Planning Board Agenda
January 28th, 2021
7:00pm

I. Call to order

II. Flag Salute

III. Roll Call

Moses Koth, Chairperson
Frantz Wackmann, Vice Chairperson
Jean Berthomieux
Shmuel Baum
Jean Simon
Yitchok Sable

IV. Approval of minutes from last meeting

V. Public hearings

a) 324 Route 59- Final

b) 14 Memorial Park Drive-Final

c) 34 Ridge Ave-Final
VI. Old business
   a) 15 Chestnut Street-Adopt a Part 2
   b) 4 Jay Street- Consideration of a Negative Declaration
   c) 127 Bethune Boulevard- Consideration of a Negative Declaration

VII. New business
   a) 24 Memorial Park Drive- Notice of Intent
   b) 86, 90-92 Lake Street-Notice of Intent

VIII. Adjournment
MEMORANDUM

TO: Village of Spring Valley Planning Board
FROM: Michael D. Kauker, PP, AICP
        Principal
DATE: March 4, 2020
SUBJECT: 34 Ridge Avenue
        Review # 5

The following materials were received and reviewed by this office:

1. Site Plan consisting of 3 sheets prepared by Anthony R. Celentano, P.E.
3. SEQRA Short Environmental Assessment Form dated 4/30/19.

The following comments are submitted regarding this application for the Planning Boards consideration:

Introduction
The applicant has submitted an application for a two-lot subdivision in which two, two-family homes are proposed to be constructed on each newly created lot. The subject property is an interior lot located on the east side of Ridge Avenue and south of Park Avenue. The site has an area of 12,873 square feet and is located within the R-2 District. The proposed development will require subdivision and site plan approval from the Planning Board and variances from the ZBA.

Application Status
The applicant is on for a continued public hearing before the Planning Board and it is the applicant’s fourth appearance before the Planning Board.

State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA)
Pursuant to SEQRA regulations this action is identified as an unlisted action. The Planning Board has taken the following actions related to the SEQRA review:

- Declaration of intent to be Lead Agency: May 2, 2019
• Declaration of Lead Agency: May 30, 2019
• Adoption of Part 2: May 30, 2019
• Adoption of Negative Declaration: June 25, 2019

Board Action
The applicant returns to the Planning Board after receiving variances from the ZBA for consideration of subdivision plat approval for a two-lot subdivision in which it is proposed that a two-family dwelling be constructed on each lot.

Technical Comments
1. The plans are very difficult to read as there are multiple layers of information on each sheet. The existing conditions should be removed and included on a separate sheet. The following sheets should be provided:
   a. Survey showing existing conditions.
   b. Subdivision Plat including all information below in “Subdivision Requirements”
   c. Layout plan showing proposed development and other improvements including
      bulk table, 
   d. Topography and other environmental constraints 
   e. Landscaping and lighting, 
   f. Utilities, separate sheet with grading and drainage.
2. Dimensions of the parking spaces and driveways shall be shown on the plans.
3. The site layout plan should indicate the variances that were granted and the date.
4. Details for the dumpster enclosure should be provided.
5. The type and height of the fence surrounding the property and play area should be provided.
6. Is there enough room for the proposed bollard located between the proposed dwelling and parking space 2 on the front lot?
7. We would recommend that the 15-foot tall light poles be eliminated or replaced with bollard lighting as we feel the lights are out of character for a two-family residential development.

Subdivision Requirements
Preliminary layouts submitted to the Planning Board shall be drawn to a convenient scale, not more than 100 feet to an inch, and shall show the following information:
A. The location of the property with respect to surrounding property and streets; the names of all adjoining property owners of record or the names of adjoining developments; and the names of adjoining streets. There shall be included an area map at a scale of one inch equals 400 feet showing all streets and property within 1,000 feet of the proposed subdivision and identifying all property held by the applicant in the area.
B. The location and dimensions of all boundary lines of the property (include entire area proposed to be subdivided and remainder of the tract owned by the subdividing owner), certified by a licensed land surveyor.
C. The location of existing streets, sewers, drains, water mains, easements, water bodies, streams and other pertinent features, such as swamps, buildings and outstanding trees,
that may influence the design of the subdivision. Topography shall be shown at a contour interval of not more than two feet, where required by the Planning Board.

D. The location, width, grade and profiles showing existing surfaces and proposed grades of all streets and typical cross-sections of the proposed grading, roadways and sidewalks.

E. Proposed connections with existing water supply and sanitary sewerage system or alternative means of providing water supply and sanitary waste treatment and disposal, as provided in §§ 1115, 1116, 1117 and 1118 of the Public Health Law; proposed provisions for collecting and discharging surface water drainage, including the proposed location and sizes of drains, culverts, catch basins, curbs and gutters; and the proposed locations of fire hydrants, street trees, streetlighting standards, street signs or other improvements to be provided in connection with the subdivision.

F. The approximate locations, dimensions and areas of all proposed or existing lots.

G. The approximate location and dimensions of all property proposed to be set aside for park or playground use.

H. The name and address of the owner or owners of land to be subdivided and the name and address of the subdivider, if other than the owner, and the name of the land surveyor.

I. The date of the map, approximate true North point and scale.

Drawing, scale and size of plat and construction plans. The plat and construction plans shall be clearly and legibly drawn at a scale of not more than 100 feet to the inch. Maps shall be uniform size sheets, not larger than 24 inches by 36 inches. Whenever any project is of such size that more than one sheet is required, an index map on the same size sheet shall be filed showing the entire subdivision at an appropriate scale.

Information to be shown on plat. Plats shall show the following information:

A. The proposed subdivision name or identifying title, which shall not duplicate or too closely approximate that of any other development in the village.

B. The date of the plat, approximate true North point and graphic scale.

C. The name and address and signature of the owner, the subdivider and a licensed engineer or land surveyor.

D. The names of owners of record of abutting properties or developments.

E. Boundary lines of the property being subdivided.

F. Locations, names and widths of existing and proposed streets.

G. Locations and names of existing and proposed parks.

H. Locations and widths of existing and proposed easements.

I. Lot lines with accurate dimensions and bearings or angles.

J. Lot areas in square feet or acres to hundredths for all lots shown.

K. Sufficient data acceptable to the Village Engineer to determine readily the location, bearing and length of all lines and to reproduce such lines upon the ground. Where practicable, these should be referenced to monuments included in the state system of plane coordinates and, in any event, should be tied to reference points previously established by a public authority.

L. Radii of all curves and lengths of arcs.

M. The location, material and approximate size of all monuments.
Information to be shown on construction plans. Construction plans shall show the following information, except that where requirements have been waived, applicable specifications may be omitted:

A. Profiles showing existing and proposed elevations along the center lines of all streets. Where a proposed street intersects an existing street or streets, the elevation along the center line of the existing street or streets, within 100 feet of the intersection, shall be shown. All elevations must be referred to established United States Geological Survey bench marks.

B. The Planning Board may require a cross-section where steep slopes exist showing the present elevation of all proposed streets every 100 feet at five points on a line at right angles to the center line of the street, and said elevation points shall be at the center line of the street, at each property line and at points 25 feet inside each property line.

C. Plans and profiles showing the location and a typical cross-section of street pavements, including curbs and gutters, sidewalks, manholes and catch basins; the gutters, sidewalks, manholes and catch basins; the locations of street trees, streetlighting standards and street signs; the location, size and invert elevations of existing and proposed sanitary sewers, stormwater drains and fire hydrants; and the exact location and size of all water, gas or other underground utilities or structures.

Property Description

The subject property is an interior lot located on the east side of Ridge Avenue and south of Park Avenue in the R-2 District. The property has a lot area of 12,873 square feet. The property is currently occupied by a one-story single-family home.

The subject property is surrounded primarily by residential uses.

The aerial photograph below shows the subject property and its relationship to the surrounding neighborhood.
The following map shows the lot that is the subject of this application in relation to the other lots in the area.

Proposed Development
The applicant’s proposal consists of a two-lot subdivision in which two, two-family homes will be constructed, one two-family dwelling on each lot. Proposed lot 1 will have frontage on Ridge Avenue and will have a lot area of 6,139 square feet. Proposed lot 2 is a flag lot with only 15 feet of street frontage and would require a variance for this proposed condition. Proposed lot 2 will have a lot area of 6,734 square feet. Access to proposed lot 1 is provided from ridge Avenue and there are 4 parking spaces proposed in the front yard. The dimensions of the parking spaces and drive aisle shall be shown on the plan. Access to Lot 2 is also from Ridge Avenue via 15-foot stem providing access to the flag portion of the lot. There are 4 tandem parking spaces provided in the side yard. We would recommend that the parking configuration be reconfigured.
so that the applicant provides a garage for each of the proposed units with an additional parking space in the driveway.

**Zoning Ordinance**

**Permitted Uses** – The subject property is located within the Village’s R-2 Residential District. Permitted uses in the R-2 District include One-family detached dwellings, Churches or other places of worship, Convent, Uses of the Village of Spring Valley, Uses of other governments, Public schools, One-family semiattachted dwellings, Two-family detached dwellings. Government assisted housing is permitted by special permit form the Village Board. The applicant shall confirm and provide documentation that the proposed use will be government assisted housing.

- **Bulk and Area Requirements** – The following table compares the proposed development to the bulk and area requirements of the zoning ordinance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Requirements</th>
<th>Required Two-Family</th>
<th>Proposed Lot 1</th>
<th>Proposed Lot 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>6,139 (V)</td>
<td>6,734 (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Width</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60 (V)</td>
<td>15 (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard Division</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10 (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10 (V)</td>
<td>10 (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Side Yard</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20 (V)</td>
<td>28.5 (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10 (V)</td>
<td>10 (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg. Ht. (ft./st.)</td>
<td>35/3</td>
<td>35/3</td>
<td>35/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.72 (V)</td>
<td>0.72 (V)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The applicant requires a number of variances for this proposed development as identified above.

The applicant would require the following additional variances or relief form the requirements of the zoning ordinance.

1. **Street Frontage** of 70 feet is required, where 15.01 feet is proposed for lot 2.

The applicant should provide architectural plans in order to confirm the building height and FAR.

**Landscape and Lighting Plan**

The applicant proposes a variety of plantings throughout the site. We have no additional comment regarding the landscape plan.

The lighting plan consists of two 42-inch-tall bollard lights. The first of which is located between parking space 2 and the proposed dwelling on the front lot and the second is located adjacent to the vehicular turnaround on the rear lot. Is there enough room for the bollard...
between the proposed dwelling and parking space 2 on the front lot? There are also 4 light poles that are 15 feet in height proposed along the driveway to the rear lot. We would recommend that these be replaced with the bollard lighting as we feel the lights are too high for a two-family residential development.

Circulation and Parking
See comment above related to providing a combination garage and driveway that can accommodate 2 parking spaces each.

Stormwater Management
The applicant has provided Drainage Calculations prepared by Celentano Engineering, PLLC dated June 21, 2019. It is proposed that 1 drywell will be required in order to control stormwater runoff and provide for a zero-net increase in runoff.

cc: Applicant
MEMORANDUM

TO: Village of Spring Valley Planning Board
FROM: Michael D. Kauker, PP, AICP
       Principal
DATE: January 25, 2021
SUBJECT: 15 Chestnut Street

Our office has reviewed Part 1 of the SEQRA Short Environmental Assessment Form (SEAF) and has prepared a Part 2. We would recommend that the Planning Board pass a resolution adopting Part 2 and that it be forwarded to the applicant for use in preparing a Part 3.

Attached is the Part 2, which lists the potential moderate to large impacts that have been identified. The applicant should address the impacts that have been identified as moderate to large in Part 3 of the SEAF. In instances where sufficient information was not provided or not available to determine the impact or if the impact were unknown it was marked off as a potential moderate to large impact.

In Part 3, the applicant should explain why a potential impact identified in Part 2 may result or will not result in a significant adverse environmental impact. Part 3 should, in sufficient detail, identify the impact, including any measures or design elements that are proposed by the project sponsor to avoid or reduce impacts.

In this application, the applicant has submitted an application for the consideration of preliminary and final site development plan approval in order construct a three-story office building with a basement.

The following provides some additional detail regarding questions where moderate to large impacts may occur because of the proposed project and require additional input form the applicant.

Part 2, Question 1
Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulations?

Although the proposed use is permitted in the PO zone the applicant would require several area variances. Since the applicant does not meet many area requirements, the proposed action is inconsistent with the zoning regulations. The board must determine if the variances result in a small impact or a moderate to large impact. To make this determination, the board must consider the number of variances and the magnitude of the variances being requested. Individual area
variances in of themselves, would not create a material conflict with the zoning regulations, but many variances, which significantly deviate from the requirements of the ordinance, could create a material conflict and may result in impacts to the area. The applicant is requesting several variances as shown in the table below.

The following table lists the variances and percent of the deviation requested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Requirements</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>% Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>15,483</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Width (Walnut)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>124.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Width (Chestnut)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard (Walnut)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard (Chestnut)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10 (V)</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Side Yard</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10 (V)</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg. Ht. (ft/st.)</td>
<td>35/3</td>
<td>35/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.53 (V)</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The applicant will require the following additional variances.
1. Parking – 33 parking spaces are required, where 28 are proposed.
2. Section 255-22H. Visibility at intersection.

Therefore, if the impacts associated with the requested variances cannot be mitigated the applicant should seek to eliminate or reduce the degree of the variances so there would not be any impact.

**Part 2, Question 2**
Will the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use of land?

The proposed development would result in a change of the use of land, although the proposed use is a permitted use in the zone. The proposal would require variances for the size of the building specifically FAR and would also require a variance for the number of parking spaces. If the applicant were to reduce the size of the building they could comply or more closely comply with the requirements of the zoning ordinance. The fact that the applicant proposes a larger building than permitted indicates that there will be an increase in the intensity of the use of land.

**Part 2, Question 3**
Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing community?

The proposed use of an office building is consistent with the other uses in the area. The proposed bulk conditions require variances and the deviation sin rear and side yard setbacks.
should be evaluated in order to determine if they are consistent with the conditions of other structures in the neighborhood. Consideration should be given to the location of these deviations and the proximity of structures on adjacent properties, where the deviations occur.

**Part 2, Question 4**
Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a Critical Environmental Area?

The site of the proposed action is neither located in, nor does it adjoin, a State listed Critical Environmental Area.

**Part 2, Question 5**
Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walking?

The applicant proposes to construct a 8,250 square foot office building in a fully developed suburban area. The number of trips generated by the proposed development according to the Table 1 provided in the SEAF Workbook is below the 100-trip threshold determined to result in a potential moderate to large impacts. Therefore, the increase in the number of trips would be negligible and further study would not be required. The impact would be classified as “no or small impact”.

**Part 2, Question 6**
Will the proposed action cause an increase in the use of energy and it fails to incorporate reasonably available energy conservation or renewable energy opportunities?

The applicant indicates that they will meet or exceed the state energy code requirements. The applicant should describe the proposed design features and technologies used in the development that would exceed the state requirements.

**Part 2, Question 7**
Will the proposed action impact existing:
   a. Public/private water supplies?
   b. Public/private wastewater treatment facilities?

The applicant should provide the board with information as to whether or not there is sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed office development.

**Part 2, Question 8**
Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of important historic, archaeological, architectural or aesthetic resources?

The site does not contain a structure that is listed on either the State or National Register of Historic Places and the proposed action is not located in an archeological sensitive area.
Part 2, Question 9
Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources?

The subject site is located in a fully developed suburban area, is not located in or adjacent a State listed Critical Environmental Area, does not contain any wetlands or waterbodies, does not contain any unique land forms and does not contain any species of animal, or associated habitats, listed by the State or Federal government as threatened or endangered.

Part 2, Question 10
Will the proposed action result in an increase in the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problems?

The applicant should provide an analysis assessing the impact the proposed development may have regarding stormwater runoff.

Part 2, Question 11
Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental resources or human health?

The proposed action would not create a hazard to environmental resources or human health.

cc: Applicant
**Short Environmental Assessment Form**

**Part 2 - Impact Assessment**

Part 2 is to be completed by the Lead Agency.

Answer all of the following questions in Part 2 using the information contained in Part 1 and other materials submitted by the project sponsor or otherwise available to the reviewer. When answering the questions the reviewer should be guided by the concept “Have my responses been reasonable considering the scale and context of the proposed action?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>No, or small impact may occur</th>
<th>Moderate to large impact may occur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Will the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use of land?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing community?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a Critical Environmental Area (CEA)?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walkway?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Will the proposed action cause an increase in the use of energy and it fails to incorporate reasonably available energy conservation or renewable energy opportunities?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Will the proposed action impact existing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. public / private water supplies?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. public / private wastewater treatment utilities?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of important historic, archaeological, architectural or aesthetic resources?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources (e.g., wetlands, waterbodies, groundwater, air quality, flora and fauna)?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Will the proposed action result in an increase in the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problems?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental resources or human health?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO:  Village of Spring Valley Planning Board
FROM:  Michael D. Kauker, PP, AICP
        Principal
DATE:  January 25, 2021
SUBJECT:  15 Chestnut Street
          Review # 2

The following materials were received and reviewed by this office:
2. Application Form not provided
3. SEQRA Short Environmental Assessment Form dated 11/5/20.

The following comments are submitted regarding this application for the Planning Boards consideration:

Introduction
The applicant has submitted an application for preliminary and final site development plan review in order to construct a three-story office building with a basement. The subject property is a corner lot located on the southwest corner of Chestnut Street and Walnut Place. The site has an area of 15,483 square feet and is located within the PO – Professional Office District. The proposed development will require site development plan approval from the Planning Board and variances from the ZBA.

Application Status
The applicant is on for a preliminary hearing before the Planning Board and it is the applicant’s second appearance before the Planning Board.

General Comments
1. The dumpster location shall be shown on the plan. We would recommend that any proposed dumpster area be located so that it is not visible from the public street.
2. An area for snow storage should be shown on the plan.
3. We recommend that a 5 foot landscaped buffer be provided between the parking area and the public street.
4. All driveway aisle width and parking stall dimensions shall be shown on the plan.
State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQR A)
Pursuant to SEQR A regulations this action is identified as an unlisted action. The Planning Board has taken the following actions related to the SEQR A review:

- **Declaration of Lead Agency:** November 5, 2020
- **Adoption of Part 2:** TBD
- **Adoption of Negative Declaration:** TBD

**Board Action**
The Planning Board of the Village of Spring Valley ("Planning Board") has already declared itself to be SEQR A Lead Agency. We have reviewed Part 1 of the SEQR A SEAF and have prepared Part 2 for the board’s consideration. The Planning Board can adopt the SEQR A Part 2 prepared by our office and direct the applicant to prepare the Part 3 response.

**Property Description**
The subject property is a corner lot located on the southwest corner of Chestnut Street and Walnut Place and has a lot area of 15,485 square feet. The property is currently improved with a two-story medical office and a parking area.

The subject property is surrounded primarily by a mix of uses including residential uses, a lumber yard, library and offices.

The aerial photograph below shows the subject property and its relationship to the surrounding neighborhood.
The following map shows the lot that is the subject of this application in relation to the other lots in the area.

Proposed Development
The applicant proposes to construct a three-story office building with a sub-basement. The proposed building footprint is 62.5 feet by 44 feet or 2,750 square feet and a total of 8,750 square feet for the three proposed floors. There is no are shown for garbage dumpster and this should depicted on the plan. We would recommend that any proposed dumpster area be located so that it is not visible from the public street. There is also no provision shown for snow storage and removal. We would also recommend that landscaping be provided between the parking area and the public street.

Access to the site is provided from Chestnut Street. The dimensions of the entry from Chestnut Street, the aisle width and parking stall dimensions should be provided. There are 28 parking
spaces provided inclusive of one handicap parking space, where 33 parking spaces would be required.

Zoning Ordinance

- **Permitted Uses** – The subject property is located within the Village’s PO – Professional Office District. Permitted uses in the PO District include, Convents, Uses of the Village of Spring Valley, Uses of other governments, Business or professional offices, Parking lots or parking garages of the Village of Spring Valley, Churches or other places of worship. The proposed office use is a permitted use in the PO zone.

- **Bulk and Area Requirements** – The following table compares the proposed development to the bulk and area requirements of the zoning ordinance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Requirements</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>15,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Width (Walnut)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>124.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Width (Chestnut)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard (Walnut)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard (Chestnut)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10 (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Side Yard</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10 (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg. Ht. (ft/st.)</td>
<td>35/3</td>
<td>35/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.53 (V)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The applicant requires several variances for this proposed development as identified above.

The applicant would require the following additional variances or relief form the requirements of the zoning ordinance.

1. Parking – 33 parking spaces are required, where 28 are proposed.
2. Section 255-22H. Visibility at intersection.

The applicant should provide architectural plans in order to confirm the building height and FAR.

**Building Plans and Elevations**

Should be provided.

**Circulation and Parking**

The office of the fire inspector should review the proposed layout in accordance with the provisions of §255-40G as follows:
Public safety and fire access. The site development plan shall provide for adequate fire truck maneuvering, sufficient fire hydrants, properly delineated fire lanes and adequate emergency access.

Stormwater Management
Should be provided.

cc: Applicant
MEMORANDUM

TO: Village of Spring Valley Planning Board
FROM: Michael D. Kauker, PP, AICP
        Principal
DATE: January 26, 2021
SUBJECT: 4 Jay Street
        Review # 3

The following materials were received and reviewed by this office:

3. SEQRA Short Environmental Assessment Form dated 12/10/20.
4. SEQRA Part 3 dated January 10, 2021
5. Drainage Calculations prepared by Celentano Engineering, PLLC dated January 10, 2021

The following comments are submitted regarding this application for the Planning Boards consideration:

Introduction
The applicant has submitted an application for a two-lot subdivision in which two, two-family homes are proposed to be constructed on each newly created lot. The applicant has modified the layout subsequent to comments made at the first Planning board meeting. The subject property is an oddly shaped lot located at 4 Jay Street with frontage along Jay Street and East Castle Avenue. The site has an area of 16,308 square feet and is located within the R-2 District. The proposed development will require subdivision and site development plan approval (pursuant to §255-38.B) from the Planning Board and variances from the ZBA. The application does not require a referral to the County for a GML review.

Application Status
The applicant is on for a preliminary hearing before the Planning Board and it is the applicant’s third appearance before the Planning Board.

General Comments
1. The subject property is a very odd shape making it difficult for the lot to accommodate the proposed two lot subdivision with a total of four dwelling units. Approximately 3,762 square feet or 22% of the lot is undevelopable due to the configuration of the lot. The applicant has modified the layout to better fit the oddly shaped property.
2. We would recommend that the lots be reconfigured so that they are more normally shaped. **The modifications although proposing a flag lot, propose more regular lots than the first submission.**

3. The location of the play area is not the best location as it is in the front yard of two streets and because of its proximity to the street is not the safest location. **The play area is still in the same location concerns still stands.**

4. The distance from the deck to the property line shall be provided. **Decks have been eliminated.**

5. The applicant does provide a two-car garage for each unit, which is a positive aspect of this application. **Garages have been eliminated from the front lot but are still proposed for the rear lot. We would recommend garages for the front lot or at least a turnaround so vehicles do not have to back out onto Jay Street. The parking layout for the front lot has been modified, we would recommend that the pavement be extended in the easterly portion of the aisle to allow vehicles sufficient space to back out.**

6. Dimensions for all driveways and parking spaces should be provided. **Provided for parking spaces located on front lot. Parking spaces will be 9 feet by 18 feet and there is a 24 foot aisle width between parking spaces.**

**State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA)**

Pursuant to SEQRA regulations this action is identified as an unlisted action. The Planning Board has taken the following actions related to the SEQRA review:

- Declaration of intent to be Lead Agency: n/a
- Declaration of Lead Agency: December 21, 2020
- Adoption of Part 2: January 6, 2021
- Adoption of Negative Declaration: TBD

**Board Action**

The Planning Board of the Village of Spring Valley is the lead agency for the SEQRA review and has taken the actions noted above. The applicant has provided the Planning Board Part 3 of the SEQRA SEAF for the board’s consideration. We have reviewed all of the information provided to date and have prepared a SEQRA Negative Declaration for the Planning Boards consideration.

**Property Description**

The subject property although technically a corner lot as it has frontage along Jay Street and East Castle Avenue has the majority of its frontage and is functionally located along Jay Street as the lot only has 15 feet of frontage along East Castle Avenue. The site has an area of 16,942 square feet although as mentioned above approximately 22% of the lot area is unusable because of the properties odd shape. The property is located within the R-2 District. The property is currently occupied by a two-story two-family dwelling.

The subject property is surrounded primarily by residential uses.
The aerial photograph below shows the subject property and its relationship to the surrounding neighborhood.
The following map shows the lot that is the subject of this application in relation to the other lots in the area.

![Tax Map](source: Rockland County GIS)

**Proposed Development**

The applicant’s proposal consists of a two-lot subdivision in which two, two-family homes will be constructed, one two-family dwelling on each lot. Proposed lot 1 will be an oddly shaped lot that will have frontage on Jay Street and East Castle Avenue and will have a lot area of 9,135 square feet. Proposed lot 2 is another oddly shaped lot and will have frontage on Jay Street and East Castle Avenue and will have a lot area of 9,100 square feet. Access to lots 1 and 2 is proposed from Jay Street. The applicant does provide a two-car garage for each unit. Pursuant to §229.41A, all new driveways and additions to existing driveways shall terminate no closer than five feet from the side yard property lines. We would recommend that the lots be reconfigured so that they are more normally shaped.
Zoning Ordinance

Permitted Uses – The subject property is located within the Village’s R-2 Residential District. Permitted uses in the R-2 District include One-family detached dwellings, Churches or other places of worship, Convent, Uses of the Village of Spring Valley, Uses of other governments, Public schools, One-family semiattached dwellings, Two-family detached dwellings. Government assisted housing is permitted by special permit form the Village Board. The applicant shall confirm and provide documentation that the proposed use will be government assisted housing.

• Bulk and Area Requirements – The following table compares the proposed development to the bulk and area requirements of the zoning ordinance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Requirements</th>
<th>Required Two-Family</th>
<th>Proposed Lot 1</th>
<th>Proposed Lot 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>9,135 (V)</td>
<td>9,100 (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Width</td>
<td>100/105</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>20.6 (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19.7 (V)</td>
<td>10 (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10 (V)</td>
<td>10 (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Side Yard</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23.5 (V)</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10 (V)</td>
<td>14.9 (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg. Ht. (ft./st.)</td>
<td>35/3</td>
<td>35/3</td>
<td>35/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The applicant requires a number of variances for this proposed development as identified above. Some of the yard requirements as listed in the bulk table were also incorrect and should be corrected to reflect the table above.

The applicant would require the following additional variances or relief from the requirements of the zoning ordinance.

1. Pursuant to §229-41A, all new driveways and additions to existing driveways shall terminate no closer than five feet from the side yard property lines.

The applicant should provide architectural building elevations and floor plans in order to confirm the building height and FAR.

Building Plans and Elevations
Should be provided.

Circulation and Parking
The applicant provides a two-car garage for the unit on Lot 2.
Stormwater Management

The applicant has provided a drainage plan and calculations prepared by Celentano Engineering, PLLC dated January 10, 2021, which addresses the stormwater impacts resulting from the proposed development of the site and provide for a zero-net increase in stormwater runoff from the site. It is proposed that 4 drywells will be constructed on site to accommodate the increase in stormwater runoff.

cc: Applicant
STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW
NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Notice of Determination of Non-Significance

Project Name: 4 Jay Street
Date: January 26, 2021
Lead Agency: Planning Board
Village of Spring Valley
200 North Main Street
Spring Valley, NY 10977

Prepared by: Michael D. Kauker, PP, AICP
Kauker & Kauker, LLC
356 Franklin Ave.
Wyckoff, NJ 07481
(201) 847-2900

This notice has been prepared in accordance with Article 8 (State Environmental Quality Review Act) of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law.

The Planning Board of the Village of Spring Valley, as lead agency, has determined that the proposed action described below will not have a significant effect on the environment and a Draft Environmental Impact Statement will not be prepared.

Name of Action: 4 Jay Street

SEQR Status: Unlisted

Conditioned Negative Declaration: No

Description: The applicant has submitted applications for subdivision and site development plan approval from the Planning Board and associated variances from the Zoning Board for a two-lot subdivision in which one, two-family home is proposed to be constructed on each newly created lot for a total of 4 dwelling units.

Location: The subject property is an oddly shaped lot located at 4 Jay Street with frontend along Jay Street and East Castle Avenue in the R-2 District, Village of Spring Valley, Rockland County, New York.
Reasons Supporting This Determination:

1. The proposed use is not anticipated to result in any adverse environmental impacts as further described below.

2. The proposed action will not cause a substantial adverse change in existing air quality, ground or surface water quality or quantity, traffic or noise levels; a substantial increase in solid waste production; a substantial increase in potential for erosion, flooding, leaching or drainage problems;

3. The proposed action will not result in the impairment of the environmental characteristics of a Critical Environmental Area;

4. The proposed action will not result in a major change in the use of either the quantity or type of energy;

5. The proposed action will not result in the creation of a hazard to human health;

6. The proposed action will not result in a substantial change in the use, or intensity of use, of land including agricultural, open space or recreational resources, or in its capacity to support existing uses;

7. The proposed action will not result in the encouraging or attracting of a large number of people to a place or places for more than a few days, compared to the number of people who would come to such place absent the action.

8. The applicant has provided a drainage plan and calculations prepared by Celentano Engineering, PLLC dated January 10, 2021, which addresses the stormwater impacts resulting from the proposed development of the site and provide for a zero-net increase in stormwater runoff from the site.

9. This Negative Declaration does not constitute any approval of any drainage plan.

10. In addition, this negative declaration does not constitute any approval of any site plan and it only shows that the potential impacts could be mitigated.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Village of Spring Valley Planning Board
FROM: Michael D. Kauker, PP, AICP
       Principal
DATE: January 26, 2021
SUBJECT: 127 Bethune Boulevard
          Review # 4

The following materials were received and reviewed by this office:

3. SEQRA Short Environmental Assessment Form dated 10/28/20.

The following comments are submitted regarding this application for the Planning Boards consideration:

Introduction
The applicant has submitted an application for the consideration of preliminary and final site plan approval in order construct a 9-unit multifamily development. The subject property is an interior lot located on the west side of Bethune Boulevard north of Crispus Attucks. The subject property has an area of 14,644 square feet and is located within the PRD Planned Residential Development Overlay District. The proposed development will require preliminary and final site plan approval from the Planning Board, variances from the ZBA a special permit from the Village Board.

Application Status
The applicant is on for a preliminary hearing before the Planning Board and it is the applicant’s fourth appearance before the Planning Board.

General Comments
1. Given the number and degree of variances we feel that the proposal is an overutilization of the property. The applicant has modified the layout and now provides a greater side yard of 15 feet on the north side of the building.
2. The applicant would be required to provide affordable housing on site commensurate with the requirements of the Village.
3. The Planning Board requested that the FAR be reduced to 0.65. The applicant has not yet revised the plan to incorporate this recommendation. **The FAR has been reduced from 0.76 to 0.7.**

4. In addition to the reduction in FAR, I would also recommend that the side yard be increased to 15 feet. I am not aware of another multi-family dwelling that the board has approved with a side yard less than 15 feet. **The side yard to the north of the building has been increased to 15 feet.**

**State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA)**

Pursuant to SEQRA regulations this action is identified as an unlisted action. The Planning Board has taken the following actions related to the SEQRA review:

- Declaration of intent to be Lead Agency: November 5, 2020
- Declaration of Lead Agency: December 21, 2020
- Adoption of Part 2: December 21, 2020
- Adoption of Negative Declaration: TBD

**Board Action**

The Planning Board of the Village of Spring Valley is the lead agency for the SEQRA review and has taken the actions noted above. The applicant has provided the Planning Board Part 3 of the SEQRA SEAF for the board’s consideration. We have reviewed all of the information provided to date and have prepared a SEQRA Negative Declaration for the Planning Boards consideration.

**Property Description**

The subject property is an interior lot located on the west side of Bethune Boulevard north of Crispus Attucks. The subject property is located within the PRD zoning district and has a lot area of 14,644 square feet. The property is developed with a single-family dwelling.

The aerial photograph below shows the subject property and its relationship to the surrounding neighborhood.
The following map shows the lot that is the subject of this application in relation to the other lots in the area.

Proposed Development
The applicant’s proposal consists the construction of a three-story 9-unit apartment building. The applicant should provide the number of bedrooms for each unit. Access is provided from one curb cut along Bethune Boulevard. The dimension of the drive aisle width is 24 feet. There are 19 parking spaces proposed, where 18 would be required. The dimensions of the parking spaces are 9 feet by 18 feet. There is a play area shown in the rear yard. There is no garbage dumpster shown and no provision for snow removal is provided.

Zoning Ordinance
• Permitted Uses – The subject property is located within the Village’s PRD Planned Residential Development Overlay District. Permitted uses in the PRD District include One-family detached dwellings, Churches or other places of worship, Convents, Uses of the
Village of Spring Valley, Uses of other governments, Public schools, One-family semiattached dwellings and Two-family detached dwellings. The proposed multi-family use is a permitted by special permit form the village board in the PRD District.

- Bulk and Area Requirements – The following table compares the proposed development to the bulk and area requirements of the zoning ordinance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Requirements</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>14,644 (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Width</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>75 (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10/15 (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Side Yard</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25 (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20 (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg. Ht. (ft./st.)</td>
<td>40/3</td>
<td>40/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7 (V)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The applicant requires several variances for this proposed development as identified above.

The applicant would require the following additional variances or relief from the requirements of the zoning ordinance.

1. The density for multifamily dwellings shall be a maximum of 18 dwelling units per acre, where the applicant proposes a density of 26 units per acre. In other words, 6 units would be permitted on this site, where 9 units are proposed.

The applicant should provide architectural plans to confirm the building height and FAR.

Building Plans and Elevations
Should be provided.

Circulation and Parking
The office of the fire inspector should review and provide their comments on the proposed site plan, specifically related to areas of public safety and fire access. Pursuant to §255-40G of the code, “The site development plan shall provide for adequate fire truck maneuvering, sufficient fire hydrants, properly delineated fire lanes and adequate emergency access.”

Stormwater Management
The applicant has provided a drainage plan and calculations prepared by Celentano Engineering, PLLC dated January 6, 2021, which addresses the stormwater impacts resulting from the proposed development of the site and provide for a zero-net increase in stormwater runoff from
the site. It is proposed that 4 drywells will be constructed on site to accommodate the increase in stormwater runoff.

cc: Applicant
STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW
NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Notice of Determination of Non-Significance

Project Name: 127 Bethune Boulevard

Date: January 26, 2021

Lead Agency: Planning Board
Village of Spring Valley
200 North Main Street
Spring Valley, NY 10977

Prepared by: Michael D. Kauker, PP, AICP
Kauker & Kauker, LLC
356 Franklin Ave.
Wyckoff, NJ 07481
(201) 847-2900

This notice has been prepared in accordance with Article 8 (State Environmental Quality Review Act) of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law.

The Planning Board of the Village of Spring Valley, as lead agency, has determined that the proposed action described below will not have a significant effect on the environment and a Draft Environmental Impact Statement will not be prepared.

Name of Action: 127 Bethune Boulevard

SEQR Status: Unlisted

Conditioned Negative Declaration: No

Description: The applicant has submitted applications for site development plan approval from the Planning Board, a special permit from the Village Board and associated variances from the Zoning Board in order construct a 9-unit multifamily development.

Location: The subject property is an interior lot located on the west side of Bethune Boulevard north of Crispus Attucks in the PRD Planned Residential Development Overlay District, Village of Spring Valley, Rockland County, New York.
Reasons Supporting This Determination:

1. The proposed use is not anticipated to result in any adverse environmental impacts as further described below.

2. The proposed action will not cause a substantial adverse change in existing air quality, ground or surface water quality or quantity, traffic or noise levels; a substantial increase in solid waste production; a substantial increase in potential for erosion, flooding, leaching or drainage problems;

3. The proposed action will not result in the impairment of the environmental characteristics of a Critical Environmental Area;

4. The proposed action will not result in a major change in the use of either the quantity or type of energy;

5. The proposed action will not result in the creation of a hazard to human health;

6. The proposed action will not result in a substantial change in the use, or intensity of use, of land including agricultural, open space or recreational resources, or in its capacity to support existing uses;

7. The proposed action will not result in the encouraging or attracting of a large number of people to a place or places for more than a few days, compared to the number of people who would come to such place absent the action.

8. The applicant has provided a drainage plan and calculations prepared by Celentano Engineering, PLLC dated January 6, 2021, which addresses the stormwater impacts resulting from the proposed development of the site and provide for a zero-net increase in stormwater runoff from the site.

9. This Negative Declaration does not constitute any approval of any drainage plan.

10. In addition, this negative declaration does not constitute any approval of any site plan and it only shows that the potential impacts could be mitigated.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Village of Spring Valley Planning Board
FROM: Michael D. Kauker, PP, AICP
       Principal
DATE: January 26, 2021
SUBJECT: 24 Memorial Park Drive

The following materials were received and reviewed by this office:

3. SEQRA Short Environmental Assessment Form dated 1/26/21.

The following comments are submitted regarding this application for the Planning Boards consideration:

Introduction
The applicant has submitted an application for the consideration of preliminary and final site development plan in order construct a 22-unit multifamily development. The subject property is located along Lake Street to the east and Memorial Park Drive to the west. The subject property has an area of 17,102 square feet and is located within the PRD Planned Residential Development Overlay District. The applicant previously received approval for 8 units on this site back in 2012. Approvals for that development have since expired. The proposed development will require preliminary and final site plan approval from the Planning Board, variances from the ZBA a special permit from the Village Board.

Application Status
The applicant is on for a preliminary hearing before the Planning Board and it is the applicant’s first appearance before the Planning Board.

General Comments
1. The applicant shall confirm the lot area of the lot.
2. In the previous application approved by the board the 19 parking spaces that are proposed are on an adjacent lot to the south, which is owned by the Village.
3. If the applicant included this land in the lot area calculation and the property is still going to be owned by the Village it should be removed as it should not be included in the minimum lot area calculation.
4. In addition, the lots should be clearly delineated on the plan and the side yard would need to be recalculated.
5. The applicant would also need some form of authorization from the Village to use this parcel.
6. The applicant would be required to provide affordable housing on site commensurate with the requirements of the Village.

State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA)
Pursuant to SEQRA regulations this action is identified as an unlisted action. The Planning Board has taken the following actions related to the SEQRA review:

- Declaration of intent to be Lead Agency: TBD
- Declaration of Lead Agency: TBD
- Adoption of Part 2: TBD
- Adoption of Negative Declaration: TBD

Board Action
As early as possible in an agency's formulation of an action it proposes to undertake, or as soon as an agency receives an application for funding or for approval of an action, it must do the following:
(i) determine whether the action is subject to SEQR. If the action is a Type II action, the agency has no further responsibilities under this Part;
(ii) determine whether the action involves a Federal agency. If the action involves a Federal agency, the provisions of section 617.15 of this Part apply;
(iii) determine whether the action may involve one or more other agencies; and
(iv) make a preliminary classification of an action as Type I or Unlisted, using the information available and comparing it with the thresholds set forth in section 617.4 of this Part. Such preliminary classification will assist in determining whether a full EAF and coordinated review is necessary.

Pursuant to SEQRA Regulations, the Planning Board of the Village of Spring Valley ("Planning Board") finds (i) that the proposed action is subject to SEQRA; (ii) the action does not Involve a Federal agency; (iii) the action may Involve one or more other agencies, including the of Spring Valley Planning Board ("PB") the Village of Spring Valley Board of Trustees, and the Village of Spring Valley Zoning Board of Appeals ("ZBA"), ("Involved agencies"), and (iv) this action is classified as an Unlisted action.

We recommend that the Planning Board issue its Notice of Intention to be the SEQRA Lead Agency for this action, and to distribute said Notice of Intention to all Involved agencies.

Property Description
The subject property is a through lot located along Lake Street to the east and Memorial Park Drive to the west. The subject property is located within the PRD zoning district and has a lot area of 24,402 square feet. The lot area shall be confirmed as the prior application had a lot area of 17,102 square feet.
The aerial photograph below shows the subject property and its relationship to the surrounding neighborhood.
The following map shows the lot that is the subject of this application in relation to the other lots in the area.

Proposed Development
The applicant’s proposal consists the construction of a 22-unit multi-family development. It is proposed that two buildings with 4 attached dwellings in each building be constructed in which 2 of the dwellings units would contain 2 units and 6 would contain 3 units. The applicant should provide the number of bedrooms for each unit. Access is provided from one curb cut along Lake Street. The dimension of the drive aisle width is 24 feet. There are 35 parking spaces proposed, where 44 would be required. There are 16 garage parking spaces and 19 exterior surface parking spaces. The dimensions of the parking spaces are 9 feet by 18 feet. There is a recreation area shown in the rear yard. There is no garbage dumpster shown and no provision for snow removal is provided.
In the previous application approved by the board the 19 parking spaces that are proposed are on
an adjacent lot to the south, which is owned by the Village. These spaces where originally to be
used to provide parking for both the proposed development and additional parking for the multi-
family development to the south. At that time, the applicant verbally indicated that the Village
would maintain ownership of this property and there will be a license agreement for use by the
applicant of this property and multi-family use to the south.

The following comments were made during the last application, but I do not have any
documentation confirming.

- The ownership and use of this parking area should be confirmed and documented in
  written form.
- The site plan should clearly indicate who has use of the proposed parking areas.
- It is also proposed that the proposed stormwater detention system will be located on the
  property owned by the Village. It should be discussed as to who would be responsible
  for maintaining the driveway, parking area and stormwater detention system since they
  are located on Village owned property. I would assume it would be the applicant and it
  would be stipulated in the license agreement.

Zoning Ordinance

- Permitted Uses – The subject property is located within the Village’s PRD Planned
  Residential Development Overlay District. Permitted uses in the PRD District include One-
  family detached dwellings, Churches or other places of worship, Convents, Uses of the
  Village of Spring Valley, Uses of other governments, Public schools, One-family
  semi-attached dwellings and Two-family detached dwellings. The proposed multi-family use
  is a permitted by special permit form the village board in the PRD District.

- Bulk and Area Requirements – The following table compares the proposed development to
  the bulk and area requirements of the zoning ordinance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Requirements</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>24,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Width (Lake)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>173.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Width (Memorial)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>108.43 (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard (Lake)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16.4 (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard (Memorial)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10 (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10 (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Side Yard</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10 (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg. Ht. (ft./st.)</td>
<td>40/3</td>
<td>40/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.2 (V)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Lot area to be confirmed by applicant as lot area for prior application was 17,102 square feet.
The applicant requires several variances for this proposed development as identified above.

The applicant would require the following additional variances or relief from the requirements of the zoning ordinance.

1. The density for multifamily dwellings shall be a maximum of 18 dwelling units per acre, where the applicant proposes a density of 39 units per acre. In other words, 10 units would be permitted on this site, where 22 units are proposed. The density calculation is based on the lot area of 24,402 square feet, if the lot is smaller the density would be even greater.
2. Parking – There are 35 parking spaces proposed, where 44 would be required. If the 19 spaces are located on a separate lot than only 16 parking spaces are proposed.
3. Distance between buildings of the height of the buildings 40 feet is required, where only 20 feet is proposed.

The applicant should provide architectural plans to confirm the building height and FAR.

Building Plans and Elevations
Should be provided.

Circulation and Parking
The office of the fire inspector should review and provide their comments on the proposed site plan, specifically related to areas of public safety and fire access. Pursuant to §255-40G of the code, “The site development plan shall provide for adequate fire truck maneuvering, sufficient fire hydrants, properly delineated fire lanes and adequate emergency access.”

Stormwater Management
Should be provided.

cc: Applicant
MEMORANDUM

TO: Village of Spring Valley Planning Board
FROM: Michael D. Kauker, PP, AICP
Principal
DATE: January 25, 2021
SUBJECT: 86, 90-92 Lake Street

The following materials were received and reviewed by this office:

3. SEQRA Short Environmental Assessment Form dated 1/17/21.

The following comments are submitted regarding this application for the Planning Boards consideration:

Introduction
The applicant has submitted an application for the consideration of preliminary and final site development plan in order construct a 32-unit multifamily development. The subject property is a double corner lot with frontage on three streets including Ohio Avenue to the north Lake Street to the west and Columbus Avenue to the south. The subject property has an area of 28,125 square feet and is located within the PRD Planned Residential Development Overlay District. The proposed development will require preliminary and final site plan approval from the Planning Board, variances from the ZBA a special permit from the Village Board.

Application Status
The applicant is on for a preliminary hearing before the Planning Board and it is the applicant’s first appearance before the Planning Board.

State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA)
Pursuant to SEQRA regulations this action is identified as an unlisted action. The Planning Board has taken the following actions related to the SEQRA review:

- Declaration of intent to be Lead Agency: TBD
- Declaration of Lead Agency: TBD
- Adoption of Part 2: TBD
- Adoption of Negative Declaration: TBD
Board Action

As early as possible in an agency's formulation of an action it proposes to undertake, or as soon as an agency receives an application for funding or for approval of an action, it must do the following:

(i) determine whether the action is subject to SEQR. If the action is a Type II action, the agency has no further responsibilities under this Part;
(ii) determine whether the action involves a Federal agency. If the action involves a Federal agency, the provisions of section 617.15 of this Part apply;
(iii)determine whether the action may involve one or more other agencies; and
(iv) make a preliminary classification of an action as Type I or Unlisted, using the information available and comparing it with the thresholds set forth in section 617.4 of this Part. Such preliminary classification will assist in determining whether a full EAF and coordinated review is necessary.

Pursuant to SEQRA Regulations, the Planning Board of the Village of Spring Valley ("Planning Board") finds (i) that the proposed action is subject to SEQRA; (ii) the action does not Involve a Federal agency; (iii) the action may Involve one or more other agencies, including the of Spring Valley Planning Board ("PB") the Village of Spring Valley Board of Trustees, and the Village of Spring Valley Zoning Board of Appeals ("ZBA"), ("Involved agencies"), and (iv) this action is classified as an Unlisted action.

We recommend that the Planning Board issue its Notice of Intention to be the SEQRA Lead Agency for this action, and to distribute said Notice of Intention to all Involved agencies.

Property Description

The subject property is a double corner lot with frontage on three streets including Ohio Avenue to the north Lake Street to the west and Columbus Avenue to the south. The subject property is located within the PRD zoning district and has a lot area of 24,402 square feet. The lot area shall be confirmed as the prior application had a lot area of 17,102 square feet.

The aerial photograph below shows the subject property and its relationship to the surrounding neighborhood.
The following map shows the lot that is the subject of this application in relation to the other lots in the area.

Proposed Development
The applicant’s proposal consists the construction of a 32-unit multi-family development. It is proposed that two buildings with 16 units in each building will be constructed. Access is not clearly shown on the plan and should be shown more clearly. There are 51 parking spaces proposed, where 64 would be required.

Zoning Ordinance
- Permitted Uses – The subject property is located within the Village’s PRD Planned Residential Development Overlay District. Permitted uses in the PRD District include One-family detached dwellings, Churches or other places of worship, Convents, Uses of the Village of Spring Valley, Uses of other governments, Public schools, One-family
semiaattached dwellings and Two-family detached dwellings. The proposed multi-family use is a permitted by special permit form the village board in the PRD District.

- Bulk and Area Requirements – The following table compares the proposed development to the bulk and area requirements of the zoning ordinance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Requirements</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Width (Lake)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Width (Memorial)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard (Lake)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard (Memorial)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Side Yard</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg. Ht. (ft/st.)</td>
<td>40/3</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The applicant shows two separate bulk tables for the project we would recommend they be combined, and the project viewed as one project.

cc: Applicant