

VILLAGE OF CHESTNUT RIDGE **COMPREHESIVE PLAN**

**Village of Chestnut Ridge
Rockland County, New York
277 Old Nyack Turnpike
Chestnut Ridge, New York 10977**

CHESTNUT RIDGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

**Rosario Presti, Jr., Mayor
Grant Valentine, Deputy Mayor
Richard Miller, Trustee
Chaim Rose, Trustee
Paul Van Alstyne, Trustee**

DRAFT

DRAFT October 14, 2020

**Prepared by
Nelson, Pope & Voorhis, LLC.
156 Route 59, Suite C6
Suffern, NY 10901**

**Jonathan T. Lockman, AICP – Principal Environmental Planner
Maximilian Stach, AICP – Partner**

PROPOSED TABLE OF CONTENTS-

	<u>Page</u>
COVER SHEET	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ii
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
Background	
Scope of Work	
2.0 EXISTING CONDITIONS	3
2.1 Key Points – Summary of Inventory & Analysis	
2.2 Community Demographics and Business Characteristics	
2.3 Land Use, Zoning	9
2.4 Natural Resources	16
2.5 Scenic & Historic Resources	24
2.6 Community Services & Facilities	30
2.7 Transportation	35
2.8 Retail and Services Market Conditions – ESRI Business Analysis	
3.0 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT – VISIONING WORKSHOP AND SURVEY	45
4.0 VISION AND GOALS	49
5.0 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN SURVEY	53
6.0 CONCEPTUAL LAND USE PLAN	64
5.1 General Divisions of the Village into Sub-Areas	
5.2 Adjustments to Residential Districts to Decrease Non-conformities	
5.3 Adjustments to PI and LO Districts	
5.3 PUD Floating Zoning and Traffic Improvements	19
7.0 SUMMARY MATRIX OF LAND USE PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS	75
	30

TABLES

<u>Table Number</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Page</u>
---------------------	-------------	-------------

FIGURES

FIGURE 1	Village Location Map
FIGURE 2	Village Base Map
FIGURE 3	Existing Land Use
FIGURE 3	Village Current Zoning
FIGURE 4	Existing Nonconforming Lots Below Required Minimum Lot Area
FIGURE 5	Steep Slopes
FIGURE 6	Wetlands and Flood Zones
FIGURE 7	Parcels with Development Potential for Other than Single-Family Uses
FIGURE 8	Conceptual Land Use Plan
FIGURE 9 & 10	Proposed Revisions to Zoning Map

APPENDICES

- APPENDIX A** ESRI Business Analyst Retail MarketPlace Profiles: Chestnut Ridge Village
 - Within a 15 Minute Drive Time Radius to Village
- APPENDIX B** ESRI Business Analyst Community Profiles: Chestnut Ridge Village
 - Within a 15 Minute Drive Time Radius to Village
- APPENDIX C** Comprehensive Plan Survey – Summary and Raw Results
- APPENDIX D** Proposed PUD Floating Zoning District
 -
 -
 -
 -
 -

DRAFT

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The overall goal of this project is to provide the first Comprehensive Plan for the Village of Chestnut Ridge, supporting the Village’s Zoning Code and Land Use Policies for the next ten years. Recommendations include changes to promote appropriate development of the Red Schoolhouse Road and Chestnut Ridge Road corridors to provide economic development and employment opportunities, and to establish improvements to the zoning code to provide better management of residential areas. All goals, objectives and recommendations focus on enhance the Village’s green landscape, preserving trees, corridor views, and promoting high quality architecture.

1.2 Scope of Work

Task 1 of this process included a land use reconnaissance and mapping of existing conditions. GIS resources were gathered from the State of New York GIS Clearinghouse to form the base mapping in the figures of this report for roads, aerial photography, and physical and environmental constraints such as steep slopes, wetlands, waterbodies and designated floodplains. Zoning district boundaries were taken from the Village’s official zoning map most recently updated in 2013. Data on existing land use was taken from 2015 tax assessment records and field checked in the Fall of 2019.

Demographic and economic data was obtained from ESRI’s Business Analyst statistical package, and the federal census American Community Survey. Demographics included population, income, and household size. Economic data included consumer spending by category, and retail demand and supply by industry group. Profiles were established for the Village as well as fifteen-minute drive time from the Red Schoolhouse Road Corridor.

Task 2 of this process included a meeting with Village Board of Trustees in the fall and winter of 2019-2020 to review the existing conditions analysis, to identify any missing information, and develop a strategy to involve the public, designing a Visioning Workshop and a Comprehensive Plan Survey.

Task 3 included a two-pronged approach to public involvement: a Visioning Workshop and a Comprehensive Plan Survey. The Visioning Workshop was held at the Chestnut Ridge Middle School Cafeteria on January 8, 2020. The Comprehensive Plan Survey was circulated beginning on March 19, 2020. The results of this public involvement effort are document in section 3 of this report. (See sec. 3: Visioning Workshop and Survey.)

Task 4 included meetings with the CPC and Village Board to review the public input and develop a Vision, Goals and Objectives.

Task 5 included development of land use concepts and strategies and zoning amendments, during the summer months of 2020.

During Task 6, completed in the fall of 2020, a draft Comprehensive Plan was developed and a SEQRA review was conducted, with development of a GEIS and the holding of required hearings.

DRAFT

2.0 EXISTING CONDITIONS – INVENTORY & ANALYSIS

2.1 Key Points – Summary of Inventory and Analysis

This introductory section provides a quick summary of the inventory and analysis of the existing conditions in the Village of Chestnut Ridge.

Demographics

- Population is growing modestly; only 1.2% increase since 2010.
- Median age decreased from 46 to 38.
- 29% of the population is under age 20.
- 11% of residents are not US citizens.

Housing

- About half of all the housing stock in the Village was built during the 1960's.
- Approximately, 90% of homes are owner-occupied, compared to just 66% within Rockland County.
- Median home value rose significantly since 2000 by \$132,000.
- Home values are most commonly found in the \$300,000 to \$500,000 price range, with only 6% of homes valued under \$300,000.
- 42% of renters face a “severely unaffordable cost burden,” paying more than 50% of their income for rent.

Economy

- The number of employed residents has increased slightly since 2012.
- “Education services, health care and social assistance” is by far the largest employment sector for residents.
- Unemployment rates have stayed the same, hovering at around 4% during this time.
- There has been a sharp decrease in construction occupations as well as modest decreases in manufacturing and finance, insurance, and real estate.
- 82% of residents commute by car, including 13% who carpool. 8% of residents take public transit, while 4% use “other” means.
- Just over 7% of residents work from home.

Income and Poverty

- Since 2010, Chestnut Ridge's median household income has declined by \$16,000 or 14%. In contrast Rockland County saw an increase of 7% in median household income during this same time.
- However, Chestnut Ridge's median household income still is higher than the County median (\$94,464 compared to \$88,571).
- Almost half (49%) of Village households earn greater than \$100,000 while 24% earn \$ 50,000 or less. Nearly 31% of households at the County level earn \$ 50,000 or less.
- The share of households receiving SNAP Food Assistance benefits has risen during this same period from 4% to 8% and a similar increase was also noted within Rockland

County. To qualify for SNAP, a household must have an income below 130% of the Federal Poverty Level.

Land Use and Zoning

- The majority of larger vacant parcels or parcels with redevelopment potential are located in the Red Schoolhouse Road area.
- The LO and Regional Shopping zones as currently written have not been successful in attracting new office or retail development, and much of the development pressure in recent years has been for light industrial and housing at higher than single-family densities.
- The Village contains large acreage of educational and institutional uses, particularly at the Green Meadow and Gould sites.
- Many lots are non-conforming to the current minimum lot area requirements for the district in which they are located.
- Single family house lots are the predominant land use.
- Some permitted uses need definitions, and consistency between listed terms in the use tables and definitions within the Zoning Code should be achieved.
- Zoning provisions adopted prior to the completion of this Plan regarding Places of Worship should be maintained, with only minor adjustments to be consistent with any new provisions of this Plan.

Natural Resources

- The terrain of the Village is moderately hilly, with 65% of its area with slopes of between 3 and 8 percent.
- Wethersfield soils predominate, and they are usually deep and well-drained.
- Within the New England Upland - Hudson Highlands Physiographic Province.
- All of the land in the Village is located within two watersheds: The Saddle River and the Hackensack River; within each are two sub-watersheds: The Upper Saddle River and the Pascack Brook.
- Streams include the Hungry Hollow Brook, Pine Brook, and the Pascack Brook. All of these streams flow south into Bergen County, New Jersey, and have FEMA-designated floodplains.
- The latest Water Quality Assessment Reports for Pine Brook and Pascack Brook and its tributaries for the years 2014 & 2012 show the status of these waterbodies as impaired.
- The Pascack Brook is the only county-regulated stream located within the boundary of the Village of Chestnut Ridge.
- Wetlands and floodplains comprise a relatively small area compared to other Villages.
- The Village of Chestnut Ridge discharges to a municipal separate storm sewer system subject to the MS-4 law. This law establishes methods for controlling the introduction of pollutants into the MS4 to comply with requirements of the SPDES General Permit for Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems.
- Water demand in the utility's service area has been largely flat since 2000 despite a growing population, and that an estimated 2-3 million gallons per day of leakage exists within the system. Recent reports conclude that improvements to service as well as user conservation and green infrastructure practices would drive down water demands

while achieving increased water supply independence and prevent any need for increased capacity into the foreseeable future.

- The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation’s Natural Heritage Program reported that there are no known occurrences of rare or state-listed animals, plants, or other significant habitats within the Village of Chestnut Ridge or in its immediate vicinity.
- No critical environmental areas (CEAs) have been designated by the Village.
- 4 Brownfield sites are listed by the DEC. One has been remediated and three are subject to a voluntary cleanup program.

Scenic & Historic Resources

- The Village of Chestnut Ridge has a number of older homes, buildings, and landscapes reminiscent of its agricultural heritage. Although there are no sites designated “historic” or scenic” within the Village, there is an awareness among residents as to this historic character as noted on the Village website.
- Little Red Schoolhouse Museum is owned and operated by the East Ramapo Central School District.
- Duryea Farm and Jessup Learning Center operated by the Rudolf Steiner Fellowship Foundation.
- Three archaeological surveys have been conducted in connection with a T-mobile Telecommunications Tower project, the Scobo Dam Repair and Restoration, and at Hopf Subdivision.
- Rockland County is a participant in the Certified Local Government Program for historic preservation. The Village is not a CLG.
- Revolutionary War cemetery at Edwin Gould Academy.
- Haring Homestead marker at 606 S. Pascack Road.
- Joseph Eichler house (mid-20th century developer)

Community Services and Facilities

- Village Hall, Justice Court, Archives
- East Ramapo Central School District: Middle School, Eldorado, Fleetwood, Margetts Schools
- Private Schools: Green Meadow Waldorf, Sunbridge Institute, School of Eurhythmy, Pfeiffer Center, Threefold Educational Center, Specht School (proposed)
- Village of Chestnut Ridge Kobre Park
- Town of Ramapo Children’s Park
- Small, Neighborhood Parks
 - Dawn Lane: Nature area. Directions: Cherry Lane to Blossom Road; turn right on Dawn Lane
 - Lorna Lane: Basketball court, children's playground. Directions: Cherry Lane to Dorchester Drive,
 - Dorchester to Lorna Lane
 - Sandy Brook: Nature area.
 - Besen Park: Ball field, basketball court, playground.

- Capital Park: Nature Area.
- Adar Court: Children's playground.
- Elm Street: Children's playground.
- Town of Ramapo Police Department
- Hugh Gassner Fire Company, William Faist Ambulance Corps, Brewer Fire Company
- Solid Waste transferred by private haulers to Hillburn Transfer Station.
- Highway services by Town of Ramapo Highway Department, maintenance, tree work, storm drains, sweeping and plowing.
- Town of Ramapo Sewer Department – sewer collection system operations and maintenance.
- Rockland County Sewer District – sewage treatment.

2.2 Community Demographics

2.2.1 Census – The following pages show results from the United States Census - American Community Survey.

Will move from pdf package into here.

DRAFT

2.2.2 ESRI Community Analyst Software was utilized to review the population and income data of persons within Chestnut Ridge Village, as well as within a 15-minute drive of the corridor. Key results are shown below, with full results available in Appendix X

Table 1. Community Demographics

Estimates	Village	Within a 15-minute drive to the Center of the Corridor
Population	8,121	315,030
Median Household Income	\$112,795	\$98,402
Average Home Value	\$517,901	\$572,092
Per Capita Income	\$45,883	\$43,133
Median Age	45.6	37.9

DRAFT

2.3 Land Use, Zoning

2.3.1 Existing Land Uses. A map of existing land uses in the Village is shown in Figure X. The acreage of existing land uses in the Village can be broken down as follows:

Single Family Residential	1,612
Two Family Residential	19
Multifamily Residential	113
Commercial Uses	45
Mixed-Use (Comm/Res)	3
Institutional/Quasi-Public	270
Office	45
Industrial	101
Local Parks/Open Space	89
Agriculture	115
Utilities/Parking lots	13
Vacant	270

Total of All Village Parcels 2,695 acres

2.3.2 Existing Zoning Districts. A map of the existing zoning districts in the Village is shown in Figure X.

- NS – Neighborhood Shopping
- PI – Planned Industry
- PO – Planned Office
- PO-R – Planned Office R
- R-15 - Low Density Residential (15k sf)
- R-25 – Low Density Residential (25k sf)
- R-35 – Low Density Residential (35k sf)
- R-40 – Low Density Residential (40k sf)
- RR-50 – Rural Residential (50k sf)
- LO – Laboratory Office
- RS – National and Regional Retail
- RSH – Special Housing Residential

Below is a table summarizing the permitted uses and basic space and bulk requirements for each district. For full requirements, see the Village Zoning Law.

District	Uses by Right	Conditional Uses	Uses by Special Permit	Additional Requirements	Space and Bulk Requirements
Nonresidential Districts					
NS Neighborhood Shopping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Convenience Commercial Local Office-Business Libraries, Museums, Art Galleries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gas Stations Food Sales and Service 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Neighborhood Restaurants Volunteer Ambulance Assisted Living Community Place of Worship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50-foot buffer to residential district Enclosed in bldgs. No drive-in restaurants, limited restaurant seating 	Min lot 20K FAR 0.40
PI Planned Industry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Office bldgs. Laboratories & research Medical & dental clinics Industrial uses Wholesaling or warehousing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outdoor recreation Commercial recreation Automobile sales & service Laundry & dry-cleaning plants (no retail) Landscape contractors Emergency medical service offices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volunteer Ambulance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Buffers to residential district Bldg. spacing Max dimension of building width Parking placement Driveway placement Landscape contractor equipment parked indoors 	Min lot 60K FAR 0.40
PO Planned Office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Office bldgs. Libraries, Museums, Art Galleries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funeral Chapels Banks Animal Hospitals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restaurants Volunteer Ambulance Community Place of Worship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50-foot buffer to residential district Enclosed in bldgs. 	Use Group B
PO-R Planned Office R	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Office bldgs. Libraries, Museums, Art Galleries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funeral Chapels Banks Animal Hospitals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restaurants Volunteer Ambulance Community Place of Worship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50-foot buffer to residential district Enclosed in bldgs. 	Use Group K
LO Laboratory Office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Office bldgs. Laboratories & research Medical & dental clinics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outdoor recreation Hotels & motels Commercial recreation Landscape contractors Prototype mfg. accessory to Lab/office 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Boarding Kennels Volunteer Ambulance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Buffers to residential district Bldg. spacing Max dimension of building width Parking placement Driveway placement Landscape contractor equipment parked indoors 	Min lot 60K FAR 0.40
RS National & Regional Retail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Office bldgs. Supermarkets (max 45K sf) Retail Shopping Ctrs. Community Ctrs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> none 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cemeteries Hospitals Stables Ambulance Roomers Nursing homes Churches Schools Community Place of Worship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drive-thru ok No dry-cleaning No outdoor displays Building spacing No speakers/moving letter signs Fiscal impact study 	Min lot 15 ac FAR 22.0

District	Uses by Right	Conditional Uses	Uses by Special Permit	Additional Requirements	Space and Bulk Requirements
Residential Districts					
R-15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single family, one per lot • Community residence fac. • Agriculture 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nursery schools, home offices • Libraries • Density zoning residences • Two Family Detached Residences • 1 Family semi-attached Residences • Residential Gathering Places • Neighborhood Place of Worship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cemeteries • Hospitals • Stables • Ambulance • Roomers • Nursing homes • Churches • Schools • Community Place of Worship 	Buffers for nonresidential	Min lot 15K FAR 0.25
R-25 Low Density Residential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single family, one per lot • Community residence fac. • Agriculture 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Farm animals • Nursery schools, home offices • Libraries • Density zoning residences • Horses on 20 ac. • Residential Gathering Places • Neighborhood Place of Worship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cemeteries • Hospitals • Stables • Ambulance • Roomers • Nursing homes • Churches • Schools • Community Place of Worship 	Buffers for nonresidential	Min lot 25K FAR 0.20
R-35 Low Density Residential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single family, one per lot • Community residence fac. • Agriculture 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Farm animals • Nursery schools, home offices • Libraries • Density zoning residences • Residential Gathering Places • Neighborhood Place of Worship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cemeteries • Hospitals • Stables • Ambulance • Roomers • Nursing homes • Churches • Schools • Community Place of Worship 	Buffers for nonresidential	Min lot 35K FAR 0.20
R-40 Low Density Residential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single family, one per lot • Community residence fac. • Agriculture 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Farm animals • Nursery schools, home offices • Libraries • Density zoning residences • Residential Gathering Places • Neighborhood Place of Worship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cemeteries • Hospitals • Stables • Ambulance • Roomers • Nursing homes • Churches • Schools • Community Place of Worship 	Buffers for nonresidential	Min. lot 40K FAR 0.20

District	Uses by Right	Conditional Uses	Uses by Special Permit	Additional Requirements	Space and Bulk Requirements
RR-50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single family, one per lot • Community residence fac. • Agriculture 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Farm animals • Nursery schools, home offices • Libraries • Density zoning residences • Horses on 20 ac. • • Residential Gathering Places • Neighborhood Place of Worship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Place of Worship 		Min lot 50K FAR 0.20
RSH Special Housing Residential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Senior citizen housing • Physically handicapped housing • Community Place of Worship 	Buffers for nonresidential	Min lot 4 ac FAR 0.30

2.3.3 Issues when Comparing Existing Land Uses to Existing Zoning

Nonforming Residential Lot Sizes. The major problem identified when analyzing the existing pattern of development against the requirements of the existing zoning code, is that a major portion of the residential lots in the Village are nonconforming with respect to their required minimum lot size. Quite simply, 58% residential lot sizes in the Village are smaller than they are required to be (see Figure X, Analysis of Nonconforming Residential Lots Below Required Minimum Lot Size, as well as Table X below).

Table X. Analysis of Residentially Zoned Lots below the Minimum Lot Size

Residential Zoning District	Total Residential Lots in District	Residential Lots above Minimum Lot Area	Residential Lots below Minimum Lot Area	Percent of Total Residential Lots below Minimum Lot Area
R-15	87	32	55	63%
R-25	1267	690	577	46%
R-35	966	272	694	72%
R-40	44	31	13	30%
RR-50	181	54	127	70%
Total	2545	1079	1466	58%

Underutilization of the Laboratory Office Zoning District. Another issue identified when comparing existing land uses with the existing zoning, is that the Laboratory Office zone appears to be underutilized. The regional demand for the development of such building types appears to be limited, and parcels zoned LO in areas with excellent transportation access have remained vacant for many years.

Underutilization of the RS, National & Regional Retail Shopping Zoning District. The RS zone on the west side of Red Schoolhouse Road on the also appears to be underutilized. Several shopping center proposals have fallen through, and regional demand for this type of development also appears to be limited, and these parcels have never been redeveloped as the Village had hoped.

Housing and Accessory Uses for the Green Meadow Waldorf School/Duryea Farm/Threefold Foundation Campus Constrained by Current Zoning. The Green Meadow School/Threefold foundation operate housing for faculty and staff, and provide group quarters for the population it serves. The foundation operates the following programs (text excerpted from <https://threefold.org>):

Green Meadow Waldorf School

A different kind of private school, Green Meadow Waldorf School strives to create a social, cultural, and learning environment that recognizes the child's spiritual freedom and growth. Inspired by Rudolf Steiner's insights into human development, Green Meadow nurtures the physical, emotional, and intellectual capacities of the growing child through a developmentally appropriate curriculum.

Otto Specht School

At the Otto Specht School, we work to discover each child's path to lifelong learning, offering a variety of educational programs designed to meet the needs of students with developmental delays, social and sensory sensitivities, and learning challenges.

Sunbridge Institute

Sunbridge Institute, an independent, not-for-profit adult learning community, offers world-renowned Waldorf teacher education programs, along with professional development and general interest courses and workshops on Waldorf Education, Waldorf teaching, organizational leadership, and the arts.

The Pfeiffer Center

The Pfeiffer Center practices, teaches and promotes biodynamics through courses, workshops, and internships for all levels of experience and interest. The ongoing work of developing a biodynamic farm individuality in the northern suburbs of New York City is the foundation for our educational programming.

Eurythmy Spring Valley

Eurythmy Spring Valley is comprised of the internationally known performing Ensemble and the highly respected School of Eurythmy, which offers both full-time and part-time

training leading to a variety of careers in eurythmy and the potential to earn a diploma recognized by the Association of Eurythmy Trainings in Dornach, Switzerland.

Fiber Craft Studio

The Fiber Craft Studio, formerly the Craft Studio of Sunbridge College, has evolved over the course of 20 years serving the students of the college and offering courses and workshops open to the public.

Threefold Café

Threefold Cafe is a dynamic natural foods cafe adjacent to the campus of the Green Meadow Waldorf School. We strive to provide tasty, nutritious, made-from-scratch wholesome food that is sourced as locally as possible.

Hungry Hollow Co-op

The Hungry Hollow Co-op Natural Foods Market was established in 1973 as a buying club by parents at Green Meadow Waldorf School. In 1993 the Co-op moved to its present location and has become the local “corner grocery store,” open to the public seven days a week. The Co-op hosts educational workshops, seeks to develop sources for local and Biodynamically grown produce, and strives to conduct business in an environmentally and socially responsible manner.

Hand & Hoe / Meadow Lark Store

The Hand and Hoe is the Fellowship Community’s organic cafe and hand-crafted merchandise emporium, selling goods from across the Threefold Community. We offer organic products from both the Pfeiffer Center and our own biodynamic fields, as well as milk from our own dairy! Our cafe serves delicious organic foods including soups, salads, pizza, and ice cream. Our store is stocked full of hand-dipped candles, books printed on our presses, home-made bread, crystals of varying kinds, and more!

The Fellowship Community

Founded in 1966, The Fellowship is an intentional community of all ages, centered on the care of the elderly and based on anthroposophy. About 150 elderly persons, children and coworkers live in a rural setting of farm, woods and orchards. The Fellowship Community operates the Duryea farm, a mixed vegetable production which also includes an apple orchard, dairy herd and on-farm dairy.

Anthroposophic Medical Associates

Our doctors practice an integrative medical approach to healing inspired by the research of Dr. Rudolf Steiner, utilizing the best of conventional medicine and non-traditional healing arts such as mental health counseling, Rhythmical Massage, Alexander Technique, Spatial Dynamics, Therapeutic Eurythmy.

The Nature Place Day Camp

A non-competitive, nature-oriented summer camp for boys and girls ages 4-16. The joy, magic and wonder of reconnecting with our earth are inherent in all of its activities, be

they games, gardening, hiking, camping, archery, swim instruction, canoeing, cooking, storytelling, earth art, nature explorations, animal care, music, drama and more.

The Christian Community

The Christian Community church in Chestnut Ridge/Spring Valley is part of an international movement for the renewal of religion, founded in 1922 in Switzerland by the eminent Lutheran theologian and minister Friedrich Rittlemeyer with the help of Rudolf Steiner. Services for children and adults are held on Sundays and weekdays throughout the year, with many special festivals and events as well. A three-week sleep-away camp for children is also held each August.

Steiner School of Speech Arts

Our mission is to develop free and truthful expression in which the inner life connects with living language to expand the power of communication. Steiner School of Speech Arts is an innovative initiative offering an in depth overview foundation year as well as a full four year training in speech arts. We also host a variety of inspiring weekend workshops throughout the year.

The current rural residential zoning is inadequate for the foundation and school to update and expand its facilities, without the need for extensive variances for any steps taken. The organization has asked for its needs to be considered when comprehensive plan recommendations area formulated. The need for staff housing and living facilities for the Fellowship Community are particularly acute, and are not at all address in the current standards and permitted uses of the RR-50 District where these facilities are located.

2.3.4 Places of Worship and Residential Gathering Places

In early 2019, the Village Board of Trustees adopted a local law to enact standards for residential gathering places and places of worship in residential neighborhood. Since adoption, about a half dozen places of worship have applied to the Planning Board to go through the special use and site plan procedures to establish these uses in a manner, balancing the rights of citizens to establish such uses, with the desires of the surrounding neighbor who desire that all possible negative impacts would be investigated and mitigated during the review process.

This Plan does not recommend any changes to these standards, other removing allowances for undersized lots which were needed prior to adoption of this Plan. Elsewhere in this Plan, minimum lot sizes in established neighborhoods are recommended to be adjusted to reflect the existing density of each neighborhood, so that the inordinate number of undersized lots that are now nonconforming can be brought into compliance.

2.4 NATURAL RESOURCES INVENTORY AND ANALYSIS

Topography and Soils

According to the Rockland County Soil Survey compiled by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Village's terrain can be generally characterized as gently to steeply sloped topography. Approximately 65 percent of the Village has slopes between 3 and 8 percent, 28 percent has slopes between 8 to 15 percent and only approximately 7 percent of the Village has slopes of greater than 15 percent. Elevations in the Village range from 310 feet to 550 feet. Slopes as well as ponds and lakes are depicted in Figure X.

The soils most common in Chestnut Ridge are classified as Wethersfield Series consisting of very deep, well drained soils formed in reddish glacial till derived mainly from Triassic sandstone, shale, and conglomerates. The soils are typically found on smooth ridges on uplands. Slopes range from 3 to 25 percent. Wethersfield soils are very deep and well drained with a dense substratum. Permeability is moderate in the upper part and slow to very slow in the lower part. The depth to water level below land surface ranges from 7 feet in the southeast to 140 feet in the northeast from January to April.

The soil series component most common (comprising approximately 30% of the soils in the Village) is WeB-Westersfield gravelly silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes which has a farmland classification of "Prime" and "no" hydric soil rating. Hydric soils are indicators of wetlands. Slopes and shallowness to bedrock are the main development limitations of Wethersfield soils.

a. Geology

The Village occurs in the glaciated portion of the Newark Basin of the Piedmont Province of North America. As such, it is underlain by geologic materials ranging in age from youngest to oldest of about 10,000 to 300 million years old. The breaking point for these geologic deposits was some point between 4.2 and 4.9 million years ago.

The younger geologic materials were deposited by glacial ice which invaded the area starting about 30,000 years ago from the north, and that subsequently retreated from the area about 12,000 years ago. These materials consist primarily of clay through boulder-size unconsolidated deposits that were derived through erosion of overburden and bedrock occurring in areas to the north of the Village. These deposits are primarily classified as "till" and "stratified drift", which reflect the nature of their placement by either glacial ice and meltwater emanating from the glacial ice, respectively. The movement of the glaciers through the area, not only resulted in the deposition of these unconsolidated materials, but also helped shape the local topography, by scouring bedrock surfaces and filling in low-lying areas. The glacial deposits comprise the majority of the parent materials for the naturally occurring overlying soils in the Village, which consists of organic material and the split zones.

The Village is located in the southeast portion of New York State in the south part of Rockland County. This portion of New York lies within the New England Upland - Hudson Highlands Physiographic Province. The New England Upland is actually a division of the Appalachian Highlands. This region of Rockland County is also known as the Reading Prong of the New England Upland. The Reading Prong includes not only the Hudson Highlands but also the New Jersey (in

New Jersey), Housatonic (in Connecticut), and Berkshire (in Massachusetts) Highlands. The prong forms a low, but rugged mountain range consisting primarily of metamorphic rock of Proterozoic and deformed during the Grenville Orogeny. Many of these rocks are rich in uranium and may therefore release high levels of radon.

b. Surface Water

The naturally-occurring topography or land surface of the Village is primarily reflective of the underlying geologic formations and the processes responsible for their occurrence. Being occupied by some of the higher elevation areas (in excess of 500 feet above mean sea level) in the Piedmont Province of Rockland County, all of the land in the Village is located within two watersheds: the Saddle River and the Hackensack River within each are two subwatersheds: the Upper Saddle River and the Pascack Brook. Streams include the Hungary Hollow Brook, Pine Brook and the Pascack Brook. All of the corresponding streams flow south into Bergen County, New Jersey.

Water in the streams and wetlands occurring in the Village is derived from precipitation runoff and natural ground-water discharge (“base flow”). As such, local land use can affect the quantity and quality of water in these resources.

Currently, the conditions of the central and major watershed in the Village - Saddle River and its tributaries are generally of good quality. Aquatic life in Saddle River, however, is known to experience minor impacts. These impacts are thought to be the result of nutrient loadings and other pollutants from municipal/industrial inputs and nonpoint urban runoff.

The NYS Department of Environmental Conservation (NYS DEC) indicates the best use for streams based on letter classifications. Stream use is correlated with water quality, where the ability for use as drinking water or contact recreation (Class A, AA), such as swimming, is high quality water, whereas waters classified as D (use for fishing but will not support fish reproduction) may have high levels of pollutant inputs or be particularly sensitive to pollutant inputs. Classifications include :

- A, AA, A-S and AA-S: best usage for a source of drinking water, swimming and other recreation, and fishing.
- Classification B: best usage for swimming and other recreation, and fishing.
- Classification C: best usage for fishing.
- Classification D: best usage for fishing, but these waters will not support fish propagation.

Water Quality Sampling A biological (macroinvertebrate) assessment of Saddle River just across the state line in Upper Saddle River, New Jersey (at Lake Road) was conducted in 2002. Sampling results indicated slightly impacted water quality conditions. The fauna was heavily dominated by facultative filter-feeding midges and caddisflies. Municipal/industrial sources were identified as the most likely influence on the sample. (DEC/DOW, BWAM/SBU, June 2005)

Segment Description This segment includes the length of Pine Brook (-6), Saddle River (-7) and West Branch Saddle River (-8), within NYS, and all tributaries. The waters of the stream are

primarily Class C, with the lower 100 feet designated Class A(TS). Tribs to this reach/segment are also primarily Class C.

The other subwatershed in the Village is the Pascack Brook, situated in the east, it is described by the State with the following information:

Overview Aquatic life and recreational uses in Pascack Brook are impaired by unspecified pollutants attributed to municipal/industrial inputs and urban/stormwater runoff.

Water Quality Sampling A biological (macroinvertebrate) assessment of Pascack Brook in Pearl River (at West Washington Street) was conducted in 2002. Sampling results indicated moderately impacted water quality conditions. Biological communities were dominated by facultative filter-feeding caddisflies and species richness was low. Impact Source Determination indicated municipal/industrial influences were the likely source of the impacts. (DEC/DOW, BWAM/SBU, June 2005)

The latest Water Quality Assessment Reports for Pine Brook and Pascack Brook and its tributaries for the years 2014 & 2012 show the status of these waterbodies as impaired¹. The Pascack Brook is the only one county-regulated stream located within the boundary of the Village of Chestnut Ridge.

c. Ground Water

The main aquifer underlying the Village and tapped by many private and public wells consists of the sedimentary bedrock units (shale, sandstone and conglomerate) of the Brunswick Formation, which generally underlie all of the unconsolidated materials occurring in the Village. This “rock” aquifer relies primarily on precipitation infiltration both directly and through the overburden, accumulated storm-water runoff (e.g., floodplains and local wetlands), and man-made features (e.g., dry wells and septic systems) originating within the County and the Village for recharge.

Recharge to the aquifer underlying the Village is derived from infiltration of precipitation and runoff, and constitutes a fraction of overall amount of ground-water recharge. Ground-water recharge consists of the amount of precipitation and storm water runoff which infiltrates below the “root zone” of the local vegetation. Some of the ground-water recharge will move laterally through the local geologic formations and possibly “daylight” in local wetlands and surface-water bodies (“base flow”), while some will continue vertically downward until it is realized as “aquifer recharge.” As a result, generally only a fraction of ground-water recharge is available as aquifer recharge. Previous studies by the County indicate that average recharge rate for the bedrock aquifer underlying the Village is about 200,000 gallons per day per square mile (gpd/mi²). This reported value is based on “average” hydrologic conditions (normal precipitation amounts and patterns), and reflective of the land usage (e.g., amounts of impervious surface and storm water management techniques) existing at the time of the evaluations. Consequently, variations in hydrologic conditions and future development in the Village can affect local ground-water recharge which in turn can affect local aquifer recharge.

¹https://ofmpub.epa.gov/waters10/attains_waterbody.control?p_list_id=&p_au_id=NY1501-0015&p_cycle=2012&p_state=NY&p_report_type=A

The amount of ground-water recharge available in a particular area is dependent on several factors. One of the more important determining factors is the prevailing land use and land cover (LULC). Another important factor controlling ground-water recharge is the type of soil underlying an area. The type of soil controls in part the ability of precipitation runoff to infiltrate beyond the root zone of the local vegetation and into the underlying geologic formations. Besides the LULC and soil type, the amount of ground-water recharge available for a particular area is also dependent on the local climate. The climate reflects the average annual precipitation, temperature, and wind velocity for a particular area, which when considered together can control the amount of precipitation that is ‘not available as ground-water recharge due to its loss to evaporation and plant transpiration processes (i.e., evapotranspiration).

d. FEMA Flood Zones & NWI Wetlands

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has developed advisory flood maps, or Advisory Base Flood Elevation (ABFE) maps. According to FEMA:

“Following large storms, such as Hurricane Sandy, FEMA performs an assessment to determine whether the 1% annual chance flood event, shown on the effective FIRMs [Flood Insurance Rate Maps] adequately reflects the current flood hazard. In some cases, due to the age of the analysis and the science used to develop the effective FIRMs, FEMA determines there is a need to produce ABFEs...ABFE maps were developed for the New Jersey/New York coastal region following Hurricane Sandy because in some cases, the effective FIRMs were more than 25 years old and did not accurately reflect coastal flood hazards in the area.”⁵

The ABFEs for Chestnut Ridge are shown in Figure X . The following definitions are required to interpret the FEMA Advisory Base Flood Elevation maps:

- Zone A: Areas subject to inundation by the 1-percent-annual-chance flood event generally determined using approximate methodologies. Because detailed hydraulic analyses have not been performed, no Base Flood Elevations (BFEs) or flood depths are shown. Mandatory flood insurance purchase requirements and floodplain management standards apply.
- Zone AE: Areas subject to inundation by the 1-percent-annual-chance flood event determined by detailed methods. Base Flood Elevations (BFEs) or flood depths are shown. Mandatory flood insurance purchase requirements and floodplain management standards apply.
- Zone X: Areas of moderate flood hazard, also known as the 2-percent-annual-chance, or 500-year flood area.

Wetlands, are present throughout the Village as indicated in Figure X. There are three levels of wetland protection: national, state and village. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is responsible for regulating national wetlands, and issues permits for regulated activities under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, which regulates the disposal of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States. Wetlands over 12.4 acres in size are mapped and protected by the (New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC). The only NYSDEC designated wetlands

within the Village is in the northeast, in an area east of Pine Brook and south of the New York State Thruway identified on the State Freshwater Wetland Map as: PR-2 , Wetland Class: 2, Wetland Size (Acres): 21.6.

e. Stormwater Management

Stormwater discharges are generated by precipitation and runoff from land, pavement, building rooftops, and other impervious surfaces. Under the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) stormwater program operators of large, medium and regulated municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s) are required to obtain an NPDES permit. A sub-set of small MS4s, referred to as “regulated” small MS4s, are covered by the Federal stormwater regulations. A small MS4 can be designated as a regulated MS4 through automatic designation by EPA or by meeting designation criteria developed by the NPDES permitting authority, the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) in New York State. DEC has designated the Village of Chestnut Ridge as an Automatic MS4. MS4s located wholly or partially within the Automatically Designated Urbanized Areas or the New York State Additionally Designated Areas are required to develop Phase II stormwater programs for that portion of the MS4 located within the regulated area.

The Village of Chestnut Ridge had joined the Stormwater Consortium, those municipal separate stormwater system municipalities within Rockland County who together with Cornell Cooperative Extension have implemented the regulation of non-stormwater discharges to the municipal separate storm sewer system. This law establishes methods for controlling the introduction of pollutants into the MS4 in order to comply with requirements of the SPDES General Permit for Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems.

f. Water Supply

Water in the Village is primarily supplied by a series of wells and surface water resources throughout Rockland County, piped and maintained by Suez New York (formerly United Water). In a few instances, water is supplied by individual private wells. Suez New York supplies water to approximately 90 percent of Rockland County, with the remainder provided by smaller companies and individual private wells.² Due to the interconnectivity in municipal water service the Rockland County Health Department (RCDOH) has taken a lead role in determining the availability of this resource. In 2015 the Public Service Commission ordered Suez (the United Water) to work with a County Task Force on Water Resources Management in response to long term water supply strategies. The Task Force commissioned a study titled *Water Losses and Customer Water Use in the United Water New York System* which found that water demand in the utility’s service area has been largely flat since 2000 despite a growing population, and that an estimated 2-3 million gallons per day of leakage exists within the system. The report concludes that improvements to service as well as user conservation and green infrastructure practices

² Amy Vickers & Associates, Inc. *Water Losses and Customer Water Use in The United Water New York System*. Prepared for Rockland County Task Force on Water Resources Management. July 2015.

would drive down water demands while achieving increased water supply independence, and prevent any need for increased capacity into the foreseeable future.

Since the resource is shared by all municipalities in the County, the Village of Chestnut Ridge does not have total control over the allotment of water that is available for any single municipality in the system, but it does have the ability to encourage residents to conserve, and businesses to utilize green infrastructure measures.

Wells derives its supply from ground-water resources in the Village and as such can potentially be impacted by local changes in recharge and water quality. As such, hydrologic and land use changes which affect recharge mechanisms available to these sources can impact the quantity of supply available. Given this relationship, the potential impacts of current zoning and future land use changes on ground-water recharge should be considered relative to Village land use ordinances. Specifically, ordinances geared towards maintaining and/or enhancing ground-water recharge (i.e., 0% loss of recharge) should be considered. These can include the use of storm water recharge basins, promotion of pervious surfaces and limitations on impervious surface areas associated with new and rebuilt construction.

g. Water Protection

Chestnut Ridge, similar to other surrounding municipalities, regulates development in and around its wetlands and water courses. Village Subdivision Regulations requires the Village Engineering Consultant to study the effect of each subdivision on existing downstream drainage facilities outside the area of the subdivision. The county drainage study of May 1960, together with such other studies as shall be appropriate, shall serve as a guide to needed improvements. Where it is anticipated that the additional runoff incident to the development of the subdivision will overload an existing downstream drainage facility, the Planning Board may withhold approval of the subdivision until provision has been made for the improvement of said potential condition or, in the alternative, the developer may deposit in escrow the full cost of the required improvement of the said potential condition in such sum as the Planning Board shall determine. No subdivision shall be approved unless adequate drainage will be provided to an adequate drainage watercourse or facility therein on the Official Map.

The Rockland County (RC) Department of Health has established general groundwater protection zones (see RC Comprehensive Plan Figure 7.3) corresponding to the overall locations of wells as defined by the State Department of Health. To date, the County has not adopted legislation or implemented regulations for these zones, and may consider doing so in the future, as well as encouraging the municipalities to adopt groundwater protection laws. The County's Private Well Testing Law, Section 389-5 of the Laws of Rockland County, which is implemented by the County Health Department, does require the completion of a well-water test when any new individual well is constructed, when ownership of properties with an individual water supply well are transferred, and on a regular and ongoing basis for rental properties. The intent of this law is to protect the public health by ensuring that residents, whether owners or renters, are aware of the quality of their water. This law also has the secondary benefit of eventually allowing the County Health Department to locate all private water systems within Rockland because of the mandatory

reporting requirement. As shown in Figure 7.3, there are three protection zones identified as 35, 71 and part of 73.

h. Endangered Wildlife and Plants / Significant Natural Communities

The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation’s Natural Heritage Program reported that there are no known occurrences of rare or state-listed animals, plants or other significant habitats within the Village of Chestnut Ridge or in its immediate vicinity.³

i. Critical Environmental Areas

Critical Environmental Areas are specific areas having “exceptional or unique character” (6NYCRR Part 617.14(g)). Designation of Critical Environmental Areas must follow a detailed process of boundary identification, public notice, public hearing and notification to the NYSDEC and other review or regulatory agencies. To date no CEA’s have been designated in the Village. The benefit of designating a Critical Environmental Area is to strengthen the SEQRA review of projects, which requires that the potential impact of a proposed action on the particular characteristics of the CEA be thoroughly evaluated.

J. Environmental Cleanup /Brownfields

A number of brownfields are present in the Village. A brownfield site is any real property where a contaminant is present at levels exceeding the soil cleanup objectives or other health-based or environmental standards, criteria or guidance adopted by NYSDEC that are applicable based on the reasonably anticipated use of the property, in accordance with applicable regulations. Below is a list of Village sites listed by NYSDEC:

Site Name: Chestnut Ridge Village Park
Site Code: B00037
Program: Environmental Restoration Program
DEC Region: 3
Address: 780 Chestnut Ridge Road
City: Ramapo Zip: 10977-
County: Rockland
Latitude: 41.08420248
Longitude: -74.05567857
Site Type:
Estimated Size: 0.55 Acres

Site Description

This is a 0.55-acre site formerly used as a gas station and automotive repair shop. It is owned by the Village and had been vacant since January, 1995. Petroleum and VOCs contamination existed

³ This information should not be substituted for on-site field surveys that may be required for individual project environmental impact assessment.

at the site. The site has been remediated. Asbestos abatement, building demolition and soil removal has been completed. A park has been built on the site.

Site Environmental Assessment

The primary contaminants of concern at the site include BTEX and PCE. The site has been remediated. Asbestos abatement, building demolition and soil removal has been completed.

Site Health Assessment

Petroleum and other automobile-related contamination has been detected on site as a result of past operational activities. Volatile organic compounds are present in the groundwater, however the surrounding area is served by public water. The February 2001 ROD calls for the demolition of the on-site building and the excavation of contaminated soil, eliminating the potential for direct contact exposure. The NYSDOH and NYSDEC will be evaluating the need to conduct additional investigations to determine the potential for soil vapor intrusion into structures on or near the site.

Site Name: Anthony & Sylvan Pools
Site Code: V00166
Program: Voluntary Cleanup Program
Site Description: Description Not Available
DEC Region: 3
Address: 267 Red Schoolhouse Road
City: Chestnut Ridge Zip: 10977
County: Rockland
Latitude: 41.06625154
Longitude: -74.05529427
Estimated Size: 0 Acres

Site Name: Church of the Presentation
Site Code: V00164
Program: Voluntary Cleanup Program
Site Description: Description Not Available
DEC Region: 3
Address: 264 Red School House Road
City: Chestnut Ridge Zip: 10977
County: Rockland
Latitude: 41.06653522
Longitude: -74.05210961
Estimated Size: 0 Acres

Site Name: Yellow Freight System, inc.
Site Code: V00165
Program: Voluntary Cleanup Program
Site Description: Description Not Available
DEC Region: 3
Address: 250 Red Schoolhouse Road
City: Chestnut Ridge Zip: 10977
County: Rockland
Latitude: 41.06714692
Longitude: -74.05258894
Estimated Size: 0 Acres

2.5. SCENIC AND HISTORIC RESOURCES INVENTORY AND ANALYSIS 5

a. Overall Setting

The Village of Chestnut Ridge is located along the southern boundary of Rockland County in New York State, within the scenic Hudson River Valley. Rockland, the smallest County in New York State outside of New York City, is approximately 176 square miles and is located on the west bank of the Hudson River approximately 33 miles north of New York City. The Village, which is approximately 4.9 square miles, is located in the Town of Ramapo, north of the state of New Jersey; east of Airmont; south of Spring Valley and west of Clarkstown. Chestnut Ridge was incorporated as a village within the Town of Ramapo in 1986 in part to direct and control the intensity and types of land use allowed in the Village.

A the time of European contact and settlement, the Village and surrounding territory were probably occupied by the Tappans who were likely a subtribe of the Munsie speaking Lenni Lenape (Delaware) (Bolton 1975:map & chart; Ferdon 1986: 22; Bedell 1968: 27-30; Synder 1969:2). Indian trails entered Rockland County from New Jersey. The Assanpink Trail connected Trenton, New Jersey with Suffern in Rockland County (Synder 1969:2).

During the eighteenth century most of the inhabitants were engaged in growing maize, potatoes, cereals, fruit orchards and flax. Wool was sheared and spun and hay was gathered (Bedell 1968: 54).

Currently the Village is characterized as having a rural feeling with residential, non-residential zones, retail locations, office zones and industrial areas. The two main commercial corridors running through the Village are Chestnut Ridge Road and Red School House Road, and there are multiple parcels of undeveloped land along those corridors which provide the opportunity for commercial and/or mixed use development in the future. The Village Board has been cognizant of that development potential, and has undertaken a study of the Red School House Road Corridor as a tool in developing the Village wide Comprehensive Plan.

b. Historic Setting

The Village of Chestnut Ridge has a number of older homes, buildings and landscapes reminiscent of its agricultural heritage. These homes as well as outbuildings and other features provide the community with its own unique character and sense of place. Although there are no sites designated “historic” or “Scenic” within the Village. there is an awareness among residents as to this historic character as noted on the Village website.

c. Historic Landmarks and Places of Interest

- Little Red Schoolhouse Museum – 50 Schoolhouse Road, east of Route 45. Once a one-room schoolhouse, now a museum owned and operated by the east Ramapo Central School District. Built in 1890 and used until early 1970s when pre-kindergarten classes

were held there.



- Duryea Farm of the Fellowship Education Foundation (Fellowship Community) – 101 Ackertown Rd., Chestnut Ridge, NY 10952 356-1988. Founded in 1883. Beginning in 1960, the Duryeas invited the public to their harvest. The farm is now owned and operated by the Rudolf Steiner Fellowship Foundation, which converted the orchards and gardens to produce biodynamic organic fruits and vegetables. The farm includes the Jessup Learning Center, which offers an exhibit of agricultural artifacts and classes.

d. Archeology

Archeology is also a key component of historic preservation. State and National Registers listed and eligible resources receive a measure of protection whenever state and federal agencies fund, license or approve projects in New York State. Under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and Section 14.09 of the New York State Historic Preservation Act, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) strives to ensure that effects or impacts on eligible or listed properties, including archeological sites, are considered and avoidance or mitigation measures are developed during the project planning process. The SHPO also provides archeological assistance to numerous state and federal agencies and offers archeological guidance and recommendations to local municipalities upon request.

Use of SHPO's online resource, the [Cultural Resource Information System](#) (CRIS), and the [Spatial Search](#) tools areas of interest can be viewed including the Archaeological Sensitive Areas layer. Two buffer areas around archaeological sites are recorded by SHPO in the northeast and northwest corners of the Village. Because these areas are only based on proximity, locations

within these areas may not be archaeologically sensitive, and locations outside these areas may be archaeologically sensitive. SHPO's CRIS currently lists the following sites in the Village:

Archaeology Surveys

- Survey Number: 04SR54337
Name: Phase I Archaeological Survey, Proposed T-Mobile Telecommunications Tower Project, Chestnut Ridge/American Legion, Rockland County, New York Archaeology Surveys
- Survey Number: 00SR51232
Name: Phase 1A Cultural Resources Survey, Site Assessment Phase, Proposed Scobo Dam Repair and Restoration, Village of Chestnut Ridge, Rockland County, New York
- Survey Number: 01SR51610
Name: Phase 1a and 1b Cultural Resources Investigation of the Hopf Enterprises Subdivision, Village of Chestnut Ridge, Town of Ramapo, Rockland County, New York

Consultation Projects

- Project Number: 17PR07258
Name: Hungry Hollow Rd. over I-87 (BIN 5514060)
Status: Open
Location Desc: Bridge replacement
- Project Number: 19PR01492
Name: East Ramapo CSD - Fleetwood Elementary Window Replacement and Related Work
Status: Closed
Location Desc: Existing window wall system

While the Village does not have a process for designation, Rockland County is a participant in the Certified Local Government (CLG) program, a status which it obtained in 2002 upon recommendation from the New York State Historic Preservation Office and the National Park Service, and can designate properties as historic. The CLG program consists of grants and technical assistance provided to support local historic preservation efforts. In order to participate, a local government is required to adopt a local law that meets certain standards and to establish a qualified preservation board. Instead of requiring that Rockland County have the power to approve or disapprove of demolitions and new construction affecting designated historic properties, as is the case for cities, towns and villages, the New York State guidelines make special requirements for County CLGs. The New York State guidelines specify that each county CLG must, at least, have the power to review and comment upon all undertakings that

might affect historic properties and to report to the pertinent county agency or municipality whenever the county is called upon to formulate planning advice concerning actions that may affect historic properties.

The main functions of the Rockland County Historic Preservation Board are to: provide advice and guidance to property owners and government agencies concerning historic preservation issues, recommend designation of properties and historically sensitive areas as worthy of preservation, and participate in and support the nomination of worthy properties to the State and National Registers of Historic Places.⁴ In order to be eligible for designation on the County Register, properties must be, “Associated with persons, events, physical design, broad cultural patterns, archeology or natural events significant to the development of the county, and which significance was achieved at least fifty years or more ago.”⁵

e. State and National Registers of Historic Places

Sites and districts may be eligible for listing on the State or National Register of Historic Places if they meet one of four criteria. These criteria are:

1. Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns in history;
2. Associated with the lives of persons significant in the past;
3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction; or represents the work of a master; or possess high artistic values; or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction;
4. Have yielded or may be likely to yield information important in prehistory or history.

Under Federal law, owners of private property listed in the National Register are free to maintain, manage, or dispose of their property as they choose provided that there is no Federal involvement. Owners have no obligation to open their properties to the public, to restore them or even to maintain them, if they choose not to do so.

Recognition on the Register does provide benefits, however. Owners of properties listed in the National Register may be eligible for a 20% investment tax credit for the certified rehabilitation of income-producing certified historic structures such as commercial, industrial, or rental residential buildings. Grant money is widely available to not-for-profit organizations and municipalities for historic preservation purposes.

In 1998, the Historical Society of Rockland County undertook a comprehensive survey of the county’s historic sites and structures. The survey was an effort to increase awareness of the history of Rockland County and of historic sites and structures by local government planning

⁴ Rockland County Historic Preservation Board website: www.co.rockland.ny.us/planning/historic_board.htm

⁵ “Rules and Regulations of the County of Rockland Historic Preservation Board”, adopted November 2005.

boards. Due to privacy concerns, the digitally mapped portion of the survey is not published or released to the public in such a way that addresses or precise locations can be determined.

There are several 19th and 20th century buildings in the Village that have been maintained in condition to be eligible for listing as part of a State or National Register Historic District. These structures would also likely qualify for local designation, should the Village pursue Certified Local Government Status.

Nineteenth century historic map documented structures appear in the Village and continue into the twentieth century. According to the county historic society’s website, there is a Revolutionary cemetery on the former Edwin Gould Academy.

f. Historical Markers

The Historical Society of Rockland County has erected historical markers to commemorate significant historical areas and events. Haring Homestead marker is on S. Pascack Rd. The homestead was Jade Village, a restaurant, at time of marker dedication. Marker is at or near this postal address: 606 S Pascack Rd,



Construction of this sandstone farmhouse was started c. 1788 by the Halstead family. John Yeary bought the property in 1791 and built a sawmill, later combined with a gristmill on the nearby Pascack Brook. In 1795 the farm was purchased by Abraham Garret Haring whose descendants

occupied it for four generations - 111 years. In 1906 the house became Martens Falls Inn and has continued as a restaurant through successive owners (see photo below).



g. Notable Architecture

A 20th Century site may be eligible for National Register listing, and could be researched further to begin that process. Work with the Historical Society of Rockland County and other appropriate organizations to ensure that these resources are granted official recognition. Noted mid-20th-century developer Joseph Eichler's home exist in the Village. [Joseph L. Eichler](#), whose modernist tract homes can be found throughout the Bay Area in Northern California as well as the Greater Los Angeles area, was one of the most celebrated residential homebuilders of the mid-20th century.

2.6 COMMUNITY SERVICES AND FACILITIES INVENTORY AND ANALYSIS

A number of community facilities service residents of Chestnut Ridge. Community services are provided by governmental agencies and institutions such as Village of Chestnut Ridge, Rockland County, Ramapo Township, East Ramapo School District, and others. The following community service facilities are located in Chestnut Ridge.

1. Village Campus

- Village Hall
- Courthouse
- Archives

2. Schools

The East Ramapo Central School District serves students in the Village of Chestnut Ridge. The District is an urban/suburban school district that serves over 37,000 students from 47 countries and various socio-economic backgrounds. The District serves students in the Towns of Ramapo, Clarkstown and Haverstraw.

The East Ramapo school district has experienced a decline in enrollment due to a shift in preference toward private or parochial schools. There are three public elementary and one middle school within Village boundaries.

Public Schools

- Chestnut Ridge Middle School - 892 Route 45, Chestnut Ridge, NY 10977
- Eldorado Elementary School - 5 Eldorado Drive, Chestnut Ridge, Ny 10977
- Fleetwood Elementary School - 22 Fleetwood Avenue, Chestnut Ridge, NY 10977
- Margetts Elementary School - 25 Margetts Road, Chestnut Ridge, NY 10977

Private schools

- Green Meadow Waldorf School, a pre-kindergarten through 12th grade Waldorf school
- Sunbridge Institute, a Waldorf teacher training center
- School of Eurythmy, a movement arts training in Eurythmy
- The Pfeiffer Center, a biodynamic gardening and agricultural training center
- The Threefold Educational Center, an educational trust

3. Parks and Recreation

Chestnut Ridge is located in close proximity to a number of excellent parks that provide residents with a variety of recreational opportunities. Located at Chestnut Ridge Road and Red School

House Road is Chestnut Ridge Village Park which honor’s Jerome Kobre, the village’s first mayor. The Village also owns land that has remained unimproved. These parcels may represent opportunities to create passive open space recreational areas within the Village. There are six (6) state parks within a half hour drive of the Village, including Harriman State Park, Sterling Forest State Park and Bear Mountain State Park, which are large natural reserves that provide for swimming, camping, hunting, backpacking, biking and a variety of other activities. There are also seven (7) parks maintained by Rockland County that are located within the Town of Ramapo, all of which are within a half hour drive of the Village as listed in **Table XX**.

Chestnut Ridge is a Greenway Community, a participant in the Rockland County Greenway Compact Plan and the state sponsored Hudson River Valley Greenway program, a voluntary regional strategy for preserving the scenic, natural, historic, cultural and recreational resources of the Hudson River Valley while promoting compatible economic development.

Since the Village is within the Town of Ramapo, Village residents are eligible to participate in all recreational opportunities offered by the Town at the same rates as all Town residents. A complete list of Town parks is shown in **Table XX**. Along with these park facilities, the Town also maintains camps and two (2) swimming pool complexes, the Ramapo Cultural Arts Center, Joseph T. St. Lawrence Community Health and Sports Center, and an Equestrian Center. Town and County recreation facilities are also supplemented by recreational facilities of local school districts, as well as several passive, public- and privately-owned forested areas.

TABLE XX: Rockland County Parks Within The Town Of Ramapo

Name	Village	Acreage	Facilities Offered
Dater Mountain Nature Park	Sloatsburg	350.5	Hiking
Eleanor Burlingham Memorial Park	Sloatsburg	45	Fishing, canoeing, bird watching and hiking.
Flat Rock Park	Hillburn	1	Fishing, canoeing, and wild life observation
Kakiat Park	Suffern	353	Hiking, Horseback riding, picnicking, fishing and guided tours
Monsey Glen Park	Airmont	25	Hiking Trails
Samuel Fisher / Mount Ivy Park	Pomona	272	Hiking, Wildlife observation
Schwartz Park	Airmont	11	Wildlife Preserve

Source: Rockland County Parks Commission, 2005

TABLE XX: Town of Ramapo Parks and Recreational Facilities

Name	Location	Facilities Offered
Herb Reisman Sports Complex	Pomona	Little League field, baseball/ softball field, soccer/football field, sand volleyball courts, 2 basketball courts, paved walking path, picnic pavilion, restrooms, fields illuminated for night use.
Eugene Levy Memorial Park	Pomona	Children's playground, two handball courts, exercise trail, paths for jogging and walking, nature area and bathrooms
Willow Tree Park	Wesley Hills	Pond for fishing, nature area, walking and jogging path. Group use is not permitted.

Orchard Hills Park	Monsey	Playground, two handball courts, ball field.
Manny Weldler Park	Monsey	Eight tennis courts, four handball courts, four ball fields, children's playground, nature area, bathrooms, walking and jogging paths.
Clark Center	Suffern	Four Hard tennis courts, picnic tables, children's playground, accessible bathrooms, basketball court, Bark Dog Park.
Fredrick J. Rella Little League Fields	Tallman	Three ball fields, restrooms
Harry Reiss Park	Monsey	Walking path and Nature Play Trail for children
Children's Park	Chestnut Ridge	4 Sand filled tennis courts, 4 handball courts, ball field, playground, bathrooms, nature area, pond, paths for jogging, walking and biking, basketball court.
Palisades Credit Union Park	Pamona	Home of the NY BOULDERS baseball team and serves as a multi-purpose venue that hosts local college, high school and amateur baseball.
Ramapo Tennis at Rustic Brook	Airmont	Ten tennis courts
Senior Citizen's Community Center	Suffern	Community Center
Ramapo Dog Park	Suffern	Three section Dog Park
Harmony Hall – Jacob Sloat House	Sloatsberg	Arts and educational programming.
Spook Rock Golf Course	Montebello	Golf Course

Small, Neighborhood Parks

- Dawn Lane: Nature area. Directions: Cherry Lane to Blossom Road; turn right on Dawn Lane
- Lorna Lane: Basketball court, children's playground. Directions: Cherry Lane to Dorchester Drive, Dorchester to Lorna Lane
- Sandy Brook: Nature area. Directions: New Hempstead Road to Pennington Way, right on Sandy Brook Drive
- Besen Park: Ball field, basketball court, playground. Directions: New County Road to Appleland Road; Appleland Road to Besen Parkway
- Capital Park: Nature Area. Directions: Route 45 to Pine Brook Road
- Adar Court: Children's playground. Directions: Park Ave. to West Central
- Elm Street: Children's playground. Directions: Union to Twin to Elm St.

4. Police

Chestnut Ridge is protected and served by the Town of Ramapo Police Department (TORPD). The TORPD covers 68 square miles of western Rockland County, NY, located at 237 Route 59, Suffern, New York 10901, and consists of 120 sworn police officers, and 25 civilian personnel.

The TORPD has the power and authority to protect life and property, prevent crime, detect and arrest offenders, preserve public peace, enforce all laws and ordinances over which the department has jurisdiction, and to regulate traffic within the Town of Ramapo.

5. Fire and Ambulance Service

- Hugh Gassner Fire Company
- William P. Faist Ambulance Corps
- Brewer Fire Company No.1

6. Solid Waste

The Village has the responsibility for municipal solid waste, yard waste and recyclables collection and disposal, through contracts with private haulers.

All solid waste is transported to the County Solid Waste Management Authority facilities in accordance with the County Flow Control Law, and is then transferred to out-of-county disposal facilities. Solid waste is transported to the Hillburn Transfer Station on Torne Road in Hillburn.

7. Public Works

a. Highways

The Town of Ramapo Highway Department is responsible for highway services to the Village of Chestnut Ridge.

Responsibilities of the Highway Department include:

- Salting and treating the road surfaces during snow storms and removal of snow and ice from the roads.
- Brush, tree, and branch/limb trimming, and removal when necessary, due to obstructions of the road, and if in the rights of way.
- Paving and patching the roadways (Capital improvements to Village roads are the responsibility of the Villages)
- Cleaning and maintaining storm drains and drainage easements
- Installing, maintaining, and repairing traffic signs as needed

- Street sweeping

b. Sanitary Sewer System

The local collection system is regulated and operated by the Town of Ramapo Sewer Department. The Rockland County Sewer District operates the sewage treatment plant.

DRAFT

2.7 Transportation

Additional material to be added. RSHR area traffic study process and initial results to be included.

2.3.4 Traffic Counts (ADT 2015), from NYS Traffic Data Viewer

Garden State Parkway – 56,440

Red Schoolhouse Road, North of Parkway – 6,801

Red Schoolhouse Road, South of Parkway – 12,157

2.3.5 Access to Garden State Parkway

The south end of the corridor has good access to the Garden State Parkway, but entrances and exits do not work in both directions.

Travelers can enter the Parkway from Red Schoolhouse Road in the northbound direction only (There is no southbound entrance to the GSP). To travel south on the Garden State Parkway from the corridor, traffic must head south on Red Schoolhouse Road which then turns into Spring Valley Rd at the NY state border, and then make a right turn on West Grand Avenue in Montvale. West Grand Avenue has a southbound entrance to the Parkway.

Southbound travelers on the GSP are the only drivers that can exit directly onto Red Schoolhouse Road (as there is no northbound exit from the GSP). To travel to the corridor study area when going northbound on Garden State Parkway, drivers must exit at West Grand Avenue in Montvale (NJ), make a right turn on West Grand, and then a left turn onto Spring Valley Rd. Spring Valley Rd then turns into Red Schoolhouse Road when it crosses the state border into New York.

2.3.6 Pedestrian Environment.

Red School House Road Corridor

Significant portions of the corridor study area are not served by sidewalks, and in general, the corridor is not friendly to pedestrians or cyclists. There is an existing concrete sidewalk on the west side of Red Schoolhouse Road, extending approximately 1900 feet from the intersection of Chestnut Ridge Road, southward to a point across the street from Chestnut Ridge Business Park (80 Red Schoolhouse Rd.). Another short stretch of concrete sidewalk is found on the east side of Red Schoolhouse Rd., beginning at the south side of the school house, and extending about 350 feet southward to the entrance of Par Pharmaceuticals. No bicycle lanes are dedicated within the corridor. The entire corridor length is approximately 7,600 feet or 1.4 miles.

Outside of the Red Schoolhouse Road Corridor

Most of the residential areas of Chestnut Ridge outside of the center of the Village at Red Schoolhouse Road have developed without sidewalks. This is not in sync with modern trends to provide safe opportunities to walk for ecological and health reasons.

DRAFT

2.8 Retail and Services Market Conditions

2.3.1 Leakages and Surplus Factors for the Village, and Areas within a 10 and 15 minutes Driving Time

ESRI's Business Analyst software was utilized to study the characteristics of the retail market in Village of Chestnut Ridge and its vicinity. The software estimated the 2016 population at 8,121 persons, with 2,712 households. The Village itself does not provide a full complement of retail and services for these households, and residents must travel outside of the Village for most significant purchases.

The program estimated the demand or retail potential inside the Village for a list of business types comprising subsectors of the retail trade sector of the North American Industry Classification System and estimated the retail sales within the Village for those subsectors. The difference between the demand and the supply is called a "retail gap." If demand in an area is bigger than the retail sales, there is a positive retail gap, which must be filled by consumers leaving the area to buy what they need. This is known as "leakage" – as consumers "leak" out of the area to shop in another. At the Village level, many categories of retail and services have a leakage factor of 100, meaning that all consumers who want those items or services must leave the Village. Notable categories with very high leakages to outside of the village (factor = 100) include:

- Motor vehicle dealers for vehicles other than automobiles (such as ATV's, motorcycles)
- Auto parts, accessories, and tire stores
- Beer, Wine and Liquor stores
- Gasoline Stations
- Shoe Stores
- Jewelry, Luggage, and Leather Goods Stores
- Book, Periodical and Music Stores
- Department Stores
- Drinking Places – Alcoholic Beverages

The Village does offer a few retail and service categories that show as a "surplus" – which means that the local need for these is met within the Village, and consumers even are drawn in from outside of the Village to shop for these items. Only two categories came out with a surplus factor over 25:

- Other Miscellaneous Store Retailers (selling other than General Merchandise)
- Used Merchandise Stores

Once you look outward beyond the Village of Chestnut Ridge limits, the picture changes considerably. ESRI estimates that 124,237 people in 37,743 households live within a 10-minute drive to the center of the Red Schoolhouse Road Corridor Study Area. At this range, there is no retail leakage to the outside of this area shown with a factor of 100. This means that most any

retail or service need a consumer might have could be met within a 10-minute drive of the corridor study area, at least to some extent. Within a 10-minute drive, the following notable categories show a modest degree of leakage to outside of that area, with a leakage factor of 25 or more:

- Automobile dealers
- Motor vehicle dealers for vehicles other than automobiles (such as ATV's, motorcycles)
Lawn and Garden Equipment and Supplies
- Shoe Stores
- Used Merchandise Stores
- Drinking Places and Alcoholic Beverages

The 10-minute drive time area shows a “surplus” with a factor greater than 25 for several notable retail or service categories for which people come from outside of the area to purchase. These include:

- Furniture Stores
- Electronics and Appliance Stores
- Office Supplies, Stationery & Gift Stores
- Special Food Services

We utilized the ESRI Business Analyst software to look at the same parameters for an area within a 15-minute drive to the center of the Red Schoolhouse Road Corridor Study Area. This area is estimated to contain 315,030 people in 100,521 households. At this scale, there were only minor changes to the leakage and surplus categories. See appendix A for the full results.

2.3.2 Summary of Retail and Service Businesses Available to Consumers at Nearby Shopping Areas within 15 minutes Driving Time

2.3.2.1 Ramsey/Mahwah/Rt. 17 – 1.5-mile radius centered at 295 N. Franklin Tpke., Ramsey, NJ

2.3.2.2 Tice’s Corner – 1-mile radius centered at 430 Chestnut Ridge Rd., Woodcliff Lake, NJ

2.3.2.3 Wegman’s – 1-mile radius centered at 300 W. Grand Ave., Montvale, NJ

2.3.2.4 Palisades Center – 1-mile radius centered at 9 Cemetery Ln., Clarkstown, NY

2.3.2.5 Shops at Nanuet – 1-mile radius centered at 75 W. Route 59, Clarkstown, NY

2.3.2.6 Spring Valley Marketplace – 1-mile radius centered at 1 Spring Valley Market Pl., Spring Valley, NY

2.3.2.7 Tallman – Walmart/Shoprite – 1-mile radius centered at 241 Route 59, Airmont, NY

Table 2. Businesses and Employees Surrounding Neighboring Shopping Areas

Shopping Area	Radius (miles)	Total Number of Businesses	Total Employees	Retail Trade Businesses	Finance, Insurance, Real Estate Businesses	Services	Government
Ramsey/Mahwah/Rt. 17	1.5	1,598	19,394	346	185	575	21
Tice’s Corner	1.0	383	11,768	75	74	139	6
Wegman’s	1.0	535	13,924	83	90	211	7
Palisades Center	1.0	524	7,406	249	34	127	6
Shops at Nanuet	1.0	963	10,282	290	118	355	11
Spring Valley Marketplace	1.0	881	8,157	272	110	306	8
Tallman – Walmart/Shoprite	1.0	625	7,456	107	82	270	23

2.3.3 Analysis of Opportunities for Development of Unmet Retail and Services Needs in the Red Schoolhouse Road Corridor

2.3.3.1 Input from Rockland County Economic Development Director, Jeremy Shulman. On May 26, 2017, Jonathan Lockman interviewed Jeremy Shulman, President & CEO of the Rockland Economic Development Corporation in Pearl River, for gathering his opinion on commercial real estate market conditions in the area, and opportunities for economic development in the Red Schoolhouse Road Corridor Study Area. His key points are summarized below:

- The economic focus of the area currently is the pharmaceutical industry, which will probably remain as its strength in the future.
- The area has potential for additional low-density industrial park development for light industry and warehouse distribution/flex space which would continue to fit into the existing pattern of corridor development. Such uses are moving out of New York City and are shopping for space in Rockland County
- Health care companies are currently looking actively for a site to develop patient care facilities on sites of 6-8 acres.
- Specialty recreation facilities (such as an aquatics or equestrian center) may fit, given the recommendation that the Ramapo town-owned equestrian center may be closed.
- Rockland needs additional hotel, convention and meeting spaces, as meetings often must house conferees in New Jersey.
- Retail, entertainment, or restaurant demand is limited.
- Inquiries have been received for locating artist live-work spaces.

2.6.3.2 Input from Steven Yassky, President, Rockland Realty. On June 7, 2017, Jonathan Lockman interviewed Steven Yassky, President of Rockland Realty in Nanuet, to gather an additional opinion on commercial real estate market conditions in the

area, and opportunities for economic development in the Red Schoolhouse Road Corridor Study Area. His key points are summarized below:

- The current Laboratory Office (LO) zoning is not useful, as it does not allow warehouse or light assembly types of uses, which the market is demanding.
- The former Gace property, zoned National and Regional Retail (RS) may not work as a retail location, given competition with the new Wegman's and other surrounding centers. The Garden State Parkway exit area at Red Schoolhouse road is not "prime" enough, or with high enough traffic counts to support a national retail chain.
- Flexible Light Industrial/Office uses are recommended. Warehouse showrooms would work. Steve recommends using the LIO and PED districts in the Town of Clarkstown as a model. Perhaps more of the corridor could be zoned "PI," or Planned Industry.
- The corridor area could host a corporate campus or data center. The market for conventional office space is soft.
- A hotel use would be difficult to support as it would be hard to find going northbound on the Garden State Parkway. Also, two hotels are in the pipeline to be constructed near the Spring Valley Marketplace.

2.6.3.3 Existing Conditions Analysis - Considerations for Appropriate Opportunities

- Leakage and Surplus data, when combined with anecdotal reports from Rockland EDC, suggest that there may be opportunities for a new restaurant/drinking establishment/entertainment venue within the Red Schoolhouse Road study area.
- LO Zoning may need to be adjusted, and additional areas zoned PI, to allow more flexibility between light industrial, warehousing, showroom, laboratory and office uses, as well as some retail, to reflect market conditions identified by real estate professionals in the area.
- A hotel/restaurant/meeting-convention facility may meet a need for the western portion of Rockland County. However, two hotels are in the pipeline for construction near the Spring Valley Marketplace.

3.0 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT – VISIONING WORKSHOP

3.1 Introduction

On January 8, 2020 at 8:00 PM, the Village of Chestnut Ridge held a visioning meeting and workshop about the future of the Village at the Chestnut Ridge Middle School Cafeteria. The meeting was for the purpose of collecting background data, views and opinions from community residents and stakeholders. This was the first of two public meetings at the outset of the Comprehensive Plan Process to develop policy recommendations and zoning code changes that will guide the future development of the community.

To accomplish this, Nelson, Pope & Voorhis (NPV) – the Village Planners - coordinated with the mayor and Village Board to design a meeting that would consist of four break-out groups. Each group had an opportunity to discuss the Village’s strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats.

This meeting was well-attended by roughly 70 members of the public, as well as the Comprehensive Plan Committee members and five staff members from NPV. The meeting began with introductions and a welcome by Mayor Presti and Jonathan Lockman of NPV. Mr. Lockman provided a short description of why the Town was undertaking the comprehensive planning process and how the process would unfold over the following year. Mr. Lockman further explained the purpose of the public meeting, introduced the process that the consultant team had undertaken thus far, and provided a framework for the workshop procedure.

METHOD

Prior to the meeting, blank flip chart pads were set up in four corners of the cafeteria room at the Chestnut Ridge Middle School cafeteria. Five maps of the area were on display showing aerial photography, zoning and existing land uses, environmental constraints, and an analysis of zoning non-conformities. Attendees were mostly divided into four random groups according to the quarter of the year when their birthdays occurred (January-March; April-June; July-September; and October-December), although some attendees declined to attend the group indicated by their birthday.

Jonathan Lockman, Stu Turner, Adriana Beltrani and Maxwell Vandervliet served as facilitators for the four groups. Each group was invited to discuss Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats facing Chestnut Ridge, with approximately 20 minutes for each of the four topics. It was clarified that a strength was an existing positive quality of the Town, while an opportunity was a positive circumstance that was not present in the Town yet but could be pursued in the future. Likewise, a weakness was an existing negative quality of the Town, while a threat was a negative circumstance that was not present in the Town yet but could develop in the future.

After all groups had been given time to engage with facilitators on each of the four topics of the SWOT analysis, flip chart pages with notes from each group were taped up against the back windows for all participants to see. Participants were provided eight sticker dots and asked to vote on the compiled lists of responses by placing their dots next to the responses on the lists that they felt were most important. Each person had to decide how to allocate their dots among the various responses in the four categories. Attendees were allowed to use all dots in one category or on one item, or to place single or multiple dots among the various responses in different categories however they wished.

Because there was only one set of lists and only a few persons could vote at a time, a half hour of time was allocated after individual group discussion for participants to cast their votes. This also allowed opportunities for attendants to engage the consultants, the Mayor and Village Board and Comprehensive Plan committee members on a one-on-one informal basis.

Upon completion of the and discussions and voting, the consultant team announced the close of the meeting. It was announced that the results of the SWOT meeting would be posted on the Village Website. It is noted that the responses set forth below are paraphrased notes of the more robust discussions held during the meeting.

RESULTS

These are the raw results from the exercise :

<u>Strengths</u>	Number of Dot Votes	No dot Votes But Listed (# of times)
• Greenspace, trees, environment and open space 3	31	
• Family oriented & child friendly	17	2
• Residential character, small community and suburban feel	16	2
• Historic sites and architecture	8	
• Proximity to resources (NYC, NJ shopping)	7	
• Village Services: Fire, water and ambulance	3	
• Diversity and multiple houses of worship	2	
• Light traffic	2	
• Senior Housing and assisted living	2	
<hr/>		
Total dot votes: 88		

<u>Weaknesses</u>	Number of Dot Votes	No dot Votes But Listed (# of times)
• Lack of zoning enforcement, poor property maintenance, parking enforcement problems, illegal rentals and conversions	42	10
• Outdated or inadequate zoning codes	38	
• Lack of Gov. transparency and communication, inadequate website and follow-through	27	7
• No village center and lack of community	16	2
• Pedestrian connections, bike safety & lanes	11	4
• High property taxes, school system and recycling/garbage services	6	
• Lack of community, participation and intertown socialization	5	4
• No interest in preserving history	2	
• Threats, division and potential for hate crimes	2	
• Traffic and too many trucks and non-school busses		3
• Dirty roadways, potholes and litter		2
• Too many sidewalks and streetlights		2

Total dot votes: 149

<u>Opportunities</u>	Number of Dot Votes	No dot Votes But Listed (# of times)
• Improve zoning ordinances, make realistic/fair	32	5
• Curtail/regulate urbanization to specific areas	10	
• Increase tax revenue/ratables	8	2
• Additional restaurants, businesses and business opportunities	6	3
• Create a Village Center	5	3
• Cultivate a sense of community among all residents and neighbors	4	3
• Increase communication among existing residents and newcomers	4	1
• Preserve green space and historic/cultural resources		2
• Decrease traffic, improve pedestrian connections		1

Total dot votes: 69

Threats	Number of Dot Votes	No dot Votes But Listed (# of times)
• Lack of zoning enforcement related to housing	56	20
• Declining school system and decreasing youth	27	2
• Loss of trees, greenspace and lot sizes	23	4
• Increasing traffic and pedestrians in roadways	19	1
• Poor and declining infrastructure & public services	17	3
• Increasing property taxes	16	2
• Trash, litter and disrespect of physical environment	9	
• Hate crimes, threats, political divisions	7	
• Lack of affordable and adequate housing	4	
• Leaving land undeveloped	4	

Total dot votes: 182

Final Totals	
Total Dots Pasted on Sheets	491
Dots fell off (votes not counted)	3
Grand total of dot votes counted	488
Number of votes / number of participants	7.1 votes per participant (69 people present)

4.0 Comprehensive Plan Vision and Goals

4.1 Vision

Long range planning begins with a community's vision for its future. The vision statement provides a short succinct statement against which all policies can easily be tested. The Village of Chestnut Ridge's vision statement is based on significant citizen input received at the Visioning Workshop meeting held on January 8, 2020. The public was divided into several groups and a SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) exercise was conducted to focus stakeholders on the positive and negative attributes of the community as well as evolving opportunities and concerns. Following the SWOT exercise, the public participated in an extensive written survey on potential Comprehensive Plan recommendations based on input from the public workshop.

Based on this stakeholder input from the public meeting, the survey, and the inventory and analysis of existing conditions, the CPC and Village Board of Trustees developed a consensus to adopt the following Vision Statement, Goals and Objectives:

Vision Statement

In 2030, the Village of Chestnut Ridge will be an orderly and attractive community which provides economic development opportunities, a variety of housing options, and diversity in its population. Collector roads will become more pedestrian and bicycle friendly considering the needs of citizens of all ages and abilities. Architectural standards will be enhanced to reflect the Village's historic identity and a unique sense of place.

In established residential areas, lower densities of single-family residential uses will dominate. Existing institutional uses will be allowed to develop housing for their staff and special needs clients. The Village's wooded character will be preserved and enhanced.

Significant future development will be focused around the Red Schoolhouse Road corridor, and along Chestnut Ridge Road and.... South of the Garden State Parkway extension, options will be expanded to encourage high-quality development consistent with the range of uses permissible north of the Parkway extension and the types of uses developing in the adjacent Borough of Montvale.

4.2 Goals and Objectives

Goals and objectives will serve as the framework for the policy recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan. Each topic examined within this plan shall be looked at with an understanding of these specific goals and objectives.

To distinguish Goals from Objectives, a Goal is generally a broad aspiration. An objective is more narrowly defined and can be objectively measured. These goals and objectives will be the basis for the policy recommendations of the Plan as adopted by the Village Board of Trustees.

Land Use:

Goal 1: *Encourage a land use pattern that reinforces the suburban and Village character of the various parts of the Village of Chestnut Ridge and promotes a sense of community through the strengthening of the Village Center.*

Objectives:

- 1.1 Locate new commercial development along the Village's major road corridors with improved requirements for landscaping and buffers.
- 1.2 Limit development of commercial uses in residential areas unsuitable for intensive building development due to environmental unsuitability or distance from existing utilities, main transportation corridors, and community facilities.
- 1.3 Preserve the remaining agricultural uses in the Village.
- 1.4 Provide a variety of housing opportunities for the Village's workforce, young families and seniors in a sustainable manner, and to promote a diverse community.
- 1.5 Create a Village Center at the Red Schoolhouse Road corridor, to create a central place to bring the community together and provide a stronger identity for Chestnut Ridge.

Environmental Protection:

Goal 2: *Conserve the backdrop of trees and greenery, parks, wetlands, and water courses, which provides Chestnut Ridge with its community character as a beautiful village.*

Objectives:

- 2.1 Protect environmentally stream ecosystems and floodplains, including Hungry Hollow Brook, Pine Brook, and Pascack Brook, and maintain adequate buffers between these systems and adjoining development
- 2.2 Situate developments in a manner that protects or enhances landscaping along travel corridors.
- 2.3 Prevent unneeded erosion by limiting land disturbance in steep slope areas.
- 2.4 Minimize lighting impacts and light pollution throughout the Village.

Community Facilities and Services:

Goal 3: *Ensure that community facilities and services continue to serve adequately the populations they are intended to serve, and to introduce or expand facilities in areas planned for future development.*

Objectives:

- 3.1 Maintain and enhance the Village-provided community services and facilities and expand recreational opportunities.
- 3.2 Participate and cooperate with regional, Town of Ramapo, and Rockland County agencies for regional provision of government services where appropriate.
- 3.3 Assure the timely delivery of emergency services from fire and ambulance providers and the Town of Ramapo Police.

- 3.4 Promote the enhancement of existing parkland throughout the Village and develop new community parks that are readily accessible to existing and planned population concentrations.

Economic Development:

Goal 4: *Promote economic development through a balanced approach to sustainable development that will expand the Village's ratable base and will provide existing and future residents with a range of business and employment opportunities.*

Objectives:

- 4.1 Create additional opportunities for light industrial, warehousing and laboratory uses, building upon the existing employment strengths of the Village, and to increase tax ratable properties.
- 4.2 Revitalize the shopping areas, and build upon the Village's historic charm, to satisfy the needs of residents and to promote shopping visits from outside of the immediate area.
- 4.3 Acknowledge and accommodate changing technology as it relates to expanded/dispersed employment opportunities in residences.
- 4.4 As the "sharing economy" grows, consider regulation of short-term rentals of residential dwelling units ensure that they are respectful of the quality of life of long-term and seasonal residents and do not impact or endanger the health, safety and general welfare of the community or its natural resources.

Infrastructure:

Goal 5: *Provide essential infrastructure in areas planned for higher density residential and planned nonresidential development.*

Objectives:

- 5.1 Tie economic development areas into the existing and proposed utility and drainage infrastructure within the Village.
- 5.2 Ensure that adequate telecommunications infrastructure is available throughout the Village to serve residents and businesses, including broadband internet access, mobile/cellular network coverage, and corresponding network support services.

Transportation:

Goal 6: *Ensure the efficient movement of people and goods and promote economic development activities in areas near major transportation corridors.*

Objectives:

- 6.1 Improve turning movements and lower traffic delays for vehicles entering or turning along major road corridors.
- 6.2 Provide pedestrian and bicycle facilities along existing major roads and within new residential developments, improving safety and providing an alternative to motorized transportation.
- 6.3 Integrate new development near the GSP interchange. Leverage private development contributions so developers will help pay for and provide necessary improvements to remedy existing traffic problems and to accommodate traffic growth.

- 6.4 Encourage non-residential uses only in incentive development areas, where developers will contribute to traffic improvements and other amenities to offset their environmental impacts.

Sustainability:

Goal 7: Encourage the expanded use of renewable energy sources, green building practices, and the principles of Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design Neighborhood Development (LEED-ND) and smart growth throughout the Village in order to promote energy independence and become a regional trendsetter for the implementation of green, eco-friendly, and sustainable development standards.

Objectives:

- 7.1 Ensure that land use and residential density within the Village is authorized only within the capabilities of natural resources, utilities, transportation infrastructure, environmental constraints to support them, and concentrate future density and land use near existing centers and corridors.
- 7.2 Promote and support the development of alternative energy sources such as solar, geothermal.
- 7.3 Emphasize the importance of energy efficiency, sustainability, and green building design standards to reduce the adverse environmental and economic impacts associated with reliance on fossil fuels.
- 7.4 Review and revise portions of Village Codes to encourage sustainable development and the incorporation of new, innovative techniques in site planning and building design.

Historic Preservation:

Goal 8: Preserve the Village's cultural and historic resources and special places, which reinforce the Village's unique identity, are a source of pride for all residents.

Objectives:

- 8.1 Implement appropriate regulations and controls to preserve remaining historic resources from development and demolition.
- 8.2 Work with the School District to revitalize the Red Schoolhouse Museum.
- 8.3 Develop a uniform sign program for identifying historic resources in the community.

Community Design:

Goal 9: Reinforce the character of Chestnut Ridge and improve the aesthetic appearance of the Village.

Objectives:

- 9.1 Work with the Architectural Review Board to refine standards for the appearance and compatibility of new buildings.
- 9.2 Protect and enhance the visual appearance of the community at the key gateways into the Village by promoting a uniform design aesthetic, signage, and landscaping.
- 9.3 Preserve greenspaces and provide landscaping along major road corridors as they develop, maintaining their wooded appearance to the greatest possible extent.

5.0 Comprehensive Plan Survey – (Summary of Results, see full raw results in appendix)

INTRODUCTION

On January 8, 2020 at 8:00 PM, the Village of Chestnut Ridge held a visioning meeting and workshop about the future of the Village at the Chestnut Ridge Middle School Cafeteria. This was the first of two planned public meetings at the outset of the Comprehensive Plan process to develop policy recommendations to guide the future development of the community.

A second public workshop session was scheduled for March 19, 2020 and was designed to engage the public on strategies to address the issues identified at the first meeting. A survey was planned to provide wider outreach for the subject matter of both planned meetings. .

On March 11, 2020, the fifth meeting of the Comprehensive Meeting was held. Both the contents of the proposed survey and the design of the March 19 workshop were finalized. However, at the time of the March 11, 2020 meeting, it was apparent that COVID-19 disease was beginning to spread, and that a public meeting might be subject to cancellation, particularly if the School District closed the Elementary School Building where the public meeting was scheduled. Unfortunately, over the next four days, the COVID-19 pandemic began to expand with multiple closures of schools and meeting venues throughout Rockland County. By the weekend, the Mayor informed the committee that the public session at Fleetwood Elementary School on March 19th was cancelled.

Considering public assembly limitations instituted by Executive Order of the Governor of New York, it was decided that the survey would be expanded to serve as a substitute to the March public session.

The Comprehensive Plan Survey, covering all the topics planned to be discussed at the March public meeting session, was released online on March 19th. An invitation to take the survey was mailed to all residents and individuals on the tax roll. Paper copies of the survey were made available to anyone who requested them, if they preferred not to submit online or did not have computer or smart phone capabilities. Originally, the survey responses were scheduled to be collected with a closing date of April 15, 2020. Given the conditions of the COVID-19 pandemic, the Mayor decided to extend the collection of survey responses to April 24, 2020, to ensure the maximum possible participation. In total, the survey received 704 total responses, exceeding all expectations. Similar sized communities typically receive only a few hundred responses.

Out of these 704 total responses, 555 were submitted by Chestnut Ridge residents (self-identified) and 149 non-residents (self-identified). Attached to this report in the appendix are three sets of raw result outputs, with tallies of answers to questions broken out three ways:

555 resident respondents;

143 non-resident respondents; and
704 total respondents.
(Note 6 respondents did not say where they were from.)

In the analysis of results on the following pages, we summarized the responses from the 555 residents. The results for the non-residents and total results are included in the appendix for context but are fundamentally similar to the results for Chestnut Ridge residents.

SURVEY METHODOLOGY

The survey was conducted and analyzed on the platform “Survey Monkey.” A postcard was mailed to all addresses on the tax rolls inviting residents to take the survey, followed up by email blasts announcing the survey and reminding residents to participate near the end of the survey collection period. Paper surveys were distributed to those who did not have computer access or who preferred the use of paper.

Survey Monkey can only accept a submission from one browser on a specific device. The software blocked a second submittal from any one browser with a pop-up message. Households with more than one respondent were advised that each member of that household who wished to participate should use a different phone, laptop, or tablet to fill out the survey.

In its reporting, Survey Monkey does not keep track of the individual device identification number (“internal IP addresses”) of the respondents. However, it does keep track of the internet router numbers from which surveys were sent (“external IP addresses”). It appears that from a look at the list of routers utilized to submit surveys, there were no security problems.

- 451 of the 704 total responses came from internet routers with a unique number.
- There were 76 instances where two people shared a router location.
- There were 18 instances where three people shared a router location.
- There were 3 instances where four people shared a router location.
- There was 1 instance where five people shared a router location.
- There were 2 instances where seven people shared a router location.
- 16 of the total responses were paper copies that were entered on NPV’s computer by Melinda Stach, Administrative Assistant, on April 28, 2020.

We did note some instances where write-in answers were identical in wording; more so than would be predicted by coincidence. However, this probably indicates discussion between respondents rather than any misuse of the software.

A router location typically is shared within a residence. Duplicate use of a particular router could also indicate employees of the same business who logged in from work, or members at a group domicile (such as a nursing home or the Fellowship Center).

Analysis of Results, for 555 Resident Respondents

Note about Scoring: Many of the questions asked respondents to indicate their level of support for a possible policy statement. Survey Monkey assigned the following values to each answer: 1 = strongly support, 2= support, 3 = neutral, 4= do not support, and 5 = strongly do not support. Percentages for each answer are shown. The software then calculated a weighted average score of all the responses to each question.

Some of the questions asked respondents to indicate their level of support with a choice between two answers, with 1 = support and 2 = do not support. For these questions, percentages for each answer are shown as well as weighted averages.

All About You – Questions 1 through 4

- Approximately 60% of residents responding lived on or near Hungry Hollow Rd. or Chestnut Ridge Rd.
- There appeared to be participation from all parts of the Village.
- About half of the respondents lived in the Village over 15 years.
- Those who indicated that they knew of families who moved out of the village indicated that the two most prevalent reasons were a desire for different schools and concerns about rising property and school taxes.
- Under “Other Reasons” for families moving away, respondents could enter phrases in their own words. 188 respondents chose to enter “other reasons.” Some of the more notable responses were:
 - Changing demographics (31)
 - Influx of Orthodox Jewish and/or Hasidic Residents (31).
 - Lax zoning and/or lack of enforcement of existing zoning (13).
 - Issues with NYS mandatory vaccination policies (8).
- It is notable that the exact phrase “lack of zoning law enforcement and overdevelopment” was entered by 8 different respondents, who submitted their surveys on April 13 and 14.

Design and Appearance of Single-Family Homes and Minimum Lot Sizes – Questions 5 through 10

Question	Analysis	1 Strongly Support (percent)	2 Support (percent)	3 Neutral (percent)	4 Do Not Support (percent)	5 Strongly Do Not Support (percent)	Weighted Average
5	The respondents were neutral about a policy of bringing nonconforming lot sizes into conformance.	23.5%	14.5%	17.3%	10.7%	34.0%	3.17
6	Respondents supported lowering Floor Area Ratio requirements .	45.0%	16.2%	8.1%	11.5%	19.2%	2.44
7	Respondents did not support relaxing Floor Area Ratio limits to allow expansion so residents can add more space.	18.1%	7.9%	7.9%	23.8%	42.3%	3.64
8	Respondents supported increases in required side and rear setbacks.	39.9%	20.5%	15.7%	15.3%	8.7%	2.32
9	Respondents supported keeping required side and rear setbacks the same.	19.7%	21.0%	27.0%	17.1%	15.3%	2.87
10	Respondents supported stricter architectural review and design guidelines.	50.4%	20.3%	12.0%	8.1%	9.2%	2.06

Multifamily Housing Choices – Potential Sites for Development, Questions 11 through 18

Question	Analysis	1 Strongly Support (percent)	2 Support (percent)	3 Neutral (percent)	4 Do Not Support (percent)	5 Strongly Do Not Support (percent)	Weighted Average
11	Respondents did not support allowing for higher density housing types such as duplexes, townhomes, or apartments.	8.3%	14.0%	7.0%	15.6%	55.0%	3.95
12	Respondents were neutral regarding an affordable housing mandate.	12.2%	27.9%	13.9%	15.5%	30.5%	3.24
13	Respondents supported a policy where a variety of housing would be available at various prices, but without a mandatory system requiring affordable housing.	21.3%	28.4%	18.6%	15.7%	16.0%	2.77
14	Respondents did not support allowing multifamily apartments or townhomes in the Red Schoolhouse Road/GSP interchange area.	10.0%	16.0%	14.0%	22.0%	38.0%	3.62
15	Respondents supported allowing the Green Meadow Waldorf School/Threefold Foundation to expand its housing for teachers.	44.3%	19.7%	17.3%	8.0%	10.8%	2.21

Question	Analysis	1 Strongly Support (percent)	2 Support (percent)	3 Neutral (percent)	4 Do Not Support (percent)	5 Strongly Do Not Support (percent)	Weighted Average
16	Respondents supported allowing the Green Meadow Waldorf School/Threefold Foundation to expand its commercial operations such as the Food Coop.	45.6%	21.2%	19.5%	6.6%	7.1%	2.08
17	Respondents did not support allowing higher density at the Gould Academy property or other sites on Chestnut Ridge Road.	9.3%	9.0%	11.1%	15.9%	54.7%	3.98
18	Respondents were neutral towards a policy to allow the creation of accessory apartments for family members at single family homes.	20.4%	24.9%	10.9%	13.3%	30.4%	3.08

Types of Housing – Visual Preferences, Questions 19 to 23

Question	Analysis	1 Strongly Support (percent)	2 Support (percent)	3 Neutral (percent)	4 Do Not Support (percent)	5 Strongly Do Not Support (percent)	Weighted Average
19 to 23	Respondents generally did not support any of the photo images of multifamily dwellings.		12.6% to 38.1%		61.9% to 87.4%		1.62 to 1.87

Religious Uses: Places of Worship and Religious Schools, Questions 24 and 25

Question	Analysis	1 Strongly Support (percent)	2 Support (percent)	3 Neutral (percent)	4 Do Not Support (percent)	5 Strongly Do Not Support (percent)	Weighted Average
24	Respondents did not support the statement that the Place of Worship amendments to the zoning code was a positive step.	22.5%	5.4%	9.8%	13.9%	48.4%	3.6
25	Respondents supported a policy that the Village should adjust the Place of Worship zoning code amendments in the years ahead if problems arise.	47.3%	16.5%	12.3%	8.0%	15.9%	2.29

Traffic Issues, Questions 26 through 32

Question	Analysis	1 Strongly Support (percent)	2 Support (percent)	3 Neutral (percent)	4 Do Not Support (percent)	5 Strongly Do Not Support (percent)	Weighted Average
26	Respondents were neutral about the relocation of the end of DeSalvo Court.	24.9%	17.8%	40.9%	6.4%	10.0%	2.59
27	Installation of a traffic signal system at Williams/Summit Roads at Red Schoolhouse Road was supported.	33.8%	31.5%	18.4%	7.7%	8.6%	2.26
28	Support was shown for the provision of sidewalks along Red Schoolhouse and Chestnut Ridge Roads, and along all major roads.	50.2%	21.0%	5.7%	6.1%	16.9%	2.18

Question	Analysis	1 Strongly Support (percent)	2 Support (percent)	3 Neutral (percent)	4 Do Not Support (percent)	5 Strongly Do Not Support (percent)	Weighted Average
29	Support was shown for the provision of sidewalks within new housing developments.	44.9%	19.6%	10.9%	8.0%	16.6%	2.32
30	An additional travel lane for Red Schoolhouse Road under the GSP bridge was supported.	38.0%	27.3%	18.2%	6.1%	10.3%	2.23
31	Widening and signalization of the northbound on-ramp for the GSP was supported.	31.7%	22.1%	25.5%	10.1%	10.6%	2.46
32	A requirement for developer contributions to fund traffic improvements around the GSP interchange in exchange for incentive zoning was supported.	55.7%	19.6%	11.4%	5.2%	8.2%	1.91

Increase in Tax Ratable Properties, More Employment, Shopping, Economic Development, Questions 33 through 43

Question	Analysis	1 Strongly Support (percent)	2 Support (percent)	3 Neutral (percent)	4 Do Not Support (percent)	5 Strongly Do Not Support (percent)	Weighted Average
33	Respondents supported industrial and commercial development in the Red Schoolhouse Road area.	28.0%	26.5%	14.2%	12.0%	19.3%	2.68
34	Respondents were neutral about allowing light industrial development where only offices are allowed now.	13.9%	29.6%	16.0%	16.7%	23.8%	3.07
35	Respondents were neutral regarding allowing light industrial development in the laboratory-office district.	18.5%	24.8%	17.4%	16.7%	22.7%	3
36 to 42	When asked to choose their visual preference between types of commercial buildings, converted residences with front and side yards as well as traditional one-or two-story shopfronts with parking lots behind, were supported. Larger commercial buildings were not supported.		29.3% to 75.4%		24.7% to 70.6%		1.25 to 1.71

Question 43. Under “Add comments about any images you see,” respondents could enter phrases in their own words. 68 respondents chose to enter comments. A majority of commenters preferred smaller scale buildings and felt that many of the images were too urban and not in character with the Village.

Green Space and Parks and How to Pay for It, Questions 44 through 47

Question	Analysis	1 Strongly Support (percent)	2 Support (percent)	3 Neutral (percent)	4 Do Not Support (percent)	5 Strongly Do Not Support (percent)	Weighted Average
44	Mandating that development blends with the natural environment was supported.	70.4%	18.8%	6.3%	2.8%	1.9%	1.47
45	The protection or acquisition of open space was supported.	69.9%	15.7%	9.1%	2.8%	2.6%	1.53
46	Requiring preserved open space as part of any rezoning for higher density housing was supported.	70.0%	14.4%	7.0%	4.2%	4.4%	1.59
47	Enactment of a Tree Law, requiring a permit to cut any tree over a specified size was supported.	61.8%	9.6%	6.1%	9.8%	12.8%	2.02

New Businesses, Question 48

- A majority of respondents supported the following types of new businesses:

Office	Farmers Market
Recreation	Hobby Shop
Grocery Stores	Clothing Store
Health Services	Bakery or Specialty Foods
Restaurants	Gym or Fitness Center
- A majority of respondents did not support the following types of new businesses:

Family Entertainment	Bar
Industry	Movie Theater
Shopping Centers	
Automotive Repair or Sale	
Entertainment	

- Respondents were given the opportunity to write in comments about new businesses. 58 respondents chose to write in their comments about what types of new businesses should be promoted. Some of the more notable responses were:
 - No changes (12)
 - Duplicative responses containing the exact words “do not support hazardous materials producers (11)
 - Parks (7)
 - Civic spaces, community gardens, arts center (6)

Mixed Use Buildings, Question 49

- 46% of respondents wished to discourage a mixed-use pattern anywhere in the Village. 21 % wanted to encourage a mixed-use pattern in the entire Village, and 19% wanted to encourage mixed uses in the Red Schoolhouse/GSP interchange area only.

Other Comments, Question 50

- Respondents were given the opportunity to write in comments about anything at all at the end of the survey. 142 respondents chose to write in. Some of the more notable responses were:
 - Issues of promoting diversity, changing mix of ethnic and religious groups (27)
 - Need for more greenspace and parks (20)
 - Member of the Fellowship Community at Threefold Foundation asking for their needs to be considered (11)
 - Need for better zoning administration and enforcement (7).
 - Sidewalks, Bicycle-Pedestrian facilities (6)
 - School quality issues (6)

6.0 Conceptual Land Use Plan

Below is a description of the sub-areas of the Village, followed by specific recommendations for changes in zoning within each sub-area.

6.1 General Divisions of the Village, with Rezoning Recommendations

A. Red Schoolhouse Road Corridor, from South to North

Area 1: South End of Corridor, from Montvale/NJ Boundary to Garden State Parkway (GSP)

This area is distinct from the corridor north of the Garden State Parkway, because the elevated GSP forms a visual and physical barrier from the other parts of the corridor. With its excellent transportation access to the region, this area has been considered as ripe for development of commercial or employment opportunities. With the proper traffic improvements, the area could be developed with commercial uses that would draw consumers to Chestnut Ridge, and housing and employment opportunities could be provided at a more intense scale than north of the Garden State Parkway, all without negative impacts to the Village. To the greatest extent possible, a more sustainable pattern of mixed use development should be promoted with integrated planning. Mechanisms should be created to ensure that developers will contribute to improve the GSP interchange area, both to fix existing traffic problems and to accommodate increased traffic that will come with future uses.

1a. West Side, Currently Zoned RS and LO.

Existing Conditions: The area on the west side of Red Schoolhouse Road, south of the Garden State Parkway, is home to a pet care facility and a distribution warehouse, as well as vacant acreage. This area is mostly zoned RS, “National and Regional Retail,” except for a small portion the southeast corner, immediately adjacent to the Montvale boundary. RS allows offices, retail, restaurants, and supermarkets (see sec. 2.3.2). The three lots in the southeast corner of the area are zoned LO, “Laboratory Office.” LO allows offices, laboratories, research, corporate parks, medical & dental clinics, health service complexes, recreation and hotels. This area has been explored by developers for commercial development as a shopping center with a movie theater in recent years. However, at the time of this writing, there is not an active Planning Board application for development in this area. However, the current property owner is participating in the Red Schoolhouse Road Traffic Study.

Recommendations: This area in its entirety should be rezoned RS, providing continuous opportunity for larger scale commercial and office development on the west side of Red Schoolhouse Road. Developers should be required to provide transportation improvements as specified by the Red Schoolhouse Road Traffic Study, which may include GSP ramp improvements, turn lanes, widening, and signalization.

1b. East Side, Currently Zoned, LO, R-35

Existing Conditions: The area on the east side of Red Schoolhouse Road, south of the Garden State Parkway, is currently home to bus and truck terminals, a building supply facility and an equestrian center, as well as some single-family homes and significant vacant acreage. The area mostly is zoned LO, except for some parcels in the eastern edge of the area that are zoned R-35. LO currently allows offices, laboratories, research, corporate parks, medical & dental clinics, health service complexes, recreation and hotels. Laboratory or office development has not occurred in this area, even though the zoning for such has been in place for a long time. Currently the Equestrian Estates mixed use residential/commercial project is proposed in this area, and a petition to establish a Planned Unit Development (PUD) floating zone, has been submitted to the Village Board for consideration. The developers have developed a scope for a Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement which was adopted by the Village Board on September 9, 2020.

Recommendations: The creation of a “PILO” District, or “Planned Industry Laboratory Office District is recommended as the underlying zone for this entire area. Such a district would essentially combine permitted uses together from PI and LO. The PI Zone at the northern section of the corridor has worked successfully, with Par Pharmaceuticals as its “anchor tenant.” We believe that development and redevelopment of higher tax-ratable projects would occur if PI uses were added to the existing LO. This area already has nonconforming, existing industrial land uses that would become conforming, were such a PILO zone to be created. It is recommended that the entire area be zoned PILO, with required buffers along the east and north sides of the area adjacent to R-35 zoning.

It is further recommended that this area, as well as others with one-half mile of the GSP interchange, become an area where the PUD floating zone is allowed to be “landed” in addition to the underlying PILO zoning district, to permit residential development at multifamily densities, to provide diversity of housing in the Village. However, this new multifamily development should be integrated with commercial and office projects. A mixed-use Planned Unit Development floating zone (PUD) is proposed that could be employed here for proposals that may come up for multifamily and commercial development, integrated together. The floating zone could be added to the zoning map upon request to the Village Board for an integrated multifamily residential/commercial/office project, with a minimum size of 25 acres. A minimum of 10% and a maximum of 35% of the gross floor area of all buildings proposed in the requested floating rezoning would be dedicated to commercial or office uses. The allowed use list for the nonresidential portion of such a floating zone would include a variety of commercial uses. The multifamily residential portion of the site would have a maximum density of 7 units per gross acre. Signalization, turning lanes, widening and other transportation improvements to mitigate traffic impacts, as identified during the SEQR process, would be required as part of the adoption of any mixed-use PUD floating zone. Payments to a fund for offsite traffic improvements may also be required along with any PUD re-zoning, following the incentive zoning requirements of New York State Village Law §7-703.

Existing Zoning, Areas 1a & 1b



Proposed Zoning, Areas 1a & 1b



Area 2: Middle of Corridor, from Garden State Parkway to Summit/Williams Roads

This area is currently zoned for Residential on the west side and for Residential and Laboratory-Office on the east side, and has a more rural feel with heavier tree growth along the road. Closer to the north side of the parkway near the interchange, vacant lands should be allowed to develop at a higher intensity with mixed uses on the east side of Red Schoolhouse Road, given the good access to the Parkway, if such development provides the necessary traffic improvements. This area should be developed with strong requirements to ensure adequate green buffers and landscaping. Turn lanes and signalization (at Summit/Williams Roads intersection) may be needed in the future to provide the ability to make turns, and keep traffic moving. Pedestrian facilities should connect through along Red Schoolhouse Road, linking the north and south ends of the corridor. Currently the west side is recommended to remain residentially zoned, and an active application is before the Planning Board for the Wellington School Project.

2a. West Side, Currently Zoned R-25

Existing Conditions: This area is adjacent to the north side of the Garden State Parkway, on the west side of Red Schoolhouse Road, and is accessed by DeSalvo Court. It is zoned R-25, a residential zoning district. It contains some nonconforming storage uses, vacant acreage, and some single-family homes along Wilshire Drive and at the end of DeSalvo Court. The Fleetwood Elementary School is in the rear of the area.

Recommendations: This area should remain residentially zoned, and is currently proposed as a site for a religious school campus with dormitories, the Wellington Educational Campus. It is eligible as a “landing area” for the PUD floating zone, as it is within one-half mile of the GSP interchange. The floating zone could be added to the zoning map upon request to the Village Board for an integrated multifamily residential/commercial/office project.

DeSalvo Court could be extended northward into this area, with its intersection with Red Schoolhouse Road moved northward to line up with the southbound off-ramp from the Garden State Parkway. See illustration on Figure X for location of the potential DeSalvo Connector. Reservation of a right-of-way for the northward extension of DeSalvo Court, as well as requirements for its construction or for a financial contribution towards a share of its cost, could be included as a condition of any SEQRA approvals for development in this area.

2b. East Side, Currently Zoned LO

Existing Conditions: This area extends along the east side of Red Schoolhouse Road from the Garden State Parkway to the rear of the residential lots along Williams Road. It contains an assisted living facility and an art supply store, both of which appear to be nonconforming uses. The area is zoned LO which allows offices, laboratories, research, corporate parks, medical & dental clinics, health service complexes, recreation and hotels.

Recommendations: This area should be zoned for PILO, or Planned Industry Laboratory Office, as its primary, underlying district. No special buffer is needed against the Garden State Parkway right-of-way to the east. As it is within one-half mile of the GSP interchange, it is an eligible area for landing the PUD floating zone if 25 acres can be assembled.

Area 3. North End of Red Schoolhouse Road Corridor, from Summit/Williams Roads to Chestnut Ridge Road. The north end of the corridor should become a Village Center, building upon the shopping, employment and civic spaces already in place. The Village should consider moving its Village Hall offices and meeting spaces here, to add vitality and strengthen the identity of Chestnut Ridge. Commercial shops and restaurants that provide neighborhood services should be allowed to expand and provide enhancements. Further southward, the Red Schoolhouse itself should be restored to better condition, and put into active use as a community facility. Employment opportunities in the current Planned Industry area should be expanded, compatible with Par Pharmaceutical and uses in the parks on the east side of Red Schoolhouse Road. Residential areas on the west side of Red Schoolhouse Road, from the Ambulance facility to Summit Road, should remain residential. Pedestrian facilities should be improved in this area, and high-quality building and landscape designs should be required. Landscaped buffers and street trees should be maintained or installed to keep the area's rural character, in harmony with the historic Red Schoolhouse at the heart of this section.

Along the entire length of Red Schoolhouse Road, this plan recommends that as properties apply for development approvals, a reserve strip for accommodating the addition of turn lanes, shoulders and drainage be dedicated as part of each site plan and/or subdivision approval, to provide for room to install the traffic improvements recommended below.

3a. West Side, Across from PI, Currently Zoned R-35

Existing Conditions: This area extends along the west side of Red Schoolhouse Road from the Ambulance Service to Summit Road, and is indicated as area 3a. It is zoned R-35, a residential zoning district. This area contains conforming single-family homes, some vacant acreage, and some non-conforming multifamily uses.

Recommendations: No changes are recommended to the existing zoning for this area.

3b. East Side, Along Williams Road, Currently Zoned R-25.

Existing Conditions: This area extends along the entire south side and part of the north side of Williams Road, just east of Red Schoolhouse Road, and is indicated as area 3b. It is zoned R-25, a residential zoning district. This area contains conforming single-family homes.

Recommendations: No changes are recommended to the existing zoning for this area.

Area 4: Planned Industry, Currently Zoned PI

Existing Conditions: This area is the heart of employment in the Corridor, and is located on the east side of Red Schoolhouse Road, between the historic Red Schoolhouse on the north side, and Williams Road on the south side. It is zoned PI or Planned Industry, and is home to PAR Pharmaceuticals and other industries located in the Rusten Corporate Park, the Chestnut Ridge Business Park, and at 70 Red Schoolhouse Road.

Recommendations: No changes are recommended to the existing zoning for this area.

Area 5: Special Housing, Currently Zoned RSH

Existing Conditions: This area is located behind the South Spring Valley Firehouse off Hubert H. Humphrey Drive and is home to the Senior Housing development, Chestnut Ridge Gardens.

Recommendations: No changes are recommended to the existing zoning for this area.

Area 6: Village Center, Currently Zoned NS, PI, R-35 and R-40

Existing Conditions: This area serves as a village center, with community and civic uses, neighborhood, shopping and dining, banking and professional services. Civic uses include the William Paul Faist Volunteer Ambulance Corps, the South Spring Valley Firehouse, the Historic Red Schoolhouse Museum, and the Jerry Kolbre Park (with Gazebo and gardens). Free-standing commercial buildings, shopping centers and professional parks offer bagels, laundromat and dry-cleaning services, stationery, a convenience grocery and deli, a nail salon, Chinese food, veterinarian, banking, pool/spa sales & service, a coffee shop, and a yoga studio.

Recommendations: The NS zoning should be extended past the Hubert Humphrey Drive until the historic Red Schoolhouse. Pedestrian and streetscape improvements should be required with new development approvals, and the creation of a Business Improvement District should be considered. Sidewalks and signalized crossings should be provided for all corners of the Chestnut Ridge/Red Schoolhouse Road intersection. It appears the permitted uses under the current NS zoning are working and do not need to be augmented. No change is recommended for the area currently zoned R-40 that is located beyond Jones Creek, north of Bulldog Coffee and Yoga Synthesis, and extends to Jama Court. This area is constrained by the Jones Creek floodplain.

Area 7: Residential Zones outside of Red Schoolhouse Road Corridor

Existing Conditions: See Existing Zoning Map X. The major problem identified when analyzing the existing pattern of development against the requirements of the existing zoning code, is that a major portion of the residential lots in the Village are nonconforming with respect to their required minimum lot size. Quite simply, 58% residential lot sizes in the Village are smaller than they are required to be (see Figure X, Analysis of Nonconforming Residential Lots Below Required Minimum Lot Size, as well as Table X in Inventory and Analysis sections).

Area 8: Current Planned Industry and Laboratory Office Zones outside of Red Schoolhouse road Corridor.

Existing Conditions: Another issue identified when comparing existing land uses with the existing zoning, is that the Laboratory Office zone appears to be underutilized. The regional demand for the development of such building types appears to be limited, and parcels zoned LO in areas with excellent transportation access have remained vacant for many years.

Recommendations for Areas 7 and 8:

See Proposed Zoning Map X for details.

- Create new zones
 - R-10, with minimum lot area of 10,000 sf.
 - R-15-1F, with minimum lot area of 15,000 sf, but differing from current R-15 with limitation to Single-Family homes only
 - R-20, with minimum lot area of 20,000 sf.
 - PILO, which would be a combination of the existing PI (Planned Industry) and LO (Laboratory Office) Zoning Districts. PILO would also allow Assisted Living and Warehousing Uses.
- Change current R-35 zone west of Chestnut Ridge Road to R-25,
- Change RR-50 zone in Lancaster Drive/Ackertown Rd./Karow Ct./Windsor Terr./Menocker Road Area to R-25.
- Change LO zones to PILO (a combination of Planned Industry and Laboratory Office Zones), except when adjacent to R-15
- Change R-15 to R-10, in portion west of Chestnut Ridge Road

- Adjust R-35 Boundaries near Margetts Road and Hungry Hollow and Eagle Street, and along Summit Road (north side).
- Change R-25 to R-15-1F (with one family houses only) in Dexter Park area (Balmoral Dr./Renfrew Rd./Carlisle Rd./Ross Ave./Lomond Ave/Aberdeen Ave./Perth Ave.)
- Change R-25 to R-20 north of Dexter Park (Samuel Rd./Brookview Blvd./Lilian Dr./Castle Dr./Cheryl St.)

Area 9: Green Meadow School/Threefold Foundation/Duryea Farm

Existing Conditions: The existing campus is located in the RR-50 District with school uses (general special and religious instruction), day camps, cafes, a coop grocery store, group quarters, faculty and staff housing, religious uses, agriculture and retreat/conferencing facilities. Almost any land use activity undertaken requires variances as the RR-50 does not acknowledge many of these uses.

Recommendations: Create a floating zone which may “land” or be utilized only in RR-50 which allows education campus/philanthropic uses/group quarters/accessory housing/agriculture to be designed in a master plan in a unified development. It is anticipated that the Threefold Foundation would petition the Village Board to adopt such a floating zone within three years of the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan.

7 Traffic Improvements and Joint Study

To unlock the potential for economic development in the Village, and particularly in the Red Schoolhouse Road corridor, there is near universal agreement that road system improvements will be needed, both to mitigate existing traffic problems and to accommodate planned increases in the intensity of land uses. There is also consensus that those developers who stand to benefit from favorable changes in land use regulations in the corridor should be required to contribute to the costs of such traffic improvements. State law provides mechanisms for Villages to couple changes in zoning or SEQRA reviews of projects under current zoning with a requirement for contributions to pay for infrastructure needed to support it.

New York State Village Law §7-703 authorizes the use of incentive zoning, where specific incentives or bonuses in density, use or other zoning requirements may be granted to a developer in exchange for the provision of community benefits or amenities, such as transportation improvements. Construction of the improvements could be required concurrently with the development, or a payment “in lieu” may be collected, to be deposited in a trust fund to be used by the Village Board at a later date if immediate construction is not practical. Required procedures to create incentive zoning include the preparation of a Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS) under SEQR to evaluate the effects of the changes, and a share of the cost of this GEIS may be charged to the applicant.

A related, subsequent section of Village Law, §7-703a, authorizes the use of planned unit development (PUD) zoning districts, to provide for a mix of residential, commercial, industrial or other land uses in which economies of scale, creative architectural or planning concepts and open space preservation may be achieved by a developer in furtherance of Village plans. Such PUD zoning could be integrated with incentive zoning to provide opportunities for higher density, mixed use projects with a mechanism for funding traffic improvements.

The following transportation improvements should be considered for inclusion in any incentive, PUD or traditional rezoning requests in the Red Schoolhouse Road corridor, or may be required during SEQR review of site plan, conditional use and special permits or subdivisions, as they occur. In August of 2020, a joint traffic study commenced with contributions from developers in the Red Schoolhouse Road area.

(Add text about Joint Traffic Study with map of 5 projects in pipeline.)

Pedestrian and Cycling Facilities

Sidewalks – A continuous sidewalk should be provided on the east and west side of the Red School House Road corridor to fill in the gaps between existing segments. At this time, segments of sidewalk are missing, and should any pedestrians try to travel the length of the corridor, walking on the roadway shoulder is required, which causes safety issues.

No bicycle lanes are present. Installation of bicycle lanes should be considered with any widening or shoulder improvements on Red Schoolhouse Road.

Ramp improvements, turn lanes and additional through lanes at the Thruway/GSP interchange

Currently, during rush periods, long queues can form on the southbound Thruway/GSP exit ramp onto Red Schoolhouse Road, as cars wait to get through the traffic light at the bottom of the ramp. Another difficult turning movement is the left turn onto the northbound Parkway entrance ramp when traveling south on Red Schoolhouse Road.

On March 29, 2018, NPV Planners Stach and Lockman met with officials of the New York State Thruway Authority, New York Division, to discuss possible improvements at the Red Schoolhouse Road/Thruway spur interchange, including an additional lane on Red Schoolhouse Road under the parkway, in order to facilitate turning movements. The following personnel from Thruway Authority were in attendance:

Lizy Philip, PE – Capital Program Manager
Brent E. Howard, PE – Assistant Division Director/Operations
Thomas M. Feely, PE – Assistant Division Highway Engineer
Kristen Resnikoff, PE – Construction Engineer

These representatives supported the Village's corridor planning efforts, and were open to ramp, turn lane and signal improvements, if funded by the Village, private developers and/or Rockland County (or any combination). They agreed that as development occurs, incentive zoning could be utilized by the Village to obtain private funding for such improvements, if provision of improvements is not practical for new developments under existing zoning using the typical SEQ process.

On April 18, 2018, NPV Planner Lockman met with officials of the Rockland County Highway Department to discuss possible improvements in the Red Schoolhouse Road corridor. The following personnel were in attendance:

Andrew M. Connors, PE – Deputy Superintendent of Highways
Dyan Rajasingham, PE – Engineer III
Joseph Pyzowski, PE – Project Manager
Joseph Arena, Senior Engineering Technician

The Highway Department officials made the following recommendations and comments:

1. The group agreed that there were good examples in the County where municipalities have sponsored improvements to County Roads, and gave as an example, the Town of Clarkstown's project to improve Lake Road.
2. There was concern that if any funds were collected from an incentive zoning process, more specific, detailed transportation improvements planning would be necessary. Such

a study would look at no build and build capacity in the corridor, and develop capital plans for improvements, with estimated costs.

3. There was a generalized concern regarding management of collected funds from developers, if planned projects turn out to be more expensive than predicted, or the timing of improvements is delayed.
4. There was also concern that while the County of Rockland would generally be supportive of the Village efforts to fund transportation improvements, and may share in improvement costs in the future, the County would not commit to any program that would obligate them in the future without legislative action.
5. Officials indicated that the recommended right-of-way width for Red Schoolhouse Road was 50 feet on the County Official Map. With turn lanes, this ROW width may need to be increased, through an acquisition program, or through dedications offered as part of development approvals.
6. Any additional signals installed or sidewalks constructed would need to be maintained by the Village, even those on or along County Roads.

Signalization improvements, new traffic signals or turn lanes beyond the interchange

Participants in the Visioning session reported long wait times for turning onto Red Schoolhouse Road from Williams and Summit Roads. As the corridor is improved, it is anticipated that SEQR review will determine that congestion at these intersections will warrant installation of a traffic signal or turn lanes. Other developments of vacant sites along the corridor at some distance from the Williams/Summit intersection or from the parkway interchange may also require such facilities. As development occurs, incentive zoning should be utilized to obtain private funding for such improvements, if provision of improvements is not practical for new developments under existing zoning.

New road connection to DeSalvo Court

It is recommended that a new through road be considered, beginning at the parkway exit ramp/Red Schoolhouse Road intersection, connecting to DeSalvo Court. Developers could reserve land area for such a connection or could be required to contribute to its construction. Such a connection also would provide access to a southbound entrance to the Thruway/Garden State Parkway from Red Schoolhouse Road, if such a project were built in the long-term future.

New Thruway/GSP ramps (southbound entrance from Red Schoolhouse Road, northbound exit from Thruway/GSP)

It is a significant disadvantage to the prospects of the Red Schoolhouse Road corridor, that in order to travel southbound on the Garden State Parkway, one must travel to Rt. 172, Broad Street in Montvale for the nearest southbound entrance. There is also no exit onto the Red Schoolhouse Road for travelers heading northbound on the Parkway (see discussion in Existing Conditions). Such new entrances and exits are very costly and are unlikely investments by the Thruway Authority in the short term, but nonetheless, the Village of Chestnut Ridge should include a

recommendation for the construction of such a new northbound exit and southbound entrance in this Corridor Plan, in order to demonstrate its long-term commitment to such an improvement. At the meeting held with Thruway Authority, officials indicated that there are no plans for the Authority to convert Red Schoolhouse Road into a full interchange. They felt it was unlikely any new ramps could be constructed unless funded entirely by others. While it is unlikely any developments proposed for the Red Schoolhouse Road corridor in the near term would be large enough to fund such development of new ramps, they may be able to contribute to further study of the issue.

DRAFT

7.0 Summary Matrix of Comprehensive Plan Recommendations

To be added in final draft.

	1.
	2.
	3.
	4.
	5.
	6.
	7.
	8.
	9.
	10.
	11.
	12.
	13.
	14.
	15.
	16.
	17.
	18.
	19.
	20.
	21.
	22.
	23.
	24.
	25.
	26.
	27.
	28.
	29.
	30.
	31.
	32.
	33.
	34.
	35.
	36.
	37.
	38.

	39.
	40.

DRAFT