

**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*

March 25, 2019

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

**Tax Data:** 56.15-1-12

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

**Map Date:** 12/6/2018

**Date Review Received:** 2/14/2019

**Item:** *JOSEPH & LEAH WEBER/23 ROBERT ROAD (R-2685)*

Variations for lot area, lot width (Johanna Lane), front setback (Robert Road and Johanna Lane) and front yard (Robert Road and Johanna Lane) to permit the construction of an addition to, and the conversion of a one-family dwelling, to a two-family dwelling on .376 acres in an R-15 zoning district. East side of Robert Road, north side of Johanna Lane,

**Reason for Referral:**

NYS Thruway, Village of Airmont, Schwartz Memorial Park

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 subject site does not meet the minimum lot area standard of 20,000 SF required for a two-family residence. The applicant is seeking an 18 percent lot area variance in order to convert the existing single family dwelling to a two family dwelling. The proposed addition will have a 30' x 45' building footprint requiring front setback and front yard variances on the Johanna Lane frontage. The lot width on Johanna Lane is also deficient. Front yard and front setback variances are required for the existing structure on the Robert Road frontage. The surrounding neighborhood is characterized by similarly-sized and smaller parcels. Granting these bulk variances will set a precedent that may result in nearby property owners seeking the same relief. A doubling of the residential density in this neighborhood of non-conforming parcels will negatively impact its community character and infrastructure capacity. Additional residents will generate more traffic on the local streets. The potential for traffic conflicts is great. While two-family residences are permitted as of right in the R-15 zoning district, they are subject to stricter bulk requirements. This site is deficient in meeting some of these more stringent standards. We recommend that the footprint of the proposed addition be reduced to more closely conform to the R-15 bulk requirements.

**JOSEPH & LEAH WEBER/23 ROBERT ROAD (R-2685)**

- 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 ability of the existing infrastructure to accommodate increased residential density on undersized and nonconforming 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. The proposed addition must be scaled back so that front yard and front setback standards are achieved on Johanna Lane.
- 3 A review must be completed by the Rockland County Health Department to ensure compliance with Article XIX (Mosquito Control) of the Rockland County Sanitary Code.
- 4 A review must be completed by the Rockland County Sewer District #1, and all required permits obtained.
- 5 The proposed residential building must comply with all requirements of the New York State Uniform Fire Prevention and Building Code.
- 6 A review must be completed by the Rockland County Office of Fire and Emergency Services, the Town of Ramapo Fire Inspector, or the Monsey Fire Department to ensure that there is sufficient accessibility to the site for fire trucks, in the event an emergency arises.
- 7 All proposed building entrances, exterior stairways, window wells and walkways must be delineated on the site plan demonstrating that they will not impact yard requirements or increase the development coverage. Parking maneuverability shall not be affected by the location of these features.
- 8 The development coverage and floor area ratio calculations must be provided on the site plan so their accuracy can be verified.
- 9 It will difficult for vehicles parked in spaces 2 or 3 to maneuver out of the spots without a turnaround area. All proposed building entrances, exterior stairways and walkways are not shown on the site plan, making it difficult to assess the parking area in relation to the pedestrian movement on site, and whether there will be safety issues for the residents. The exterior stairs on the facade of the existing structure are immediately adjacent to the parking area. The proximity of these stairs is a concern. The potential for traffic conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles is great. A resident descending the stairs will walk directly behind parked vehicles. A turnaround area must be provided so that vehicles do not have to back out into the roadway. All building features must be illustrated on the site plan so that safety issues can be properly evaluated.
- 10 A refuse containment area must be shown on the site plan and easily accessible to sanitation workers. Parked vehicles must not block access.
- 11 There is a discrepancy with the street name for Robert(s) Road. The filed map for the original subdivision specifies Robert Road. All of the application materials submitted for review indicate Robert Road. Neighborhood street signs exist for both Robert Road and Roberts Road. A Google search generates results for Robert Road and Roberts Road. The County GIS file has the road listed as Roberts Road. The Town must reaffirm the street name, and resolve the street sign inconsistency by a resolution, to avoid future confusion.
- 12 The site plan shall include map notes that list all appropriate information, including the district details.
- 13 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.

**JOSEPH & LEAH WEBER/23 ROBERT ROAD (R-2685)**

14 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  
New York State Thruway Authority  
Rockland County Division of Environmental Resources  
Rockland County Department of Health  
Rockland County Sewer District #1  
New York State Department of State  
Rockland County Office of Fire and Emergency Services  
Monsey Fire District  
  
Anthony R. Celentano P.E.  
Village of Airmont

Joseph & Leah Weber

Mona Montal, Chief of Staff

*\*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.*

