' three regional business districts, which includes one of the City's 21 industrial business zones (IBZs). The neighborhood offers a diverse range of housing options, from single- and two- family homes to low-rise town homes and high-rise apartment buildings. Jamaica has long been home to many multigenerational residents. The Proposed Actions would facilitate the development of residences, including permanently income-restricted housing; reinforce the area as a regional business district through increased industrial and commercial density; strengthening the quality of the streetscape by improving safety along key corridors, enhancing the pedestrian experience, and finding opportunities for publicly accessible open space; and supporting a comprehensive neighborhood plan to meet current and future residential demands.

The Proposed Actions would result in several adverse impacts related to 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, strengthening the existing zoning to reinforce the neighborhood's range of uses; generating income-restricted housing; promoting the area as a regional business district with the development of new job-generating uses through increased industrial and commercial density; strengthening the quality of the streetscape by improving pedestrian safety with better street design along key corridors and enhancing the pedestrian experience; and finding opportunities for publicly accessible open space for existing and future residents. The new land uses generated by the Proposed Actions would support the existing residential population of the Project Area as well as adjacent neighborhoods in the secondary study area. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse neighborhood character impacts.

## **CONSTRUCTION**

Although temporary, construction impacts can include noticeable and disruptive effects. Determination of the significance of construction impacts and need for mitigation is generally based on the duration and magnitude of the impacts. Construction impacts typically warrant a detailed assessment when construction is anticipated to exceed two years and/or when construction activity could affect traffic conditions, archaeological resources, the integrity of historic resources, community noise patterns, and/or air quality conditions. The Proposed Actions could result in significant adverse construction period impacts related to transportation, air quality, noise and other technical areas including historic and cultural resources.

### ***TRANSPORTATION***

The first quarter of 2032 was selected as the reasonable worst-case analysis period for assessing potential cumulative traffic impacts from operational trips from completed portions of the projected developments and construction trips associated with construction activities. An assessment of traffic generated during this peak period is presented below.

#### ***Traffic***

During construction, traffic would be generated by construction workers commuting via autos and by trucks making deliveries to projected development sites. Each worker vehicle was assumed to arrive in the morning and then depart in the afternoon or early evening, while truck deliveries would occur throughout the construction day. In the fourth quarter of 2037, construction-related traffic is expected to peak during the 6 to 7 AM and 3 to 4 PM periods. During the 6 to 7 AM peak hour, there would be 1,076 PCE vehicle trips, including 933 inbound trips and 143 outbound trips. During the 3 to 4 PM peak hour, there would be 846 PCE trips, including 28 inbound trips and 818 outbound trips.

It is expected that potential significant adverse traffic impacts could occur during construction and that these impacts would be within the range of impacts identified for the 2040 With-Action conditions. The mitigation measures identified for 2040 operational traffic impacts would likely be similarly effective at mitigating any potential construction traffic impacts.

#### ***Pedestrians***

During the 2037 (fourth quarter) peak construction period, net incremental construction and operational travel demand on area sidewalks, corners, and crosswalks is expected to total approximately 2,336 and 12,960 trips in the 6 to 7 AM and 3 to 4 PM peak construction hours, respectively. These trips would be widely distributed among the projected development sites that would be under construction in the fourth quarter of 2037 and would primarily occur outside the weekday AM and PM peak commuter periods and weekday midday and Saturday peak periods when area pedestrian facilities typically experience their greatest demand.

It is expected that potential significant adverse pedestrian impacts could occur during construction and that these impacts would be within the range of impacts identified for the 2040 With-Action conditions. The mitigation measures identified for 2040 operational pedestrian impacts would likely be similarly effective at mitigating any potential construction pedestrian impacts.

#### ***Transit***

The construction sites are located in an area that is well served by public transportation with eight subway stations or station complexes and 40 local bus routes, along with two commuter rail stations located on the periphery of the Project Area.

During the construction peak period, the net incremental construction and operational travel demand is expected to generate during the 6 to 7 AM and 3 to 4 PM peak construction hours approximately 1,919 and 4,937 transit trips, respectively. During the construction peak period, transit conditions during the 6:00–7:00 AM and 3:00–4:00 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 2040, as incremental demand would be lower during construction, and most construction trips would not occur during the peak hours of commuter demand. Consequently, there would be less likelihood of significant adverse subway and bus transit impacts during the peak construction period than with full build-out of the Proposed Actions in 2040.



With full build-out of the Proposed Actions in 2040, there would be a parking demand for more than a 8,000 vehicles between 11 PM and 7 AM. 2037 parking conditions during the peak construction period are therefore expected to be generally better than during the analyzed operational peak hours with full build-out of the Proposed Actions in 2040. Consequently, there would be less likelihood of a parking shortfall during the peak construction hours in the cumulative analysis year (2037) than with full build-out of the Proposed Actions in 2040. While the 2037 (fourth quarter) construction worker parking demand could contribute to any such shortfall in the midday, almost the entirety of the Project Area is located in Parking Zone 2, per 2021 *CEQR Technical Manual* guidance, and any potential shortfall would not be considered significant because the site is served by nearby alternative modes of transportation.

### *AIR QUALITY*

Measures would be taken to reduce pollutant emissions during construction in accordance with all applicable laws, regulations, and building codes. These include dust suppression measures, idling restriction, and the use of ultra-low sulfur diesel (ULSD) fuel. 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 short-term particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>), annual-average nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), and carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations would be below their corresponding CEQR de minimis thresholds and/or National Air Quality Ambient Standards (NAAQS), respectively. However, although annual-average PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations from construction sources was determined to be below the annual NAAQS, the conservative analysis presented in this chapter shows there could be the potential for an exceedance of the annual de minimis threshold for one representative projected development site out of the four sites analyzed and presented in this chapter.

The exceedance of the de minimis threshold could be considered a significant adverse air quality impact. However, due to the temporary nature of construction activities and the modeled impacts predicted to be lower than NAAQS, the temporary exceedance of the de minimis criterion does not indicate adverse public health impacts. Between the Draft and Final EIS, additional review and evaluation will be performed to determine whether the identified impacts related to Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> increments could be avoided. This may include a refinement of assumptions in terms of construction equipment usage and the use of newer construction equipment with lower particulate emissions, as applicable.

### *NOISE AND VIBRATION*

Construction under the Proposed Actions would have the potential to result in significant adverse impacts related to noise. At some receptors, construction under the Proposed Actions would result in increments that would be considered objectionable (i.e., 15 dBA or greater) or very objectionable (i.e., 20 dBA or greater). The potential for significant adverse impacts at these receptors was determined by evaluating the duration of these increments. Receptors where noise level increases were predicted to exceed the construction noise evaluation thresholds for extended durations were identified. Construction could produce noise levels that would be noticeable and potentially intrusive during the most noise-intensive nearby construction activities. The highest levels of construction noise would not persist throughout construction and noise levels would fluctuate resulting in noise increases that would be intermittent. However, the magnitude and duration of construction noise levels at the identified receptors would constitute significant adverse impacts.

However, building construction would typically occur during weekday daytime hours and would therefore not produce noise during nighttime hours when residents would be most sensitive to noise. Further, construction would comply with *New York City Noise Control Code* regulations. Per *New York City Noise Control Code* regulations, construction under the Proposed Actions would be required to prepare a Construction Noise Mitigation Plan, which may identify more control measures that would further reduce construction noise levels.

The buildings of most concern with regard to the potential for structural or architectural damage due to vibration are historic buildings that are S/NR-Listed or New York City Landmarks (NYCLs) and NYCT structures immediately adjacent to the projected development sites. Since these historic buildings and structures would be within 90 feet of the projected development sites, vibration monitoring would be

required per New York City Department of Buildings (DOB) Technical Policy and Procedure Notices (TPPN) #10/88 regulations, and peak particle velocity (PPV) during construction would be prohibited from exceeding the 0.50 inches/second threshold.

For non-historic buildings and other structures immediately adjacent to projected development sites, vibration levels within 25 feet 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 vibration decibels (VdB) limit is the pile driver. However, operation of this equipment would only occur for limited periods of time at a particular location and therefore would not result in any significant adverse impacts.

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

#### **OTHER ANALYSES**

Construction of the 103 projected development sites would not result in significant adverse impacts in the areas of land use and neighborhood character, socioeconomic conditions, open space, or hazardous materials. Based on the RWCDs construction schedule, construction activities would be spread out over a period of approximately 15 years, throughout an approximately 230-block rezoning area, and construction of most of the projected development sites would be short-term (i.e., lasting up to 24 months), with construction of the remaining approximately 45 projected development sites, some of which are assumed to include multiple buildings, lasting for 24 or more months. While construction of the projected development sites would result in temporary increases in traffic during the construction period, access to residences, businesses, and institutions in the area surrounding the development sites would be maintained throughout the construction period (as required by City regulations). No open space resources would be located on any of the projected development construction sites, nor would any access to publicly accessible open space be impeded during construction within the Project Area. In addition, measures would be implemented to control noise, vibration, emissions, and dust on construction sites, including the erection of construction fencing incorporating sound reducing measures. While construction of the new buildings due to the Proposed Actions would cause temporary impacts, particularly related to noise, it is expected that such impacts in any given area would be relatively short term, even under the worst-case construction sequencing, and therefore would not create an open space or neighborhood character impact.

A total of eight lots within the Project Area have been identified as having potential archaeological sensitivity – five of the lots are within four projected development sites (sites 48, 50, 63, and 64) and three are within two potential development sites (sites AC and AL).<sup>5</sup> Under the RWCDs, one of the projected development sites (site 64) is expected to be redeveloped under No-Action conditions, and as such, could disturb potential archaeological resources both without and with the Proposed Actions. However, the remaining seven lots identified as being potentially archaeologically sensitive would not be redeveloped under No-Action conditions, and as such, the Proposed Actions would result in new in-ground disturbance on projected development sites 48 (partial), 50 (partial), and 63, as well as potential development sites AC and CL (partial). Therefore, construction-related archaeological impacts could occur at the above-listed projected and potential development sites during construction.

Any designated NYCLs or S/NR-listed historic resources located within 90 linear feet of a projected or potential new construction site are subject to the protections of the New York City Department of Building's (DOB's) *Technical Policy and Procedure Notice (TPPN) #10/88*. Therefore, development resulting from the Proposed Actions would not cause any significant adverse construction-related impacts to NYCL-designated or S/NR-listed historic resources. However, there are four projected and five potential development sites in the Project Area (sites 61, 67, 83, 105, AU, AX, CS, DW, and DZ) where development resulting from the Proposed Actions could possibly result in construction-related impacts to six non-designated historic resources located in close proximity (i.e., within 90 feet). These include: the First Presbyterian Church in Jamaica Complex – Church Building & Church House and Magill Memorial

---

<sup>5</sup> Although the construction analysis pursuant to CEQR is based on projected development sites only, the lots within potential development sites, which are less likely to be developed by the analysis year of 2040, are also included in the discussion of archaeological resources for informational purposes.

Building, St. Joseph's Roman Catholic Parish, the Parsons Boulevard IND Queens Boulevard Line (F) Station, Mary Immaculate Hospital, and J.H.S. 8. These eligible historic resources would be afforded standard protection under DOB regulations applicable to all buildings located adjacent to construction sites. However, as the resources are not S/NR-listed or NYCL-designated, they are not afforded the added special protections under DOB's *TPPN #10/88*. Additional protective measures afforded under DOB's *TPPN #10/88* would only become applicable if the eligible resources listed above are designated in the future prior to the initiation of construction. If the eligible resources are not designated, however, they would not be subject to DOB's *TPPN #10/88*, and may therefore be adversely impacted by construction of adjacent properties resulting from the Proposed Actions.

Any potential construction-related hazardous materials would be avoided by the inclusion of (E) designations, or other measures comparable to such a designation, for all RWCDs development sites. In addition, demolition of interiors, portions of buildings, or entire buildings are regulated by DOB and require abatement of asbestos prior to any intrusive construction activities, including demolition. OSHA regulates construction activities to prevent excessive exposure of workers to contaminants in the building materials, including lead paint. New York State Solid Waste regulations control where demolition debris and contaminated materials associated with construction are handled and disposed of. Adherence to these existing regulations would prevent impacts from construction activities at any of the projected development sites in the Project Area.

## **MITIGATION**

The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts with respect to community facilities (elementary schools), open space, shadows, historic and cultural resources, transportation (traffic, transit, and pedestrians), air quality (mobile source), and construction. Mitigation measures to address the identified significant adverse impacts is discussed below.

### **COMMUNITY FACILITIES**

The Proposed Actions would result in a significant adverse impact to public elementary schools in CSD 28 Sub-districts 1 and 2. The utilization of CSD 28, Sub-district 1 elementary schools would increase from a No-Action utilization rate of approximately 84.0 percent to a With-Action utilization rate of approximately 103.7 percent (an increase of approximately 19.7 percent) with a deficit of approximately 226 elementary school seats (i.e., 226 project-generated students over the 100 percent utilization rate). The utilization of CSD 28, Sub-district 2 elementary schools would increase from a No-Action utilization rate of approximately 94.0 percent to a With-Action utilization rate of approximately 107.3 percent (an increase of approximately 13.3 percent) with a deficit of approximately 793 elementary school seats (i.e., 793 project-generated students over the 100 percent utilization rate).

To eliminate the impact in Sub-districts 1 and 2 of CSD 28 elementary schools, the following mitigation measures could be applied in conjunction with the City's monitoring of capacity: 1) restructure or reframe existing school space under the Department of Education's control in order to provide additional capacity in CSD 28 Sub-districts 1 and 2; 2) relocate administrative functions to another site, thereby increasing capacity for classrooms; and/or 3) create additional capacity by constructing a new school, building additional capacity at additional schools, or leasing additional school space constructed as part of projected development within CSD 28 Sub-districts 1 and 2. These preliminary mitigation measures will be explored between the DEIS and FEIS.

### **OPEN SPACE**

The Proposed Actions would result in indirect significant adverse impacts to total, active, and passive open space in the 0.5-mile residential study area. Possible measures that could mitigate the Proposed Actions' indirect significant adverse impact to open space in the residential study area may include: expanding existing parks, creating new open space on publicly owned land, encouraging owners of 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. These potential mitigation measures are currently being explored by the lead agency, DCP, in coordination with the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation (NYC Parks),

and will be refined between the DEIS and FEIS.

Although many of the potential mitigation measures being considered would increase the amount and/or usability of open space resources, opportunities to create new publicly-accessible open space resources in sufficient amounts within the study area to fully mitigate the identified significant adverse open space impact (approximately 22.75 acres) are limited. As a consequence, the Proposed Actions' significant adverse open space impact would not be completely eliminated and, as a result, an unavoidable significant adverse indirect open space impact would occur.

The Proposed Actions would also result in direct open space impact as a result of shadows cast under the With-Action condition on one open space resource, Archie Spigner Park (refer to discussion in "shadows" section below).

### **SHADOWS**

The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse shadows impacts to a total of nine sunlight-sensitive resources, specifically, six open space resources (Archer Avenue Greenstreet, Grace Episcopal Church Cemetery, Discovery Community Garden, both the northern and southern segments of the Merrick Boulevard Greenstreet, and Archie Spigner Park) and three historic resources (First Presbyterian Church, Saint Joseph Catholic Church, and Grace Episcopal Church).

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, possible measures that could mitigate significant adverse shadows 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. For shadow-related historic resource impacts, a potential mitigation measure may include the use of artificial lighting to simulate the sunlit conditions. The *CEQR Technical Manual* guidance also discusses strategies to reduce or eliminate shadows impacts, 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 significant adverse shadows impacts resulting from the Proposed Actions will be explored between the DEIS and FEIS.

Absent the identification and implementation of feasible mitigation measures that would mitigate the shadows impacts, the Proposed Actions would result in unmitigated significant adverse shadows impacts on Archer Avenue Greenstreet, Grace Episcopal Church Cemetery, Discovery Community Garden, both the northern and southern segments of the Merrick Boulevard Greenstreet, Archie Spigner Park, First Presbyterian Church, Saint Joseph Catholic Church, and Grace Episcopal Church.

### **HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES**

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

#### ***Archaeological Resources***

The Phase IA Archaeological Assessment conducted for the Proposed Actions concludes that eight lots in the Project Area are potentially sensitive for archaeological resources, and recommends that, should the sites be developed, archaeological testing be conducted prior to construction. As outlined in the 2021 *CEQR Technical Manual*, possible mitigation options if significant or potentially significant archeological resources are likely to be impacted by proposed construction include redesigning a project to avoid significant impacts, which is the preferred approach, or complete excavation of a site and specialized artifact treatments and analyses.

Projected development site 64 is expected to be redeveloped under both No-Action and With-Action conditions, and as such, potential archaeological resources on the site would be disturbed irrespective of the Proposed Actions. However, the remaining seven lots identified in the Phase IA study as being potentially archaeologically sensitive would only be redeveloped in the future with the Proposed Actions (Block 9754, Lots 1, 7, and 34; Block 10095, Lot 32; Block 10109, Lots 31 and 44; and Block 10115, Lot 5). As such, the Proposed Actions would result in new in-ground disturbances on these seven lots, which



are located within three Projected Development Sites (sites 48, 50, and 63) and two Potential Development Sites (sites AC and CL). As all seven lots are currently privately owned, there are no mechanisms in place to require developers to conduct archaeological testing or require the preservation or documentation of archaeological resources, should they exist, in the future with the Proposed Actions.

Absent the identification and implementation of feasible mitigation measures that would mitigate potential impacts on these seven privately owned lots, significant adverse archaeological impacts on these lots would be unmitigated in the future with the Proposed Actions. It should be noted, however, that if redevelopment on those seven sites would involve either federal or state funding or permitting, then further environmental review could be required, and historic resource issues could be addressed. Moreover, it should be noted that if human remains are encountered during the construction of an as-of-right project, it is expected that the developer would contact the New York City Police Department and the New York City Office of the Chief Medical Examiner and the New York State Unmarked Burial Site Protection Act must be adhered to. Potential mitigation measures are currently being explored by the lead agency, DCP, in coordination with the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC), and will be refined between the DEIS and FEIS. However, absent the identification and implementation of feasible mitigation measures that ensure that the potential impacts would be avoided or mitigated in full at the seven lots within the five development sites listed above, the Proposed Actions would result in unmitigated significant adverse impacts to archaeological resources.

#### *Architectural Resources*

The Proposed Actions would result in a significant adverse impact to architectural resources as a result of demolition, shadows, and adjacent construction. Shadows-related impacts to historic architectural resources are discussed in the “Shadows” section, and construction-related impacts to historic architectural resources are discussed in the “Construction” section.

The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse direct impacts to the Grace Episcopal Church Memorial Hall on projected development site 63, which is included as part of the S/NR-listed Grace Church complex and is privately owned, that would be demolished in the With-Action condition in order to make way for a larger residential building and house of worship, as well as medical office and community center space. Potential mitigation measures are currently being explored by the lead agency, DCP, in coordination with LPC, and will be refined between the DEIS and FEIS. Absent the identification and implementation of feasible mitigation measures that would mitigate, it is anticipated that significant adverse impacts as a result of demolition would be unmitigated.

Potential significant adverse impacts could occur to six eligible resources (the First Presbyterian Church in Jamaica Complex – Church Building & Church House and Magill Memorial Building, St. Joseph’s Roman Catholic Parish, Parsons Boulevard IND Queens Boulevard Line (F) Station, Mary Immaculate Hospital, and J.H.S. 8), as a result of adjacent construction located within 90 feet of projected or potential development sites. As these resources are not S/NR-listed or designated New York City Landmarks (NYCL), they will not be afforded the added special protections under New York City Department of Buildings (DOB) Technical Policy and Procedure Notice (TPPN) #10/88 requirements, potentially resulting in a construction-related impact. Mitigation measures for this impact could include preparation and implementation of a Construction Protection Plan (CPP), similar to the protections afforded through DOB TPPN #10/88. However, as sites are privately-owned, there would be no mechanism to require commitment to the CPP on privately-owned sites within 90 feet of the eligible resources noted above. Potential mitigation measures are currently being explored by the lead agency, DCP, in coordination with LPC, and will be refined between the DEIS and FEIS. Absent the identification and implementation of feasible mitigation measures that would mitigate, it is anticipated that significant adverse impacts would be unmitigated.

#### *TRANSPORTATION*

As described below, the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts to: a) vehicular traffic at 67 intersections, b) four escalators at one station, c) bus line haul conditions on five bus routes, and c) pedestrian elements at 26 sidewalks, eight corners, and 21 crosswalks. Mitigation measures that could address the significant adverse impacts are discussed below.



The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse traffic impacts at 67 study area intersections (56 signalized and 11 unsignalized) during one or more analyzed peak hours; specifically 162 lane groups at 64 intersections during the weekday AM peak hour, 116 lane groups at 57 intersections in the midday peak hour, 170 lane groups at 65 intersections in the PM peak hour, and 113 lane groups at 55 intersections during the Saturday peak hour. Implementation of traffic engineering improvements such as signal timing changes and modifications to curbside parking regulations are being proposed and would provide mitigation for some of the anticipated traffic impacts. These proposed traffic engineering improvements are subject to final review and approval by the New York City Department of Transportation (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.

Assuming all the proposed mitigation measures are implemented, **Table 8** shows that significant adverse impacts would be fully mitigated at 18 lane groups in the weekday AM peak hour, 22 lane groups in the midday peak hour, 22 lane groups in the weekday PM peak hour, and 18 lane groups in the Saturday peak hour. Intersections where these impacts would be fully mitigated would total 8, 14, 12, and 12 during these same periods, respectively. **Table 9** 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 lane groups would remain unmitigated in one or more peak hours at 58 intersections.

**Table 8: 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	325/75	163/11	162/64	18/8	144/56
Weekday Midday	320/75	204/18	116/57	22/14	94/43
Weekday PM	325/75	155/10	170/65	22/12	148/53
Saturday	317/75	204/20	113/55	18/12	95/43

# Jamaica Neighborhood Plan

CEQR No. 24DCP132Q

Page 75

**Table 9: Lane Groups With Unmitigated Significant Adverse Traffic Impacts**

Signalized Intersection	Peak Hour			
	Weekday AM	Weekday Midday	Weekday PM	Saturday
1. Hillside Ave & Van Wyck Serv. Rd SB	EB-TR, WB-L, SB-L, SB-TR	SB-L, SB-TR	EB-TR, WB-L, SB-L, SB-TR	WB-L, SB-L, SB-TR
2. Hillside Ave & Van Wyck Serv. Rd NB	EB-L, WB-R, NB-LT, NB-R	WB-R, NB-R	EB-L, WB-R, NB-R	WB-R, NB-R
3. Hillside Ave & Queens Blvd	EB-T, WB-T, NB-TR, SB-L, SB-TR	WB-T, NB-TR, SB-TR	EB-T, WB-T, NB-L, NB-TR, SB-L, SB-TR	EB-T, WB-T, NB-TR, SB-TR
4. Hillside Ave & 139th St	EB-LT, WB-T, NB-LTR		EB-LT	EB-LT
5. Hillside Ave & 143rd St	WB-T			
6. Hillside Ave & 144th St	EB-L, EB-T, WB-L, WB-T, SB-LTR	WB-L, WB-TR	EB-T, WB-L, WB-T, SB-LTR	WB-L, WB-TR
7. Hillside Ave & 146th St	WB-T			
8. Hillside Ave & Sutphin Blvd	WB-L, WB-T, NB-L, NB-R	WB-L, NB-L	EB-TR, WB-L, NB-L, NB-R	EB-TR, WB-L, NB-L, NB-R
9. Hillside Ave & 148th St	WB-T		EB-T, NB-L, NB-R	
10. Hillside Ave & 150th St	EB-L, EB-TR, WB-L, WB-TR, SB-L, SB-TR	EB-L, WB-L, WB-TR, SB-L, SB-TR	EB-L, EB-TR, WB-L, WB-TR, SB-L, SB-TR	EB-L, WB-L, WB-TR, SB-L, SB-TR
11. Hillside Ave & 153rd St	WB-T, NB-L, NB-R	NB-R	EB-T, NB-R	NB-L, NB-R
12. Hillside Ave & Parson Blvd	EB-L, EB-T, WB-TR, NB-L, NB-TR, SB-L, SB-TR	EB-L, EB-T, EB-R, WB-TR, NB-L, NB-TR, SB-L, SB-TR	EB-L, EB-T, EB-R, WB-TR, NB-L, NB-TR, SB-L, SB-TR	EB-L, EB-T, WB-TR, NB-L, NB-TR, SB-L, SB-TR
13. Hillside Ave & 162nd St	EB-TR	EB-TR	EB-TR, WB-L	EB-TR
14. Hillside Ave & 163rd St	EB-T, NB-L, NB-R	EB-T, NB-L	EB-T, NB-L	EB-T
15. Hillside Ave & 164th St	EB-T		EB-T	
16. Hillside Ave & 166th St/Merrick Blvd	EB-TR, WB-L	EB-TR, WB-L	EB-TR, WB-L	EB-TR, WB-L
17. Hillside Ave & 167th St				
18. Hillside Ave & 168th St	NB-LT, NB-R	NB-LT, NB-R	NB-LT, NB-R	NB-LT, NB-R
19. Hillside Ave & 169th St/Homelawn St	EB-L, SB-R	SB-R	SB-R	SB-R
20. 89th Ave & Sutphin Blvd	WB-LTR	WB-LTR		
21. 89th Ave & 150th St	WB-TR		WB-TR	SB-TR
22. 89th Ave & 153rd St	WB-TR		WB-LTR	
23. Jamaica Ave & Van Wyck Serv. Rd SB	EB-T, WB-L, SB-LTR	EB-T, WB-L, SB-LTR	EB-T, WB-L, SB-LTR	WB-L, SB-LTR
24. Jamaica Ave & Van Wyck Serv. Rd NB	NB-LTR		NB-LTR	EB-L, NB-LTR
25. Jamaica Ave & 138th St				
26. Jamaica Ave & Queens Blvd	EB-LT, WB-T	EB-LT, SB-L	EB-LT, WB-T, SB-L	EB-LT, WB-T, SB-L
27. Jamaica Ave & 139th St			EB-LTR	
28. Jamaica Ave & 143rd St	NB-LR			
29. Jamaica Ave & 144th St				
30. Jamaica Ave & 150th St	NB-LR, SB-LT	NB-LR, SB-LT	NB-LR, SB-LT	NB-LR, SB-LT
31. Jamaica Ave & 164th St	SB-R			
32. Jamaica Ave & 168th St	NB-TR	NB-TR	NB-TR	NB-TR
36. Archer Ave & 150th St	WB-LT, NB-LTR, SB-LT	WB-LT, NB-LTR, SB-LTR	WB-LT, NB-LTR, SB-LT, SB-R	WB-LT, NB-LTR, SB-LTR
37. Archer Ave & 153rd St	EB-L	EB-L	EB-L	EB-L
38. Archer Ave & Merrick Blvd				
39. Archer/93rd Ave & 168th St				
42. Atlantic Ave & Van Wyck Serv. Rd SB				
43. Atlantic Ave & Van Wyck Serv. Rd NB	WB-TR	WB-TR	WB-TR	WB-TR
44. 94th Ave & 143rd St	WB-LTR, NB-LT, SB-TR	WB-LTR, SB-TR	WB-LTR, SB-TR	WB-LTR, SB-TR
45. 94th Ave & Sutphin Blvd	WB-LTR, NB-L, NB-T, SB-R	NB-L, NB-T, SB-R	WB-LTR, NB-L, NB-T, SB-R	WB-LTR, NB-L, NB-T, SB-R
47. 94th Ave & 150th St	NB-LT, SB-TR	NB-LT, SB-TR	NB-LT, SB-TR	NB-LT, SB-TR
48. 94th Ave/157th St & Beaver Rd				

**Notes:** NB-northbound, SB-southbound, EB-eastbound, WB-westbound L-left-turn, T-through, R-right-turn

**Table 9: Lane Groups With Unmitigated Significant Adverse Traffic Impacts (continued)**

Signalized Intersection	Peak Hour			
	Weekday AM	Weekday Midday	Weekday PM	Saturday
51. 95th Ave & Sutphin Blvd	EB-TR, WB-LTR, NB-TR, SB-L	EB-TR, NB-TR, SB-L	EB-TR, WB-LTR, NB-TR, SB-L	EB-TR, SB-L
57. Liberty Ave & Van Wyck Serv. Rd SB	EB-TR, WB-L, SB-LTR	WB-L	EB-TR, WB-L, SB-LTR	WB-L
58. Liberty Ave & Van Wyck Serv. Rd NB	EB-L, EB-LT, WB-T, WB-R	EB-L, WB-R	EB-L, EB-LT, WB-T, WB-R, NB-LTR	EB-L, WB-R
59. Liberty Ave & Remington St	EB-TR, WB-TR		EB-TR, WB-TR	
60. Liberty Ave & Inwood St	EB-LT, WB-L, WB-T	EB-LT, WB-T	EB-LT, WB-L, WB-T	EB-LT, WB-T
61. Liberty Ave & Waltham St	EB-TR, WB-T, SB-LTR		EB-TR, WB-T, SB-LTR	SB-LTR
62. Liberty Ave & Sutphin Blvd	EB-L, EB-TR, WB-L, WB-TR, NB-LT, SB-LTR	EB-TR, WB-TR, NB-LT, SB-LTR	EB-L, EB-TR, WB-L, WB-TR, NB-LT, SB-LTR	EB-L, EB-TR, WB-TR, NB-LT, SB-LTR
63. Liberty Ave & 148th St	EB-T	EB-L, EB-T	EB-L, EB-T	EB-L, EB-T
64. Liberty Ave & 150th St	EB-TR, SB-LTR	EB-TR, WB-TR, SB-LTR	EB-L, WB-TR, NB-LTR, SB-LTR	WB-TR, SB-LTR
65. Liberty Ave & Tuckerton St			EB-L	
66. Liberty Ave & 157th St				
67. Liberty Ave & 160th St	EB-L, EB-T, WB-TR, NB-LTR, SB-LTR	EB-L, EB-T, WB-TR, NB-LTR	EB-L, EB-T, WB-TR, NB-LTR, SB-LTR	EB-L, EB-T, WB-TR
68. Liberty Ave & Guy R Brewer Blvd	EB-L, EB-TR, WB-L, WB-TR, NB-LTR	EB-L, EB-TR, WB-L, WB-TR, NB-LTR	EB-L, EB-TR, WB-L, WB-TR, NB-LTR, SB-TR	EB-L, EB-TR, WB-L, NB-LTR
69. Liberty Ave & 165th St	EB-L, WB-L, WB-TR	WB-L, WB-TR	EB-L, WB-L, WB-TR	WB-L
70. Liberty Ave & Merrick Blvd	EB-T, WB-T, SB-LT	EB-T	EB-T, EB-R, SB-LT	
71. Liberty Ave & 168th St	EB-L, NB-LT	EB-L, NB-LT	EB-L, NB-LT	EB-L
72. Liberty Ave & 170th St	EB-LT, SB-LR	EB-LT, SB-LR	EB-LT, SB-LR	EB-LT, SB-LR
73. Tuskegee Aimen Way & 148th/150th St	WB-LTR, NB-LTR, SB-LTR	NB-LTR	NB-LTR, SB-LTR	NB-LTR
74. Tuskegee Aimen Way & Guy R Brewer Blvd	EB-LTR, NB-LTR, SB-LTR	EB-LTR, SB-LTR	NB-LTR, SB-LTR	
Unsignalized Intersections	Peak Hour			
	Weekday AM	Weekday Midday	Weekday PM	Saturday
33. 91st Ave & 146th Pl				
34. Archer Ave & 146th Pl				
35. Archer Ave & 148th St				
40. 93rd Ave & 182nd St				
41. Douglas Ave & 168th St	EB-LT	EB-LT	EB-LT, WB-R	
46. 94th Ave & 148th St	NB-L	NB-L	WB-LT, NB-L	NB-L
49. 95th Ave & 138th Pl				
50. 95th Ave & Brisbin St				
52. 95th Ave & 148th St				
53. 95th Ave & 149th St	NB-LR	NB-LR	WB-LT, NB-LR	WB-LT, NB-LR
54. 95th Ave & 150th St	EB-LR, SB-TR	SB-TR	EB-LR, NB-LT, SB-TR	EB-LR, SB-TR
55. 97th Ave & 148th St				
56. 97th Ave & 149th St				
75. Shore Ave & Sutphin Blvd	EB-LTR, WB-LTR		EB-LTR, WB-LTR	
<b>Total Number of Unmitigated Intersections</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>43</b>

**Notes:** NB-northbound, SB-southbound, EB-eastbound, WB-westbound L-left-turn, T-through, R-right-turn

## Transit

### Subway Stations

The Proposed Actions would result in significant impacts to a total of four escalators at the Sutphin Boulevard-Archer Avenue-JFK Airport (E/J/Z) subway station on the BMT and IND Archer Lines, of which three are impacted in the AM peak hour and three are impacted in the PM peak hour. Potential measures to mitigate significant escalator impacts include adding appropriate vertical processor capacity (preferably an escalator or elevator), increasing operating speeds for escalators, and increasing escalator tread widths, provided that NYCT (or the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey in the case of ESC 432X and ESC433X) deems it practicable. Potential mitigation measures would fully mitigate the impacts

to one escalator in the AM peak hour and two escalators in the PM peak hour. Absent the identification and implementation of feasible mitigation measures that would mitigate the AM and PM peak hour subway escalator impacts at the Sutphin Boulevard-Archer Avenue-JFK Airport (E/J/Z) subway station to the greatest extent practicable, the Proposed Actions would result in unmitigated significant adverse subway station impacts.

#### Bus

The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts adverse bus line haul impacts are on the westbound Q5 (local), northbound Q65 (local), and northbound Q65 (LTD) buses in the AM peak hour, as well as the eastbound Q4 (local), westbound Q5 (local), and southbound Q44 SBS buses in the PM peak hour. The significant adverse impact to bus services could be fully mitigated by the addition of a total of one standard bus on the westbound Q5 (local), northbound Q65 (local), and northbound Q65 (LTD) bus routes in the AM peak hour. The significant adverse impact to bus services could be fully mitigated by the addition of a total of one standard bus on the eastbound Q4 (local), two standard buses on the westbound Q5 (local), and one articulated bus on the southbound Q44 SBS bus routes 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. Absent the provision of additional bus service on these routes, the corresponding impacts would remain unmitigated.

#### Pedestrians

Incremental demand from the Proposed Actions would significantly adversely impact 26 sidewalks, 21 crosswalks, and eight corners in one or more analyzed peak hours. Recommended mitigation measures consisting of the relocation/removal of impediments to sidewalk, curb extensions at corners, and the widening of crosswalks would fully mitigate the impacts to seven sidewalks, 16 crosswalks, and four corners. **Table 10** shows a summary of fully mitigated and unmitigated significant adverse impacts. Implementation of the proposed mitigation measures would be subject to final review and approval by DOT and by NYPD for enforcement related measures. If an identified pedestrian improvement is infeasible, and absent the identification and implementation of alternative mitigation measures, the Proposed Actions would result in unmitigated significant adverse pedestrian impacts.

**Table 10: Summary of Significant Pedestrian Impacts**

Peak Hour	Sidewalks/ Crosswalks/ Corners Analyzed	Sidewalks/ Crosswalks/ Corners with No Significant Impacts	Sidewalks/ Crosswalks/ Corners with Significant Impacts	Mitigated Sidewalks/ Crosswalks/ Corners	Unmitigated Sidewalks/ Crosswalks/ Corners
Weekday AM	77/52/96	58/41/94	19/11/2	8/11/2	11/0/0
Weekday Middy	77/52/96	54/37/91	23/15/5	11/15/2	12/0/3
Weekday PM	77/52/96	55/38/92	22/14/4	9/12/4	13/2/0
Saturday	77/52/96	57/35/93	20/17/3	6/14/3	14/3/0

#### AIR QUALITY

The mobile source analyses determined that at one of the intersections analyzed, the maximum daily (24-hour) incremental PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration is predicted to exceed the *de minimis* criterion. In addition, at each of the six intersection sites analyzed, the maximum annual incremental PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration is predicted to exceed the *de minimis* criterion. This would be considered a significant adverse air quality impact in the absence of traffic mitigation measures. Between the Draft and Final EIS, additional refinements of the analysis will be performed which could determine that the identified impacts related to mobile source 24-hour and annual average PM<sub>2.5</sub> increments will be avoided. Refined modeling using additional traffic periods will be performed to determine 24-hour average impacts from mobile sources at the affected intersection. Additional modeling of PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations (Grid Analysis) will be performed using more

refined or comprehensive analysis procedures to determine the magnitude and extent of neighborhood-scale PM<sub>2.5</sub> impacts from mobile sources. Other updates may include the use of newer vehicle emissions model data and projections. It is anticipated that these additional measures will reduce PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations below the 24-hour and annual de minimis criteria thresholds. In addition to the refined analysis which may demonstrate that potential impacts related to mobile sources would be avoided, potential mitigation measures are currently being explored by the lead agency, DCP, and will be refined between the DEIS and FEIS. Absent the identification and implementation of feasible mitigation measures the impact could remain unmitigated.

### **CONSTRUCTION**

Approval of the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse construction transportation (traffic, transit, and pedestrian), air quality, and noise impacts throughout and adjacent to the Project Area.

#### *Transportation*

It is expected that potential significant adverse traffic, transit, and pedestrian impacts could occur during construction and that these impacts would be within the range of impacts identified for the 2040 With-Action conditions. The mitigation measures identified below, for 2040 operational traffic, transit, and pedestrian impacts would likely be similarly effective at mitigating any potential construction traffic, transit, and pedestrian impacts. These mitigation measures would also be subject to review and approval by the applicable agency. If the agency determines that an identified improvement is infeasible, and no alternative and equivalent measure is identified, then the impact would be unmitigated and would constitute an unavoidable significant adverse impact.

#### *Air Quality*

Although annual-average PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations from construction sources was determined to be below the annual National Air Quality Ambient Standards (NAAQS), the conservative analysis conducted for the Proposed Actions shows there could be the potential for an exceedance of the annual de minimis threshold for one representative projected development site out of the four sites analyzed. The exceedance of the de minimis threshold could be considered a significant adverse air quality impact. However, due to the temporary nature of construction activities and the modeled impacts predicted to be lower than NAAQS, the temporary exceedance of the de minimis criterion does not indicate adverse public health impacts. Between the Draft and Final EIS, additional review and evaluation will be performed to determine whether the identified impacts related to annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> increments could be avoided. This may include a refinement of assumptions in terms of construction equipment usage and the use of newer construction equipment with lower particulate emissions, as applicable.

#### *Noise*

The Proposed Actions would have the potential to result in significant adverse construction noise impacts throughout the Project 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 Project 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, which could include a variety of source and path controls. Potential mitigation measures are currently being explored by the lead agency, DCP, and will be refined between the DEIS and FEIS. Absent the identification and implementation of feasible mitigation measures that would mitigate, it is anticipated that significant adverse impacts would be unmitigated. It should be noted that even if mitigation measures were determined to be feasible and practicable, some significant adverse construction noise impacts could potentially continue to be experienced at sensitive receptors and, as a result, be unavoidable. Therefore, the significant adverse construction noise impacts identified would be



## **ALTERNATIVES**

### ***NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE***

The No-Action Alternative examines future conditions within the Project 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). Under the No-Action Alternative, existing zoning would remain in the area affected by the Proposed Actions. It is anticipated that this area would experience moderate growth under the No-Action Alternative by 2040. Twenty one of the 103 projected development sites are expected to be redeveloped in the No-Action Alternative, resulting in a net increase of 2,802 dwelling units (DU), 113,519 gsf of commercial uses, 26,570 gsf of community facility uses, and a reduction of 105,862 gsf of industrial uses on the projected development sites, compared to existing conditions.

The significant adverse impacts anticipated to occur related to elementary schools, open space, shadows, archaeological resources, transportation, mobile source air quality, and construction noise that would occur with the Proposed Actions would not occur under the No-Action Alternative. However, the No-Action Alternative would not meet the goals of the Proposed Actions. The benefits expected to result from the Proposed Actions—including promoting affordable housing development by increasing residential density and establishing Mandatory Inclusionary Housing, encouraging economic development by mapping new commercial and manufacturing districts and increasing density in a highly transit accessible area of the City, creating pedestrian-friendly streets through active ground floor retail uses, and introducing new community resources— would not be realized under this alternative, and the No-Action Alternative would fall short of the objectives of the Proposed Actions.

### ***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 modified to avoid the unmitigated significant adverse impacts associated with the Proposed Actions which include impacts related to open space, shadows, historic and cultural resources (archaeological and architectural), transportation (traffic, transit, and pedestrians), and construction. 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.

## **UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS**

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, unavoidable significant adverse impacts are those that would occur if a proposed project or action is implemented regardless of the mitigation employed, or if mitigation is infeasible. The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts with respect to community facilities, open space, shadows, historic and cultural resources, transportation, air quality, noise, and construction. To the extent practicable, mitigation has been proposed for these identified significant adverse impacts. However, in some instances no practicable mitigation was identified to fully mitigate significant adverse impacts, and there are no reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Actions that would meet their purpose and need, eliminate their 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 schools in CSD 28 Sub-districts 1 and 2. The utilization of CSD 28, Sub-district 1 elementary schools would increase from a No-Action utilization rate of approximately 84.0 percent to a With-Action utilization rate of approximately 103.7 percent (an increase of approximately 19.7 percent) with a deficit of approximately 225 elementary school seats (i.e., 225 project-generated students over the 100 percent utilization rate). The utilization of CSD 28, Sub-district 2 elementary schools would increase from a No-Action utilization rate of approximately 98.3 percent to a With-Action utilization rate of approximately 112.2 percent (an increase

of approximately 13.9 percent) with a deficit of approximately 1,263 elementary school seats (i.e., 1,263 project-generated students over the 100 percent utilization rate).

To eliminate the impact in Sub-districts 1 and 2 of CSD 28, the following mitigation measures could be applied in conjunction with the City's monitoring of capacity: 1) restructure or reframe existing school space under the Department of Education's control in order to provide additional capacity in CSD 28 Sub-districts 1 and 2; 2) relocate administrative functions to another site, thereby increasing capacity for classrooms; and/or 3) create additional capacity by constructing a new school, building additional capacity at additional schools, or leasing additional school space constructed as part of projected development within CSD 28 Sub-districts 1 and 2.

As discussed above, the Proposed Actions include a zoning text amendment that would allow lots over 20,000 square feet to waive from floor area calculations up to 150,000 square feet of floor area for schools, as defined by the Special DJ district and under certain conditions. This would allow the New York City School Construction Authority (SCA) to work with private property owners to identify sites that may be appropriate for future school siting. As discussed in Chapter 26, Conceptual Analysis, the proposed zoning text amendment also includes a zoning authorization allowing for height modification with the provision of a school. The development of a mixed-use building with an integrated school must receive a written agreement from the SCA and New York City Department of Education (DOE) and meet their guidelines and criteria in order to be eligible to utilize exempted floor area and, or to modify bulk provisions. These elements of the Proposed Actions seek to ease the provision of new school space within the Study Area. However, it should be noted that school siting would be subject to future environmental review in relation to a site-specific proposal.

These preliminary mitigation measures will 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 unavoidable significant adverse impact on elementary schools.

### *OPEN SPACE*

The Proposed Actions would result in indirect significant adverse impacts to total, active, and passive open space in the 0.5-mile residential study area. Possible measures that could mitigate the Proposed Actions' indirect significant adverse impact to open space in the residential study area may include: expanding existing parks, creating new open space on publicly owned land, encouraging owners of 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.

These potential mitigation measures are currently being explored by the lead agency, DCP, in coordination with the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation (NYC Parks), and will be refined between the DEIS and FEIS.

As discussed in the "Conceptual Analysis" section below, as part of the Proposed Actions, a zoning text amendment is proposed that would create a zoning authorization allowing for the bonus of floor area and height modification with the provision of publicly accessible open space on zoning lots zoned R9 or R10 larger than 25,000 square feet (sf). If property owners elect to seek this authorization in the future, it is anticipated that new publicly accessible open space would be introduced on Projected Development Sites in the future, serving to offset the new demand introduced by the Proposed Actions.

Although many of the potential mitigation measures being considered would increase the amount and/or usability of open space resources, opportunities to create new publicly-accessible open space resources in sufficient amounts within the study area to fully mitigate the identified significant adverse open space impact (approximately 22.75 acres) are limited. As a consequence, the Proposed Actions' significant adverse open space impact would not be completely eliminated and, as a result, an unavoidable significant adverse indirect open space impact would occur.

The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse shadows impacts to a total of nine sunlight-sensitive resources, specifically, six open space resources (Archer Avenue Greenstreet, Grace Episcopal Church Cemetery, Discovery Community Garden, both the northern and southern segments of the Merrick Boulevard Greenstreet, and Archie Spigner Park) and three historic resources (First Presbyterian Church, Saint Joseph Catholic Church, and Grace Episcopal Church).

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, possible measures that could mitigate significant adverse shadows 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. For shadow-related historic resource impacts, a potential mitigation measure may include the use of artificial lighting to simulate the sunlit conditions. The *CEQR Technical Manual* guidance also discusses strategies to reduce or eliminate shadows impacts, 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 significant adverse shadows impacts resulting from the Proposed Actions will be explored between the DEIS and FEIS.

Absent the identification and implementation of feasible and practicable mitigation measures that would mitigate the shadows impacts, the Proposed Actions would result in unavoidable significant adverse shadows impacts on Archer Avenue Greenstreet, Grace Episcopal Church Cemetery, Discovery Community Garden, both the northern and southern segments of the Merrick Boulevard Greenstreet, Archie Spigner Park, First Presbyterian Church, Saint Joseph Catholic Church, and Grace Episcopal Church.

## **HISTORIC RESOURCES**

### *Archaeological Resources*

The Phase IA Archaeological Assessment conducted for the Proposed Actions concludes that eight lots in the Project Area are potentially sensitive for archaeological resources, and recommends that, should the sites be developed, archaeological testing be conducted prior to construction.

Projected Development Site 64 would be redeveloped under both No-Action and With-Action conditions, and as such, potential archaeological resources on the site would be disturbed irrespective of the Proposed Actions. However, the remaining seven lots identified in the Phase IA study as being potentially archaeologically sensitive would only be redeveloped in the future with the Proposed Actions (Block 9754, Lots 1, 7, and 34; Block 10095, Lot 32; Block 10109, Lots 31 and 44; and Block 10115, Lot 5). As such, the Proposed Actions would result in new in-ground disturbances on these seven lots, which are located within three projected and two potential development sites (sites 48, 50, 63, AC, and CL). Mitigation measures would include archaeological testing, and preservation or documentation of archaeological resources should they exist. As all seven lots are currently privately owned, there are no mechanisms in place to require developers to implement these mitigation measures, in the future with the Proposed Actions.

Absent the identification and implementation of feasible mitigation measures to avoid or mitigate potential impacts on these seven privately owned lots, significant adverse archaeological impacts on these lots would be unavoidable in the future with the Proposed Actions. It should be noted, however, that if redevelopment on those seven sites would involve either federal or state funding or permitting, then further environmental review could be required, and historic resource issues could be addressed. Moreover, it should be noted that if human remains are encountered during the construction of an as-of-right project, it is expected that the developer would contact the New York City Police Department and the New York City Office of the Chief Medical Examiner and the New York State Unmarked Burial Site Protection Act must be adhered to. However, absent any mechanism to ensure that the potential impacts would be avoided or mitigated in full at the seven lots within the five development sites listed above, the Proposed Actions would result in unmitigated significant adverse impacts to archaeological resources and would therefore be considered unavoidable.

The Proposed Actions would result in a significant adverse impact to architectural resources as a result of demolition, shadows, and adjacent construction. Shadows-related impacts to historic architectural resources are discussed in the “Shadows” section, and construction-related impacts to historic architectural resources are discussed in the “Construction” section.

The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse direct impacts to the Grace Episcopal Church Memorial Hall on Projected Development Site 63, which is included as part of the S/NR-listed Grace Church complex and is privately owned, that would be demolished in the With-Action condition in order to make way for a larger residential building and house of worship, as well as medical office and community center space. Potential mitigation measures are currently being explored by the lead agency, DCP, in coordination with LPC, and will be refined between the DEIS and FEIS. Absent the identification and implementation of feasible mitigation measures that would mitigate, it is anticipated that significant adverse impacts as a result of demolition would be unavoidable.

Potential significant adverse impacts could occur to six eligible resources (the First Presbyterian Church in Jamaica Complex – Church Building & Church House and Magill Memorial Building, St. Joseph’s Roman Catholic Parish, Parsons Boulevard IND Queens Boulevard Line (F) Station, Mary Immaculate Hospital, and J.H.S. 8), as a result of adjacent construction located within 90 feet of projected or potential development sites. As these resources are not S/NR-listed or designated New York City Landmarks (NYCL), they not be afforded the added special protections under New York City Department of Buildings (DOB) Technical Policy and Procedure Notice (TPPN) #10/88 requirements, potentially resulting in a construction-related impact. Mitigation measures for this impact could include preparation and implementation of a Construction Protection Plan (CPP), similar to the protections afforded through DOB TPPN #10/88. However, as sites are privately-owned, there would be no mechanism to require commitment to the CPP on privately-owned sites within 90 feet of the eligible resources noted above. Potential mitigation measures are currently being explored by the lead agency, DCP, in coordination with LPC, and will be refined between the DEIS and FEIS. Absent the identification and implementation of feasible mitigation measures that would mitigate, it is anticipated that significant adverse impacts would be unavoidable.

#### *TRANSPORTATION*

The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts to: vehicular traffic at 67 intersections in one or more peak hours; four escalators at one subway station; bus line haul conditions on five bus routes; and pedestrian elements at 26 sidewalks, eight corners, and 21 crosswalks.

##### *Traffic*

The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse traffic impacts at 67 study area intersections (56 signalized and 11 unsignalized) during one or more analyzed peak hours; specifically, 162 lane groups at 64 intersections during the weekday AM peak hour, 116 lane groups at 57 intersections in the midday peak hour, 170 lane groups at 65 intersections in the PM peak hour, and 113 lane groups at 55 intersections during the Saturday peak hour.

As demonstrated below, many of these impacts could be mitigated through the implementation of traffic engineering improvements, including:

- Modification of existing traffic signal phasing and/or timing,
- Installation of new traffic signals or all-way stop controls,
- Elimination of on-street parking to add a travel lane, and
- Modifications to lane striping.

As discussed in the “Mitigation” section, implementation of traffic engineering improvements would fully mitigate the significant adverse impacts to 18 lane groups in the weekday AM peak hour, 22 lane groups in the midday peak hour, 22 lane groups in the weekday PM peak hour, and 18 lane groups in the Saturday peak hour. Intersections where these impacts would be fully mitigated would total 8, 14, 12, and 12 during these same periods, respectively. No practicable mitigation was identified for the impacts to one or more lane groups in one or more peak hours at 58 intersections. Consequently, these impacts would constitute

unavoidable significant adverse traffic impacts as a result of the Proposed Actions.

Implementation of the recommended traffic engineering improvements are subject to review and approval by DOT. If DOT determines that an identified traffic engineering improvement is deemed infeasible, and no alternative and equivalent measure is identified, then that impact would remain unmitigated and would constitute an unavoidable adverse impact.

### *Transit*

#### Subway Stations

The Proposed Actions would result in significant impacts to a total of four escalators at the Sutphin Boulevard-Archer Avenue-JFK Airport (E/J/Z) subway station on the BMT and IND Archer Lines, of which three are impacted in the AM peak hour and three are impacted in the PM peak hour. Potential measures to mitigate significant escalator impacts include adding appropriate vertical processor capacity (preferably an escalator or elevator), increasing operating speeds for escalators, and increasing escalator tread widths, provided that NYCT deems it practicable. Potential mitigation measures would fully mitigate the impacts to one escalator in the AM peak hour and two escalators in the PM peak hour. Absent the identification and implementation of feasible mitigation measures that would mitigate the AM and PM peak hour subway escalator impacts at the Sutphin Boulevard-Archer Avenue-JFK Airport (E/J/Z) subway station to the greatest extent practicable, the projected impacts would remain unmitigated and would therefore be considered unavoidable adverse impacts.

#### Bus

The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse bus line haul impacts on the westbound Q5 (local), northbound Q65 (local), and northbound Q65 (LTD) buses in the AM peak hour, as well as the eastbound Q4 (local), westbound Q5 (local), and southbound Q44 SBS buses in the PM peak hour. The significant adverse impact to bus services could be fully mitigated by the addition of a total of one standard bus on the westbound Q5 (local), northbound Q65 (local), and northbound Q65 (LTD) bus routes in the AM peak hour. The significant adverse impact to bus services could be fully mitigated by the addition of a total of one standard bus on the eastbound Q4 (local), two standard buses on the westbound Q5 (local), and one articulated bus on the southbound Q44 SBS bus routes 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. However, if these changes are not made, these impacts would be considered unavoidable.

### *Pedestrians*

Incremental demand from the Proposed Actions would significantly adversely impact 26 sidewalks, 21 crosswalks, and eight corners in one or more analyzed peak hours. Recommended mitigation measures consisting of the relocation/removal of impediments to sidewalk, curb extension at corners, and the widening of crosswalks would fully mitigate the impacts to seven sidewalks, 16 crosswalks, and four corners. Practicable mitigation measures could not be identified for significant adverse impacts in one or more peak hours at 19 sidewalks, five crosswalks, and four corners. Implementation of the proposed mitigation measures would be subject to final review and approval by DOT and by NYPD for enforcement related measures. If DOT determines that an identified pedestrian improvement is infeasible, alternative and equivalent measures will be explored. Absent the identification and implementation of additional feasible mitigation measures that would mitigate the pedestrian impacts to the greatest extent practicable, the projected impacts would remain unmitigated and would therefore be considered unavoidable adverse impacts.

### *AIR QUALITY*

At one of the intersections analyzed, the maximum daily (24-hour) incremental PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration is predicted to potentially exceed the 24-hour average *de minimis* criterion of 8.7 µg/m<sup>3</sup>. In addition, mobile source annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> increments are predicted to potentially exceed the *de minimis* criterion of 0.1 µg/m<sup>3</sup> for the annual averaging period at each of the six intersection sites that were analyzed. This would be considered a significant adverse air quality impact. Between the DEIS and FEIS, additional review and evaluation will be performed, which is expected to determine that the identified significant adverse impact related to the mobile source 24-hour and annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> increments will be avoided. The additional review is



expected to include refined modeling using additional traffic to determine 24-hour average impacts from mobile sources at the affected intersection. Additional modeling of PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations (Grid Analysis) will be performed using more refined or comprehensive analysis procedures to determine the magnitude and extent of neighborhood-scale PM<sub>2.5</sub> impacts from mobile sources. It is expected that these additional measures will reduce PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations below the 24-hour and annual *de minimis* criteria thresholds. However, if the additional review and evaluation determines that there would still be a significant adverse mobile source air quality impact at one or more of the analyzed locations and there is no feasible or practical mitigation for these impacts, then they would constitute an unavoidable adverse impact of the Proposed Actions.

## **CONSTRUCTION**

### ***Historic and Cultural Resources***

#### ***Architectural Resources***

Potential significant adverse impacts could occur to six eligible resources (the First Presbyterian Church in Jamaica Complex – Church Building & Church House and Magill Memorial Building, St. Joseph’s Roman Catholic Parish, Parsons Boulevard IND Queens Boulevard Line (F) Station, Mary Immaculate Hospital, and J.H.S. 8), as a result of adjacent construction located within 90 feet of projected or potential development sites. As these resources are not S/NR-listed or designated New York City Landmarks (NYCL), they not be afforded the added special protections under New York City Department of Buildings (DOB) requirements, potentially resulting in an unavoidable construction-related impact.

#### ***Transportation***

It is expected that potential significant adverse traffic, transit, and pedestrian impacts could occur during construction and that these impacts would be within the range of impacts identified for the 2040 With-Action conditions. The mitigation measures identified for 2040 operational traffic, transit, and pedestrian impacts would likely be similarly effective at mitigating any potential construction traffic, transit, and pedestrian impacts. As discussed in the “Mitigation” section, most significant adverse impacts would be mitigated with the implementation of recommended mitigation measures, but unmitigated significant adverse impacts could remain at several intersections during the construction peak hours. No basic intersection improvement measures could mitigate the significant adverse construction-related impacts at these 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.

#### ***Air Quality***

Although annual-average PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations from construction sources was determined to be below the annual National Air Quality Ambient Standards (NAAQS), the conservative analysis conducted for the Proposed Actions shows there could be the potential for an exceedance of the annual *de minimis* threshold for one representative projected development site out of the four sites analyzed. The exceedance of the *de minimis* threshold could be considered a significant adverse air quality impact. However, due to the temporary nature of construction activities and the modeled impacts predicted to be lower than NAAQS, the temporary exceedance of the *de minimis* criterion does not indicate adverse public health impacts. Between the Draft and Final EIS, additional review and evaluation will be performed to determine whether the identified impacts related to annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> increments could be avoided. This may include a refinement of assumptions in terms of construction equipment usage and the use of newer construction equipment with lower particulate emissions, as applicable. In the event that refinement of assumptions and practicable mitigation measures are not identified, this would be an unavoidable impact.

#### ***Noise***

The Proposed Actions would have the potential to result in significant adverse construction noise impacts throughout the Project Area. Three representative construction sites (Projected Development Sites 29, 67, and 48) with long-term (i.e., greater than 24 months) construction duration were selected for quantitative prediction of construction noise levels during each stage of construction (i.e., Demolition/Excavation/Foundation, Building Superstructure/Exterior, and Interior Fit-Out). No significant adverse construction noise impacts are expected from construction of development site whose construction

duration would be considered short-term (i.e., less than 24 months). Based on the magnitude of construction noise during each stage and the duration of each construction stage at each development site according to the conceptual schedule, receptors expected to experience an exceedance of the construction noise impact thresholds were determined.

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 analysis is based on RWCDs conceptual site plans and construction schedules, with the possibility that the actual construction may be of less magnitude, in which case construction noise would be less than the analysis predicts.

Construction activities would follow the requirements of the *NYC Noise Control Code* (also known as Chapter 24 of the Administrative Code of the City of New York, or Local Law 113) for construction noise control measures. 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. In terms of source controls (i.e., reducing noise levels at the source or during the most sensitive time periods), the following measures would be implemented in accordance with New York City regulations:

- Equipment that meets the sound level standards specified in Subchapter 5 of the *NYC Noise Control Code* would be utilized from the start of construction.
- As early in the construction period as logistics would allow, diesel- or gas-powered equipment would be replaced with electrical-powered equipment such as welders, water pumps, bench saws, and table saws (i.e., early electrification) to the extent feasible and practicable.
- Where feasible and practicable, construction sites would be configured to minimize back-up alarm noise. In addition, all trucks would not be allowed to idle more than three minutes at the construction site based upon Title 24, Chapter 1, Subchapter 7, Section 24-163 of the *NYC Administrative Code*.
- Contractors and subcontractors would be required to properly maintain their equipment and mufflers.

In terms of path controls (e.g., placement of equipment, implementation of barriers or enclosures between equipment and sensitive receptors), the following measures for construction would be implemented to the extent feasible and practicable:

- Where logistics allow, noisy equipment, such as cranes, concrete pumps, concrete trucks, and delivery trucks, would be located away from and shielded from sensitive receptor locations.
- Noise barriers constructed from plywood or other materials would be erected to provide shielding; and
- Path noise control measures (i.e., portable noise barriers, panels, enclosures, and acoustical tents, where feasible) for certain dominant noise equipment would be employed to the extent feasible and practical based on the results of the construction noise calculations.

Construction activity is expected to follow the requirements of the *NYC Noise Control Code*. However, the implementation of these measures would not eliminate the identified significant adverse construction noise impacts predicted to occur during hours when the loudest pieces of construction equipment are in use. Further mitigation measures will be explored between the DEIS and FEIS. If no practicable or feasible mitigation is identified, these impacts would constitute unavoidable significant adverse construction noise impacts as a result of the Proposed Actions.

## **GROWTH INDUCING ASPECTS**

The term “growth-inducing aspects” generally refers to “secondary” impacts of a proposed action that trigger further development outside the directly affected area. The 2021 *City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manual* indicates that an analysis of the growth-inducing aspects of a proposed action is appropriate when an action: (1) adds substantial new land use, residents, or new employment that could

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 above, is to create a more prosperous neighborhood that promotes affordability, celebrates inclusivity and diversity, and supports investment activity and business opportunities. The Proposed Actions reflect DCP's ongoing engagement process with the community to achieve the following land use objectives:

- Expand housing opportunities by requiring permanently income restricted housing through the Mandatory Inclusionary Housing ("MIH") program in new developments to support the neighborhood diversity and further the city's equity and Fair Housing goals;
- Reinforce the area as a regional business district by strengthening the existing economic ecosystem while also promoting the development of new job-generating uses through increased industrial and commercial density;
- Strengthen the quality of the streetscape to promote safety, pedestrian experience, and opportunities for publicly accessible open space for existing and future residents; and
- Support a comprehensive neighborhood plan by aligning a zoning framework with capital investments, infrastructure needs, and services to meet both current demands and future residents.

A reasonable worst-case development scenario (RWCDs) was developed to assess the possible effects of the Proposed Actions. The total development expected to occur by the analysis year of 2040 on the 103 projected development sites identified in the RWCDs are expected to result in a net increment (compared to No-Action conditions) of approximately 12,319 dwelling units (DU), including approximately 3,125 to 3,744 permanently income restricted homes, 1,476,220 gross square feet (gsf) of commercial space, 836,034 gsf of community facility space, 24,818 gsf of industrial space, and 1,994,252 gsf of warehouse space and a net decrease of approximately 24,193 gsf of auto-related uses and 72 accessory parking spaces, over the span of 15 years.

The projected increase in residential population is likely to increase the demand for neighborhood services in the 230-block Project Area, ranging from community facilities to local goods and services. This would enhance the growth of local commercial corridors in the Project 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 employment and fiscal effects during construction on the projected and/or potential development sites and operation of these developments after their completion. However, this secondary growth would be expected to occur incrementally throughout the region over the 15-year Analysis period 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 Project Area. However, it is not anticipated that the Proposed Actions would generate significant secondary impacts resulting in substantial new development in nearby areas. The Proposed Actions would not introduce a new economic activity that would alter existing economic patterns in the Project Area. As the Project Area already has a well-established residential market and a critical mass of non-residential uses, including retail, industrial and community facility uses, the Proposed Actions would not create the critical mass of uses or populations that would induce additional development outside the Project 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.

## **IRREVERSIBLE, IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT 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 support the community-based goals of creating a more prosperous neighborhood that promotes affordability, celebrates inclusivity and diversity, and supports investment activity and business opportunities. The Proposed Actions are intended to achieve community-based land use objectives, such as expanding housing opportunities by requiring permanently income restricted housing through the Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (“MIH”) program in new developments to support the neighborhood diversity and further the city's equity and Fair Housing goals; and reinforcing the area as a regional business district by strengthening the existing economic ecosystem while also promoting the development of new job-generating uses through increased industrial and commercial density.

## **EFFECTS ON DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES**

Effective 30 December 2024, Section 8-0109(2)(k) of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law requires that Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) include a statement of the effects of the Proposed Actions on disadvantaged communities, including whether the action may cause or increase a disproportionate pollution burden. The 2021 *City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manual* predates these revisions to the Environmental Conservation Law and does not provide guidance regarding the scope of this analysis. On January 29, 2025, the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) proposed draft revisions to its State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) regulations (6 NYCRR Part 617) to implement this new statutory provision. This assessment considers the impacts that have been identified pursuant to the *CEQR Technical Manual* as well as applicable guidance from NYSDEC in determining whether the Proposed Actions would result in disproportionate impacts on disadvantaged communities.

The area affected by the Proposed Actions would affect Census Tracts comprised of Disadvantaged Communities (DACs) - both higher and lower vulnerability levels – and non-DACs. The Proposed Actions have the potential to result in significant adverse impacts in the following CEQR technical areas: community facilities and services (elementary schools); open space; shadows; historic and cultural resources; transportation (traffic, transit, and pedestrians); mobile source air quality; and construction.

There would not be any disproportionate pollution burden on DACs as a result of the Proposed Actions related to community facilities and services, open space, shadows, historic and cultural resources, transportation and construction. Most of the potential impacts would occur in non-DACs or in DACs with “lower burdens and vulnerabilities,” and would not cause a greater or more severe pollution burden in DACs as compared to non-DACs. However, as mobile source air quality impacts may occur in DACs with both lower and higher burdens and vulnerabilities, a disproportionate pollution burden could occur.

## CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS

The Proposed Actions would establish new CPC authorizations for bonus of floor area and height modification with the provision of publicly accessible open space and would allow for modification of maximum height requirements up to an additional 30 feet for sites containing schools throughout the Special Downtown Jamaica (DJ) District. The Proposed Actions also increase allowable density on City-owned sites that could be redeveloped in the future with additional discretionary actions. It is anticipated that site-specific environmental review would be conducted at the time specific actions are sought, and impacts would be studied when a specific development proposal is known. Environmental analyses prepared for any future application will be conducted in accordance with the 2021 *CEQR Technical Manual*.

Based on available information on the Future Discretionary Actions, there would be no significant adverse impacts to land use, zoning, and public policy; socioeconomic conditions; open space (direct impacts); hazardous materials; water and sewer infrastructure; solid waste and sanitation services; energy; and greenhouse gas emissions and climate change. The following technical areas require either detailed analysis or additional review beyond an initial assessment to determine the potential for significant adverse impacts: community facilities; open space (indirect impacts); shadows; historic and cultural resources; urban design and visual resources; transportation; air quality; noise; public health; neighborhood character; and construction.



---

Stephanie Shellooe, AICP,  
Director Environmental Assessment and Review Division  
New York City Department of City Planning

Cc:

Daniel R. Garodnick, Chair  
City Planning Commissioners  
Donovan Richards, Queens Borough President  
Queens Community Board 8, Chair  
Queens Community Board 8, District Manager  
Queens Community Board 12, Chair  
Queens Community Board 12, District Manager  
Perris Straughter, City Council Planning and Land  
Use Division  
Hilary Semel, OEC  
Terrell Estesén, DEP  
Emily Humes, DPR  
Colleen Alderson, DPR  
Shakil Ahmed, DOT  
Gina Santucci, LPC  
Jeremy Parnes, NYCT  
Buckley Yung, NYCT  
Kelly Murphy, SCA

Edith Hsu-Chen  
Susan Amron  
Joy Kim  
Jasmin Tepale  
Shristi Bajracharya  
Shakya  
Lin Zeng  
Kathi Ko  
Crystal Jane Eksi  
Sagi Golan  
Steven Lenard  
Ken Ramnarine  
Tat Wing Wong  
Abraham Abreu  
Kiyoshi Yamazaki  
Louisa Chang  
Sara Avila  
Mauricio Garcia  
Evan Lemonides  
Evren Ulker-Kacar  
Andrew Martini  
Susan Wong