

R-1525



COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING

18 New Hempstead Road  
New City, New York 10956  
(914) 638-5480

JOHN T. GRANT  
County Executive

April 11, 1988

Ramapo Planning Board  
237 Rte. 59  
Airmont NY 10901

WILLIAM M. CHASE  
Commissioner

ALBERT E. ASKERBERG, JR.  
Deputy Commissioner

JAMES CYMORE  
Deputy Commissioner

Tax Block & Lot : 10-9AA2-9AA#  
9BB15-9BB18, 9BB2-9BB12  
9CC1-9CC5

Re : GENERAL MUNICIPAL LAW REVIEW 239(k) \_\_\_\_\_ 239(l&m) \_\_\_\_\_ 239(n) XX

Map Date : 1/29/88

Date Review Received : 3/11/88

Item : Skyridge (R-1525)

Re-subdivision of 24.9 acres zoned R-35 into 23 lots.  
S. terminus of Overlook Drive and Trailside Place

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

- \* approve \_\_\_\_\_
- \*\* approve subject to conditions below XX request extension of time \_\_\_\_\_
- \*\* disapprove for the reasons below \_\_\_\_\_ request additional information \_\_\_\_\_

See attached statement.

cc: H. Reisman, Supervisor, Ramapo  
M. Loebenstein, member, RCPB  
SWCD  
S. Fish, PIPC  
Clarkstown Planning Board  
Applicant: Rock Apple Realty  
One Blue Hill Plaza, Pearl River

\_\_\_\_\_  
William M. Chase  
Commissioner of Planning

\* The proposed action is deemed to have no significant negative impact on nearby municipalities, County or State roads or facilities and, therefore, the ACTION IS FOR LOCAL DETERMINATION. Approval does not necessarily mean we endorse the subject action as desirable from the viewpoint of your municipality.

\*\* The GML requires a vote of "two-thirds of all the members" or "majority plus one" of your agency to act contrary to the above findings.

SKYRIDGE (R-1525)  
April 11, 1988

1. Recommendations of the SWCD letter of 3/21/87.
2. Review and approval of drainage and access by the Town of Clarkstown.
3. A 20' undisturbed conservation easement should be established along the border with the PIP as per request of the PIPC. The PIPC also requests a 75' setback for all buildings along its property line. However, that does not appear to be a problem with this proposal.

As an aside we strongly suggest that the major O & R utility easement crossing the property be treated as a lot line for building setback purposes. This will mitigate the disturbance that the future residents will suffer should a major expansion be undertaken by the utility company.

①