

TOWN OF MOUNT PLEASANT

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS TOWN OF MOUNT PLEASANT WESTCHESTER COUNTY, N.Y. HELD MARCH 12, 2026

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

CONTINUING APPLICATIONS:

ADJOURNED

DECISION ONLY

Linda Whitehead, Esq. (Applicant) for the Jewish Child Care Association (Owner) of premises at 1075 Broadway, Pleasantville, NY. Designated on the Tax Assessment Maps of the Town of Mount Pleasant as 106.11-1-21. This application has been submitted for an appeal of the Building Inspector's determination that a Health Center is prohibited use within the R-20 zoning district, pursuant to Town Code §218-45 "Parochial and private elementary schools, and colleges".

NEW APPLICATIONS:

Louis Campana (Applicant) for Nicholas Gizzo (Owner) of premises located at 55 Greenwood Lane, Valhalla, NY. Designated on the Tax Assessment Maps of the Town of Mount Pleasant as 112.16-1-39. The application is for a proposed two-story addition to an existing single-family dwelling on a legal substandard parcel (23,093 SF.) in the R-40 Zone. **The following variance(s) are requested:**

Application Z-25-62 – Nicholas Gizzo

Representative: Louis Campana, Architect

Property Address: 55 Greenwood Lane, Valhalla, New York

Tax Map Designation: 112.16-1-39

Zoning District: R-40

Prior to the first application, Chairman Prezner stated that he is a neighbor of the applicant and would recuse himself from the matter. Nicholas DeChico served as Acting Chair for the application.

Applicant Presentation:

- Mr. Catana explained that the existing dwelling is legally nonconforming with respect to the front and side yard setbacks. The proposal would add a second story over the existing first-floor footprint, without expanding the building footprint beyond current limits.
- The proposed design includes a front porch extension, new architectural detailing, Hardie board clapboard siding, asphalt roofing, trim accents, and stone veneer elements. The addition was designed to maintain the existing alignment of homes along Greenwood Lane and to remain consistent with neighborhood character.
- Mr. Catana further stated that the addition is intended to accommodate the applicant's growing family and visiting relatives who assist with childcare. The proposal was designed to integrate aesthetically with the existing structure and appear consistent with the original home design.

Board Questions:

- Clarification that the building footprint would not be expanded and that the perceived change was due only to architectural design changes.
- Discussion of alternative designs and the reasoning for the selected configuration to maintain architectural depth and visual consistency.
- Confirmation of setback measurements and the alignment of the proposed structure with neighboring homes.
- The property is legally nonconforming, the proposal does not increase the existing nonconformity related to the setbacks.

Public Comments:

- The Acting Chair opened the floor to public comment. No members of the public came forward to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

Motion:

A motion was made to approve Application Z-25-62 as submitted.

- Motion: Herb Doer
- Second: George Hlapatos

Result: Application approved 4-0, with the Chairman recused.

John Scarlato (Applicant) for Vijesh Titus (Owner) of premises located at 98 Eastview Drive, Valhalla, NY. Designated on the tax Assessment Maps of the Town of Mount Pleasant as 113.5-2-49. The application is for a proposed two-story addition to an existing single-family dwelling on a legal substandard parcel (.94 Acres) in the R-40 Zone. **The following variance(s) are requested:**

Application Z-25-64 – Vijesh Titus

Applicant: John Scarlato

Property Address: 98 Eastview Drive, Valhalla, New York

Tax Map Designation: 113.5-2-49

Zoning District: R-40

Applicant Presentation:

- Mr. Scarlato explained that the existing residence is a raised ranch-style home, with the lower level at grade and the primary living area above. The home does not contain a basement.
- The property includes a rear-yard swimming pool, which limits the ability to expand the house toward the rear of the property. The applicants purchased the home in 2017, and the pool was existing at the time of purchase.
- Due to the family's growth and the need to accommodate three children on the main living level, the applicants propose to construct an addition toward the front of the dwelling. Mr. Scarlato stated that extending toward the front was the most practical solution because expansion toward the rear would encroach too closely upon the pool area.
- The architect explained that the design intentionally varies the depth of the addition so that the structure does not present a flat façade. The bedroom portion of the addition projects the furthest, requiring the greatest portion of the front yard variance. Other portions of the addition extend less deeply and only minimally encroach into the setback.
- Regarding the second variance, Mr. Scarlato explained that the existing structure is already nonconforming along the Walberg Avenue frontage, and the proposed work largely aligns with the existing building line. The slight increase in the setback variance results from maintaining a straight building alignment due to the orientation of the existing structure.
- Mr. Scarlato also noted that the architectural design aims to maintain neighborhood character by breaking up the building mass and scaling the addition to blend with surrounding homes.
- The applicant indicated that the requested relief would allow the family to remain in the home while accommodating their growing household. Given current market conditions and the difficulty in locating larger homes, expanding the existing residence was presented as a reasonable alternative to relocation.

Board Comments:

- The greatest variance is limited to the bedroom portion of the addition projecting
-

toward Eastview Drive.

- Other parts of the addition extend less deeply into the required setback.
- The work along Walberg Avenue largely aligns with the existing nonconforming setback.

Public Comments:

- The Chairman opened the floor for public comment. No members of the public spoke either in favor of or in opposition to the application.

Motion:

A motion was made to approve Application Z-25-64.

- Motion: Adrian Novak
- Second: Herb Doer

Result: Motion approved unanimously (5-0).

Rocco DiLeo (Owner) of premises located at 33 Livingston Avenue, Valhalla, NY. Designated on the Tax Assessment Maps of the Town of Mount Pleasant as 122.7-2-35. The application is for a proposed rear and covered front porch addition to an existing single-family dwelling, on a legal substandard parcel (9,998.24 SF.) in the R-10 Zone. **The following variance(s) are requested:**

Application Z-26-1 – Rocco DiLeo

Property Address: 33 Livingston Avenue, Valhalla, New York

Tax Map Designation: 112.7-2-305

Zoning District: R-10

Applicant Presentation:

- Mr. DiLeo stated that he and his wife purchased the property in 2014 and have since raised their two daughters in the home. They wish to remain in the community but require additional living space as their children grow.
 - The existing home is a single-story ranch-style dwelling with approximately 1,477 square feet of living area. The applicant proposes a 529-square-foot single-story rear addition, which would expand the family room and dining room. The rear addition complies with all rear and side yard setback requirements.
 - Mr. DiLeo explained that the requested variances are triggered by the proposed covered front porch, which slightly encroaches into the required front yard setback and increases overall lot coverage.
 - He further explained that the property is slightly undersized and that the existing placement of the home on the lot makes it difficult to construct any front porch without some encroachment into the front yard setback.
 - To provide neighborhood context, Mr. DiLeo presented information from eight
-

nearby properties on Livingston Avenue, demonstrating that many homes on the block have front yard setbacks closer to the street than the proposed 27.5-foot setback. According to the applicant, the surveyed properties have front yard setbacks ranging from approximately 11.7 feet to 25 feet, with an average setback of approximately 23.92 feet, which is closer to the street than the proposed improvement.

- The applicant also submitted seven letters of support from neighboring property owners, including letters from adjacent neighbors.

Board Questions:

- The Chairman noted that the front porch addition was the primary reason for the variance request and referenced prior Board practice of approving modest front porch additions where appropriate.
- Board Member Novak asked whether the existing lot coverage had changed since the applicant purchased the property in 2014. Mr. DiLeo confirmed that a prior addition was constructed following the purchase, which expanded the home's footprint.

Public Comments:

- The Chairman opened the floor for public comment. No members of the public spoke either in favor of or in opposition to the application.

Motion:

A motion was made to approve Application Z-25-65.

- Motion: Herb Doer
- Second: Nicholas DeChico

Result: Motion approved unanimously (5–0).

Dimovski Architecture (Applicant) for John Pugni (Owner) of premises located at 108 Bradhurst Avenue, Valhalla, NY. Designated on the Tax Assessment Maps of the Town of Mount Pleasant as 117.17-1-15. The application is for a proposed two-lot subdivision on a legal standard parcel (43,751. SF.) located in the R-20 Zone, which is currently seeking Planning Board approval. **The following variance(s) are requested:**

Application Z-26-2 – John Pugni

Applicant: Dimovski Architecture

Property Address: 108 Bradhurst Avenue, Mount Pleasant, NY

Tax Map Designation: 112.7-2-305

Zoning District: R-10

Applicant Presentation:

- Mr. Dimovski of Dimovski Architecture appeared on behalf of the applicant. Mr. John Pugni, property owner, also appeared and provided testimony after being duly sworn.
- Mr. Pugni testified that his father purchased the property in the mid-1970s. The property historically dates back to the 1930s and was originally used as a sand and gravel quarry operation. At some point the prior owners sought zoning relief to continue the nonconforming use; however, the request was denied.
- After the Pugni family acquired the property, it was used to store construction materials associated with the family business. The Town later commenced an article 78 proceeding to terminate the nonconforming use, which ultimately resulted in cessation of the commercial use.
- Mr. Pugni further testified that he recently obtained sole ownership of the property as part of a family business separation. Currently:
 - A small white house on the corner remains occupied by a tenant.
 - A barn structure on the property is vacant.
- The applicant's representative explained that approximately 15 years ago the family explored a three-lot subdivision before the Planning Board. According to the applicant, the Planning Board expressed concerns that the proposal was excessive and did not advance the application to the Zoning Board for variances.
- At that time there was discussion of a two-lot subdivision, but the owners chose not to pursue that option. The matter remained inactive until the present application.
- The current proposal seeks to subdivide the parcel into two residential lots.
- Key elements of the proposal include:
 1. Removal of the existing small house facing Bradhurst Avenue.
 2. Construction of two single-family homes facing Armand Place, a quieter residential street.
 3. Elimination of driveway access from Bradhurst Avenue, which the applicant stated is a busy roadway.
 4. Creation of new driveways accessing Armand Place.
- The applicant stated that the Planning Board and Town Planner supported orienting the homes toward Armand Place as a better planning solution for the neighborhood and for traffic safety.
- The representative noted that the lot meets the 20,000-square-foot minimum lot area requirement, but the narrow depth of the parcel necessitates the requested variances for mean lot depth and rear yard setbacks.
- The proposed homes are intended to align their front yard setbacks with other homes in the neighborhood, which the applicant stated was done intentionally to maintain neighborhood character.

Board Discussion:

- Board members questioned the applicant regarding the rear yard setback for Lot 2, which represents a variance of approximately 50% of the required setback.
- The applicant explained that the parcel narrows toward Bradhurst Avenue, limiting buildable depth. The design places the houses consistent with the existing front yard alignment of homes along Armand Place, leaving the rear yard as the primary location requiring relief.

The applicant noted:

- A sewer easement runs through part of the property, limiting building placement.
- Substantial side yard areas would remain available for outdoor improvements such as patios or pools.
- A fence is proposed along the rear property lines for privacy in the event adjacent vacant land is developed.

Board Member Comments:

- One Board member commented that the applicant's effort to maintain compliance with the front yard setback and preserve neighborhood consistency was commendable. The member noted that the applicant effectively accepted a larger rear yard variance rather than seeking relief in the front yard, which could have been more disruptive to neighborhood character.

Public Comments:

Two neighboring residents were sworn and spoke:

- **Rachel Mezo Power**, 11 Armand Place
 - **Cara Tortora**, 20 Armand Place
 1. Both residents indicated they live adjacent to the subject property.
 2. Ms. Mezzo Power stated that while she has concerns about the slope of the property, she supports redevelopment of the site and removal of the existing barn, which she described as an eyesore.
 3. She asked whether the applicant intends to address vermin or wildlife that may be inhabiting the barn before demolition, expressing concern that animals could migrate onto neighboring properties once the structure is removed.
 4. In response to the public comment regarding potential vermin inhabiting the existing barn structure, the Chair noted that animal relocation, extermination, or pest control measures are not within the jurisdiction of the Zoning Board of Appeals.
 - Board members indicated that such matters may fall under the purview of the Building Department or other applicable municipal agencies. The resident was
-

advised that she could discuss the matter directly with the applicant outside of the Board's review.

1. The resident acknowledged the explanation and thanked the Board for the clarification.
- The resident further stated that, overall, she and other neighbors were generally supportive of the proposal, noting that redevelopment of the property and removal of the existing barn would improve neighborhood conditions. She expressed appreciation that the applicant proposed two homes rather than a larger single structure, which she believed would be beneficial for the block.
 - However, she raised additional concerns regarding public safety during construction, particularly given that the street contains numerous young children and a school bus stop located at the corner of Armand Place and Bradhurst Avenue.
 - She asked whether the Board could require a construction safety plan, such as restrictions on delivery times, management of construction vehicles, or other precautions to protect children and pedestrians on the street.
 - The Chair explained that construction logistics, including delivery scheduling and site safety management, are generally outside the authority of the Zoning Board of Appeals. The Chair noted that construction materials must be delivered and stored within the property limits rather than on the street.
 - A Board member commented that the applicant may be able to utilize the existing driveway from Bradhurst Avenue during construction to facilitate delivery and staging of materials, particularly if construction is performed on the home located farther from Armand Place first.
 - Another Board member advised the resident that, following the Zoning Board's determination, the application would return to the Planning Board, where issues such as construction management and site logistics could be discussed in greater detail. The resident was encouraged to attend the Planning Board meeting and present her concerns there, as that board may have authority to incorporate certain operational conditions into the project approvals.
 - The resident also indicated that some neighbors had not received mailed notice of the meeting, despite requesting redelivery of the certified mailing. The Chair explained that notices were sent in accordance with the requirements of the Town Code and that delivery issues would be attributable to the United States Postal Service.
 - Board members noted that additional notice would be provided for future Planning Board proceedings and that a public notice sign would also be posted on the property indicating the relevant meeting information.
 - The resident thanked the Board for the clarification and reiterated that she supported the 50-foot front setback from the curb, noting that the location of the bus stop and gathering area for children made maintaining adequate space important for safety.

Applicant Clarification:

- The applicant's representative addressed the public comments for the record.

- He stated that the applicant would not object to addressing pest control concerns prior to demolition of the barn, though such matters had not yet been formally planned.
- He further explained that the Planning Board has already requested environmental review measures, including soil and oil sampling in the area where trucks were historically parked on the property during the period when construction materials were stored there.
- The representative confirmed that the applicant would comply with those environmental testing requirements to ensure there are no contamination issues associated with prior uses of the site.

Motion:

A motion was made to approve application Z-26-2

- Motion: George Hlapatsos
- Second: Herb Doerr

Result: Motion approved unanimously (5–0).

Keith Larsen (Applicant) for Brian & Brianna Larsen (Owners) of premises located at 7 Rosehill Road, Briarcliff Manor, NY. Designated on the Tax Assessment Maps of the Town of Mount Pleasant as 99.17-2-39. The application is for a proposed 1.5-story addition to an existing single-family dwelling, on a legal standard parcel (44,179 SF.) in the R-40 Zone. **The following variance(s) are requested:**

Application Z-26-4– Brian & Brianna Larson

Applicant: Keith Larson

Property Address: 7 Rosehill Road, Briarcliff Manor, NY.

Tax Map Designation: 99.17-2-39

Zoning District: R-40

Applicant Presentation:

- Mr. Lawson explained that Brian and Brianna Lawson purchased their home in 2023 and have since undertaken improvements to the property, which he described as previously being in somewhat dilapidated condition.
 - The applicants are seeking approval to construct a two-car garage addition.
 - Currently, the property contains an oversized one-car garage located at the basement level, which presents two primary hardships:
 1. Insufficient storage and parking capacity, as only one vehicle can fit in the existing garage.
 2. Difficult accessibility from the main level of the house, requiring residents to descend approximately 14–15 steps to reach the garage.
 3. Mr. Lawson noted that the homeowners have two young children under the
-

age of three, with another child expected, and the existing configuration makes daily access difficult and potentially hazardous, particularly in winter conditions.

To address these issues, the proposal includes:

- Construction of a two-car garage addition located in front of the existing garage, raised approximately eight feet above the current driveway elevation.
 - Abandonment of the existing driveway on the right side of the property.
 - Regrading and filling of the central area of the existing horseshoe driveway to create a new access configuration.
 - Installation of a side-entry garage with improved driveway circulation.
 - The revised layout would allow vehicles to enter the driveway, pull into the garage, and perform a three-point turning maneuver to exit the property safely.
 - Green areas representing driveway removal
 - Yellow areas representing new driveway construction
 - Cross-hatched areas representing modified driveway surfaces that will be raised and repaved
 - Mr. Lawson explained that the work would improve vehicle circulation, provide a safe turnaround space, and create a flatter area where children could safely play, as the current driveway has a steep pitch.
-
- A porch addition to visually connect the garage with the existing house
 - A side-facing garage door orientation so that the garage doors are minimally visible from the street
 - Decorative architectural elements such as a dormer used solely for aesthetic purposes
 - Removal of one tree located near the proposed driveway expansion
 - Possible removal of rock outcropping near the garage addition
 - Backfilling and regrading portions of the driveway area
 - Mr. Lawson noted that calculations show a net reduction in impervious surface area, as more driveway pavement is being removed than added. He also described a proposed planter wall near the garage addition to soften the visual impact of the raised structure and blend it into the surrounding topography with landscaping.

Board Comments:

- The Board continued its discussion with the applicant regarding the requested front
-

yard setback variance.

- Mr. Lawson confirmed that the existing house is located approximately 73.4 feet from the street at its closest point, which significantly exceeds the required 60-foot front yard setback. The proposed garage addition would extend forward to approximately 45 feet from the street, resulting in the requested variance.
- A Board member asked whether the proposed garage could be moved back approximately 10 feet to reduce the need for the variance. Mr. Lawson explained that the proposed garage location is directly aligned with the existing garage structure, and moving it back would require relocating the existing house structure or redesigning the entire configuration.
- He further stated that the topography of the property, which rises in the center, influenced the design. Positioning the garage in that location allows the project to address the accessibility issue by reducing the number of steps from the front entrance while also taking advantage of the naturally elevated portion of the site.
- Mr. Lawson also explained that relocating the garage to the side of the house was not feasible due to the location of utility infrastructure, including gas, electric service, and a generator, as well as the slope and rock conditions on that side of the property.
- Board members discussed the typical considerations under Town Code §267-b, noting that variance requests are frequently self-created, but that such fact alone does not preclude approval. The Board also considered whether the proposed improvement would enhance or detract from the character of the neighborhood.
- Mr. Lawson stated that the completed project would be architecturally attractive and that significant landscaping improvements were planned, including new plantings around the addition and removal of a portion of the existing driveway to create additional green space.
- A Board member stated that, in light of letters submitted by nearby residents expressing concerns about the visual prominence of the garage addition, it would be appropriate to include a landscaping condition as part of any approval.
- Specifically, the Board suggested that the removal of the existing driveway area should be replaced with landscaping, shrubs, or trees so that the modified site would appear natural and blend with the surrounding neighborhood once the driveway curb is restored.
- Mr. Lawson stated that the applicants had already incorporated significant landscaping plans, including plantings around the garage addition and near the driveway entrance, and agreed that additional landscaping could be added in the area where the driveway would be removed.
- Another Board member agreed and suggested that taller evergreen plantings would be appropriate to soften the appearance of the addition and help screen portions of the structure from the street.
- The Board also discussed the language used in the public notice describing the project as a “1.5-story addition.” One Board member indicated that such wording may have led some residents to believe that a substantial second-story structure was being added to the home, when in fact the proposed structure would not appear

as a full additional story due to the grade and landscaping.

Public Comments:

1. Mr. Brandon Zappi - 15 Rose Hill Road

1. Mr. Zappi stated that he lives two houses beyond the subject property and that the four houses located beyond the Lawson residence are the only properties likely to be directly affected by the proposal. He also noted that the applicants are his sister and brother-in-law.
2. Mr. Zappi stated that many homes on the street were built approximately 50–60 years ago and that a number of them have not undergone significant improvements since their construction. He expressed the opinion that the proposed project would represent a positive improvement to the neighborhood, likely increasing property values and modernizing the property.
3. He stated that as one of the neighbors most directly affected by the project, and as someone who passes the property daily, he supports the application and believes the improvement would benefit the community.

Motion:

A motion was made to approve application Z-26-4 with conditions

- Motion: Nick DeCicco
- Second: Herb Doerr
- The area of the existing driveway proposed to be removed shall be replaced with evergreen arborvitae plantings with an initial height of approximately eight (8) feet, which are expected to grow to a height sufficient to screen the garage addition both vertically and horizontally within approximately five (5) years.

Result: Motion approved unanimously (5–0).Motion:

INSPECTION MEETING WILL BE HELD ON