

**COMMENT M-1 (Aesthetics):**

The renderings you showed were misleading *and* only showed what the buildings would look like from a very specific angle for each. From other views they are still a mass of concrete.

*Debra Dumas, 4 Preston Ave., Sea Cliff NY, electronic mail dated July 10, 2009*

**RESPONSE M-1 (Aesthetics):**

The representative views show the architectural character and massing of the buildings and their relationship to adjacent open space from locations identified in the Scoping Document. The Applicant believes that the renderings, taken at various scales and vantage points, do not mislead but rather represent illustratively the aesthetic characteristics of the buildings from actual vantage points, showing the before and after conditions.

**COMMENT M-2 (Aesthetics):**

I am at a loss to understand the impetus behind this massive waterfront project when in the City's own legal notices, the public is provided with countless reasons why this plan should not go forward, such as modified existing visual character of the water and altered views. We have two public restaurants on the Harbor, and the outdoor view, particularly at Steamboat Landing, with the water, boats and trees gives one the feeling that you are far away from the City; that is the appeal. I doubt that customers would go out of their way to patronize a restaurant where they will be looking at buildings that look like Queens. The view from Sea Cliff boardwalk on a beautiful day is calming and tranquil. You won't feel serenity looking at a twelve-story cityfied development, alterations to the site's topography and the addition of approximately thirty-five acres of impervious surfaces.

*Ms. Barbara Hall, resident, Public Hearing Transcript, City of Glen Cove Planning Board Meeting, June 25, 2009, Section 82, lines 6-25; Section 83, lines 8, pp.73-74*

These gigantic proposed buildings are ugly and are way out of character with our neighborhood.

*Ms. Pat Tracy, resident, Public Hearing Transcript, City of Glen Cove Planning Board Meeting, June 25, 2009; Section 106, lines 17-20; p. 94 and letter dated July 16, 2009.*

I am opposed to the RXR Glen Isle mixed-use waterfront development project proposed for the north side of Glen Cove Creek for the following reasons:

The density of the development is out of character with our community.

*Alan Mitzner, President, American Pie, LLC, Sea Cliff resident, electronic mail, dated June 19, 2009*

The 12-story buildings are out of character with any development along our harbor shoreline.

*Alan Mitzner, President, American Pie, LLC, Sea Cliff resident, electronic mail, dated June 19, 2009. Similar comment from Raymond & Nansi Borom, 2 Laurel Way, Sea Cliff, NY, letter dated June 19, 2009, Michael & Stephanie Lipsey, 95 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Sea Cliff, NY, three letters dated June 22 and 23, 2009*

We believe that 12 stories is simply too high for this historic waterfront setting. That height will be unique for the North Shore of Long Island and is out-of-character with our historic, exurban waterfront community and shoreline. We do not oppose tasteful development of the site. Having

visited many places which have prospered from tasteful waterfront development, we note that none of Peggy's Cove, Nova Scotia-a World Heritage Site which draws significant tourist dollars Sausalito, Pacific Grove, and Monterey, CA; Langley, Townsend, Whidbey Island, WA; Salem, Cohasset, Scituate, MA, to name a few, have buildings of this height. These towns all draw visitors and residents in a manner that has not compromised their historic waterfront character. We believe that a maximum of six stories would be more appropriate to the Glen Isle site.

Once the proposed buildings are constructed there is no turning back: our waterfront will be lost permanently to the urban precedent exemplified by New Roc City to our west. Therefore, we implore you to balance the important environmental and planning precedent of the Glen Isle development against the hypothetical financial profit of maximum height and density as you make your decisions.

*Victoria B. Bjorklund, Hank Bjorklund, 24 Cliff Way, Sea Cliff, NY, letter dated June 21, 2009*

I am opposed to the RXR Glen Isle mixed-use waterfront development project proposed for the north side of Glen Cove Creek for many reasons. The 12-story buildings will destroy treasured view corridors, and are out of character with the harbor shoreline and neighboring communities.

*Laura Andrysiak, 6 Greely Square, Glen Head, NY, letter dated June 20, 2009*

The density of the development is out of character with our community.

*Michael & Stephanie Lipsey, 95 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Sea Cliff, NY, three letters dated June 22 and 23, 2009*

- The buildings proposed are far too tall for this community - they are totally out of character. The mass of the Avalons was objected to, and they helped to set a precedent for what is coming. If we permit buildings to 10 and 12 stories, that will also be the precedent that will be demanded by property owners who are eagerly watching this play out. I cannot be convinced that anything taller than 8 stories could ever be acceptable, and that would be setting a precedent as well.

*David S. Nieri, letter dated July 18, 2009.*

The 10- to 12-story buildings are out of character with Glen Cove (as well as with any other community on the North Shore of Long Island).

*Andrew Quasha, letter dated July 20, 2009. Similar comment from Ellen Quasha.*

The unsightly affects to the view of the shoreline. Please look across the Sound to get a feeling of what an out of proportion structure looks like from afar.

*Eileen Aherne, email dated July 20, 2009.*

- The density of the building will destroy the look of the entire area. Picture Sea Cliff building what you want across from our coast line. Ugly and scary. Who wants to pay high taxes to look at high rises and pay for services that we didn't want anyway. The Avalon is already too tall for Glen Cove and looks like a prison building.

*Linda Thompson, letter dated July 20, 2009.*

I am not opposed to the development of the waterfront, but believe the development should blend in with its surroundings and should enhance the waterway and the natural beauty of the Glen

Cove shoreline and existing wetlands. The development should be a place of beauty and not high rise noise and eyesore. I ask the Planning Board to carefully scrutinize the DEIS.

*Linda Thompson, letter dated July 20, 2009.*

The DEIS states that the development project would result in positive aesthetic impacts to the area along the north shore of Glen Cove Creek. Although eliminating "blight or blighting influences" in this area is certainly positive, exchanging blighted areas for the unprecedented type of development project that is planned along Glen Cove Creek does not automatically translate to a positive impact. We believe that the density and building heights proposed for this project are completely out of character with all waterfront areas along Hempstead Harbor and would effectively change the suburban landscape of Glen Cove to an urban setting and adversely affect the City of Glen Cove as well as neighboring communities.

*Karen Papasergious and Carol DiPaolo, President and Programs Director and Water-Monitoring Coordinator, Coalition to Save Hempstead Harbor, letter dated July 20, 2009.*

We, the undersigned, are opposed to the high-density, high-rise development project as proposed for our Waterfront. This petition shows that there is little public acceptance or support for this proposal:

The proposed development of 16 story towers is out of character with our suburban community.

*Unknown commentor, copy of petition in Record Pilot, dated April 2007.*

10-12 story buildings are grossly out of character with our suburban community and will set a precedent for future similar oversized development

- the high density and scale of the project will cause irreparable harm to our environment and quality of life

*29 Glen Cove residents, Petition, attachment to letter from Carol E. Kenary, President, Landing Pride Civic Association, Glen Cove, NY, dated July 20, 2009; and 13 individual letters, dated July 13, 2009*

### **RESPONSE M-2 (Aesthetics):**

The heights for the various buildings proposed for the site vary, ranging from four stories up to 10 and 12 stories on the western parcels (Blocks A-C) and from one to two stories up to eight stories on the eastern parcel (Blocks D-J). Only two of the ten blocks include elements with heights of 10 to 12 stories, and as illustrated in the FEIS visuals, the tallest sections are only a portion of each building. Along the esplanade, the buildings are primarily three to four stories tall and faced with townhouses. Behind the townhouses, the buildings begin to set back and step up, breaking down the overall massing of the buildings. The multiple setbacks also provide variety in the building massing, avoiding the effect of otherwise bulky buildings with uniform floor plates and uniform height.

The buildings would represent a departure from conventional suburban development patterns and the heights of certain building elements would be higher than the predominant development pattern elsewhere in the City. However, the proposed building heights are in conformance with the requirements of the MW-3 district. In addition, the Glen Cove Creek waterfront is a distinct area with a different visual and land use context than the bulk of Glen Cove. It has also been

identified both locally and at the State level as an area for concentrated redevelopment. (The project area is one of only four waterfront redevelopment areas on the North Shore identified by the Long Island Sound Coastal Management Program.) A variety of regional planning organizations, including Vision Long Island, have also recognized that the conventional development pattern that characterizes much of Long Island is failing to meet some vital planning objectives, including minimizing sprawl, supporting and enhancing the County's downtowns, providing for a variety of housing types to meet changing demographic needs, and enhancing public access to the coastline, and that more dense development within the core of the Island's communities will be necessary to achieve a sustainable development pattern.

**COMMENT M-3 (Aesthetics):**

The 12-story buildings will destroy treasured view corridors

*Alan Mitzner, President, American Pie, LLC, Sea Cliff resident, electronic mail, dated June 19, 2009. Similar comment from Raymond & Nansi Borom, 2 Laurel Way, Sea Cliff, NY, letter dated June 19, 2009, Michael & Stephanie Lipsey, 95 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Sea Cliff, NY, three letters dated June 22 and 23, 2009*

Regarding view corridors, we are not convinced by the photo simulations that current view corridors would be preserved. Further, the reference to creating new view corridors is misleading, because the proposed buildings will obliterate the green view that exists currently and then create relatively small openings between buildings that at certain distances or angles may not be perceived.

*Karen Papasergious and Carol DiPaolo, President and Programs Director and Water-Monitoring Coordinator, Coalition to Save Hempstead Harbor, letter dated July 20, 2009.*

**RESPONSE M-3 (Aesthetics):**

As described in Response M-2, the buildings have been designed with multiple setbacks to break down the building massing, avoiding the effect of otherwise bulky buildings with uniform floor plates and uniform height. The higher midrise buildings are also oriented perpendicular to the waterfront, ensuring that they present a short façade along Garvies Point Road and the building footprints have been spread apart to frame new and existing view corridors.

As the site currently has very limited development, existing views from across the Creek have most of the rise of Garvies Point Preserve as the backdrop. Any development of the site will necessarily reduce the extent of the Preserve backdrop that will be visible and the overall openness of the view. It is acknowledged that the degree of visibility of the corridors may be reduced from certain viewing angles.

**COMMENT M-4 (Aesthetics):**

The 12-story buildings will set a precedent for other development in Glen Cove.

*Michael & Stephanie Lipsey, 95 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Sea Cliff, NY, three letters dated June 22 and 23, 2009*

**RESPONSE M-4 (Aesthetics):**

Development activity throughout the City is regulated by the Zoning Ordinance. The project is located in the MW-3 district. The only area of MW-3 in the City is along the Glen Cove Creek. There is, therefore, no potential for the project to set a precedent in relation to allowable heights or scale elsewhere in Glen Cove.

**COMMENT M-5 (Aesthetics):**Aesthetics

We repeat our previous request that balloons be put up at all building locations higher than 2 stories indicating the various heights of each such building. Further, we submit that the applicant should be required to include more realistic photosimulations (the ones presented are unrealistic and excluded Sea Cliff Beach) of the appearance of Glen Isle from the following locations:

- Sea Cliff Beach
- The Boulevard and Carpenter Avenue
- Carpenter Avenue and Prospect Avenue
- The pergola and the mid-point of Cliff Way

*Bruce Kennedy, Mayor, Village of Sea Cliff, letter dated July 17, 2009.*

**RESPONSE M-5 (Aesthetics):**

Balloons are typically flown to provide reference points for use in calibrating photo simulations when there are few distinct features available in the existing condition. However, there are sufficient reference points in and around the project site to provide for accurate photosimulation. The exhibits provided in DEIS Section III.M provide a realistic depiction of the building massing. Hand renderings have been layered on top of computer massing models to provide a depiction of building articulation and detail.

The DEIS and FEIS present simulations from the series of viewpoints that were identified in the Final Scope prepared for the DEIS. A public scoping session was conducted during the drafting of the scope and no other significant vantage points within reasonable proximity were identified at that time. The provided simulations from locations within Sea Cliff include Carpenter Avenue and Prospect Avenue, and the pergola at the mid-point of Cliff Way. Simulations are also provided from Hempstead Harbor and the mouth of the Glen Cove Creek. Given the relative proximity to, and similar angle to, other vantage points used in the DEIS, it is not anticipated that the visual character of the project would be appreciably different from the additional requested Sea Cliff Beach or the Boulevard and Carpenter Avenue locations.

**COMMENT M-6 (Aesthetics):**

I attended a recent meeting of the Landing Pride group where a presentation of the current plans for development was made to the audience. Two things hit me quite hard. One was the daunting sight of a great wall of much too tall buildings that one would see while traveling down Garvies Point Road at the most sensitive part of the area. That sight overwhelmed me. The loss of the openness of the view was distressing and would forever mar Glen Cove.

*Ralph Cioffi, letter dated July 16, 2009*

**RESPONSE M-6 (Aesthetics)::**

See Response M-3.

**COMMENT M-7 (Aesthetics)::**

The vast light pollution and its effects on the night sky. At this time the sky is full of visible constellations throughout the year.

*Eileen Aherne, email dated July 20, 2009.*

**RESPONSE M-7 (Aesthetics)::**

Project lighting will employ full cutoff and dark sky compliant fixtures to minimize light trespass and sky glow.

**COMMENT M-8 (Aesthetics)::**

1. Section II.C.7 (*Description of the Proposed Action: Project Description and Site Design: Landscaping, Lighting, Signage*), page II-43, Last ¶ - The DEIS states "upon leasing to tenant(s), the Block D office building would include signage typical of that used for corporate offices throughout the region."

- a. The FEIS should describe the "signage typical of that used for corporate offices throughout the region" that would be used for the proposed project at a level of detail that would be adequate to evaluate aesthetic impacts.
- b. The applicable controls regulating signage (i.e., the Glen Cove Sign Ordinance) should be described.
- c. As the proposed office building is intended to be located near the waterfront, and thus visible by boaters in the Glen Cove Creek and possibly residents of the Village of Sea Cliff, information regarding the height limit of proposed signage should be discussed.

*Steven Perotta, Cashin Spinelli & Ferretti, LLC, letter dated July 20, 2009.*

**RESPONSE M-8 (Aesthetics):**

Typical signage for corporate offices would include a corporate logo or name on the façade of the building, typically located on the top floor. All signage details will be developed in accordance with the City of Glen Cove ordinances, and submitted as part of building permit plans for approval. Building signage will be limited in location to within the height of the building.

**COMMENT M-9 (Aesthetics):**

38. Section III.M.2.b (*Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures: Aesthetics: Potential Impacts: Photo Simulations*), page III.M-16, Exhibit III.M-11 - The view looking east along the Glen Cove Creek appears, based on the photo simulation, to have obstructed all views of the Garvies Point Preserve. It would appear as though obstruction of the preserve is not in line with the intent of the MW-3 PUD zoning, which requires view corridors to the preserve.

*Steven Perotta, Cashin Spinelli & Ferretti, LLC, letter dated July 20, 2009.*

**RESPONSE M-9 (Aesthetics):**

Exhibit III.M-11 presents a view from along the proposed development and looking east down the Creek. The primary view corridors through the site are to the north. Exhibits III.M-12 and III.M-13 for example, illustrate the view corridors through the site. It is noted that any level of development at the site would obstruct views of the preserve from this vantage point.

**COMMENT M-10 (Aesthetics)::**

39. Section III.M.2.d (*Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures: Aesthetics: Potential Impacts: Lighting*), page III.M-34, 1st ¶ - The DEIS states "architectural lighting may be utilized in select locations, such as the hotel, office and commercial areas." While the DEIS has mentioned that street lights will have full cut-off shades, a description of the "architectural lighting" should be discussed, identifying if it is intended to be "up-lighting" (which potentially could impact the view of the nighttime skies) or "down-lighting."

*Steven Perotta, Cashin Spinelli & Ferretti, LLC, letter dated July 20, 2009.*

**RESPONSE M-10 (Aesthetics)::**

Architectural lighting in select locations will be utilized to highlight building features and entrances. The lighting plan is intended to minimize light trespass. Therefore, it is anticipated that the accent lighting will utilize downlight fixtures. Building lighting fixtures will be further reviewed during the detailed Site Plan applications for each phase.

**COMMENT M-11:**

The following amendments should be considered to improve the FEIS:

As the taller buildings are located closer to the mouth of the creek we find that it offers an abrupt and startling entrance to the creek in contrast to the open waters of Hempstead Harbor (as demonstrated by photo simulation Exhibit III.M-10- View 1). The FEIS should consider an alternative which modifies the current configuration by reducing the height of the structures at the mouth of the creek, perhaps stepping up to the taller structures to a greater degree than is currently proposed, and/or by opening the footprint of Block A to soften the overall visual appearance at the entrance to the creek.

*Jaime Ethier, Coastal Resources Specialist, New York State Department of State, Office of Coastal, Local Government and Community Sustainability, letter, dated July 20, 2009*

**RESPONSE M-11:**

As required by the adopted Scope, the DEIS analyzed a reduced height alternative in which the buildings were brought to a height of 10-stories.

View 1 presents a view point that is relatively close to the Creek entrance. Boaters heading towards the Creek and marinas will likely have picked up visibility of the project and its context with the rise of the Garvies Point Preserve earlier and will not be immediately confronted with a close-in view. The base of Block A is also set back more than 180' from the mean low water line at its closest point, and as described earlier the building articulation will help break down the building massing.

**COMMENT M-12:**

The following amendments should be considered to improve the FEIS:

As demonstrated by some of the photosimulations in Section III.M, there are visual impacts associated with some of the taller structures in relation to the ridgeline that could potentially be avoided. The FEIS should consider an alternative that reduces the height of the tallest structures (Blocks A, B, and C) by one or two stories to reduce the amount of visual obstruction.

*Jaime Ethier, Coastal Resources Specialist, New York State Department of State, Office of Coastal, Local Government and Community Sustainability, letter, dated July 20, 2009*

**RESPONSE M-12:**

The Modified FEIS Plan has further reduced building heights in the core of the western parcel to four stories of residential over one parking level. Alternative D in the DEIS analyzed a reduced height building scenario, which included buildings with a height of 10-stories.

It is noted that while in some of the views it appears the buildings are visually impacting the ridgeline, this is primarily due to the view of the perspective and the distance and angle of vantage point relative to the buildings and Garvies Point Preserve. The proposed building heights do not exceed the height restrictions of the MW-3 district.

**COMMENT M-13:**

Various views simulating the proposed development along the creek, particularly View 1 (Hempstead Harbor looking northeast to the site) and View 4 (location along south side of Glen Cove Creek looking to site) indicate a development that may be out of scale with the surrounding area. It also appears that views of the abutting Garvies Point Preserve would be mostly blocked.

*Satish Sood, Deputy Commissioner, Nassau County Planning Commission, letter dated April 21, 2011.*

**RESPONSE M-13:**

The FEIS Plan would result in decreased building heights in the core of the western portion of the site as compared to the DEIS plan. This would allow for expanded view corridors to, and additional visibility of, Garvies Point Preserve to the north of the project site from vantage points on the south side of the Creek. As with the DEIS Plan, all buildings would still be below the treetop elevation of the ridge at Garvies Point Preserve as required by the MW-3.

As described in Response M-2, the buildings would represent a departure from conventional suburban development patterns and the heights of certain building elements would be higher than the predominant development pattern elsewhere in the City. However, the proposed building heights are in conformance with the requirements of the MW-3 district. In addition, the Glen Cove Creek waterfront is a distinct area with a different visual and land use context than the bulk of Glen Cove. It has also been identified both locally and at the State level as an area for concentrated redevelopment.



As the site currently has very limited development, existing views from across the Creek have most of the rise of Garvies Point Preserve as the backdrop. Any development of the site will necessarily reduce the extent of the Preserve backdrop that will be visible and the overall openness of the view.

As describe in Response M-12, View 1 presents a view point that is relatively close to the Creek entrance. Boaters heading towards the Creek and marinas will likely have picked up visibility of the project and its context with the rise of the Garvies Point Preserve earlier and will not be immediately confronted with a close-in view. The base of Block A is also set back more than 180' from the mean low water line at its closest point and, as described earlier, the building articulation will help break down the building massing.