

September 3, 2024

To: Village of New Hempstead Planning Board

From: Deborah Munitz, 5 Rose Hill Road Montebello, NY

Re: Union Village

I am a board member of ROSA 4 Rockland, an environmental not-for-profit that advocates for properly legal procedures in land use cases especially with advocating for complete applications and compliance with the procedural and substantive requirement of SEQRA and we advocate for public participation in comprehensive planning processes.

The following are new comments in addition to my prior comments at the July 9, 2024 meeting.

1. The Village of New Hempstead does not have zoning code definitions for attached single family homes as shown on the site plan or for townhouses/townhomes, which are not shown on the Site Plan. State building code definitions defines a town house as “a single family dwelling unit constructed in a group of three or more attached units...”. The Planning Board should request the Village Board address this lack of definition in any zoning code amendments following passage of the comprehensive plan.
2. The current site plan is not showing the town home lots that the builder wants to propose and there are no measurements of the coverage for town house lots to show how the bulk requirements are being met.
3. The net lot area rules have not been applied which requires 25%-100% deduction for easements and right of ways depending on type. The calculations in various review documents do not address this requirement. After all deductions it remains to be seen if the 8 acres lot area minimum is met and whether variances might be required.
4. The net lot area is necessary for density calculations to confirm if the proposed number of units is allowable.
5. The layout of all home lots versus common lots is needed to see if the lot coverage requirements are met.
6. The rear yard setbacks are not met.
7. The lead agency should issue a Pos Dec and the FEAF Part 2 should be available to the public for review before a determination other than a Pos Dec is made.
8. The FEAF Part 2 should contain multiple Yes answers requiring a DEIS be produced and reasonable alternatives considered to reduce impacts. At a minimum there should be Yes assigned to questions 1 (large land disturbance in residential neighborhood and area of heavy traffic), 9 (the golf course/open space is a current scenic resource and this is a marked change), 11 (the golf course is a site for

recreation and open space that is being impacted), 13 (traffic impact admitted by RC HWY and planner), 15 (will increase lighting from nothing to lots of lighting for community, 17 (sharp contract from zoning in the area), 18 (inconsistent with existing community character).

9. This is not an as of right development and the setbacks are minimums. The standards for review are meant to ensure compatibility with the surrounding area and all setbacks must be considered within the context of the code intent and review standards. All setbacks to the propose side walk on Union Road should be no less than the setbacks that would have been provided by single family homes and should more closely resemble the setbacks provided by The Views of Pomona.
10. The propose community center is too large and exceeds the maximum of 2,500 sf and should be reduced.
11. Reductions in the number of units to comply with net lot area standards and reductions in the size of the units should provide more opportunities to right size the site plan to better match the surrounding neighborhood.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Bill E. Hentz". The signature is written in dark ink on a white background.