

**Village of Airmont
Planning Board Meeting
Thursday, May 22, 2025
In Person**

Members Present: Yehuda Friedland, PB Chairman
Pinny Glauber, Member
Mordechai Grinberger, Member
Shimon Blumenberg, Ad Hoc Voting Member
Yisroel Friedman, Ad Hoc Voting Member

Members Absent: John Cornelius, Member
Alan Liani, Member

Others Present: Rob Knoebel, PB Village Attorney
Todd Maurizzi, Fusco Engineering and Planner
Lou Zummo, Building Inspector
Suzanne Carley, P&Z Clerk

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Friedland at 7:00pm followed by the pledge of allegiance and roll call. Chairman Friedland approved the meeting minutes of April 24, 2025, which were seconded by Mordechai Grinberger. Chairman Friedland appointed both Ad Hoc's Shimon Blumenberg and Yisroel Friedman as voting members for the evening. All in favor motion carried. Chairman Friedland opened the meeting.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING-Town Buildings LLC 233 Route 59

Chairman Friedland made a motion to continue the application to the Thursday, 7/24/25 PB Meeting at 7:00pm at Airmont Village Hall as requested in the letter dated 5/13/25 from attorney Paul Baum of Sarajain & Baum PLLC which was seconded by Mordechai Grinberger. All in favor motion carried.

WORKSHOP- Shulem Schik

245 Cherry Lane

Proposed Freestanding Place of Worship under 10,000 sf
Proposed Site Plan & Architecturals

Applicant represented by attorney Paul Baum of Sarajain & Baum PLLC New City, NY and engineer Rachel Barese PE of Civil Tech Engineering Suffern, NY. The application proposes to construct an addition to the single-family dwelling consisting of 4,095 SF for the use as a place of worship. 1,632 SF of the addition will be dedicated for religious worship. Parking for 28 vehicles is also proposed. The breakdown of the residential place of worship is as follows:

First Floor:

Main Sanctuary Area	1,120 SF
Women's Section	512 SF
Mikvah	997 SF
Lobby/ Bathrooms	746 SF

Second Floor: Storage 720 SF

The existing residential structure will be used by the Rabbi for his residence.

The total square footage of the residential component of the place of worship is 1,992 SF.

Services are scheduled for the following days:

Monday through Friday- 7:00 AM service of about 15 congregants. Monday through Thursday- 8:00 PM services of about 15 congregants. Friday evening services of about 25 congregants.

Saturday morning services of about 25 congregants.

Saturday evening services of about 25 congregants.

Section 210-12.3(8)(9)(a) requires off street parking to be provided at the rate of one parking space for every 60 square feet of the sanctuary/assembly area. Based upon 1,632 square feet sanctuary/assembly space, 28 parking spaces are required for the place of worship and an additional two parking spaces are required for the residence for a total of 30 parking spaces. A total of 28 parking spaces are proposed. A parking waiver is requested for 2 parking spaces.

The applicant is requesting that the PB declare itself as Lead Agency for the environmental review.

Review Letters received for the record RC Planning GML dated 5/19/25; RC Sewer letter dated 4/24/25, Tallman Fire Department letters dated 4/6/25 & 5/22/25; Airmont's Fire Inspector dated 4/1/25; Traffic Scope response from Nelson & Pope dated 5/2/25; Fusco Engineering dated 5/20/25; Civil Tech Engineering Narrative dated 4/9/25; project Narrative dated 3/18/25; RC Highway dated 5/20/25; RC Health Department dated 5/19/25 and SHPO Letter dated 3/19/25.

Traffic Study scope was reviewed and discussed between the applicants traffic engineer Ron Reiman of Colliers Engineering and the PB Traffic Engineer Osman Barrie of Nelson & Pope. The traffic study is being worked on and would be submitted in the next few weeks for Nelson & Pope's review and comments.

There were comments from the PB in regard to ensuring that there is proper circulation and enough parking spaces for the congregants since this is on a very busy County Road with many school buses and the new Hatzolah is now located on Cherry Lane as well. It was discussed that the applicant would look into the curb cuts and parking which would also be part of the traffic study review.

Chairman Friedland motioned to have the PB Attorney circulate a NOI and declared the PB as lead agency which was seconded by Mordechai Grinberger. All in favor motion carried.

The applicant will return when they submit for a public hearing at which time a date certain was not specified.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING-Central UTA of Monsey 236 Cherry Lane

New Three-Story Classroom Building with Basement

Proposed Amended Site Plan & Special Permit

Applicant was represented by attorney Ira Emanuel who indicated that they were last before the PB on 3/27 when they re-affirmed their Negative Declaration. They were before the ZBA and received their variances in April and are back for consideration for final approval.

There was a discussion of parking and that all students will be bused. Teachers will arrive via taxi or their own cars. For events the entire school will not be in attendance all at once, only two or three grades at a time. It was noted that there are 8 bus parking spaces and they are not allowed to park overnight or will make an appropriate application to do so to be in compliance. In the Zoning Code there is no overnight parking permitted. They adjusted the lights as requested by the neighbors, so they did not shine on the other properties. There was a letter from the fire inspector with conditions for building 5 and building 1 which they will comply with. The GML dated 9/25/24 and ARC memo dated 5/22/25 were read into the record. There are sidealks proposed on the other side of Cherry Lane as it would be too difficult to build on the school side within the right of way which is a county road from one end of the property. RC Highway indicated that they would need to go in on the opposite side. A crosswalk is proposed and was put on the plan. It was recommended to put in a turning lane into the school but the applicant's attorney noted that they are way past that phase as a Negative Declaration was already issued.

Chairman Friedland made a motion to open the continued public hearing which was seconded by Mordechai Grinberger. All in favor motion carried.

Marnie Milidantri 219 Cherry Lane – noted that there was a video sent into the ZBA with regard to audio the concern of loud music and voices across the property line. She requested that they be mindful of the noise for the neighbors. She thanked the applicant for addressing the lights. Noted she was completely unaware of the sidewalks that would be going in front of their property. Mentioned a need for a retaining wall to hold the property in by the slope.

Melanie Phillips 217 Cherry Lane – concerned with the number of buses as it currently looks like a used car lot and the buses are parking overnight. She felt it would be a great idea to change the driveway in and out for traffic if they would agree to it as it affects other people's properties. She was also unaware of the sidewalks and asked who takes care of them? How will the Village manage the number of students for the plans of the school going forward for safety reasons.

Chairman Friedland made a motion to close the public hearing which was seconded by Mordechai Grinberger. All in favor motion carried. It was noted the sidewalks are the homeowners responsibility. Letters read into the record:

1. Letter from Village of Airmont, Office of the Building Inspector dated March 10, 2025.
2. Letters from the Village of Airmont Fire Inspector dated March 25, 2025, March 26, 2025 and May 20, 2025.
3. Letters from Fusco Engineering and Land Surveying, PC, dated June 6, 2023, July 8, 2024, August 12, 2024, September 25, 2024, October 28, 2024, March 26, 2025 and May 20, 2025.
4. Letters from Nelson & Pope on Traffic Study letters dated September 23, 2024, October 30, 2024, November 15, 2024.
5. GML Letters from County of Rockland, Dept of Planning dated September 25, 2024, and February 7, 2025
6. GML review by County of Rockland, Dept of Planning dated August 8, 2024
7. Letters from Rockland County Center for Environmental Health dated September 24, 2024, November 18, 2024
8. Letter from Rockland County Highway Dept dated October 29, 2024
9. Letters from Rockland County Sewer District #1 letters September 16, 2024, and October 3, 2024
10. Letter from Town of Ramapo, Dept. of Public works dated November 15, 2024
11. Letter from NYS Parks, Recreation and Historical Preservation letter dated July 12, 2024
12. Letters from Tallman Fire Dept. dated June 12, 2023, July 7, 2024, August 10, 2024,

- and October 22, 2024
13. Letter from NYS Dept of Environmental Conservation dated August 7, 2024
 14. Letters from US Environmental Protection Agency letter dated November 21, 2021 and August 14, 2024.
 15. Departmental Review by the Rockland County Drainage Agency dated May 2, 2025.
 16. Letter from Veolia New York Water dated October 14, 2024
 17. Memorandum Decision of the Village of Airmont Architectural Review Committee dated May 22, 2025

The Planning Board's conditioned the approval upon map notes being added to the plan to restrict the use of the premises for functions related to the school and its students, such that the premises should not be used for weddings, catering, bar mitzvahs, or outside events by organizations that are not part of the school. Additional notes being added to the plan to include the following:

- a. Sidewalks shall be provided on the opposite side of the street as shown on the plan and in the county right of way.
- b. Crosswalks shall be provided for and added to plan.
- c. Signage is not included as a part of this approval and any signage must return to the planning board for approval.
- d. The operation of the property must comply with the village noise ordinance for sound
- e. This shall be no overnight bus and van parking.
- f. All approved variances must be shown on the plan

The Applicant shall provide the landscaping, screening and fencing on the Project Site shown on the Plans to the satisfaction of the Village Building Department and in accordance with comments set forth by the Architectural Review Committee and otherwise comply with all terms and conditions of their decision dated May 22, 2025, which include, but are not limited to all fencing along Cherry Lane shall have slats and the emerald arbor vitae shown along the building shall be changed to green giant variety.

Site Plan approval was motioned by Chairman Friedland and seconded by Member Glauber. Motion was carried by a vote of 5-0.

SEQRA FINDINGS STATEMENT AND COMPLETION OF SEQRA REVIEW-

Blue Rill Estates 444 Saddle River Road

Review & Adoption of Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) pursuant to SEQRA

Proposed Plan for Senior Housing

Proposed Site Plan and Special Permit

The applicant is represented by attorney Ira Emanuel and Jacklyn Hayes, Jennifer Ceponis and Dennis Murphy of MJ Engineering. The applicant submitted their final environment impact statement which was reviewed by all parties.

Chairman Friedland made a motion to accept the FEIS which was seconded by Pinkas Glauber. All in favor motion carried.

Chairman Friedland made a motion to have the applicant attend the 6/26/25 PB Meeting as a workshop to discuss the parking on the site, the overlay and architectural. The motion was seconded by Mordechai Grinberger. All in favor motion carried.

PUBLIC HEARING - Bnos Binah

51 Church Road

Proposed School of Religious Instruction
Proposed Site Plan, Architecturals & Renderings

A recap of the project was provided by the applicants' attorney Ira Emanuel and the applicants Engineer Rachel Barese of Civil Tech Engineering. The layout of the project and review of Fusco Engineering and Planning review letter dated 5/20 was discussed. It was noted that variances required included parking setback, developmental coverage and floor area ratio. Additionally, a variance as per §210-35c fence greater than six feet less than 2/3 its height from the property line will be required. They asked that the play area fencing be clarified that they install wood solid fencing and landscaping at neighboring dwellings for a buffer.

The Notice of Intent dated 4/24/25 had previously been sent out. The applicant was advised at the previous PB Meeting to try and make the project smaller. The landscaping plan was revised to provide additional & more robust landscaping along Smith Hill Road and between the project and lot 61.08-2-2 to provide the neighbor with additional screening. A 6' high chain link fence with slats is now specified with a 4' high fence provided in the front yard.

The FAR and development coverage calculations were now provided. The bulk table has been slightly adjusted accordingly. A Traffic Impact Study dated 4/28/25 was provided by Colliers Engineering & Design. Based on their study, no significant traffic impact is anticipated from the proposed project, however they just responded to the PB traffic engineers letter dated 5/13/25 on the TIS. The PB will not have a final response to the comments until the next PB Meeting.

Letters read into the record: Village PB Engineer & Planner letter dated 5/20/25, RC Sewer dated 5/5/25, TOR DPW dated 5/5/25 and RC Health dated 4/23/25. There is no GML required from RC Planning for this parcel. The applicant needs to submit a submission to the Architectural Review Committee and to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Chairman Frieddland made a motion to open the public hearing which was seconded by Pinny Glauber. All in favor motion carried.

There was a long public hearing with over twenty (20) people that spoke in opposition to the project with concerns regarding incompatibility with zoning intent, aesthetics, scale & character of their neighborhood, traffic congestion, safety hazards for those that walk in the area, noise, lighting, infrastructure of sewer & water, loss of privacy, reduction of surrounding property values & litter. There were six (6) emails sent to the PB in opposition to the project from residents in the immediate neighborhood that were unable to attend.

There were 5 people that spoke completely in favor of the project noting the need for the school, their children were travelling for over an hour plus to the current location in Spring Valley and that it would be an asset to the community. It made more sense to have the school in Airmont when 85% of the student enrollees are from Airmont. They had no opposition to the project and were completely in favor of it.

Chairman Friedland made a motion to close the public comment which was seconded by Mordechai Grinberger. All in favor motion carried.

The PB Chairman noted that he personally felt that the building was too big for the site, it goes way back from three sides and all the way to the perimeter. It is of his opinion that the whole building is way too big and stuffed into the lot and is shoehorned in. The Planning Board noted that looking at the bird's eye view it is too big and there were a lot of concerns from neighbors.

The applicant will need to return to the PB to get their Negative Declaration as the response to the PB Traffic Engineer's initial comments still needs review as it was just submitted a day or prior to the 5/22 Meeting.

Chairman Friedland made a motion to continue the application to the 6/26/25 PB Meeting at 7:00pm at Village Hall which was seconded by Pinny Glauber.

NEW BUSINESS- The P&Z Clerk reminded the PB Members of the upcoming certification training series sessions that are being offered.

Chairman Friedland made a motion to end the meeting which was seconded by Pinny Glauber. All in favor, the meeting ended.