



Rockland County

Ed Day, Rockland County Executive

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

February 25, 2020

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

Tax Data: 50.53-1-15

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

Map Date: 11/20/2019

Date Review Received: 1/29/2020

Item: **14 ELENER LANE (SV-994)**

A variance application to allow the construction of a two-family dwelling on 0.21 acres in the R-1A zoning district. Variances are requested for lot width, side yard, and total side yard.

The southern side of Elener Lane, approximately 175 feet east of North Rigaud Road

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. 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 proposed lot width is 92% of the required minimum. The side and total side yards are deficient by 33%. The ability of the existing infrastructure to accommodate increased residential density on undersized 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 Village must consider the cumulative and regional impacts of permitting such development. The size of the building must be reduced so that the side yard and total side yards are compliant.

14 ELENER LANE (SV-994)

2 The Town of Ramapo is the reason this proposal was referred to this department for review. The municipal boundary is approximately 325 feet west of the parcel. 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.

3 There are discrepancies between the site plan and the architectural plans that were provided by Hartman Design, dated January 12, 2020. Two rear decks are depicted on the architectural plans but are not indicated on the site plan. The architectural plans depict a building jog along each side wall of the structure, set back approximately 16 feet from the front façade. The site plan appears to indicate building jogs approximately 24 feet from the front façade. The site plan indicates there are two side entries with staircases and an 8'x8' entry platform that are not depicted in the architectural plans. Lastly, there are two front projections indicated on the site plan that are not in the same configuration as those depicted in the architectural plans. All materials must be consistent. The applicant must clarify their intentions and correct these discrepancies, and if required, additional variances sought.

4 The front projections, as depicted in the architectural plans, consist of enclosed living space and do not fall under the yard exemption of Section 255.22.C of the village's zoning regulations. The site plan must be amended to measure the front yard distance from the property line to these projections. If a variance of the front yard is required, the application must be revised and resubmitted for review and a new public hearing notice must be issued.

5 The architectural plans provided are not to-scale. To-scale drawing must be provided.

6 A review must be completed by the Rockland County Department of Health to ensure compliance with Article XIX (Mosquito Control) of the Rockland County Sanitary Code.

7 A review must be completed by the County of Rockland Sewer District No. 1 and all required permits obtained from them.

8 Public sewer mains requiring extensions within a right-of-way or an easement shall be reviewed and approved by the Rockland County Department of Health prior to construction.

9 A turnaround area must be provided to prevent vehicles from backing into the roadway.

10 The application form indicates the property receives water service from United Water. The form must be corrected to Suez.

14 ELENER LANE (SV-994)

11 The NYS Department of State has determined that the Village is not administering or enforcing the State Uniform Fire Prevention and Building Code in accordance with minimum standards set forth in 19 NYCRR part 1203. Given the concerns about the Village's administration and enforcement of the State Uniform Fire Prevention and Building Code initially raised in the Executive Deputy Secretary of State's letter of July 15, 2016, and subsequently again in December 18, 2017, the proposed residential building must be held to the requisite minimum standards and comply with all requirements of this code.

12 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.

13 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: Mayor Alan Simon, Spring Valley
Rockland County Department of Health
Rockland County Sewer District #1
New York State Department of State

Anthony R. Celentano P.E.
Town of Ramapo Planning Board

**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.