

TOWN OF MOUNT PLEASANT

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS TOWN OF MOUNT PLEASANT WESTCHESTER COUNTY, N.Y. HELD AUGUST 14, 2025

Present	Chairman	Ron Prezner
	Board Member	Nick DeCicco - ABSENT
	Board Member	George Hlapatsos
	Board Member	Herb Doerr - ABSENT
	Board Member	Adrienne Novak
	Building Inspector	Joe Bregante - ABSENT
	Zoning Secretary	Cathy Grohowski

CONTINUING APPLICATIONS:

NEW APPLICATIONS:

Leonard Vallender (Owner) of premises located at 633 Commerce Street, Thornwood NY. Designated on the Tax Assessment Maps of the Town of Mount Pleasant as 106.18-4-8.

The application is for a Special Use Permit Renewal to continue research and development of a machine shop, in accordance with the Town Code. Premises are located on a legal parcel (.31 Acres) in the C-NR Zone.

Z-25-27 Leonard Vallender (owner) of Fenbar / 633 Commerce Street, Thornwood, NY

Chairman Mr. Prezner: We are going to start this evening with Application 25.27, Leonard Vallender. The application for a Special Use Permit renewal to continue research and development of a machine shop. Please state your name and relationship to the application.

Mike Allen: My name is Mike Allen, and I am the son-in-law to Leonard Vallender. I am a partial owner of the property. 50/50 percent owner of the property, as well as I am the owner of the business that operates that property.

Chairman Prezner: So you've been in business for how long? Mr. Allen replied: since 1954. Has anything changed or been expanded? Mr. Allen replied; no sir.

Board Member Mrs. Novak: I don't have any questions. I do want to make note for the record. We were out of the property on Saturday. The property is meticulously cared for. Mr. Allen replied," thank you.

Motion was made by George Hlapatsos to approve the application as

submitted, seconded by Adrienne Novak. All remaining members voted in favor of the application. Application carried 3-0.

MAP Architecture (Applicant) for Robert Cabrera (Owner) of premises

located at 52 STANLEY ST, Pleasantville, NY. Designated on the Tax Assessment Maps of the Town of Mount Pleasant as 106.10-6-10.

Proposed second floor addition to an existing single-family dwelling, on a legal standard parcel (10,000 SF.) in the R-5A Zone. **The following variance(s) are requested:**

Z-25-30 MAP Architecture (Applicant) for Robert Cabrera / 52 Stanley Street, Pleasantville NY.

Chairman Mr. Prezner: This application is for a proposed second floor addition to an existing single-family dwelling on a legal standard parcel. The front yard setback which is 30-feet required, existing is 25-feet, proposing 25-feet, So, you will need a variance of 4 FT. 10 INCH? Mike replied; correct.

Mike Piccolo: Their existing house is within the front yard, so the desire is to expand the Second Floor to make it more habitable for them. Mr. Prezner replied; So this other thing too is that you have a maximum fence height, four feet is required. They were they were unaware when they installed the fence many, many years ago that they had we that, Mount Pleasant has that regulation. So, they're seeking relief from that since it's been there for a very long time, it's fully screened, they have support of the of the surrounding neighbors for the application as well as legalizing the fence. So the existing nonconformity on the front yard, cuts through the existing First Floor of the house, the desire is to do a new second floor, and part of that second floor will impact the front yard setback, no further than the existing house. Again, we're looking to basically go straight up with that, we think it'll be a major improvement to the house aesthetically as well as giving them additional living space. As far as the fence goes, again, it's been there for a long time before I was involved with the project.

Chairman Mr. Prezner: Now the second story addition, are you going to be blocking or covering that front portion of the house? Or is that going to be recessed also? Mike replied; the existing house is back in here, but the only portion here will affect the front yard setback. We're maintaining the nonconformity.

George Hlapatsos: Just with respect to the, the fact that we did during our site visit. It was the one with the black fence on the side and then there was, like, the garden and, we talked to the two neighbors next door. During our site visit, we did observe the neighboring homes, and found them to be consistent with the new, design of this home. Nature of the neighborhood or the impact on the communities. Although self-created, obviously, that factor alone was not spotted. Based upon our site visit and examination, I didn't find that any of the statutory factors militate against, issuing the application.

Motion was made by Adrienne Novak to approve the application as submitted, seconded by George Hlapatsos. All remaining members voted in favor of the application. Application carried 3-0.

Christine Broda (Applicant) for Ron Lynch (Owner) of premises located at 10 ELSA AVE, Pleasantville, NY. Designated on the Tax Assessment Maps of the Town of Mount Pleasant as 106.14-1-20.

Proposed construction of a new sun-room and the legalization of an existing enclosed front porch, and fence with an existing single-family dwelling, on a legal substandard parcel (5,000 SF.) in the R-3A Zone. **The following variance(s) are requested:**

Z-25-32 Christine Broda (applicant) for Ron Lynch (owner) / 10 Elsa Avenue, Pleasantville NY.

Chairman Prezner: proposed construction of a new sunroom and legalization on existing enclosed front porch to an existing single-family dwelling.

Front yard setback 30-feet required existing is 25-feet, proposing 21-feet.

Therefore from the 30-foot mark you're asking for a variance of 8.1-feet or actually what you're looking for more is about almost 4-feet. The rear yard setback 30-feet is required, 36-feet is existing, proposing 24-feet, and you're asking for a 5.7-foot variance. You're proposing 1,473 square feet or 473 square feet additional. Then the fence, side yards only 4-feet, 6-feet is existing, 6-feet proposed, 2-foot variance.

Chris Broda: You can see there's a shed and patio, large patio that goes to the back. When my client bought the property, that was the extent of the patio out in the back. The house itself sits over the front setback, so let's first address the setback for the front. There was originally a portico on the front of the house, and my client, without the benefit of a permit, enclosed that porch because you came in from the porch and you were right away in the living room, and it made for a lot of draft. When it's an open portico, it's not considered part of the building itself and so therefore it's more cover its coverage, so we're not increasing the coverage with it, but we are increasing the actual footprint of the houses itself.

So that's the first legalizing variance we need. The second one is for the fence, which you can see here extends around the property. It comes up to the back of the main part of the house. There is a little bit of an addition on the back that you can see right here. That is the kitchen, but the fence stops here at the main part of the house. While the regulations are, my clients were not aware of this when they put the fence up, that you would have to stop the 6-feet part of the fence at the rear yard setback and then the rest would have to drop down on the sides. So for about 15.5-feet from the rear yard setback to the front back of the house, it would drop down four feet. So they've made it a full six feet up to that point, and you can see it extends. There's actually fencing into the neighbor's house also at six feet at that point. That's the other variance we're asking for, for a legalization. It's to get the 2 Ft. allowance to allow the fence to remain at that height the entire way of rather than have it come and step down. So now the other two variances that we're looking for, one is the rear yard setback. This property is half the size of what is proposed what is required by the district, and that's true of some of the other properties in the neighborhood.

The setbacks had the property been deeper, we would not have an issue with setbacks. This is half the size of the normal properties, and so we are looking for a variance to allow them to put a sunroom on the back of the home. Of course that subsequently leads into the next variance, which is for the coverage, because we're already at this point over the coverage. We are in exchange for the additional square footage of the addition. We're trying to reduce as much as we can of the other coverage. So we're reducing the size of the patio and allowing for more grass in the backyard. That shed will no longer be there where you see the blue tarp in the corner. That's where the sheds going to be placed in the appropriate location, 5-feet away from the property line. We will be cutting that patio pretty much in about half. So we will be reducing that, but we still are because we started already over the coverage allowance. We're still going to be over coverage allowance to get this sunroom in. The other thing that contributes to it is the wider driveway at the at the bottom you can see.

Board Member Mrs. Novak: when we did the site inspections, we kind of tried to walk it, its very tight back there. I didn't know at the time that you were looking to reduce the imprint of the patio. Which I do think will have an effect of the opening up that. I do not have any further questions; I do want to note that it was tight back there on our inspection.

Board Member Mr. Hlapatsos: Just with respect to miss Novak's reference to our site visit, we did note that the property is, although the chair doesn't like the term substandard, it is a smaller lot. So that does compress the, pertinent fixtures in the rear yard. I didn't think that the front yard setback, which is only less than 33% of the rear yard, which is 20%. The fence height, I understand why you're, for aesthetic purposes, trying to make it look again consistent with the with the other parts that have a different grade. I also understand that minimizing the patio, as you put it, is an offset of sorts. Is there a need for the sunroom to be to extend as far to the rear lot line as it does? Chris replied; its prefabricated, and comes in panels.

Motion was made by George Hlapatsos to approve the application as submitted, seconded by Adrienne Novak. All remaining members voted in favor of the application. Application carried 3-0.

Kevin Pulcini (Owner) of premises located at 45 ETON ROAD, Thornwood, NY. Designated on the Tax Assessment Maps of the Town of Mount Pleasant as 107.17-1-30.

Proposed new 12' x 12' deck to an existing single-family dwelling on a legal standard parcel (1.115 Acres) in the R-40 Zone. **The following variance(s) are requested:**

Z-25-34 Kevin Pulcini (owner) / 45 Eton Road, Thornwood NY.

Chairman Mr. Prezner: proposed 12x12 Ft. deck to an existing single-family dwelling, on a legal standard parcel.

Board Member Mr. Novak: Can you explain to us why the need to the deck this size? Kevin replied; So, my 83 --year old father lives with us. He's handicapped, so I take care of him. He lives in that portion of the house, so that staircase is his

in and out of the premises. He can't walk very well he also can't sit outside. He can't get to the back of the house where we hang out. So I want to put a deck on so we can sit outside, kind of an extension of his studio. It's the best reason for a deck, so we can give him that extra outdoor space.

Motion was made by Adrienne Novak to approve the application as submitted, seconded by George Hlapatsos. All remaining members voted in favor of the application. Application carried 3-0.

Jonathon Villani (applicant) for Sal Pepaj (owner) of premises located at 174 ELWOOD AVE, Hawthorne, NY. Designated on the Tax Assessment Maps of the Town of Mount Pleasant as 112.17-1-58.

Proposed one-story addition to an existing single-family dwelling, on a legal substandard parcel (5,000 SF.) in the R-10 Zone. **The following variance(s) are requested:**

Z-25-34 Jonathon Villani (applicant) for Sal Pepaj (owner) / 174 Elwood Avenue, Hawthorne NY.

Chairman Mr. Prezner: Proposed one story addition to an existing single-family dwelling on a legal standard a substandard parcel of 5,000 SF. in R-10 zone. I think the front yard setback, 30-feet required, 9.4 is existing, proposing 12. So you're asking for an 18-foot variance, correct? Mr. Villani replied; yes, you are correct.

Mr. Villani: I don't know if you recall, we presented this because it was, built without a permit, so we were legalizing it prior to. We subsequently got denied, so I sat down with my client, discussed what we were going to do, and we decided to start from scratch, which we're going to knock it, demolish the structure and rebuild it. So then I started to look at it as a new application, and is it an egregious variance we're requesting? I went through the five standards of, principles of area variances, and, it doesn't seem to be standing out as any egregious variance as far as, detriment to the neighborhood. Every home I think if you recall last time we presented, I was presenting it to legalize, but now as a new application presented, all the houses along Elwood Avenue are nonconforming. So we, I said as a compromise, we'll knock it down, rebuild it, and I'll set back the addition an additional 30 inches from the nonconforming front of the house of 9.4 feet to 12 feet. So we're presenting that as a new application. We're going to rebuild it and it allows him to still keep the kitchen addition and bathroom. We're just reducing the closet size.

Board Member Mrs. Novak: I just want to note for the record all those houses on that street are very close to the road. There is a lot of room in the back, its deceiving how much space there is there in the back. That side is really the problem, and as our chairman's stated, you could fit a prayer through there. In the back you really do open up and have a good amount of space. So the maximum lot coverage in my opinion is the same.

Board Member Mr. Hlapatsos: I'm just going to make a point for the record regarding how this application, arose before us this evening. This is not connected in any way to the previous application. It may have the determination of the

previous application may have given rise to this application, but its do-over. Its not in anyway connected to the first application. That said, if I understand correctly, the proposed addition will not, encroach further upon the front yard setback in the home.

Motion was made by George Hlapatsos to approve the application as submitted, seconded by Adrienne Novak. All remaining members voted in favor of the application. Application carried 3-0.

INSPECTION MEETING WILL BE HELD ON

[MIN_SIGNATURES]

August 14, 2025