

State Environmental Quality Review

AMENDED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Notice of Determination of Non-Significance

PROJECT: Breton Hills

CITY OF GLEN COVE, NEW YORK

DATE: September 17, 2019

This notice is issued pursuant to Part 617 of the implementing regulation pertaining to Article 8 (State Environmental Quality Review Act) of the Environmental Conservation Law.

The Planning Board of the City of Glen Cove, as lead agency, has determined that the proposed action described below will not have a significant effect on the environment and a Draft Environmental Impact Statement will not be prepared.

Name of Action: Breton Hills Site Plan and Subdivision Approval

SEQR Status: Type 1

Conditioned Negative Declaration: No

Description of Action: Subdivision of 9.43 acre tract into four lots to support an existing temple and 72 Condominium units in 7 buildings and one recreational clubhouse building to be constructed in two phases. The property was previously rezoned from R-3A and R-6 Zoning classification to an R-5 district zoning classification. The existing Temple will remain.

Purpose of Amendment: The project sponsor submitted revised plans reflecting realignment of structures, redesign of grading and retaining walls, gating of community, minor changes to building footprints, addition of a clubhouse recreational building, and some minor changes to improvements on the Temple property.

Location: Corner of Hill Street and Cottage Row in the City of Glen Cove, Nassau County, New York.

Reasons Supporting This Determination:

The proposed action is not anticipated to result in any adverse environmental impacts based on the following:

1. On or about May 1, 2009, the Planning Board received a Part 1 Full Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) for the application of Glen Cove Mews providing environmental setting, project description, agency jurisdiction, and planning and zoning information;
2. On or about May 5, 2009 the Planning Board received a proposed Part 2 EAF prepared by the City's Planning Consultant at the Board's instruction;
3. On or about June 30, 2009 the Planning Board adopted the Part 2 EAF indicating potential large impacts to:
 - a. stormwater impacts to erosion;
 - b. aesthetic impacts from development obviously different from the surrounding land use; and
 - c. traffic impacts at the site entrance and area intersections
4. In adopting the Part 2 EAF, the Planning Board made a further determination that the proposed action would not result in the following potential large impacts:
 - a. a substantial adverse change in existing air quality, or noise levels; a substantial increase in solid waste production; a substantial increase in potential for erosion, flooding, leaching or drainage problems;
 - b. the removal or destruction of large quantities of vegetation or fauna; substantial interference with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species; impacts on a significant habitat area; substantial adverse impacts on a threatened or endangered species of animal or plant, or the habitat of such a species; or other significant adverse impacts to natural resources;
 - c. the impairment of the environmental characteristics of a Critical Environmental Area as designated pursuant to subdivision 617.14(g) of this Part;
 - d. the creation of a material conflict with a community's current plans or goals as officially approved or adopted;
 - e. the impairment of the character or quality of important historical, archeological, architectural, or of existing community or neighborhood character;
 - f. a major change in the use of either the quantity or type of energy;
 - g. the creation of a hazard to human health;
 - h. a substantial change in the use, or intensity of use, of land including agricultural, open space or recreational resources, or in its capacity to support existing uses;
 - i. the encouraging or attracting of a large number of people to a place or places for more than a few days, compared to the number of people who would come to such place absent the action;
 - j. the creation of a material demand for other actions that would result in one of the above consequences;
 - k. changes in two or more elements of the environment, no one of which has a significant impact on the environment, but when

considered together result in a substantial adverse impact on the environment; or

- I. two or more related actions undertaken, funded or approved by an agency, none of which has or would have a significant impact on the environment, but when considered cumulatively would meet one or more of the criteria in this subdivision.
5. The applicant submitted a Part 3 EAF at its September 15, 2009 meeting, the Planning Board reviewed the submission and considered the advice of its consultants and having found the document provided adequate information and analysis to determine the importance of potential large impacts, adopted the Part 3 EAF;
6. It was determined that any potential impacts to ground or surface water quality and quantity were unlikely given that the project will be required to meet DEC, Nassau County and City DPW standards for stormwater management and erosion control and that the permit requirements of such agencies will result in adequate mitigation of any potential large impacts;
7. It was determined that the project proposes to preserve much of the existing trees on site, and that where trees are proposed to be removed, adequate landscape buffering is proposed to screen the site from neighboring residences, public rights-of-way and other substantial public vantage points. Further, the applicant has proposed to significantly improve the originally proposed facades of buildings visible from public rights-of-way and making significant impact to aesthetic resources unlikely;
8. It was determined that significant traffic impacts were unlikely due to the division of the Temple and residential site accesses. More specifically, the relocation of the residential site access to the west, from the original proposal, has resulted in the traffic entering and exiting the site at an intersection that is much better able to accommodate increased demands without requiring any additional off-site mitigations;
9. On or about December 7, 2011, the project sponsor submitted an application for Final Subdivision showing a layout revised in response to the requirements of Nassau County during that agency's various departmental reviews. The modifications were largely with the building footprints (and resultant changes to the facades), the width of the driveway at the intersection with Hill Street, building facades and the landscape plan;
10. On or about July 5, 2012, the project sponsor submitted further revised plans based on further comments from Nassau County. The modifications were largely to the details of the sanitary and storm sewer systems, the design of which are subject to County approval;
11. On or about July 17, 2012 the lead agency considered the changes proposed for the project and determined that those changes are not anticipated to result in any adverse environmental impacts;
12. On or about March 19, 2013, the project sponsor submitted further revised plans indicating the removal of balconies from all building facades, and a

- singular treatment for all rear facades, regardless of location or proximity to public rights-of-way.
13. On or about April 16, 2013, the Planning Board determined that the revised facades sought would not result in significant adverse visual impacts;
 14. On or about June 13, 2019, Arcadia Landing, LLC, submitted application materials indicating that they had purchased the partially constructed project and advance an application for amended site plan approval, modifying the layout to:
 - a. Realign/relocate buildings 1-4 to provide more space for an additional 1 story amenity building;
 - b. Increase the size of buildings 1-4;
 - c. Provide an electronic access control gate at Hill Street;
 - d. Redesign proposed Temple improvements;
 15. On or about August 19, 2019 the Planning Board distributed a notice of intent to become lead agency copying same to the Nassau County Department of Public Works;
 16. On or about September 17, 2019, the Glen Cove Planning Board having received no objection re-established itself as lead agency for the purpose of considering project changes;
 17. On or about September 17, 2019, the Glen Cove Planning Board, having reviewed the Part 1 EAF provided by the applicant for the revised plan as well as the extensive revised site plan sheets detailing changes, determined that the proposed application and proposed project changes were not likely to result in any significant adverse impacts.
 18. No other impacts have been identified.

This Amended Negative Declaration shall be filed with:

Tim Tenke, City of Glen Cove Mayor - 9 Glen Street, Glen Cove, NY 11542

City of Glen Cove Planning Board - 9 Glen Street, Glen Cove, NY 11542

Sean E. Sallie, Deputy Commissioner -Nassau County Planning Commission
100 County Seat Drive, Mineola, NY 11501

Nassau County Department of Health, Environmental Division
106 Charles Lindbergh Blvd. Uniondale, NY 11553

Nassau County Department of Public Works - 1194 Prospect Avenue
Westbury, NY 11590-2723

NYS Department of Environmental Conservation – Region 1 (SPDES)

Division of Environmental Permits, SUNY Stony Brook 50 Circle Road
Stony Brook, NY 1170

Environmental Notice Bulletin - 625 Broadway, Albany, NY 12233-1750.