

TOWN OF MOUNT PLEASANT

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING BOARD TOWN OF MOUNT PLEASANT WESTCHESTER COUNTY, N.Y. HELD OCTOBER 2, 2025

BUSINESS ITEMS

Acceptance of minutes drafted from the 9-15-2025 Planning Board meeting.

Motion was made by Eileen McClain to adopt the minutes, seconded by Walter E Hickey, all members present voted in favor.

CONTINUING APPLICATIONS

- 1. Proposed: 95 Bradhurst, Blythedale Childrens Hospital, Three-phase improvement plan including expansion for long-term care, parking deck, and improvements to site utilities and infrastructure.**

Application: Site Plan SP - 25-02

Location: 95 Bradhurst Avenue, Valhalla

Section/Block/Lot: 117.17-1-2

Zone: R-20

Owner & Applicant: Blythedale Childrens Hospital

Engineer/Architect: Langan; Colliers; E4H Architecture

Attorney Janet Giris with a team of design professionals appeared to represent the application. The following was discussed:

- Since the last appearance at the July 21 meeting we have been going back-and-forth replying to comments from the Town Engineer, Labella traffic consultants and any others received. We have addressed all comments to date, the last was from the Town Engineer received on 9/22/25, to which we have already turned around a reply. We believe we have adequately addressed all outstanding comments and are hopeful that you will set a public hearing at your October 20 meeting.
- A meeting is scheduled for Tuesday of next week with the building inspector to review the Zoning Board of appeals application to be submitted.

Chairman Collins asked the applicant to do a high-level summary of the topics of concern for the

public and the Town Engineer.

The following comments were made by the applicant's professionals and design team:

- The third-party Labella traffic study cited with our opinions on the review of our traffic analysis, specifically that the facility is not a new facility and not a typical hospital so existing conditions were used for calculations.
- The North 80 calculations were included in our report as LaBella suggested.
- The town engineer suggested having a channelized island in operation at the southerly entrance to further restrict turns out of the driveway, if the DOT requires it, we will do it.
- DOT suggested a left-turn lane at the north access, our opinion right now is that it is not needed. It's a slow-speed road and there is no accident history to support it. DOT will determine that as it is their road, and we can address that when we hear from them.
- We responded to DOT comments at the end of August and are awaiting their reply to us.

Comments from Board Members:

- What is the quantity of fill and trips proposed, would like to be assured that there is a traffic maintenance plan for the route? Reply, there will be a construction management plan prior to getting our permit.
- Please address the request for the Grasslands Rd exit and what DOT comments are relating to that? Reply, DOT did not see that as a safe option with the proximity of the driveway to the Bradhurst Ave corner and the Sprain Brook Parkway entrance.
- There have been comments sent in about the quantity of accidents at this location, you said you did an accident report, however you reported no accidents. Reply, yes, we looked at accidents from the timeframe of 2018 to 2024 at the intersection of Bradhurst Ave and Grasslands Road. The report showed one accident, any others were outside the scope of our research. We can review 2025 and provide that to you. We will reach out to the Police department again.
- Chairman Collins commented we are here at this point not to decide on the application, but on its readiness to go to a Public Hearing. Mr. Patrick Cleary commented this is an unusual application it requires Special Use approval as well as variances both granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals. You need to move along your SEQOR review prior to those determinations being made. Plus we have history with neighbor involvement with this property so it is beneficial to obtain that neighbor comment sooner rather than later. So in this particular instance it is appropriate to get to the public hearing stage as soon as possible, you can always keep the public hearing open while the applicant proceeds through the other boards. As we know neighbors have a lot to say and some of that information is helpful.
- Has the applicant addressed comments, dotted the I's and crossed the T's, is it suitable enough to go to a Public Hearing? Mr. Cleary replied at the moment it is ready for Public

Hearing, if something changes from the Public Comments that's a different story.

- Chairman Collins commented we have the latitude to extend the public notices further out than just the adjoining parcels and would like to see the surrounding neighborhoods including Armond Place, Pleasant Ridge, Thomas Place, Lisa Lane, Ronald Court.
 - We think the I's are dotted and the T's crossed and there is enough material documented correctly to have a public hearing to talk to the public and get feedback from them.

Motion was made by JD Summa to schedule a Public Hearing, seconded by Eileen McClain, all members present voted in favor.

TOWN BOARD REFERRALS

- 2. Proposed: Local Law amendments, Planning Board's review and referral to Town Board on its proposal to Draft Local Law Amending the Zoning Code Definitions under Town Code § 218-3, Adding definition of family, and Enacting § 218-20.7 Affirmatively Prohibiting Roomers or Boarders in the Town, as well as Removing a Reference to Roomers or Boarders in Town Code Chapter 218 Attachment 1.**

Application: Town Board Referral

Location: 1 Town Hall Plaza

Applicant: Town of Mt Pleasant

Patrick Cleary commented, this definition for family will be used throughout the code.

Comments from Board Members:

- This definition is far greater than any definition in the code. There are a lot of layers to it.
- There are a wide variety of situations out there that this might pertain to, an elder person who is hired and acts as live-in help, a friend going through a divorce who needs a place for a while, college students sharing the cost of a house.
- Is the problem that rampant in town that we need a separate definition and code for it? If there is a problem with extra parking on the street or on the parcel, there are codes for that; if there is loud noise, there is a code for that; if there are property maintenance issues, there are codes for that. What is the real issue that we need this code with a new definition?
- We need more background information on this, we don't want to get into peoples' houses.
- Would like to have the town attorney come to our next meeting and give us more information on this code and definition.

Patrick Cleary commented, if we do not have a definition in our code, then we go by the state code definition.