



**GERBER ESTATE - 556 & 558 HAVERSTRAW ROAD (M-175)**

- 6 The site plan indicates a driveway and utility easement for lot 33 is to be granted on lot 34. However, there is no reciprocal driveway easement on lot 33, nor is there an indication of an agreement regarding access to and maintenance of the tennis court. A driveway easement for lot 34 must be added to lot 33 on the site plan, and an agreement regarding the shared tennis court must be noted on the site plan and in place prior to approval of the application.
- 7 Prior to the start of construction or grading, all soil and erosion control measures must be in place for the site. These measures must meet the latest edition (November 2016) of the New York State Guidelines for Urban Erosion and Sediment Control.
- 8 There shall be no net increase in the peak rate of discharge from the site at all design points.
- 9 The proposed dimensions in the bulk tables on drawing ZV-1 are not consistent with the proposed variances listed below the tables. All materials must be consistent, and must clearly and accurately indicate which variances are necessary for the current proposal. The public hearing notice must be reviewed and, if it contains inaccurate information, revised and reissued.
- 10 We request the opportunity to review any variances that may be needed to implement the proposed site plan, as required by New York State General Municipal Law, Section 239-m (3)(a)(v).
- 11 Pervious pavers are proposed for several parking area. To reduce the extent of the maximum development coverage variance, pervious pavers must be used for the proposed patio areas, as well.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Douglas J. Schuetz  
Acting Commissioner of Planning

cc: Mayor Lance Millman, Montebello  
Rockland County Department of Health  
Rockland County Drainage Agency  
New York State Department of Transportation  
Rockland County Division of Environmental Resources  
  
Edward J. Frattaroli, Inc.  
Town of Ramapo

*\*NYS General Municipal Law Section 239 requires a vote of a 'majority plus one' of your agency to act contrary to the above findings.*

*The review undertaken by the Rockland County Planning Department is pursuant to, and follows the mandates of Article 12-B of the New York General Municipal Law. Under Article 12-B the County of Rockland does not render opinions, nor does it make determinations, whether the item reviewed implicates the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act. The Rockland County Planning Department defers to the municipality forwarding the item reviewed to render such opinions and make such determinations if appropriate under the circumstances.*

*In this respect, municipalities are advised that under the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act, the preemptive force of any provision of the Act may be avoided (1) by changing a policy or practice that may result in a substantial burden on religious exercise, (2) by retaining a policy or practice and exempting the substantially burdened religious exercise, (3) by providing exemptions from a policy or practice for applications that substantially burden religious exercise, or (4) by any other means that eliminates the substantial burden.*

*Proponents of projects are advised to apply for variances, special permits or exceptions, hardship approval or other relief.*

*Pursuant to New York State General Municipal Law §239-m(6), the referring body shall file a report of final action it has taken with the Rockland County Department of Planning within thirty (30) days after final action. A referring body which acts contrary to a recommendation of modification or disapproval of a proposed action shall set forth the reasons for the contrary action in such report.*