A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter analyzes the effects of the proposed action on publicly accessible open space. An open space assessment may be necessary if a proposed action could potentially have a direct or indirect effect on open space resources in the area. A direct effect would "physically change, diminish, or eliminate an open space or reduce its utilization or aesthetic value." An indirect effect may occur when the population generated by a project would be sufficient to noticeably diminish the ability of an area's open space to serve the existing or future populations. According to the guidelines established in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a project that would add fewer than 200 residents or 500 employees, or a similar number of other users to an area, is typically not considered to have indirect effects on open space. The proposed project would introduce more than 200 new residents to the area, but is not expected to generate a net increase of 500 or more employees. In accordance with the guidelines established in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, this chapter assesses the adequacy of open space resources in the area and the project's effect on their use.

The proposed project would not directly displace any existing open space resources, as no open spaces currently exist on the project site. As shown in this analysis, the proposed action would not result in significant adverse open space impacts.

B. METHODOLOGY

Based on the reasonable worst-case development scenario (RWCDS), compared to the future without the proposed action, the proposed project would result in a net increment of approximately 1.1 million sf of new development on the project site. Principal uses would include an approximately 900 dwelling unit (DU) residential tower, local retail, health club space, ground-level automobile sales, preparation and repairs space, and a NYPD Mounted Unit facility. The proposed action would also introduce an incremental increase of 225 accessory parking spaces to the project site. The Build Year for the proposed project is 2011.

The residential component of the proposed project would include 720 market rate DUs and 180 low/moderate income/affordable housing DUs. For analysis purposes, it is assumed that the 720 market rate DUs would have an average household size of 1.64, which is the average size for Manhattan Community District 4. This would result in approximately 1,181 residents of the market rate units. For the 180 affordable housing DUs, an average household size of

2.50 is assumed[1], resulting in approximately 450 low-moderate income residents. In total, the proposed development would have approximately 1,631 residents. There would be no development in the future on the project site without the proposed action, and therefore no new residents in the No-Build condition. As such, a detailed quantitative open space assessment was conducted to examine the change in total population relative to total public space in the area, in order to determine whether the increase in user population due to the proposed action would significantly reduce the amount of open space available for the area's population. This entails the calculation of the existing open space ratio, as well as the open space ratios in the future without and with the proposed action in place. The open space ratio is expressed as the amount of public open space acreage per 1,000 user population.

As noted above, generally a detailed analysis of the indirect effects of the worker population is required if a proposed action would generate more than 500 new employees to a study area. The proposed action is expected to generate approximately 465 new employees. This would include 36 retail employees, 22 health club employees, 330 dealership employees, 47 mounted unit employees, and 40 residential building employees.

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, for areas with a large worker population, it is appropriate to include the worker population in the analysis, even if less than 500 new employees are generated. Therefore, as the study area has a substantial worker population, this chapter assesses the potential impacts the proposed project would have on the open space resources in the area for the combined residential and worker population.

With an inventory of available resources and potential users, the adequacy of open space in the study area is first assessed quantitatively, and then, if the potential for significant adverse impacts is found, a qualitative assessment is conducted. The quantitative approach computes the ratio of open space acreage to the population in the study area and compares this ratio with certain guidelines. The qualitative assessment examines other factors that can affect conclusions about adequacy, including proximity to additional resources beyond the study area, the availability of private recreational facilities, and the demographic characteristics of the area's population.

Open Space Study Area

After determining the affected populations for analysis, the next step is to determine the study area. According to the *CEQR Technical Manual* methodologies, the open space study area is based on the distance a person is assumed to walk to reach a neighborhood open space, as well as the type of open space typically utilized by a particular user. Workers or other daytime populations (non-residents) are assumed to walk approximately a quarter-mile distance (about 10 minutes), and typically use passive open spaces within walking distance of their workplaces. Residents are more likely to travel farther to reach parks and recreational facilities, and they use both passive and active open spaces. Residents will typically walk

[1] Rate previously used in *No. 7 Subway Extension - Hudson Yards Rezoning and Development Program FGEIS* (2004, CEQR #03DCP031M) and *Special W. Chelsea District Rezoning and High Line Open Space FEIS* (2005, CEQR #03DCP069M).

approximately a half-mile distance (up to about 20 minutes) to reach neighborhood open spaces. While they may also visit certain regional parks (such as Central Park), which are located outside of the study area, such open spaces are not included in the quantitative analysis but can be described qualitatively.

As the RWCDS associated with the proposed project consists of both commercial and residential components, a residential use study area is analyzed in this chapter, based on a half-mile distance from the project site. The study area comprises all census tracts that have 50 percent or more of their area located within a half-mile distance from the boundaries of the project site (see Figure 5-1). For conservative analysis purposes those census tracts that have close to 50 percent of their area within the half-mile radius have also been included. Although significantly less than 50 percent of census tract 317.02 is within the half-mile radius, the population of the census tract is small enough that it would not significantly impact the open space survey or ratios and has therefore been included in the open space study area. Census tract 317.02, stretches from W. 57th Street to the north, down the Westside Highway (NY Route 9A) to Chambers Street to the south, therefore the portion of the census tract within the half-mile radius has been included in the study area. Using this methodology, the resultant study area for analysis is shown in Figure 5-1.[2] As shown in the figure, the defined study area extends roughly from Eighth Avenue, to the east, W. 42nd Street to the south, the Hudson River to the west, and W. 72nd Street, W. 70th Street, W. 66th Street and W. 62nd Street to the north. Also, it should be noted that although the open space study area is demarcated along census tract borders, open spaces that fall within the half-mile radius, but outside of the open space study area census tracts were included in this analysis. Conversely, open spaces that fell outside of the half-mile radius, but were within census tracts included in the open space study area were also included in this analysis.

Residential Study Area Population

Demographic data were used to determine residential populations served by existing open space resources in the defined study area. To determine the number of residents located within the study area, data were compiled from the 2000 Census for census tracts comprising the study area. The 2000 Census data was updated to 2008 Existing conditions by applying a 0.5 percent per year background growth rate and accounting for the additional residents introduced to the area through major new residential developments from 2000 to 2007 (developments completed in 2008 are accounted for under No-Build conditions as these developments typically take several months to be fully occupied). The methodology used to calculate the number of residents these new DUs brought to the study area was a combination of the average household population of Manhattan Community District 4 to calculate market rate household residents, and the household rate for low/moderate/middle income DUs, used by previous Environmental Impact Statements in the Community District. The background growth accounts for general increases in population and smaller developments not identified individually.

[2] Using this methodology, the study area defined for analysis consists of census tracts 121, 127, 129, 133, 135, 139, 145, 147 and 155 in their entirety and the portion of census track 317.02 that falls within the half-mile radius from the project site.

Worker Study Area Population

Table 5-1 shows the existing worker population for the census tracts included in the open space study area. Census tracts within or mostly within the half-mile radius surrounding the project site were included in the open space study area. The methodology for determining the study area for the proposed project is discussed in further detail below as the open space study area for both workers and residents are the same in this analysis. It should be noted that the worker population has been adjusted to exclude workers in the area who "work from home" as these are assumed to be counted in the residential analysis.

As shown in Table 5-1, there are approximately 55,730 workers in the open space study area under existing conditions. Approximately 1,495 workers in the study area were reported to "work from home," and were therefore excluded from the existing conditions worker population.

Table 5-1
Existing Conditions Worker Population

Census Tract[1]	Worker Population	Worked from Home	Adjusted Worker Population
121	5,200	315	4,885
127	7,790	135	7,655
129	8,155	180	7,975
133	4,490	135	4,355
135	8,835	25	8,810
139	5,380	340	5,040
145	10,205	135	10,070
147	1,500	35	1,465
151	4,035	195	3,840
317.02	1,635	0	1,635
Worker Total	*57,225*	*1,495*	***55,730***

(1) Source: Census Transportation Planning Package 2000, Journey-to-Work data

Inventory of Publicly-Accessible Open Space

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, open space may be public or private and may be used for active or passive recreational purposes, or be set aside for the protection and enhancement of the natural environment. Public open space is defined as facilities open to the public at designated hours on a regular basis and is assessed for impacts under CEQR. Private open space is not accessible to the general public on a regular basis and is considered qualitatively, and only if required due to the potential for a significant adverse impact.

An open space is determined to be active or passive by the uses that the design of the space allows. Active open spaces are intended for vigorous activities, such as jogging, field sports, and children's active play. Such features might include play equipment, basketball and

handball courts, fields, and playgrounds. Passive facilities encourage such activities as strolling, reading, sunbathing, and people watching. Gardens, walkways, and benches/seating areas, as well as game tables (e.g., chess tables), and picnic areas often characterize passive open spaces. However, some passive spaces can be used for both passive and active recreation; for example, a green lawn or a riverfront walkway can also be used for ball playing, jogging, or rollerblading.

Within the defined study area, all publicly-accessible open spaces were inventoried and identified by their location, size, owner, type, utilization, equipment, hours, and condition of available open space. The information used for this analysis was gathered through field inventories conducted from March to July 2007 and September 2008; from the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation's (DPR) website; and from the New York City Oasis database and other secondary sources of information.

The condition of each open space facility was categorized as "Excellent," "Good", "Fair", or "Poor." A facility was considered in excellent condition if the area was clean, attractive, and all equipment was present and in good repair. A good facility had minor problems such as litter, or older but operative equipment. A fair facility was one which was poorly maintained, had broken or missing equipment, or other factors which would diminish the facility's attractiveness. A poor facility exhibited characteristics such as serious deficiencies in cleanliness, security, and landscaping. Determinations were made subjectively, based on a visual assessment of the facilities. Judgments as to the intensity of use and conditions of the facilities were qualitative, based on an observed degree of activity or utilization. If a facility seemed to be at or near capacity, i.e., the majority of benches or equipment was in use, then utilization was considered heavy. If the facility or equipment was in use, but could accommodate additional users, utilization was considered moderate. If a playground or sitting area had few or no people, usage was considered light.

Adequacy of Open Space Resources

Comparison to City Guidelines

The adequacy of active and passive open space in the study area is assessed both quantitatively and qualitatively. In the quantitative approach, the amount of useable open space acreage in relation to the study area population--referred to as the open space ratio-- is compared with guidelines established by the New York City Department of City Planning (DCP). To determine the adequacy of open space resources for the residential population of a given area, two sets of guidelines are used. The first guideline is a Citywide median open space ratio of 1.5 acres per 1,000 residents. The second is an optimal planning goal established by DCP of 2.5 acres per 1,000 residents (2.0 acres of active and 0.5 acres of passive open space per 1,000 residents). It is recognized that these goals are not feasible for many areas of the City, and they are not considered impact thresholds. Rather, these are benchmarks indicating how well an area is served by open space.

Impact Assessment

The assessment of potential significant adverse impacts on open space is both quantitative and qualitative. The proposed project's potential quantitative impact on open space resources is calculated by assessing the change in the open space ratios in the future with the proposed actions compared with the ratios in the future without the proposed action. The qualitative assessment considers any nearby destination resources and project-created open spaces or private/quasi-private recreational facilities not available or not usually available to the general public. It is recognized that DCP open space planning goals are not feasible for many areas of the City, and they are not considered impact thresholds. Rather, they are benchmarks indicating how well an area is served by open space. In addition, the proposed project's direct effects on open space resources are considered, as well any project-generated changes in open space conditions and/or utilization. Consideration is also given to the adequacy of open space resources in the future with the proposed action relative to specific user and/or age groups.

C. EXISTING CONDITIONS

Residential Study Area Population

Table 5-2 provides the residential population data for the defined study area in both 2000, and for 2008 Existing conditions. Residential population from the 2000 Census, as well as projected residential population from background growth and major residential developments since 2000, are included. The 2008 Existing residential population for the study area is approximately 59,208 residents.

Different age groups represent different types of open space users (for example, toddlers use more passive recreation such as sandboxes and open grass, while young and middle-aged adults are more likely to utilize active open space uses), therefore the residential population of the study area was also broken down by age groups, as seen in Table 5-3. As shown in Table 5-3, there is an overwhelming majority of residents in the study area between the ages of 20 and 64 at 78.3 percent, which is significantly higher than the 61.4 percent of the same age group in New York City as a whole. The study area also hosts a significantly lower rate of school-aged children than New York City as a whole, with a combined 11.7 percent of residents aged 19 and younger, compared to a combined 26.9 percent in New York City as a whole. The percentage of elderly residents over the age of 65 is relatively comparable between the study area (10 percent) and the entire City (11.7 percent).

This data could reflect a proportionately lower demand for passive recreational space among study area residents, compared to the entire City. Also, the hours of open space demand would be expected to be concentrated during weekends, early morning and late afternoon to evening hours during the week, as it could be assumed that most residents aged 20 to 64 would work on weekdays.

Table 5-2, Residential Study Area Population

Census Tract [1]	**Residential Population**	
121	8,288	
127	7,278	
129	4,457	
133	5,805	
135	3,505	
139	9,795	
145	4,411	
147	2,231	
151	7,091	
317.02	3	
Residential Total in 2000:	*52,864*	
Estimated Project Development since 2000 [2]	**Additional Residents***	
	Market Rate	Low/Moderate/ Middle Income
Encore West	0	213
Old School & Flats	0	215
Hit Factory	44	0
10 WEA	294	0
540 W. 50th St.	48	0
Archstone W. 54th	291	111.0
564 W. 52nd St./ 565 W. 51st St.	0	72.2
The Clinton	143	54.5
501 W. 52nd St.	0	67.5
The Westport	487	185.5
The Nicole	184	70.0
The Helena	783	298.5
Clinton Parkview Apartments	0	240.0
West 58	26	0
The Element	325	0
Residential developments since 2000:	*2,625*	*1,567*
Background Growth (@ 0.5% per year)	*2,152*	
Total Residents in Study Area	**59,208**	

(1) Source: 2000 Census of Population and Housing

(2) Source: PHA research of print and online media (see Table 2-2).

** Market rate household size: 1.64, from Manhattan Community District 4 - 2000 CENSUS average; Low/Moderate/Middle Income household size: 2.5, from Hudson Yards EIS & W. Chelsea EIS rates for below-market rate units.*

Table 5-3a, Study Area Age Groups

Age Category	Persons	Percent of Total Population
Census Tracts within Study Area[1]		
4 and younger	1,711	3.2%
5-9	1,409	2.7%
10-14	1,354	2.6%
15-19	1,696	3.2%
20-64	41,396	78.3%
65 and older	5,298	10.0%
Subtotal	**52,864**	100.0%
New Developments/ Background within Study Area since 2000*		
4 and younger	205	3.2%
5-9	169	2.7%
10-14	162	2.6%
15-19	204	3.2%
20-64	4,968	78.3%
65 and older	636	10.0%
Subtotal	**6,344**	100.0%
TOTAL	**59,208**	

** Age breakdown by residents calculated by using same age breakdown as 2000 Census rates*

Table 5-3b, New York City Age Groups[1]

Age Category	Persons	Percent of Total Population
4 and younger	540,878	6.8%
5-9	561,115	7.0%
10-14	530,816	6.6%
15-19	520,641	6.5%
20-64	4,916,971	61.4%
65 and older	937,857	11.7%
Total	**8,008,278**	100.0%

(1) Source: U.S. Census 2000 Summary File-1.

Worker Population

As discussed above and shown in Table 5-1, there are approximately 55,730 workers in the open space study area under existing conditions. Approximately 1,495 workers in the study area were reported to "work from home," and were therefore excluded from the existing conditions worker population.

Inventory of Publicly-Accessible Open Space

Table 5-4, Open Space Inventory, identifies the address, ownership, hours, acreage of active and passive open spaces in the study area, and their condition and utilization. Figure 5-2

provides a map of their locations. The Map Key number provided in the first column of Table 5-4 indicates the appropriate marker for each open space in Figure 5-2.

As shown in Figure 5-2, 42 publicly-accessible open space and recreational resources within the study area are included in the quantitative analysis. These resources comprise a total of approximately 52.94 acres, almost evenly split between passive open space (approximately 26.76 acres, or 50.5 percent of total) and active open space (approximately 26.18 acres, or 49.5 percent of total). Some of the larger open space resources included in the quantitative analysis are described briefly below.

In addition to the above resources, large open space resources that fall outside of the open space study area, including Central Park, Riverside Park, and the remainder of Hudson River Park located outside the study area boundary, are not included in the quantitative analysis (identified by letters in Figure 5-2 and Table 5-4), yet are significant open spaces for the general area and entire City, and are therefore discussed in the qualitative analysis below.

Open Space Resources

De Witt Clinton Park (Table 5-4, #14)
This 5.8-acre park occupies two blocks between W. 52nd and W. 54th Streets from Eleventh Avenue to Twelfth Avenue, directly west of the project site. It contains benches and plantings that make it suitable for passive recreation, but most of the park is occupied by facilities for active recreation, including ball fields, basketball courts, handball courts, a dog park, and a playground. The ball fields, which have lights and bleachers, are the most heavily used facilities. The Erie Canal playground has been renovated with climbing rocks and colorful play equipment, including a jungle gym and swings. Maria Clinton's perennial garden is located at the southern end of the park.

Hudson River Park/Clinton Cove (Table 5-4, #3)
The two-acre portion of Hudson River Park from W. 55th to W. 57th Street combines both active and passive recreational uses, featuring a lawn, dotted with trees and sitting rocks that face a view of the Hudson River and the New Jersey shore. A public boathouse is located on Pier 96, along the northern part of Clinton Cove, and benches, lighting, chairs and tables line walkways that connect to the bike/walk path that stretches the length of Hudson River Park, from W. 59th Street to the north, down to Chambers Street in TriBeCa to the south.

Amsterdam Plaza at Harborview Terrace (Table 5-4, #19)
A 2.1-acre plaza located in the Harborview Terrace housing complex between W. 55th and W. 56th Streets and Tenth and Eleventh Avenues, which contains a large paved basketball court, tables, benches, a children's playground with play equipment and more benches and planters located near the entrance to the residential building is open to the public.

TABLE 5-4
Inventory of Existing Open Space and Recreational Facilities in Study Area

Map No.	Name	Address / Location	Owner	Features	Hours of Access	Total Acres	Active		Passive		Condition	Use Level
							%	Acres	%	Acres		
1	McCaffrey Playground	W. 43rd St. btw. Eighth & Ninth Avenues	NYC DPR	Playground, basketball & handball courts, spray shower	Closes at dusk	0.44	79.5%	0.35	20.5%	0.09	Good/ Excellent	Moderate
2	Gregory J.M. Portley Sitting Area	W. 43rd St. btw. Ninth & Tenth Aves.	Manhattan Plaza, Inc.	Benches	Closes at 12am	0.17	0%	0.00	100%	0.17	Good	Heavy
3*	Hudson River Park/Clinton Cove*	Hudson River btw. W. 55th & W.57th Streets	NYC DPR	Boathouse, eateries, museums, paved walkways, seating, lawn, trees, viewing area	Closes at 1am, bike path open 24 hours	2.00	80.0%	1.60	20.0%	0.40	Good	Moderate
4	May Matthews Playground	W. 46th St. btw. Ninth & Tenth Avenues	NYC DPR	Handball & basketball courts, playground, spray fountain	Closes at dusk	0.48	77.1%	0.37	22.9%	0.11	Good	Moderate
5	Ramon Aponte Park	W. 47th St. btw. Eighth & Ninth Aves.	NYC DPR	Basketball & handball courts, playground, benches, trees	Closes at dusk	0.20	50%	0.10	50%	0.10	Good	Light
6	Professional Performing Arts HS/J.S. 17/P.S. 212 Midtown West School	W. 47th St. btw. Eighth & Ninth Aves.	NYCDOE	paved yard, jungle gym	School hours	0.16	100%	0.16	0%	0.00	Excellent	Heavy
7	Hell's Kitchen Park/47th Street Playground	Tenth Avenue btw. W. 47th & W. 48th Streets	NYC DPR	Playground, basketball & handball courts, benches	Closes at dusk	0.58	29.3%	0.17	70.7%	0.41	Excellent	Heavy
8	Clinton Community Garden	450 W. 48th St. btw. Ninth & Tenth Aves.	NYC DPR	Flowers, plants, trees, grass, paths, benches	Closes at dusk	0.35	0%	0.00	100%	0.35	Excellent	Light
9	Firefighters Memorial Park at the Ritz Plaza	W. 48th Street btw. Broadway & Eighth Ave.	Ritz Plaza	Trees, planters, benches, tables, lighting	Summer: 7am - 11:30pm, Winter: 7am - 7pm	0.09	0%	0.00	100%	0.09	Excellent	Light
10	One Worldwide Plaza	825 Eighth Avenue	ZCWK Plaza Associates	Chairs, trees, panters, benches, sculptural lighting, tables	24 hours	0.60	0%	0.00	100%	0.60	Excellent	Light

TABLE 5-4(continued)
Inventory of Existing Open Space and Recreational Facilities in Study Area

11	Gutenberg Playground	W. 49th St. btw. Ninth & Tenth Avenues	NYC DPR/ NYCDOE	Handball & basketball courts, bleachers	Closes at dusk	0.55	100%	0.55	0%	0.00	Good/ Excellent	Moderate
12*	Open Space*	W. 50th St. btw. Eighth & Ninth Aves.	341-363 W 50th St. Redevelopment Company	Benches, play equipment, parked cars	N/A	0.13	37%	0.05	63%	0.08	Good	Light
13*	Hudson View Terrace Plaza	Tenth Avenue btw. W. 50th & W. 51st Sts.		Seatings, plantings	24 hours	0.30	0%	0.00	100%	0.30	Good	Moderate
14	DeWitt Clinton Park	Btw. W. 52nd & @. 54th Sts and Eleventh & Twelfth Aves.	NYC DPR	Ball fields, basketball courts, benches, trees, plantings, walkways, play equipment, dog park, rocks	Park closes at 11pm	5.90	79.7%	4.70	20.3%	1.20	Fair	Heavy
15	P.S. 111 Playground	Tenth Ave btw. W. 52nd & W. 53rd Sts.	NYCDOE	Playground, basketball courts, paved ball field, community garden	School hours	0.80	87.5%	0.70	12.5%	0.10	Good	Light
16	Oasis II Community Garden	W. 52nd Street btw. Tenth & Eleventh Aves.	NYC DPR/ Greenthumb	Vegetables, seatings, picnic tables, meeting area	N/A	0.52	0%	0.00	100%	0.52	Poor	Light
17	Clinton Towers Plaza	790 Eleventh Ave.	P&L Management & Consulting	Benches, slides, trees	Restricted hours	0.40	25%	0.10	75%	0.30	Fair/Poor	Light
18	Harborview Terrace Plaza	W. 54th St. btw. Tenth & Eleventh Aves.	NYCHPD	Seating	8am - 10pm	0.10	0%	0.00	100%	0.10	Fair	Light
19	Amsterdam Plaza at Harborview Terrace	W. 55th St. btw. Tenth & Eleventh Aves.	NYCHA	Plantings, seatings, playground, paved basketball court	Unknown	1.20	100%	1.20	0%	0.00	Poor	Light
20	330 W. 56th Street	330 W. 56th Street	Berkley Associates	Benches, trees, planters	24 hours	0.06	0.0%	0.00	100.0%	0.06	Fair	Low
21	Balsley Park	Ninth Ave. btw. W. 57th and W. 56th Sts.	Rose 29 LLC	Garden, play area, seatings, lawn, trees, eatery	Summer: 7am - 9pm, Winter: 7am 7pm	0.30	33.3%	0.10	66.7%	0.20	Good	Moderate

TABLE 5-4(continued)
Inventory of Existing Open Space and Recreational Facilities in Study Area

22	555 W. 57th Street	555 W. 57th St. btw. Tenth & Eleventh Aves.	Green W. 57th Street LLC	Benches, trees	24 hours	0.05	0%	0.00	100%	0.05	Good	Moderate
23	Parc Vendome/ Sheffield Plaza	322/350 W. 57th St.	Southcroft Company	Seatings, plantings	Seatings, plantings	0.50	0%	0.00	100%	0.50	Fair	Low
24	St. Luke's - Roosevelt Hospital Entrance Plaza	Tenth Ave. btw. W. 58th & W. 59th Sts.	St. Luke's - Roosevelt Hospital	Trees, planters, benches, flowers	8am-sunset	0.08	0%	0.00	100%	0.08	Fair	Moderate
25	W. 59th St. Recreation Center	W. 59th St. btw. Tenth & Eleventh Aves.	NYC DPR	Indoor/Outdoor pools, multi-use gym, paved outdoor area	M-F: 930am-9pm, Sat/Sun: 10am-5pm	2.50	48%	1.20	52%	1.30	Poor	Low
26	Roosevelt Staff House/ Millicent V. Hearst House Plaza	W. 59th St. btw. Tenth & Eleventh Aves.	Augustus & James Corp	Plantings, seatings	Open, but private	0.05	0%	0.00	100%	0.05	Fair	Low
27	Public Plaza	W. 59th St. btw. Tenth & Eleventh Aves.	Columbus/ Amsterdam Associates	Benches, trees	8am-sunset	0.18	0%	0.00	100%	0.18	Fair	Low
28	Columbus Circle	Btw. W. 60th & W. 58th Sts., Broadway and Eighth Aves.	NYC DPR	Statue, benches	24 hours	0.20	0%	0.00	100%	0.20	Good	Heavy
29	Dale F. Frey Plaza	Btw. W. 60th & W. 61st Sts., Central Park West & Columbus Ave.	Trump International Hotel & Tower	Sculpture, benches, trees	24 hours	0.20	0%	0.00	100%	0.20	Good	Moderate
30	The Regent**	28 Columbus Ave, 345 W. 60th St.	Glenwood Management Company	Seatings, plantings, water fountain	7am-sunset	0.20	0%	0.00	100%	0.20	Good	Moderate
31	The Beaumont	30 W. 60th St.	Carlos E. Diaz Flores	Seatings, plantings, trees	24 hours for residents only	0.20	0%	0.00	100%	0.20	Excellent	Low
32	Fordham University Plaza	Btw. W. 60th & W. 62nd St., Ninth & Tenth Aves.	Fordham University	Benches, trees, flowers, lawn, sculptures, lighting	24 hours	3.00	0%	0.00	100%	3.00	Good	Moderate
33	P.S. 191 Amsterdam School	Tenth Avenue btw. W. 60th & W. 61st Sts.	NYCDOE	Planting, seating, paved courts, playgrounds	School hours	2.00	65%	1.30	35%	0.70	Good	Heavy

TABLE 5-4(continued)
Inventory of Existing Open Space and Recreational Facilities in Study Area

34	Amsterdam Houses Open Space	Btw. W. 61st & W. 64th Sts., Tenth & Eleventh Aves.	NYCHA	Seating, plantings, playground	Closed at 10pm	2.50	48%	1.20	52%	1.30	Fair/Poor	Low
35	Damrosch Park	Amsterdam Ave. & W. 62nd St.	NYC DPR	Bandshell, plantings, seating	24 hrs	2.40	0%	0.00	100%	2.40	Fair	Low
36	Lincoln Center Plaza	Btw. W. 65 & W. 63rd Sts., Columbus & Amsterdam Aves.	NYCDPR	Seatings, fountain, sculpture	24 hrs	3.80	0%	0.00	100%	3.80	Excellent	Heavy
37	15-44 W. 62nd Street	W. 62nd St. & Columbus Ave.	Lincoln Plaza Greenfield Organization	Plantings, skylight cover	24 hrs	0.20	0%	0.00	100%	0.20	Good	Low
38	West End Towers Park	W. 63rd St. and West End Ave.	West End Towers	Animal art, lighting, lawns, walkways, chairs, tables, playgrounds,benches, trees, plantings	7am-10pm	1.70	70.6%	1.20	29.4%	0.50	Good	Moderate
39	Samuel N. 2nd Bennerson Playground/Amsterdam Houses Playground	Btw. W. 63rd and W. 64th Sts, Amsterdam and West End Aves.	NYC DPR	Basketball courts, play equipment	Closes at 10pm	0.75	62.7%	0.47	37.3%	0.28	Good/Fair	Low
40	James Felt Plaza	W. 64th St. btw. Amsterdam & West End Aves.	NYCHA	Seatings, plantings, children's playground, fountain, sculpture	Open, playground restricted to childcare center	0.10	40%	0.04	60%	0.06	Good/Fair	Low
41	Martin Luther King, Jr. High School	Amsterdam Ave. & W. 65th St.	NYCDOE	Seatings, planters, sculpture	24 hours	1	0%	0.00	100%	1.00	Good	Low
42	Riverside Park South*	Btw. W. 68th and 72nd Sts, Hudson River, Westside Hwy.	NYC DPR	Benches, fishing piers, play areas, walk/bike path, Little Engine Playground, eatery	7am-11pm	16	70.0%	11.20	30.0%	4.80	Good/Fair	Moderate

TABLE 5-4(continued)

Inventory of Existing Open Space and Recreational Facilities in Study Area

A	*Central Park****	*Btw. W. 59th Street, Central Park West, West 110th Street and Park Ave.*	*NYC DPR*	*Basketball and tennis courts, ball fields, bike paths, play equipment, boating amenities, skating rinks, refreshments, benches, seating*	*6am-1am*	*843*	**	**	**	**	*Good*	*Heavy*
B	*Riverside Park****	*Btw. W. 72nd Street and W. 158th Street, Hudson River, Westside Hwy.*	*NYC DPR*	*Benches, tennis courts, baseball fields, bird sanctuaries, dog runs, snack bars, gardens, playground areas, promenades, skate park, carousel, boat basin*	*7am-11pm*	*330*	**	**	**	**	*Good*	*Heavy*
					TOTAL	**52.94**	50.5%	26.76	49.5%	26.18		

Notes:

Field surveys were conducted on March 27-29, 2007 between the hours of 12pm-3:30pm, except for 15-44 W. 62nd Street, where information was obtained from West 61st Street Rezoning FEIS, 2006, with validation surveying conducted on September 24, 2008.

NYC DPR - New York City Department of Parks and Recreation, NYCDOE - New York City Department of Education, NYCHA - New York City Housing Authority

GreenThumb has been a program of the New York City Parks Department since 1995, funded by federal Community Development Block Grants.

** Passive vs. active use acreage has been estimated; total acreage of The Allegro has been estimated; total acreage of Riverside Park South based on development plans for 2007.*

*** The Regent contains two open spaces, one at 28 Columbus Ave. and one at 345 W. 60th St. Acreage numbers are from combined totals.*

**** Central Park does not lie within the study area and is not considered in the quantitative open space analysis, but has been included in the qualitative analysis due to large size and proximity to the study area.*

Sources:

New York City Department of Parks & Recreation website - www.nycgovparks.org; Hudson River Park/Clinton Cove website - www.hudsonriverpark.org, www.clintoncove.com; PHA field

W. 59th Street Recreation Center (Table 5-4, #25)
This facility is entirely an active recreation space with a multi-use gymnasium, indoor sports courts, an indoor pool, an outdoor pool, and an outdoor water fountain. The outdoor facilities, particularly the pool, are in poor condition and not useable, therefore the pool acreage is not considered in this analysis.

P.S. 191 (Table 5-4, #33)
This approximately 0.6-acre facility is the playground for P.S. 191, a New York City public elementary school located on Amsterdam Avenue, between W. 60th and W. 61st Streets. The open space includes a large paved area featuring different outdoor activities, including baseball, basketball and tennis. In addition, there are two smaller, well-maintained playgrounds with colorful equipment, including jungle gyms. During school hours, use is restricted to students, but the open space is open to the public at other times.

Fordham University Plaza (Table 5-4, #32)
The Fordham University campus between W. 60th and W. 62nd Streets and Ninth and Tenth Avenues features a 3.0-acre public plaza that is mostly passive open space, well-maintained with lawns, trees, flowers, sculptures, and benches. While it primarily functions as a campus green for Fordham students, it is also open to and used by the public.

Amsterdam Houses/Samuel N. 2nd Bennerson Playground (Table 5-4, #39)
Amsterdam Houses are New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA) residential buildings with some facilities that are open to the public and some designated for NYCHA residents only. The 0.75-acre Samuel N. 2nd Bennerson Playground contains a variety of active and passive spaces, while the additional 2.5-acres of open space operated by NYCHA includes attractive landscaped walkways and a separate young children's playground.

West End Tower Open Space (Table 5-4, #38)
This 1.7-acre park is located on West End Avenue between W. 63rd and W. 64th Streets near the West End Towers residential buildings, overlooking the large expanse of Riverside Park South and includes children's play equipment and courts, attractive landscaping and topography, walking paths, lawns, trees, sculpture and playgrounds.

Lincoln Center Plaza (Table 5-4, #36)
3.8-acres between the theaters at Lincoln Center comprise a major open space and local gathering place, featuring a fountain, reflecting pool with sculptures, and ledges for sitting. In the summer, outdoor music performances are held in the plaza. The portion of the plaza between Avery Fisher Hall and Vivian Beaumont and Mitzi Newhouse theaters is landscaped and occupied by benches and modern sculpture, but also hidden from the street and not as heavily used at the main part of the plaza.

Damrosch Park (Table 5-4, #35)
Adjacent to Lincoln Center Plaza, Damrosch Park is a 2.4-acre passive open space that has trees, plantings, benches, and a band shell but no lawns. It is a popular area for recreation and offers numerous outdoor music and dance performances during the summer months.

Riverside Park South (Table 5-4, #42)
There are approximately 16 acres of open space between the existing Riverside and Hudson River Parks, between W. 72nd and W. 59th Streets, the Hudson River and the Westside Highway. A bike path/walkway currently runs through Riverside Park South, connecting Riverside to the north and Hudson River Park to the South. Other amenities include open grass space, soccer and baseball fields, basketball and tennis courts, seating areas, fishing piers, a café and the Little Engine playground, which features children's play equipment and benches. Also the Science Barge, a sustainable urban farm, is located on the Hudson River, opposite W. 70th Street. This resource also includes four acres, from W. 65th to W. 59th Streets that were completed and opened to the public in summer 2008. Riverside Park South is affiliated with Phases I, II, III, and V of the Riverside South Development (also known as Trump Place).

Analysis of the Adequacy of Open Space Resources

Quantitative Assessment

As shown in Table 5-4, the study area includes a total of approximately 52.94 acres of open space, of which an estimated 26.76 acres are for active use and 26.18 acres are for passive use. With the study area containing approximately 59,208 residents, the existing open space ratio in the study area is approximately 0.894 acres of open space per 1,000 residents. As shown in Table 5-5, there are approximately 0.452 acres of active open space per 1,000 residents (50.5 percent), and 0.442 acres of passive open space per 1,000 residents (49.5 percent).

Based on the previously mentioned DCP guidelines, the study area exhibits a low open space ratio, compared to the city-wide median ratio of 1.5 acres per 1,000 persons and the planning goal of 2.5 acres per 1,000 persons (0.5 acres of passive space and 2.0 acres of active space). The study area would therefore require a more detailed analysis of open spaces resources available to the residential community.

Table 5-5
Analysis of Adequacy of Open Space Resources in the Study Area Under Existing Conditions

Study Area	Existing Conditions	Open Space Acreage (3)			Open Space Ratio per 1,000 people			DCP Open Space Guidelines		
		Total	Active	Passive	Total	Active	Passive	Total	Active	Passive
Residential Population (1)	**59,208**	52.943	26.761	26.182	0.894	0.452	0.442	2.5	2	0.5
Combined Resident and Worker Population (2)	**114,938**				0.461	0.233	0.228	N/A	N/A	0.33 *

(1): Refer to Table 5-2
(2): Refer to Tables 5-1 and 5-2
(3): Refer to Table 5-4
**Passive space weighted average combining 0.15 acres per 1,000 workers and 0.50 acres per 1,000 residents*

As discussed above, for a more conservative analysis, this chapter includes assessment of the proposed project on passive open space resources for the combined resident and worker population. As shown in Table 5-5, the passive open space ratio for the combined resident and worker population (0.228) is below the weighted DCP guideline of 0.33 acres per 1,000 residents and workers.

Qualitative Assessment

As noted above, Central Park, Riverside Park, and the remainder of Hudson River Park not within the open space study area boundary were not included in the quantitative assessment. All three are vast open spaces located outside of the both the open space study area, and the half-mile radius, yet are considered significant open space resources as they are regional destination facilities that are used by study area residents.

Central Park is the premier open space in New York City and spans approximately 843 acres in the center of Manhattan, comprises approximately 16 percent of the borough and includes 136 acres of woodlands, 250 acres of lawns, 150 acres of water in 7 waterbodies, 58 miles of pedestrian paths, 4.5 miles of bridle paths, 6.5 miles of Park drives, and 7 miles of benches. Amenities also include Belvedere Castle, Tavern on the Green restaurant, playgrounds, the Great Lawn, sports fields and courts, bridges and arches, sculptures, rocks, trees, bushes and shrubberies, a carousel and Wollman skating rink. Many of these are internationally famous and top visitor destinations within the city, with Central Park attracting approximately 25 million visitors annually.[3] While Central Park lies just outside of the open space study boundary for the proposed action, the park's distinction as an international destination is sufficient to assume that residents living around the proposed action would travel outside of the study area boundary to visit this open space resource.

Riverside Park extends along the Hudson River for four miles, between W. 72nd and W. 158th Streets, spanning approximately 330 acres of waterfront open space. A bike path/walkway runs through Riverside Park, connecting Riverside Park South and Hudson River Park, and past numerous seating areas, sports fields and courts, monuments, children's play areas and equipment, promenades, dog runs, snack bars, gardens, bird sanctuaries and a skate park. There is also a waterfront esplanade and boat basin located at W. 95th Street and a carousel at W. 145th Street. The extension of Riverside Park, from W. 72nd Street to W. 62nd Street was added in 2000 and named Riverside Park South. The remaining section that connected Riverside Park South to Hudson River Park at W. 59th Street was completed and opened in summer 2008.

Hudson River Park stretches for nearly 550 acres south along the western shore from W. 59th Street to Lower Manhattan, through the waterfront neighborhoods of Clinton, Chelsea, West Village, and ending in TriBeCa at Chambers Street, offering approximately five miles of a bike pathway/walkway just west of the Westside Highway, and also extends north to connect to Riverside Park. While some parts are currently under development or planned for

[3] *Information from Central Park Conservancy website: www.centralparknyc.org*

construction, Hudson River Park already features, public piers and upland parkland areas featuring benches and open lawn opened for public use, plazas, fountains, a community garden, dog runs, children's play areas, a non-motorized boathouse, and a kayak boathouse. While a majority of Hudson River Park falls outside of the open space study area, similar to Riverside Park, the continuous bike path/walkway provides a link between the park sections in the study area and the other portions of the park.

Therefore, a substantial amount of additional open space is available to the study area's user population, beyond what has been included in the quantitative analysis. Although these resources are located outside of the study area boundary, they are relatively large, accessible, and widely-utilized open spaces that are expected to attract existing and future users within the study area boundary.

D. FUTURE WITHOUT THE PROPOSED ACTION

Open Space Study Area Population

As discussed in Chapters 1, "Project Description," and 2, "Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy," in the future without the proposed action there would be no new development on the project site and therefore no increase in residents or workers on the project site. In the study area there are several identified developments expected to be developed in the future without the proposed action, as discussed in Chapter 2, that are located within or near the defined open space study area. In addition, a 0.5 percent per year background growth rate is applied to the 59,208 existing population to account for general increases in population and smaller developments not identified individually. These No-Build developments and the background growth combined are expected to increase the study area population by approximately 4,936 residents by 2011 to a total of 64,143~~,~~ residents (see Table 5-6).

Open Space Resources

As presented in Chapter 2, "Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy," there are two open space resources anticipated to be developed within the study area by 2011 without the proposed action. As shown in Figure 5-3 and Table 5-7, the Pier 97 Expansion of Clinton Cove Park is located to the west of the project site, along the Hudson River waterfront and is expected to be completed in 2010, and the approximately 5,000 sf community garden as part of The Old School & The Flats and 530-548 W. 53rd Street No Build developments is located on the block south of the project site, and expected to be completed in 2010.

Table 5-6, 2011 Study Area Population without the Proposed Action

Total 2008 Residents in Study Area [1]	**59,208**	
Anticipated No-Build Development in the 2011 Future[2]	**Additional Residents [3]**	
	Market Rate	Low/Moderate/ Middle Income
Archstone Clinton	833	313
501-505 W. 51st Street Phase I		30
Centro 505	179	
Helena II	738	
405 W. 53rd St.	139	
Harborview Terrace Houses Expansion	200	550
462 W. 58th St.	110	
501-505 W. 51st Street Phase II		25
Real Estate Industrials, Inc. Project	194	75
533-541 W. 52nd St.		250
530-548 W. 53rd St.		250
460 W. 54th St.	157	
Additional No-Build Development Residents:	*2,550*	*1,493*
Background Growth (@ 0.5% per year)	*893*	
Total Residents in Study Area	**64,143**	

(1) See Table 5-2

(2) Source: PHA research of print and online media; W. 61st Street Rezoning FEIS (2006); PLUTO Files (2005); ACRIS; BIS (refer to Chapter 2, "Land Use, Zoning & Public Policy," Table 2-4 for details.

(3) Assumes 1.64 Residents per Household for Market rate units and 2.5 residents per household for Low/Moderate/Middle income units

Table 5-7, Open Spaces Changes in the Study Area - No Build Conditions

Open Spaces Added to the Study Area in the Future Without the Proposed Action 2011						
Map No.	Resource	Location	Program	Open Space Acreage Active	Passive	Year
1	Pier 97 Conversion	Hudson River waterfront at W. 57th Street	Pier 97 converted from existing vehicle and sand storage to part of Clinton Cove open space.	0.7	0.3	2010
2	Combined Community Gardens	The Old School & The Flats and 530-548 W. 53rd Street	Two combined identical-sized 25' x 100' community gardens as part of new No-Build developments comprising approximately 5,000 sf of total garden space	0	0.1	2010
Open Spaces Removed from the Study Area in the Future Without the Proposed Action 2011						
A	Amsterdam Plaza at Harborview Terrace	W. 55th St. btw. Tenth & Eleventh Aves.	Existing open space of basketball courts, seating, plantings and playground replaced with residential development and parking facilities as part of Harborview Terrace expansion	1.2	0	2009
Open Space Changes in the Study Area in the Future Without the Proposed Action 2011						**-0.1 Acres**

The Pier 97 Expansion of Clinton Cove Park would add approximately one acre of open space to the existing Hudson River Park, at W. 57th Street. Clinton Cove, as previously mentioned, refers to the development of Piers 95 and 96 to include seating areas, open space with a waterfront view, and a public boathouse. Pier 97 has been utilized by the NYC Department of Sanitation (DOS) as salt storage and vehicle parking for fleet sanitation trucks. A new DOS garage at W. 57th Street and Twelfth Avenue, just upland of Pier 97 and is expected to be completed in 2008. Once this garage is completed, DOS will relocate their fleet from Pier 97 to the new parking facility and Pier 97 will be incorporated into Clinton Cove. It is anticipated that Pier 97 will feature new public amenities, including a skate park, basketball court, an open lawn and a dock to berth historic ships. It is assumed that this new acre of open space added to Clinton Cove would be split into approximately 70 percent active space and 30 percent passive space. It is estimated that the park improvements to Pier 97 will be completed by 2010.

The community garden would actually be two adjacent community gardens, one part of the planned The Old School & The Flats development and the other part of the planned 530-48 West 53rd Street development, mentioned previously as No-Build developments (Table 5-6). The two identical-sized gardens are expected to each be approximately 25 feet wide by 100 feet long and comprise 5,000 sf, or approximately 0.1 acres, of combined garden space, just south of the project site.

In the future without the proposed action, it is also expected that the open space in Amsterdam Plaza at Harborview Terrace (#19, Table 5-4) would be replaced with residential development and parking facilities. For conservative analysis purposes, it is assumed that the open space, including basketball courts, seating, plantings and a paved playground, would not be replaced in the future No-Build scenario. This would take away approximately 1.2 acres of existing open space from the study area, as compared to the future without the proposed action.

Therefore, in the future without the proposed action, the total amount of open space within the study area would decrease by approximately 0.1 acres, to a total of 52.84 acres. Passive open space would increase to 26.58 acres, but active open space would decrease to 26.26 acres.

Quantitative Analysis of Open Space Adequacy

New developments and general background growth in the study area are expected to introduce residents to the area in the future without the proposed project, along with the new open space resources currently being developed and also planned in the future. Although the new developments would also introduce new employees to the area, as previously mentioned, this analysis will focus exclusively on the potential impacts of the proposed action on the residential population of the study area. As shown in Table 5-8, in the future without the proposed action, the total open space ratio for the study area would be 0.825 acres per 1,000 residents, which is below the recommended City-wide community district median of 1.5 acres per 1,000 residents. In addition, the active open space ratio would decrease from the existing conditions of 0.452 acres per 1,000 residents to 0.409 acres, well below the recommended

ratio of 2.0 acres per 1,000 residents, and the study area would not be well-served by active open space. However, although the passive open space ratio for the study area's residents would also decrease, from 0.442 acres per 1,000 residents under existing conditions to 0.414 acres per 1,000 residents under the No-Build condition, this ratio is close to the recommended 0.5 acres per 1,000 residents guideline and therefore, the study area would be served moderately well by passive open space. The passive open space ratio for combined residents and workers would also decrease, from 0.228 acres per 1,000 residents and workers under existing conditions to 0.222 acres per 1,000 residents and workers in the No-Build condition, a 2.6 percent decrease. This is below the weighted DCP guideline for combined worker and residents passive open space ratio, which increased from existing conditions to 0.34 acres per 1,000 residents and workers.

Table 5-8
Analysis of Adequacy of Open Space Resources in the Study Area Under No-Build Conditions

Study Area	Existing Conditions	Open Space Acreage (3)			Open Space Ratio per 1,000 people			DCP Open Space Guidelines		
		Total	Active	Passive	Total	Active	Passive	Total	Active	Passive
Residential Population (1)	**64,143**	52.843	26.261	26.582	0.824	0.409	0.414	2.5	2	0.5
Combined Resident and Worker Population (2)	**119,873**				0.441	0.219	0.222	N/A	N/A	0.34 *

(1): Refer to Table 5-2
(2): Refer to Tables 5-1 and 5-2
(3): Refer to Table 5-4
**Passive space weighted average combining 0.15 acres per 1,000 workers and 0.50 acres per 1,000 residents*

Qualitative Assessment of Open Space Adequacy

The anticipated open space expansion of Pier 97 in the future without the proposed action would not add a substantial amount of open space acreage to the study area, but would contribute to creating the seamless connection between Hudson River Park, Clinton Cove, and Riverside Park South. The conversion of Pier 97 from utility storage to open space would extend Clinton Cove to further blend with the final phases of development of Riverside Park South and allow users to better access the open space along the entire Hudson River waterfront from the study area. As one of the most the prominent features of these waterfront open space resources is the continuous bike path/walk way that runs almost the entire length of Manhattan along the Hudson River, the residents within the study area would actually have greater access to active open space resources than the quantitative assessment would show, as the study area boundary only includes a portion of the bike path/walkway. As it is highly likely that residents within the study area would utilize the bike path/walkway beyond the study area boundary, there would be a considerable amount of active open space available in the future without the proposed action.

E. FUTURE WITH THE PROPOSED ACTION

Open Space Study Area Population

Chapter 1, "Project Description" shows that in the future with the proposed action, it is estimated that the RWCDS associated with the proposed project would result in a net increment of approximately 1.3 million sf of new development on the project site by the year 2011, compared to the No-Build condition. As previously mentioned, the proposed project is also expected to introduce 1,631 new residents to the project site and the total residents in the study area would increase from 64,143 to 65,774 residents in the future with the proposed action.

Quantitative Analysis of Open Space Adequacy

As a result of the new resident population introduced by the proposed project, the passive open space ratio would decrease from 0.414 acres per 1,000 residents under the No-Build condition to 0.404 acres per 1,000 residents in the With-Action condition (Table 5-9). This shows a reduction in passive open space resources within the study area of 2.4 percent.

Table 5-9
Analysis of Adequacy of Open Space Resources in the Study Area Under Build Conditions

Study Area	Existing Conditions	Open Space Acreage (3)			Open Space Ratio per 1,000 people			DCP Open Space Guidelines		
		Total	Active	Passive	Total	Active	Passive	Total	Active	Passive
Residential Population (1)	**65,774**	52.843	26.261	26.582	0.803	0.399	0.404	2.5	2	0.5
Combined Resident and Worker Population (2)	**121,504**				0.435	0.216	0.219	N/A	N/A	0.34 *

(1): Refer to Table 5-2
(2): Refer to Tables 5-1 and 5-2
(3): Refer to Table 5-4
**Passive space weighted average combining 0.15 acres per 1,000 workers and 0.50 acres per 1,000 residents*

The active open space ratio would also decline, from 0.409 acres per 1,000 residents to 0.399 acres per 1,000 residents, in the future with the proposed action, a decrease of approximately 2.5 percent. The passive open space ratio for the combined resident and worker population would also decrease, from 0.222 to 0.219 in the future with the proposed action. This remains below the DCP guideline of 0.34 acres per 1,000 residents and workers. The *CEQR Technical Manual* states that a decrease in the open space ratio that would approach or exceed 5 percent is generally considered to be a substantial change, warranting a more detailed open space analysis if the area is well-served by open space. In this case, the study area is underserved by open space and the CEQR guidelines state that an increase of one percent or more could result in a significant adverse impact.

The overall residential open space ratio in the future with the proposed action would decrease from 0.824 in the No-Build condition and to 0.803 in the Build condition, representing a 2.5 percent decrease (or a decrease of approximately 0.021 acres per 1,000 residents). The decrease for the combined resident and worker population is approximately 1.3 percent. Because the study area is underserved by open space, other factors must be considered to determine if this decrease in the passive and active open space ratios would result in a significant adverse impact.

In this instance, a number of factors demonstrate that although the study area has a low active open space ratio and this ratio would decrease with the proposed project, this decrease would not constitute a significant adverse impact. First, it is recognized that the DCP guidelines are not feasible for many areas of the city, and they are not considered impact thresholds. Moreover, the ratios would decrease by a maximum of 0.01 acres per 1,000 people with the proposed project. Further, as noted below in "Qualitative Analysis," Central Park, Hudson River Park and Riverside Park, three destination open spaces with a substantial amount of active and passive recreation facilities, are located just outside the study area. These open spaces would help to alleviate any open space shortage, for both the residential (active and passive) and combined residential/worker (passive) populations. Therefore, even though the active space ratio falls below City guidelines and would decrease with the proposed project, the proposed project would not result in a significant adverse impact on open space resources.

Qualitative Assessment of Open Space Adequacy

As discussed above, although proposed project would decrease the open space ratios by more than one percent, the surrounding area provides offsetting factors. In the future with the proposed action, the proximity of Central Park, Hudson River Park, and Riverside Park would continue to be a factor in relieving the active open space deficiency of the residential study area. All of these large open spaces either overlap or are just outside of the open space study area boundary and are prominent open spaces in the neighborhood, borough, and entire City. These resources' numerous amenities would provide many opportunities for residents in the study area to enjoy both passive and active open space recreation. Also, the project site is located directly across from DeWitt Clinton Park, which also offers an array of passive and active open space resource features and encompasses almost 6 acres just across Eleventh Avenue from the proposed project site.

It should also be noted that the proposed project would include approximately 52,569 sf of private open space that would be utilized by residents of the new development. As part of the proposed action, the building would be shaped in an "S" formation, moving diagonally across the site with a sloped roof line that would create a series of stepped outdoor terraces. The private open space would be located in the two scooped out triangular areas of the "S", providing approximately 1.2 acres of landscaped terrace space, approximately 42 feet from the ground (Figure 1-7). Residents would be able to enjoy private seating areas, plantings and an elevated view of the surrounding area. The outdoor terraces along the stepped roof line would be for individual residents' use and not openly accessible to the entire development. Further, the proposed action would provide waivers for height, setback, signage, and location of uses and therefore locks in the design of the proposed project, including the proposed on-

site open space. Although the exact program of the open space is not subject to CPC approval, the applicant has stated their commitment to provide attractive, usable open space for their residents.

Overall, the proposed project would not have any significant adverse impacts on open space in the study area. The decreases in active and passive open space ratios that would result from the proposed project would be alleviated by the substantial open space amenities just outside the study area, including Central Park and the waterfront parks, Hudson River Park, Riverside Park South, and Riverside Park. As mentioned in the No-Build section, the relatively low active open space ratio within the study area boundary is offset by the continuous bike path/walkway that stretches from the northern end of Riverside Park to the southern end of Hudson River Park that is easily accessible from Clinton Cove and other waterfront areas within the study area boundary. There would also be no significant adverse impacts to open spaces within the study area, nor would the proposed project overburden the facilities or open spaces to be developed in the future without the proposed action.

F. CONCLUSION

As per *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines, a proposed action may result in a significant adverse impact on open space resources if (a) there would be a direct displacement/alteration of existing open space within the study area that has a significant adverse effect on existing users; or (b) it would reduce the open space ratio and consequently result in overburdening existing facilities or further exacerbate a deficiency in open space.

The overall ratio of open space per 1,000 residents would decrease from No-Build conditions with the development of the proposed project, from 0.824 to 0.803. This would represent a 2.5 percent decrease from the No-Build ratio. The active open space ratio would continue to be well below the City's planning goal and median. In addition, the passive open space ratio for the area's residents and workers would decrease somewhat in the future with the proposed project. It is expected that the accessibility to Central Park, Riverside Park and Hudson River Park would provide additional active open space resources, as well as offset the decreased total open space ratios of the study area as a result of the proposed action. Also, the proposed action would introduce 1.2 acres of private open space for the residents of the development, further offsetting the relatively low total open space radios of the study area. These open spaces would help to alleviate any open space shortage, for both the residential (active and passive) and combined residential/worker (passive) populations. Therefore, even though the active space ratio falls below City guidelines and would decrease with the proposed project, the proposed project would not result in a significant adverse impact on open space resources.