



COUNTY OF ROCKLAND
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING

Building T
Pomona, NY 10970
(845) 364-3434
Fax. (845) 364-3435

EDWIN J. DAY
County Executive

DOUGLAS J. SCHUETZ
Acting Commissioner

ARLENE R. MILLER
Deputy Commissioner

May 18, 2015

Ramapo Zoning Board of Appeals
237 Route 59
Suffern, NY 10901

Tax Data: 50.17-2-10

Re: GENERAL MUNICIPAL LAW REVIEW: Section 239 L and M

Map Date: 1/23/2015

Date Review Received: 4/21/2015

Item: *RACHEL PERLMUTTER (R-2500)*

Variances for lot area, lot width, rear setback, street frontage, maximum development coverage and floor area ratio to allow the demolition of a single-family dwelling and the construction, maintenance and use of a three-family residence on .124 acres.

West side of Twin Avenue, 100 feet south of Elm Street

Reason for Referral:

Village of Spring Valley

The County of Rockland Department of Planning has reviewed the above item. Acting under the terms of the above GML powers and those vested by the County of Rockland Charter, I, the Commissioner of Planning, hereby:

****Recommend the following modifications***

1 The Village of Spring Valley is the reason this proposal was referred to this department for review. The municipal boundary is approximately 165 feet north of the site. New York State General Municipal Law states that the purposes of Sections 239-l, 239-m and 239-n shall be to bring pertinent inter-community and countywide planning, zoning, site plan and subdivision considerations to the attention of neighboring municipalities and agencies having jurisdiction. Such review may include inter-community and county-wide considerations in respect to the compatibility of various land uses with one another; traffic generating characteristics of various land uses in relation to the effect of such traffic on other land uses and to the adequacy of existing and proposed thoroughfare facilities; and the protection of community character as regards predominant land uses, population density, and the relation between residential and nonresidential areas. In addition, Section 239-nn was enacted to encourage the coordination of land use development and regulation among adjacent municipalities, and as a result development occurs in a manner that is supportive of the goals and objectives of the general area.

The Village of Spring Valley must be given the opportunity to review the proposal and its impact on community character, traffic, water quantity and quality, drainage, stormwater runoff and sanitary

RACHEL PERLMUTTER (R-2500)

sewer service. The areas of countywide concern noted above that directly impact the Village of Spring Valley must be considered and satisfactorily addressed, as well as any additional concerns about the proposal.

2 Permitting development that does not comply with the applicable bulk standards can set an undesirable land use precedent and result in the overutilization of individual sites. The applicant is seeking a 30 percent increase over the maximum permitted development coverage. The ability of the existing infrastructure to accommodate increased residential density on non-conforming lots is a countywide concern and must be evaluated. This evaluation must consider whether local roads will become more congested and the sewer system, stormwater management systems and the public water supply will be overburdened. The Town must consider the cumulative and regional impacts of permitting such development.

3 The proposed residential building must comply with all requirements of the New York State Uniform Fire Prevention and Building Code.

4 As noted by the Chief Fire Inspector in the February 12, 2015 Town of Ramapo Building, Planning and Zoning Department's denial letter, a fire hydrant must be shown within 600 feet of the site.


5 Since an exit stairway is not illustrated on the plot plan, it is not possible to determine if there is sufficient turning room for a vehicle parked in the westernmost parking space. A turnaround area must be provided.

6 It will be difficult for sanitation workers to access the dumpster enclosure if a vehicle is parked in space #1. The dumpster enclosure must be moved to a more accessible location.

7 Section 376-131.D.(1)(d) states that the minimum lot width and lot frontage for non-complying lots in the R-15C district shall be 65 feet. The bulk table indicates that the required lot width and street frontage are 75 feet. This must be corrected.

8 The project narrative does not indicate that variances are required for minimum lot area, lot width or street frontage although they are noted on the bulk table. All application materials must be consistent. The notice for the public hearing will have to be reissued if it did not include all of the required variances.

9 Page 2 and page 4 of the project narrative contain different numbers for the provided rear setback and maximum development coverage. The variance for development coverage is 30 percent over the permitted maximum; the variance for floor area ratio is 3.3 percent over the permitted maximum. These percentages are understated in the project narrative. All inconsistencies in this document must be corrected.



Douglas V. Schuetz
Acting Commissioner of Planning

cc: Supervisor Christopher St. Lawrence, Ramapo
Rockland County Department of Health
Rockland County Drainage Agency
Rockland County Sewer District #1
Anthony R. Celentano P.L.S.
Village of Spring Valley

RACHEL PERLMUTTER (R-2500)

New York State Department of State,
Division of Code Enforcement and Administration
Yitzchok Altman

**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.

