AKRF

Environmental and Planning Consultants

440 Park Avenue South
7th Floor
New York, NY 10016
tel: 212 696-0670
fax: 212 213-3191
www.akrf.com

Domino Sugar Rezoning Technical Memorandum

CEQR No. 07DCP094K
ULURP Nos. C100185ZMK, N100186ZRK,
C100187ZSK, C100188ZSK, C100189ZSK,
N100190ZAK, N100191ZCK, N100192ZCK
June 4, 2010

A. INTRODUCTION

The Domino Sugar Rezoning project is the subject of Uniform Land Use Review Procedure applications currently under consideration by the City Planning Commission (CPC) and analyzed in a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) completed on May 28, 2010. The CPC is currently considering modifications to the heights of the three commercial modules on Site A (the proposed modifications). This Technical Memorandum analyzes whether the proposed modifications would result in any significant adverse environmental impacts not already identified in the FEIS.

The analysis, as discussed in detail below, concludes that the proposed modifications would not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts not already identified in the FEIS for the proposed project.

B. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS

The proposed modifications would reduce the heights of the three commercial modules on Site A to 130 feet, 160 feet, and 250 feet, from 200 feet, 240 feet, and 300 feet, respectively. These reductions in height would be achieved by a combination of adjustments to the floor-to-floor height of the Site A buildings and a reallocation of approximately 11,000 square feet of community facility space from Site A to elsewhere on the waterfront parcels (Sites B, C, and/or D). There is space available within the zoning envelopes of Sites B, C or D to accommodate 11,000 square feet of additional area, and this allocation of community facility space would not result in any additional parking requirement at these sites (B, C, and/or D). With the exception of the building heights on Site A, all above-grade uses with the proposed modifications, including building envelopes and design, building materials, and access/egress points, would be the same as those for the proposed project. The proposed modifications would also have the same total square footage, public open space, and upland connections as the proposed project.

An alternative with similar building heights on the tower portion of Site A was analyzed in the FEIS as the Reduced Site A Alternative. The proposed modifications would result in a project that would be identical in height to the Reduced Site A Alternative, except that the tallest portion of Site A would rise to 250 feet instead of 205 feet under the alternative. With the lower building height, the Reduced Site A Alternative would result in the reallocation of approximately 20,000 square feet of community facility space from Site A to elsewhere on the waterfront parcels (Sites B, C, and/or D), compared to 11,000 square feet with the proposed modifications.

C. POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS

The proposed modifications would affect the height of Site A and could shift approximately 11,000 sf of community facility space to the other waterfront parcels. As noted above, the project's overall development program including the public open space would remain the same under the proposed modifications. As only the height of certain specific building elements of Site A would change along with a relatively small shift of floor space within the project site, the significant adverse impacts—and the associated mitigation measures to address those impacts—related to community facilities, historic resources, transit, and pedestrians identified in the FEIS for the proposed project would not be affected if the project were modified as described above. Therefore, the analysis below focuses only on the technical areas affected by height and the potential shift in floor area, specifically shadows, urban design and visual resources, traffic, air quality, and construction.

SHADOWS

With the exception of a reduction in heights of the three commercial modules on Site A, the proposed modifications would result in the same building massing arrangements as the proposed project, and the shadows resulting from the modifications would be similar to those of the proposed project. The proposed modifications, as with the proposed project, would not result in any significant adverse shadow impacts to the East River or the PS 84 William Sheridan Playground.

The heights of the buildings on Site A would be shorter with the proposed modifications compared to the proposed project and would cast shorter shadows. As noted in the FEIS, the height of the proposed building on Site A would need to be reduced to 70 feet or less to eliminate the significant adverse shadow impact on Grand Ferry Park. It is expected that the reduction in height of the tower portion of Site A (from 300 feet, 240 feet, and 200 feet to 250 feet, 160 feet, and 130 feet, respectively) would result in more sunlight in Grand Ferry Park, particularly on the northern section of the park, during the spring, summer and fall analysis days. However, the significant adverse impact would not be eliminated as there would still be a substantial increase in the duration and extent of the shadows on Grand Ferry Park. During the winter months, the proposed modifications would result in the same shadows as the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed modifications would result in the same significant adverse impact to Grand Ferry Park during the fall, winter, and early spring and would require the same mitigation measures. The proposed modifications would not result in any significant adverse shadows impacts to Grand Ferry Park that were not previously identified in the FEIS.

URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES

With the exception of the heights of the buildings on Site A—which would be shorter with the proposed modifications when compared to the proposed project—the proposed modifications would be the same as the proposed project in terms of layout, setbacks, landscaping, open spaces, and overall urban design. The proposed modifications would be consistent with the design principles of stepping up building heights from Kent Avenue to the waterfront and staggering the heights of the buildings. The modifications would also positively affect the urban design of the project site because they would add more variation in building height and tower form compared to the project. The potential for significant adverse impacts on urban design and visual resources would be the same as with the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed modifications would not change the FEIS conclusion that the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse urban design and visual resource impacts.

TRAFFIC

While the proposed modifications may result in the reallocation of approximately 11,000 square feet of community facility space from Site A to elsewhere on the waterfront parcels (Sites B, C, and/or D), this would represent a minimal shift in activity for this 2.8-million-square-foot development program. This reallocation of floor area could result in a shift of up to 0, 9, 17, and 16 vehicle trips during the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday midday peak hours, respectively, from Site A to elsewhere on the

waterfront parcels. Compared to the total number of vehicle trips generated by the proposed project (approximately 572 to 957 vehicle trips, depending on the peak hour), this shift would have minimal effects on traffic conditions in the study area. Therefore, the proposed modifications would result in the same significant adverse traffic impacts as the proposed project and would require the same potential mitigation measures. The proposed modifications would not result in any significant adverse traffic impacts not previously identified in the FEIS.

AIR QUALITY

As noted above, with the proposed modifications, the three buildings comprising the tower portion of Site A would be reduced to 130 feet, 160 feet, and 250 feet, from 200 feet, 240 feet, and 300 feet, respectively. An analysis of the HVAC system for this alternative, as seen in Table 1 below, found that the stack location restriction on Site A would not change; however, boiler exhaust stacks on Site A under this alternative must have a minimum exhaust height of 275 feet above Brooklyn Datum (compared with 309 feet for Site A under the proposed project) to avoid any potential significant air quality impacts. The restriction on the use of natural gas as fuel and restrictions on other buildings would remain the same. Therefore, the proposed modifications would not change the FEIS conclusion that the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse air quality impacts associated with HVAC systems.

Table 1
Comparison of Stack Parameters for Site A

	Proposed Project	Proposed Modifications
Modeled Stack Height (ft)	309	275
Building Gross Square Feet	375,038	364,038
$PM_{2.5}$ ST Emissions (g/s) @ 100% Load	0.0132	0.01295
Max $PM_{2.5}$ 24-Hour Concentration	1.92	1.94
Location of maximum receptor on Site B	329 ft on Northern Façade	286 ft on Northern Façade

CONSTRUCTION

Although the proposed modifications would result in shorter building heights on Site A when compared to the proposed project, it is expected that construction activities associated with these modifications would result in similar construction effects as the proposed project since both would construct similar types of buildings. In addition, as discussed in the FEIS, the development of Site A would occur near the end of the overall construction period and any changes as a result of the program differences on this site would have a minimal effect on the overall site development. Therefore, both the proposed modifications and the proposed project could result in the same significant adverse construction traffic and noise impacts and would require the same potential mitigation measures. The proposed modifications would not result in any significant adverse construction impacts not previously identified in the FEIS.

CONCLUSION

The proposed modifications would not have the potential for any new or additional significant adverse impacts not already identified in the FEIS for the proposed project.