

May 4, 2022

Village of South Blooming Grove  
Zoning Board of Appeals  
811 NYS Route 208  
Monroe, NY 10950

Re: SBL # 219-1-2.1&2.2; RMF Holdings LLC

Below please find responses to nine (9) comments in regard to the amended site plan application for RMF Holdings LLC as per an email from the ZBA's attorney Gardiner Barone dated 5/2/22.

**Comment No. 1**

*"The ZBA Application provided to me is not complete. A complete application, with all required materials, such as the deed to the property needs to be submitted to the ZBA and its consultants for review. The Orange County Tax records show the owner as Metro Asset Management LLC. The application materials need to be notarized where required."*

**Response No. 1**

A complete ZBA application is hereby submitted. The application includes a copy of the notarized Deed. Metro Asset Management is listed as the legal owner with the Orange County Tax Records because the County has not yet updated their records to reflect the current owner. The application materials have been notarized where required and are attached hereto.

**Comment No. 2**

*"The Owner's proxy should match the stated owner of record. No ownership documents were provided and the tax identification numbers (219-1- 2.1 and 2.2) DO NOT match anything reported on the Orange County Property Data website. Please provide an explanation relative to the tax lot numbers being used."*

**Response No. 2**

The owner of record is 577 Route 208 LLC as per the attached notarized deed. CPC will be representing the owners as their Project Planning Consultant as per the attached authorization. The tax identification numbers (219-1-2.1 and 2.2) do not match anything reported on the Orange County Property Data website because the County is backdated in updating their records and the two tax were formed as a result of a subdivision approved by the Village Planning Board in June of 2021 and filed with the County thereafter. The tax identification numbers were previously identified as a single lot SBL # 219-1-2.

**Comment No. 3**

*"The tax identification numbers provided on the Application (and in the Public Hearing Notice) do not match a property in the Orange County Property Data website for the Village of South Blooming Grove. The tax map identification for the property needs to be confirmed."*

**Response No. 3**

Please refer to Response No. 2 above.

**Comment No. 4**

*“I was not provided with any SEQRA documents, such the EAF Part 1”*

**Response No. 4**

A FEAF Part 1 is submitted along with these responses.

**Comment No. 5**

*“As to classifying the action under SEQRA, the proposed development might be considered a Type 1 Action, which requires coordinated review under SEQRA. The Village Engineer (Fusco) should determine if the action triggers any of the thresholds, such as involving 10 acres or more acres, which would require the designation of a lead agency after circulation of a Notice of Intent. It appears that the project site is 10 acres. If this project is a Type 1 action for SEQRA review, it is suggested that the Planning Board take the steps necessary for the Planning Board to be designated the Lead Agency. The ZBA cannot take any final action to approve or deny the requested variances until the Lead Agency renders a determination of significance under SEQRA.”*

**Response No. 5**

The Project Site consists of 8.971 acres, which less than 10 acres.

**Comment No. 6**

*“The Site Plan provided to me indicates that the project site is in at least three overlay districts. Two of these districts, the Scenic Viewshed and the Ridgeline impose additional constraints that likely impact the proposed development and variances requested. The Applicant should consider whether it needs to obtain variances from the restrictions imposed by any applicable overlay district. For example, the Ridgeline Overlay requires the height of the building not to exceed the ridge and/or vegetation (trees) on the site, requires the preparation and review of a visual assessment, etc. I was not provided with a visual assessment.”*

**Response No. 6**

The Project would comply with the constraints applicable to all Overlay Districts in which it is located. Once the application is referred back to the Planning Board, it is the Applicant’s intention to request a waiver for the Visual Assessment from the Planning Board as per Section 235-14.4 of the Village Zoning Code.

**Comment No. 7**

*“No narrative was provided as part of the application materials and Part II of the Application was not completed.”*

**Response No. 7**

A narrative as well as Part II of the Application is hereby submitted along with these responses.

**Comment N. 8**

*"I was not provided with a referral from the Planning Board. If there is a paper referral from the ZBA, it should be provided."*

**Response No. 8**

We have requested that the Village provide us with a copy of the paper referral in accordance with this comment.

**Comment No. 9**

*"A complete application (including a Site Plan, EAF, etc) needs to be sent to the Orange County Department of Planning because the project is within 500' of a state roadway per GML 239."*

**Response No. 9**

Noted. We intend to submit a complete application to the Orange County Department of Planning.

Respectfully,



Simon Gelb