

**DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING**

Dr. Robert L. Yeager Health Center  
50 Sanatorium Road, Building T  
Pomona, New York 10970

Phone: (845) 364-3434 Fax: (845) 364-3435

**Douglas J. Schuetz**  
*Acting Commissioner*

**Arlene R. Miller**  
*Deputy Commissioner*

June 20, 2019

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

**Tax Data:** 50.13-3-30

50.13-3-27

50.13-3-26

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

**Map Date:** 5/9/2019

**Date Review Received:** 5/13/2019

**Item:** **BLUEFIELD EXTENSION (R-2421G)**

Use and bulk variances to permit a four-lot subdivision of 1.05 acres in the R-15 zoning district. The proposed residential development includes a semi-attached, two family residence with two accessory apartments on Lot 1; a semi-attached, three-family residence with one accessory apartment on Lot 2; a semi-attached, three-family residence on Lot 3; and a semi-attached two-family residence with two accessory apartments on Lot 4. Semi-attached two-family residences, three-family residences and accessory apartments are not permitted uses in the R-15 zoning district. A use variance is therefore required. The bulk tables reflect the R-15 standards for Use Group x.3. Each lot requires variances for lot width, front setback, front yard, side setback, total side setback, rear setback, street frontage and floor area ratio. Rear setback variances are needed for the decks on Lots 1 and 4. Lots 2 and 3 require development coverage variances. A 280A variance is required for Lot 1; a side yard variance is necessary on Lot 2.

East side of Union Road, opposite Bluefield Drive, and 360 feet south of Eckerson Road

**Reason for Referral:**

Village of Spring Valley, Eckerson Road (CR 74), Village of New Hempstead

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:

***\*Disapprove***

1 As presented, this proposal will result in a gross overutilization of the 1.05-acre site and is inconsistent with the community character of the surrounding neighborhood. A residential density of 16 units per acre is being proposed in an R-15 zoning district, where a maximum of just over four units per acre are permitted. Currently, one- and two-family residences are the predominant land uses on Union Road, Ibeck Court, Stetner Street, Jacaruso Drive and Zuba Lane. While multi-family developments are located to the south and east of the subject site, and three-family, semi-attached residences make up the Bluefield Gardens development, this denser residential development is not the predominant land use. The number of lots and units must be reduced.

## **BLUEFIELD EXTENSION (R-2421G)**

2 The proposed subdivision results in four oddly-configured lots that do not conform to the R-15 bulk standards for Use Group x.3 reflected in the bulk table. Each lot is deficient in meeting the lot width and street frontage requirements. The residential structures illustrated on the ZBA Plan require yard and setback variances ranging from 25 to 100 percent. Each building significantly exceeds the maximum permitted floor area ratio. Development coverage variances are required for two lots. The bulk standard non-conformities are compounded by the fact that semi-attached two- and three-family dwellings are not permitted in the R-15 zoning district. Accessory units are also forbidden. As noted in previous reviews, the layout plan more closely resembles a townhouse development in the way the buildings and parking are configured. Townhomes are not permitted use in the R-15 or R-15C zoning districts. This type of residential development is only permitted in Ramapo's multi-family and mixed-use zones. We continue to recommend that the proposed subdivision and the multi-family development be denied, and that a proposal that conforms, both in use and bulk standards, be submitted.

3 The undated project narrative describes the proposed residential structures as single-family dwellings. While more than one residential structure is not permitted on lots in the R-15 or R-15C zoning districts, the ZBA Plan depicts a townhome configuration rather than the two- and three-family structures permitted in the R-15C zoning district. The proposed five-unit structures, with accessory apartments, are not permitted, even with a use variance. The number and type of units must conform to the R-15 zoning district standards.

4 This assemblage has less than 50 feet of street frontage along Union Road. This is deficient in all residential zoning districts. The 49-foot wide strip of land extends roughly 144 feet from Union Road to the remainder of the proposed subdivision area. This approximately 7,000 SF land area will serve as the sole access to the rear portion of the site. As such, this land area should not be included in the minimum lot area calculation for any of the proposed lots. A private road is the most appropriate use for this land area. Only the remaining land area can be factored into a minimum lot area calculation for residential development purposes. We estimate this land area to be approximately 38,800 SF. Four semi-attached single-family residences or two detached, two-family residences are the most appropriate development proposals on this portion of the site. Accessory apartments are not permitted in the R-15 zoning district. One accessory apartment is permitted on parcels with a minimum lot width of less than 75 feet in the R-15C zoning district, yet the applicant is proposing two on Lot 1, one on Lot 2 and two on Lot 4. As noted above, to grant a use variance that requires multiple bulk variances undermines the integrity of the zoning ordinance, and is not an appropriate land use planning tool. The use variance shall not be granted.

5 Eighteen on-site parking spaces are proposed for 15 residential units. This does not meet the R-15 standard of two spaces per unit; only 60 percent of the required on-site parking is provided. The bulk table specifies the R-15C parking standard rather than the R-15 requirement. The parking spaces are only eight-feet wide and require a variance for stall width. The current number of spaces is a reduction from previous submissions. The inability to provide additional on-site parking is a further indication that the proposed residential project will result in an overdevelopment of the property. As stated above, the number of lots and residential units must be reduced so that adequate on-site parking can be provided.

6 Eight parking spaces are shown along the north side of the access drive, and four are provided on the south side. These twelve spaces are not in close proximity to any of the residential units, and their location raises concerns about pedestrian safety. The proposed play area and garbage enclosures are also far removed from the residences. The potential for conflicts between vehicles entering or exiting the site along this narrow driveway, and residents navigating on foot is great. On-site parking for two- and three-family dwellings must be immediately proximate to the residential structures. As noted previously, the proposed residential development resembles a townhouse community in the building configuration, as well as the multi-space parking area. The number of lots and residential units must be reduced so that the required number of parking spaces are provided on each lot.

## **BLUEFIELD EXTENSION (R-2421G)**

7 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. This proposal does not conform to the R-15 or R-15C bulk standards. The ability of the existing infrastructure to accommodate increased residential density on undersized, non-conforming parcels 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. Fewer lots shall be permitted, and the number of residential units must be limited to four.

8 This department is not generally in favor of granting use variances because of the land use precedent that can be set. An applicant must prove that applicable zoning regulations and restrictions have caused unnecessary hardship in order for a use variance to be granted. To prove such unnecessary hardship the applicant shall demonstrate to the board of appeals that for each and every permitted use under the zoning regulations for the particular district where the property is located:

- A. The applicant cannot realize a reasonable return, provided the lack of return is substantial as shown by competent financial evidence.
- B. The alleged hardship is unique and does not apply to a substantial portion of the district or neighborhood.
- C. The requested variance will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood.
- D. The alleged hardship is not self-created.

The applicant has not demonstrated that an unnecessary hardship exists. No financial evidence was submitted with this GML referral. The standards for granting a use variance have not been achieved.

The following comments address our additional concerns about the variances required for this ZBA application.

9 The Villages of Spring Valley and New Hempstead are two of the reasons this application was referred to this department for review. The Spring Valley municipal boundary is along the southern property line of the site and along Union Road directly adjacent to the site, as well as 175 feet east of the site. The New Hempstead municipal boundary is 410 feet northeast 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 Villages of Spring Valley and New Hempstead must be given the opportunity to review the current proposal and its impact on community character, traffic, water quantity and quality, drainage, stormwater runoff and sanitary sewer service. In letters dated May 14, 2015, September 29, 2017 and June 19, 2019, the Village of New Hempstead Planning Board concurred with this department's GML recommendations. The board also expressed concerns about overutilization, community character and traffic. The areas of countywide concern noted above that directly impact the Villages of Spring Valley and New Hempstead must be considered and satisfactorily addressed, as well as any additional concerns about the proposal.

10 The applicant must satisfactorily address the conditions of the Rockland County Sewer District #1's May 31, 2019 letter.

## **BLUEFIELD EXTENSION (R-2421G)**

- 11 An updated review of the May 19, 2019 ZBA Plan must be completed by the Rockland County Health Department. In addition, the applicant must satisfactorily address the conditions of the Health Department's April 10, 2019 letter.
- 12 The applicant must satisfactorily address the conditions of the Rockland County Highway Department's May 28, 2019 letter.
- 13 The proposed residential buildings must comply with all requirements of the New York State Uniform Fire Prevention and Building Code.
- 14 A review must be completed by the Rockland County Office of Fire and Emergency Services, the Town of Ramapo Fire Inspector, or the Hillcrest Fire Department to ensure that there is sufficient maneuverability on site for fire trucks, in the event an emergency arises. A truck turning analysis must be provided demonstrating that emergency vehicles can access the residential structures.
- 15 Given the deficient on-site parking, designated parking spaces must be assigned to each residential unit, and clearly identified in the field.
- 16 Areas designated for snow removal must be clearly delineated on the site plan so that the plow drivers will know where to place the snow piles. This will help to protect the proposed landscaping from damage due to the weight of the snow and salt intrusion. In addition, providing specific locations on the site for the snow piles will reduce the loss of available parking spaces meant to be used by residents and their guests. This is especially critical given that the minimum on-site parking requirement is not achieved.
- 17 A turnaround area must be provided at the southern end of the parking area on Lot 4 so that a vehicle can easily exit the handicapped space.
- 18 The dwelling type labels for Lots 3 and 4 are incorrect on the May 9, 2019 ZBA Plan. A semi-attached three family dwelling is labeled as a two-family residence with two accessory apartments on Lot 3; and a semi-attached two-family residence with two accessory apartments is labeled as a three-family residence on Lot 4. All application materials must be consistent. The public hearing notice must be reissued if it contains incorrect information.
- 19 Map Note # 7 must be corrected to indicate that the ZBA Plan conforms to Section 239L and M of the General Municipal Law as this is an application for variances not a subdivision.
- 20 Map Note # 24 shall be eliminated as it is repetitive of Map Note # 7, and references an invalid section of the GML.
- 21 Pursuant to the Rockland County Sanitary Code, Article XIII, Section 13.8.1, all multiple dwellings with three or more rental units must register and obtain a Multiple Dwelling Rental Certificate (MDRC). If this proposed multi-family dwelling meets the requirements of the Multiple Dwelling Rental Registry requirement, then the owner must register and obtain the MDRC. Failure to comply is a violation of Article XIII, which may result in penalties of \$2,000 per day.
- 22 Pursuant to General Municipal Law (GML) Section 239-m and 239-n, if any of the conditions of this GML review are overridden by the board, then the local land use board must file a report with the County Commissioner of Planning of the final action taken. If the final action is contrary to the recommendation of the Commissioner, the local land use board must state the reasons for such action.

**BLUEFIELD EXTENSION (R-2421G)**

23 In addition, pursuant to Executive Order 01-2017 signed by County Executive Day on May 22, 2017, County departments are prohibited from issuing a County permit, license, or approval until the report is filed with the County Commissioner of Planning. The applicant must provide to any County agency which has jurisdiction of the project: 1) a copy of the Commissioner report approving the proposed action; or 2) a copy of the Commissioner of Planning recommendations to modify or disapprove the proposed action, and a certified copy of the land use board statement overriding the recommendations to modify or disapprove, and the stated reasons for the land use board's override.

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

cc: Supervisor Michael B. Specht, Ramapo  
Rockland County Department of Highways  
Rockland County Department of Health  
Rockland County Sewer District #1  
New York State Department of State  
Rockland County Office of Fire and Emergency Services  
Hillcrest Fire District  
Rockland Community College  
  
Villages of Spring Valley and New Hempstead  
Rockland County Department of Law,  
Office of the County Attorney  
Terry Rice  
Bluefield Extension, LLC.

Mona Montal, Chief of Staff  
Rockland County Planning Board Members

*\*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.*

