

# TOWN OF MOUNT PLEASANT

MINUTES OF THE  
MEETING OF THE ZONING BOARD  
TOWN OF MOUNT PLEASANT  
WESTCHESTER COUNTY, N.Y.  
HELD JUNE 13, 2024

---

## CONTINUING APPLICATIONS:

**James W. Kane III owner of premises located at 2 ZEISS DR, THORNWOOD NY**, which appeal is from a decision of the Building Inspector of the Town of Mount Pleasant, and is designated on the Tax Assessment Maps of the Town of Mount Pleasant as 89/112.8-1-74. The application is for a proposed Zoning approval sought for the location of a monument sign located on the southeast corner of Columbus Avenue and Zeiss Drive on a legal parcel (10.45 Acres) in the OB-5 Zone. **The following variance(s) are requested:**

Application adjourned.

---

## NEW APPLICATIONS:

**Joseph P. Soricelli owner of premises located at 17 Cambridge Street, Valhalla, NY.**, which appeal is from a decision of the Building Inspector of the Town of Mount Pleasant, and is designated on the Tax Assessment Maps of the Town of Mount Pleasant as 89/117.15-1-40. The application is for a proposed 6-foot-high fence on a legal substandard parcel (7,500 SF.) in the R-10 Zone. **The following variance(s) are requested:**

**Z-24-16 Soricelli/ 17 Cambridge Street W, Valhalla, NY.**

Joseph Soricelli owner of the premises appeared for the proposed application of a 6-foot-high fence. Yes. I'm looking to impose the backyard.

I am looking to enclose the back portion of my, property right here in the backyard going from the back corner here along the side down to the patio and meet at the corner at the shed in the back corner, then back from the along the backside from the shed again and right up here to the also back corner of the house. So just a rear 50, percent of the of the property. I, drove around my neighborhood, and I found the most common fence. There was a 6 -foot white vinyl fence. We saw I saw a lot of variations of solid in the front, solid on the side, lattice on the side. I'm looking to do, solid sides with the lattice in the front of the, on the front side. So

---

mainly the driveway portion and then again on my neighbor's side where that other really will just be a gate. There won't be much fence there other than a few inches of it.

**Board Member Mr. Doerr:** Tell me the reason why it has to be 6-feet, why you're requesting 6 feet. Mr. Soricelli replied; Exhibit A. This is Jack. Jack is my, very large German shepherd. This is a 4-foot pillow right here. You can see the lower down here where it comes to just about 4 feet. Jack could very easily clear a 4-foot fence. It's really a safety issue for him. The, second, not so close but still very close issue is, I have 2 teenage girls and an infant that I would like a little bit of privacy for in the backyard. I'll give you for the kids, but not the dog. Okay. I mean, I've seen a small little puppy jump 6 feet from that standpoint.

**Mr. Doerr replied;** I've got a 162 greyhound that can jump 6-feet, but it's a 4-foot fence and you just train them not to jump. That that doesn't cut it. I'll give you the privacy from that standpoint with the children, but the dog is not cutting it out of any reason.

**Motion to approve application as submitted made by George Hlapatsos, seconded by Herb Doerr. All remaining members voted in favor, Carried 4-0 AYE.**

---

## **ADJOURNED**

**Thomas Lusardi owner of premises located at 19 LOCUST STREET, VALHALLA, NY,** which is appeal is from a decision of the Building Inspector of the Town of Mount Pleasant, and is designated on the Tax Assessment Maps of the Town of Mount Pleasant as 89/117.11-4-4. The application is for a proposed 6-foot-high fence on a legal substandard parcel (5,000 SF.) in the R-10 Zone. **The following variance(s) are requested:**

Application Adjourned.

---

**Brian Kantrowitz owner of premises located at 553 WARREN AVENUE, THORNWOOD, NY.,** which appeal is from a decision of the Building Inspector of the Town of Mount Pleasant, and is designed on the Tax Assessment Maps of the Town of Mount Pleasant as 89/112.6-2-45. The application is for a proposed attached single-car garage, new covered entry to an existing single-family dwelling, on a legal standard parcel (11,499 SF.) in the R-10 Zone. **The following variance(s) are requested:**

**Z-24-18 Kantrowitz/ 553 Warren Avenue, Thornwood, NY.**

Jim Coleman (architect) appeared on behalf of the property owner to represent the proposed application.

So, this is the drive you saw which floods, and this is where we're proposing a garage and you fill this in at the level of the house you can see. So, the so what you're doing is the existing garage will be turned into, like, a room of some sort? Yeah. In the basement. So, this is it was a, variance was granted in 2006 to subdivide this property. Right. So, this was one property, and this sort of flagship was cut out. And this line was cut out. The garage is, 33 feet, the reason for that is

---

to create an access out of this finished basement because we're closing it off, out here. Like, this was being filled in. This is being filled in. There will be this will be a concrete slab. This will be a room underneath as well, so we're putting in structural beam's underneath.

**Board Member Mr. Doerr:** Which stone wall are you talking about? The one that was on the left side that we weren't sure were the property line. Mr. Coleman replied; On the front end. Street side? Yeah. If you're facing if you're facing the houses, the stone wall I know. So, if I'm interpreting what I'm hearing you tell the chairman, the current space where the driveway goes down is going to be a room of some type. Correct. Joe, that can't be livable unless he puts access windows. Correct?

**Building Inspector Mr. Bregante replied;** No. To escape the rest of the building.

**Board Member Mr. Hlapatsos:** Just with regard to the I understand the dynamic with it appears as though it's the rear of the structure that, abuts the neighbor in lot 2. Right. What's the height going to be on this finished garage? It's, it's I need that dimension. Mr. Coleman replied; so, to the ridge would be probably, like, point 22 feet. Just to gauge the reason why you decided to locate the garage here as opposed to using all the available space because the depth of the driveway is such that it appeared that this was, I don't want to say arbitrary, but it had flexibility in terms of its location, and it could have been placed further up still giving you the square footage you were looking for, not impacting on the function of the driveway and yet would have less of an impact on the owner of lot 2. Was there a reason why it was pressed back so far as to create the need for what it affects the 40 percent variance? So, a couple things. This is very well screened. These are trees are taller than the building.

Mr. Coleman: The above garage space is Just store stuff. It's a tactical house.

**Chairman Mr. Prezner:** You can go 2 and a half stories, 35 feet if you want to. I'm just questioning whether it's a livable space or not. Mr. Coleman replied; No. It won't be livable

**Motion made by Herb Doerr, to approve the application as submitted, seconded by George Hlapatsos, all remaining members voted in favor. Carried 4-0 AYE.**

---

**Nannyhagen 420, LLC., owner of premises located at 420 Nannyhagen Road, Thornwood, NY.,** which appeal is from a decision of the Building Inspector of the Town of Mount Pleasant, and is designated on the Tax Assessment Maps of the Town of Mount Pleasant as 89/107.17-2-16. The application is for a proposed subdivision currently seeking Planning Board Approval to subdivide an existing lot into 2 lots. The existing single-family dwelling will remain on Lot #1 and be restored. The proposed new home will be placed on lot #2, on a legal standard parcel (2.08 Acres) in the R-40 Zone. **The following variance(s) are requested:**

**Z-24-20 Nanny Hagen 420, LLC. / 420 Nanny Hagen Road, Thornwood, NY.** Trevor Spearman appeared to represent the application. So as stated, it's over 2-

---

acre parcel. We are looking to subdivide the current access being utilized by a house that sits there, remains, and we want to renovate. It was built in 1776. Here it's accessed from Nanny Hagen Road. That has a driveway easement that we do not touch. We do not affect anything that is regarding that front or northern, over, 40,000 sf., lot. Perhaps Phil Grimaldi, who's with me this evening, will speak more to the easements and right of way concerns. But this is where we would pull into Davidson Drive, and Davidson Drive, for its 4th first portion, is owned by 412 Nanny Hagen.

For its next portion, is actually owned by 420 Nanny Hagen Road. So, we actually own the road that we're looking to access our rear lot from. That Davidson Drive would then open up here and because it is in the R-40 zone, it is, measured the front yard setback is not a simple 60-feet when it is on a street that is less than 50 feet wide. The code requires we add 25-feet to the 60-foot, front yard setback at 85 from the central line of the street of Davidson. So, when we do that, we come back here and we have this width of our front yard setback, which turns out to be 72, point 1-foot, I believe. Now, if we continue further down Davidson Drive, it actually feeds into number 5 and number 6 Davidson Drive. And, those were mapped out also on a separate sheet. I do have one small handout, if I may. It just indicates where other flag light like or irregular lots exist with their width at Front Yard Setback. So, if I may hand that out. Go ahead. So here, we can just take about a quarter mile length of Nanny Hagen Road, starting on the east of this map, and we can see about 17 or 18 flag lots. So, it is kind of the fabric of the neighborhood, that there is flag lots readily available. Our width of 72 feet is marked on the subject property. It actually is only exceeded by one other property. And the lot width at Front Yard Setback is very often in the 25 to 40-foot range. So, we don't believe our request of at 72 feet is a substantial request at all. So, with that being said, I'd either like to hand it back to the chairman or perhaps Phil Grimaldi, if he has some things to add.

**Chairman Mr. Prezner:** Let me ask you this. I'm looking at the map. You have a line drawn on the property line and you got a steel, which I haven't seen in years, a solid steel pool in that backyard. Yes, we do. Now, why can't that opening be wider? Mr. Spearman replied; the pool location is a pool in actual it was in somewhat disrepair, but salvageable. And we wanted to keep that pool. So, our property line is basically, driven by keeping the requests in front of this board to a minimum. In other words, we've kept and maintained a full 25 foot here. We've maintained 25 foot off of the pool. That is where the property line then can, get towards Davidson Drive. That way we don't come to this board, if this line was drawn a little closer here, requesting yet another variance for the existing lot number 1. Because we drove down that Davidson Drive and it's pretty narrow. It's a narrow street, basically speaking. And there are several houses at the end of the street.

**Mr. Grimaldi:** I'm the attorney for the applicant. I had submitted, to the board yesterday morning. I'm sorry I was so late. Just my analysis under §267.B (3)(b) of the, town law. And I think Trevor didn't specifically mention every point, but I think his presentation basically covers those areas, including, you know, the fact that,

---

you know, it's not really going to have an impact on the on the neighborhood or a detriment.

Answering your question about, when it was subdivided, in 1968, Deckers and Davidson owned everything. He owned 420, both the lot that we have here. He owned 5 Davidson, 6 Davidson. He owned 412 Nanny Hagan. And he owned a lot in the back that was conveyed to the New York, DEC. So anyway, Mr. Davidson was very prescient because in in 1969, when he began subdividing, he reserved for himself this 30-foot right of way known as Davidson Drive, even though he didn't need it because he had access over Nanny Hagan Road. But he reserved that to himself anyway. And, the funny thing is that when, and he sold he sold a lot in 1969 to Ian Aquino, who I understand still lived there. He sold in 1960 8 a lot to Donald Van Cook. Van Cook was, 5 Davidson. It was 6 Davidson in the back. Van Cook couldn't didn't have any access. So, in 1969, Jan Aquino had to give the easement to Van Cook. So that's basically, how they get access. And the other way they get access is in 1993, a subdivision plat was filed and it depicted Davidson Drive. So, as the board may be aware, when you, have a roadway and it's on a filed subdivision map, then the abutting property owners have the right to use that. And that's those are the both ways that we have access to that road, both from the grant in 1969 and the, and the fact that it was on a filed subdivision map. So now who has the responsibility for that road? Well, I believe there's an agreement, and we don't have any issue with contributing to the upkeep of that road. That's not even an issue. I believe the 3 owners now, 5, 6, and 412 maintain it. But, you know, we're happy to contribute to that. That's not an issue. Well, if you have other people contributing and then you're going to be using it Yeah. It would be nice to put a couple of couple of coins into the pot to help Absolutely.

**Board member Mr. Doerr:** I just want to hear who's for against it before I have any questions. Okay. I assume everybody here is for this particular application. Am I correct?

**Public Comments:**

Frank & Ellie Calabrio, we reside at 5 Davidson Drive. The issue lies, I believe Davidson Drive is very narrow. I measured it. It's 15 feet. I went ahead and measured Lilac, 22 feet. Eton, 18 feet. Richard, 20 feet. Virginia, 24 feet. So, it's narrow. It's supposed to be a thoroughfare to go through, not park on. So, there's work being done now. I mean, to make it easy, they park there and do the work. We're not there's no problem with that. But to build a house, that could be a real problem with the big trucks. We don't have an agreement to take care of the road. We participate in plowing. We share the cost, but it's starting to deteriorate. Potholes, I go out there and fill the cracks with tar to try to nobody we don't have an agreement in place. So, with big equipment on it, I mean, it's really going to fall apart. We're really concerned about, what if they were able to take that the trucks and run it through 4, 420, the driveway through 420. Is that a is that a I like that idea. I like that idea. Is this something that can be done, or is it dangerous? I mean, I believe it could be done. I mean, I also believe there is some kind of, some reference to sharing the cost of the maintenance of the road in your deed,

---

actually? I don't think so. Okay. If there's something from the lake If there is, we can't we can't find out. We've always maintained the road. Davidson's never did anything to maintain it. Here is we have a road that's how wide? 15-feet. If 2 cars pass each other, especially if you have, like, a truck or something, their mirrors are going to hit.

Exactly. Right. The mirrors are going to hit. Here's the issue. That might be a planning issue. What we're asking you for today, mister president, is that that one variance is whether that variance will have an impact. Like I said in the letter, but for that pool, we wouldn't even have to be here. And these comments will be properly addressed to the planning board. And, again, we're we have bought this road that's on a wild map that we have already I agree with you. So, and, again, that might be a conversation between the neighbors and the applicant about the road or maybe it's wide. It's a 30 foot right away. 30 feet is pretty wide. But what's the actual width? It's well, he said what? 15.

**Chairman Mr. Prezner:** The reason I say that say this, miss Miller, even though we are a Zoning Board and a Planning Board does a lot of, I'll say the structural layouts of properties, a lot of times when this board sees a clear and present danger to a certain application, and we've had this, we've denied an application. I'm not saying we're denying this. I'm just saying when we look at something, we don't look at it just from a zoning point of view. But if we look at it because we're sort of like an arbitrator. And as you know, I've always said this many times, nobody leaves here with a full loaf of bread.

Ellie replied; There's safety issues with that road also. There's another thing is that the garbage. There's no garbage truck that comes down there. You have to bring your garbage out to Nanny Hagan Road. You we have a neighbor that doesn't really like that we have to put our garbage, all 3 residents out on Nanny Hagan Road abutting his property. So now that's going to be 4 people with garbage. So, then we have the narrow road, because you can't get a garbage truck. No. No. They can't turn around, and we widened our road. We widened our property, took our property, made it a little wider so that you can have the mailman turn around at least? We wouldn't have a problem. And we don't have a problem with them building a house. We have a problem with the driveway being put on Davidson Drive because it's a small road access. It's one way in, one way out. There's no other egress. I mean, if they began building, let's say they got would they park vehicles on Davidson and work, or would they park on their property? You know, I don't want to see trucks loaded. They're going to start building. And for the next year, I got trucks up and down. I can't barely get out.

**Chairman replied;** I understand your situation. I really do. There are other people I would like to talk to. I'm trying to see if there is a way if the construction work can be done on, for something, for 29, if it's possible to use it as a temporary measure so that it doesn't impact the people that are living on this on there. Because if a truck goes down that street, the car's got to back up onto Nanny Hagan Road. Nanny Hagan Road in the mornings, I know its 's dangerous. It's like a drag strip. Yep. Everybody thinks they're Mario Andretti. They go down there. They make the

---

sharp turns going through the reds of water. And the only thing that stops them is the red light over at 120. It's scary. I have no problem with what you're trying to do. I'm trying to see what we can do for the for the people that live within that area. Carmine Iannacchino, Jr. Behind me are my sisters Lisa and Deborah. This property at 412 Nanny Hagan Road is where we grew up. I live in Somers, New York. When you first turn into Davidson Drive, that is our house. My father built that house. He was the first person to purchase that subdivision. So, he was the 1st house to build it. He built it himself. He owns the road up to the back part of our property line. So, he told us for many years, I own that road. I have an easement to have the 2 homes in the back pass through. So, my understanding is that he only approved 2 homes. There was never approval for a 3rd home. Davidson never said anything like that. So, I have some concerns about adding a third home to the back of that property. See, 56 Davidson Drive sit behind the entrance to this driveway that they're proposing, so they won't really see drive by traffic. Since we're in the front, we have the traffic from 56, which is fine. Now we're going to add another property. I don't know who's going to build this house. I don't know how many kids they may have. I don't know any of that. Adding another 2, 3 cars to the road? Those are the things that are my concern. So, we're concerned about that. Secondly, when the town entered sewers, I forget what year it was, they dug up the road. It was quite a mess. It was a huge disturbance. I don't know if another home that wants access to Davidson Drive is going to pull from that sewer line or the gas line. What's happening with that? Is there a new line that has to be put in? Does it tap into an existing line? So, my sister brought up a point. During some of the construction of the homes behind us, when trucks were going back to to build those homes, there's a pipe, there's a book line that goes through our property underneath Davidson Drive and it spills out to the far side of our property. More trucks are just going to continue to ruin that pipe and damage the road. So, we're very concerned about additional traffic, heavy truck in fact, trucks are coming on it now. So, we are concerned over the traffic and the weight of the vehicles.

Gerard Pagello, I reside at 6 Davidson Drive, Thornwood, NY. We are at to the left when you get to the end of the cul-de-sac. I don't really think that we have too much to add other than what the Calabrio's have said. We have a nice relationship, the 3 of us, and without a formal agreement written anywhere. We have worked everything out with the plowing of the road and the maintenance of the road over the years. No issues at all. What makes us a little nervous is that we don't know the ultimate buyer of the proposed new lot, and it puts us into a bad position. If, Trevor and Robert were still going to own it, if one of them was going to live there, we would feel really comfortable with the both of them. We have a nice relationship with them also. Well, it would make no difference if you sold your house. Correct. Somebody that's living in this house, say, you know, who is living here? Correct. Well, hopefully we've been there and we all intend to stay there for, for a long time. So, we have a nice 25 years. And we're the new people on the block. Yeah. And we're staying. We have every intention of staying. I think that the main issue is construction equipment. I mean, that's a real big issue. If you have 1

---

or 2 cars or even 3 cars, they're not all coming out at the same time. Who goes to work? As Carmine pointed out, there is a brook that runs underneath the road. And I don't think it's capable of handling any kind of heavy truck traffic, while its ex while it's, in its current state. The other thing I might add, and this is probably not I understand this is a zoning board right now, but the but the planning board, it would be nice to make an approval conditional on getting a formal agreement for the maintenance of the road and the snow plowing, etcetera, with that property. So that going forward, we would feel comfortable. So, what you're saying what you're telling me is that it would be the responsibility of the new property owner to be responsible for a certain portion of the maintenance of Davidson Drive. Right. As all the other life Right. People are. Right. I don't know who handles that.

**Board Member Dr. Hlapatsos:** I could appreciate when I'm looking at §267B (2), whether or not there's another feasible means of accomplishing, basically, access to the new proposed lot. I could appreciate the fact that the Department of Environmental Protection, may be difficult to work with, and maybe there's a significant lack of faith that that an application would be successful to have a new agreement drawn. But if you were to achieve the ability to run access to the new lot off of Nanny Hagen using the existing drive, which goes and when we did our site visit, it goes all the way to the edge of lot 2 already. It's already paved. To give that new homeowner use of the driveway that already exists seems to me to be it would it would alleviate all the concerns of the neighbors on Davidson. It would eliminate your need for a variance here. It would enable you, in effect, to counter almost all the complaints that have been raised, and it hasn't yet been explored. So, all I'm suggesting is because of the fact that it's a viable option, I don't know what the likelihood maybe mister Doerr knows better what the DEP's likelihood is of approving a new agreement, but they had an agreement in place already to allow access to this this edge of their parcel. I'm not sure that I would assume Well, just to be clear, that was not it's not quite as you would think. What happened is there was a 1-acre lot over here, originally Davidson. There you go. They, as part of that, because the driveway was already on that acre, gave the easement. I don't think there's any way, you know, they would ever change or modify that easement. But what I'm saying is it doesn't actually require any additional paving. I mean, in effect I don't think paving's an issue. Impact wouldn't be no greater if you granted an easement to the new proposed owner of proposed lot 2 to use the existing paved, drive. But it wouldn't be on us to grant an easement to them because this is property owned by the DEC. So, it's not on our property to grant an easement. What I'm suggesting is you use your drive, your property, lot 1's property, and allow the owner proposed owner of lot 2 to use that drive. A big portion, George, of the driveway is already on the city's property. We can't give them an easement over the city's property. City would have to agree to that.

All I'm saying is because it hasn't even been explored, although I understand that there may be beliefs amongst several here that it would be a fool's errand, it seems to me that without having actually been explored it, it shouldn't be assumed that it's not an available feasible option that would eliminate the need for the



variance and the concerns of the neighbors on Davidson. Right. Look. Let me just say this, and I don't know what he what he wants to do, but as the owners of Davidson Drive, we have the right, not only use it, but to expand it, okay, to widen it. That might be a feasible alternative because 412, they turn in.

**Chairman Mr. Prezner:** So, at times, it's entirely the driveway. It's just over the line on the DEP line. And at times, it's about 50/50 of shared. It meanders through. And then the parking area that exists on 420 Nanny Hagen is all on the, DEC property.

What if that driveway was within the confines of that of property number;

1. Yeah. So, it can't be because of the location of the curb cut. So, the curb cut is, let's call it
2. 2 thirds on DEC side and 1 third on our side, right there. And then the road or the driveway immediately more enters onto the DEC property.

So, there'd be no option to I mean, moving a curb cut up farther is, you know, we have the brook. We have wetlands and steep slopes here too. It would be a non-option. And the bend in any bigger. I know just from past experience that when the DEP wanted properties, and that they made some We would love to sell it to them. They made some considerations regarding, in this case, what we had was, putting up buildings for the golf carts and a maintenance room. So, you had these things and they permitted it, but you couldn't use certain fertilizers and everything else. Yep. But in this case, maybe the DEP, since it's a simple driveway, could be something that we could look into. I think it's more likely that the DEP might offer or want to actually just expand upon their conservation easement, because it's actually too different.

Mr. Spearman: There's a 1-acre conservation easement here, and then there's the actual reservoir land, which kind of starts down here. The reservoir is really nice. You've got the planes flying over and dropping their gasoline into the reservoir. That's real healthy.

**Chairman Mr. Prezner:** Or widen the road or do something else or maybe come in through but you can appreciate. All I was trying to do was save you from needing a variance. I saw a feasible again, I don't know what the likelihood of success would be, but it's a feasible alternative to what you've come with that would obviate the need for a variance at all. You need 0% variance. Thank you. You, wouldn't be here, and that's what my purpose was for bringing that out. Now I understand that it may not be again, again, I don't know what the likelihood is of working with the DEP to get this this approval, but since the entire drive from Nanny Hagen to the lot line of lot 2 is already paved, it's already a functioning drive. It seemed, again, worth exploring to me. But that said, mister Spearman pointed out that there's a lot of, other issues. I could appreciate moving the house back further on the lot closer to the DEP property so you wouldn't have the long drive that you were concerned about.

Robert Monti (Mr. Spearman's Business Partner): Okay. I just want to say, obviously, good points. Now as far as coming in on that driveway, that's very

narrow for trucks. I actually I'm the contractor for the house right now. We have an we actually came and come down that driveway with a very small dump trucks, the bridge and the pipe underneath that bridge, we don't own the DC homes and it's in very poor shape. It's not feasible. But like I said, we can't even bring our small dump truck now from a main house across that bridge. It's extremely narrow where you Yeah. That driveway. I can't even turn my pickup truck around. It's just a pickup truck without driving up to the lawn. So that is and that's in disrepair that we have to see because the DC will even allow us to pave and repair that for the main house, forget about another house. So, the narrowness of disrepair and the drainage pipe in the old 300-year-old stone bridge on that would be a huge problem for construction vehicles, which it already is, and for another lot. And it's even more narrow. The danger of commanding you can drive for trucks coming out of that driveway is incredible. We're just spinning your wheels and this car is, flying past you. So, all I'm saying is I don't want to discredit any ideas, but a couple of factors of using that, I think, is severely more problematic for construction vehicles and dangerous to navigating drive as well as you don't own it makes it even more of a problem as far as agreements and improvements and things. And to say even if we went down that route that maybe it solves some problems for the neighbors on Davidson Drive. Quite frankly, I don't think it solves problems for this board.

**Meeting is adjourned till July 11<sup>th</sup> meeting.**

---

**Robert Astorino owners of premises located at 338 Kelly Street, Hawthorne, NY.,** which appeal is from a decision of the Building Inspector of the Town of Mount Pleasant, and is designated on the Tax Assessment Maps of the Town of Mount Pleasant as 89/111.12-1-43. The application is for the proposed legalization of an existing enclosed deck on a legal sub-standard parcel (6,250 SF.) in the R-10 Zone. **The following variance(s) are requested:**

**Z-24-21 Astorino/ 338 Kelly Street, Valhalla, NY.**

Robert Astorino owner of 338 Kelly Street appeared for the proposed application.

**Chairman Mr. Prezner:** When we were out there on Saturday, to be honest with you, I didn't see really see a problem with it as far as I'm concerned. It's an existing it's an existing deck. It's enclosed I don't know how long it's been there. It's been there quite a while.

Mr. Astorino replied; I don't know how long though. About 30 years, I think. Yeah.

**Board Member Mr. Doerr:** It's straightforward. It looks like it's been there for a while. Yeah. There's nice screening all the way around it, including the fine trees right next to it.

**Motion to approve application as submitted by Herb Doerr, seconded by**

---

**Adrienne Novak, all remaining members voted in favor. Carried 4-0 AYE**

---

**INSPECTION MEETING WILL BE HELD ON**

