



COUNTY OF ROCKLAND
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING

EDWIN J. DAY
County Executive

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

DOUGLAS J. SCHUETZ
Acting Commissioner

ARLENE R. MILLER
Deputy Commissioner

April 20, 2015

Spring Valley Zoning Board of Appeals
200 N. Main Street
Spring Valley, NY 10977

Tax Data: 57.29-1-51

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

Map Date: 2/19/2015

Date Review Received: 3/19/2015

Item: 35 COLLINS AVENUE (SV-820A)

Variances for lot area, lot width, side yard, total side yard and street frontage to allow a two-lot subdivision of .2640 acres in an R-2 zoning district, and the construction, maintenance and use of a two-family dwelling on each lot.

West side of Collins Avenue, approximately 500 feet north of West Church Street

Reason for Referral:

Town of Ramapo

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 applicant is proposing to create two significantly undersized lots and construct the densest residential development permitted in the R-2 zoning district. Each parcel will require a 42.5 percent variance for minimum lot area. The lots will also be non-conforming in terms of lot width (50 percent variances) and street frontage (28.6 percent variances). Several yard variances are required for the proposed residential buildings. We recommend that the project be scaled back to more closely conform to the R-2 bulk standards. While one-family semi-attached residences will also require variances, the extent of the non-conformance will be much lower. The applicant must scale back this proposal to more closely comply with the R-2 bulk requirements. We recommend that only a single-family residence be permitted on each parcel.

35 COLLINS AVENUE (SV-820A)

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, 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 Village must consider the cumulative and regional impacts of permitting such development.

3 The Town of Ramapo is the reason this proposal was referred to this department for review. The municipal boundary is 290 feet west 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 Town of Ramapo 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 sewer service. The areas of countywide concern noted above that directly impact the Town of Ramapo must be considered and satisfactorily addressed, as well as any additional concerns about the proposal.

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

5 Two curb cuts are proposed on each parcel to provide access to the on-site parking. Long, narrow turnaround areas are proposed to allow vehicles to exit the parking spaces. The width of the turnaround area is less than ten feet. We do not believe this is sufficient to allow vehicles to safely maneuver in and out of parking spaces. This awkward configuration is another indication that this proposal will result in an overutilization of the site. A scaled back proposal must be submitted that does not require four separate driveways along 100 feet of street frontage.

6 An outdated version of the Short Environmental Assessment Form is included with this application. The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation revised its SEQRA forms in 2013. The applicant must use the current forms.



Douglas J. Schuey
Acting Commissioner of Planning

cc: Mayor Demeza Delhomme, Spring Valley
Rockland County Department of Health
Rockland County Drainage Agency
Rockland County Sewer District #1
Anthony R. Celentano P.L.S.
Town of Ramapo

35 COLLINS AVENUE (SV-820A)

New York State Department of State,
Division of Code Enforcement and Administration
Esther Rother

**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.

