

TOWN OF MOUNT PLEASANT

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING BOARD TOWN OF MOUNT PLEASANT WESTCHESTER COUNTY, N.Y. HELD MAY 7, 2026

BUSINESS ITEMS

Minutes from 4-20-2026 Planning Board Meeting

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

28 Country Club Lane Briarcliff Manor, Adoption of resolution of approval for the structural stabilization of an existing failed slope as well as the construction of a new single-family residence, which has been designed to better fit with the existing topography of the site. Steep Slopes application# PSS26-3, R-20, 104.15-1-33, David Eun & Rochelle Yu

Mr. Patrick Cleary commented the Town Engineer ask that there be added the need for a bond to be established in the event of damage to roads for heavy truck traffic, so that was added.

Motion was made by Eileen McClain to adopt the resolution with the amendment that there be a bond for potential road repair from heavy truck volume, seconded by Steve Schwan, all members present voted in favor.

CONTINUING PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 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, engineer Dan Paisano, and Blysdale officer John Flanagan appeared to present the application, the following was discussed:

- 44 beds are proposed, New York State Department of health will determine of the 44 how many will be used
- In 14 months there have been modifications made to the application based upon public and review comments.
- Changes include landscaping for better visual impact. The the caliber of trees was increased as well as maintenance obligations so to better screen the Lisa Lane residents.
- Five traffic reviews have been performed on our submitted reports.
- Improvements are proposed to help these traffic concerns.
- We are looking to close the public hearing tonight and continue on the approval process.

Comments from the public:

- Michael Savino, 1 Lisa Lane – the traffic signal at grasslands and Bradhurst seems to have been changed. Is there any requirement for anyone to notify the local residents because it seems that traffic has gotten a lot worse. Reply, New York State DOT owns the road and the traffic light.
 - The last traffic report shows no increase to traffic, yet you say there is an increase. These reports are not clear.
 - This is a three – phase approval, can you pick phase one and not phase 3 or is it an all-or-nothing type of situation? Reply, this is one whole application so it gets approved as one. Eileen McClain commented obviously there will be an increase to traffic, the result is it will not have a negative impact. Chairman Collins requested the traffic consultant from Creighton Manning to step up and speak on their review report, Amanda Larosa made the following statements :
 - The original and revised traffic study reports along with New York State DOT comments were reviewed, she concurs with the methodology used to generate reports and the off-site improvements that will be implemented.
 - New York State DOT approval process is very rigorous and is not taken lightly.
 - Walter Hickey questioned what the crash monitoring period was at the DOT and who owned that study? Reply, the Blythedale consultants own that study.
 - Chairman Collins questioned if the construction phase of the project with trucks and workers arriving on site daily was part of the traffic review study? Reply, no, it was not.
- Alan Howard –. When we moved in here in 2015 John Flanagan had been working with us. He got us a new fence and helped us out, now they have changed. This winter there was seven and 8 foot mounds of snow by the car-park area.
 - They will be removing established older trees that will be replaced with smaller young trees. If the trees die, are they going to replace them?
 - I sent in pictures of people urinating on my fence and the step back is at the 150

feet and they're already on my fence.

- The hospital has simply outgrown their space.
- Megan Chioppa, 5 Lisa Lane – we did not get an answer to our question last meeting, is the parking structure able to hold an additional level? Dan Paesano replied no, it is not designed to hold another level.
 - Going from Lisa Lane to Grasslands Road, which is less than a half a mile, took 10 minutes today.

Sean Quigley, Valhalla - the applicant's attorney responded to my comments on April 2nd, I just saw it for the first time today and would like time to reply to that.

- We always hear that there is no impact, every application they've done they have claimed there is no impact, but there is a huge impact to the residents.
- Have any cumulative analysis been done over the last 25 years? Mr. Pat Cleary replied, the last time the applicant did an application it was answered in their FEAF
- Condition 21 of the 2008 resolution states they should do work to relax the drainage conditions, was that done?
- There are concerns for ADA pedestrian safety, I sent in pictures of a family with a child trying to access the entrance, when does this get analyzed?
- At the last meeting, they were asked for a plan of the 250 trucks of fill coming out of this site, this is an enormous liability for the town.
- The application tracker on the town website has this Blythedale application listed as an unlisted action, there is another subdivision application before the board for 108 Bradhurst Ave. which is flatland and that one is listed as a Type I application. How is this?
- The biggest concern is the blowing out of the footprint. How about you say no every once in a while.

Dominic Vita, Hawthorne. The next step in this application is to determine a positive or negative declaration, it sounds like you have more than enough information to determine a positive declaration.

- I live by a project that had a negative declaration and there are impacts now after this development, flooding traffic.
- There are other projects proposed for development in the near future around this site, the North 80, the hospital expansion, 19 Bradhurst etc.
- All residents pay the price when development increases.
- I am hoping for a positive declaration.

Glenn Accocella- last time I was accused of using AI, I took those pictures and those pictures are real that I sent in.

- There should be a fund for smart development, so to have a smart infrastructure.
- This parcel is grossly, grossly over developed.

- At the end of the day, when do you say no?

Steven Kavey, chairman of the CAC - a positive declaration would be an appropriate decision at this time for items such as stormwater, CEA and traffic.

Chairman Collins offered the applicant an opportunity to reply to the comments, the following was discussed:

- All patients when brought to this hospital arrive via ambulance or hospital special vehicle, etc., the visitors are the ones taking them out, is not within the hospital regulations to address that.
- Five experts have reviewed the traffic studies. We have looked at areas of concern and determined that there is no significant impact. We are not responsible to fix the traffic conditions that exist today; we are requested to mitigate our own impact.
- A stormwater pollution plan has been prepared and submitted.
- I believe the board has received some misinformation. I take exception to the CAC and their comments tonight, they have not reviewed the plans and are not in the position to make the statement they made tonight.
- Under the law, a positive declaration is not required. Mr. Steven Kavee commented, if there is an adverse significant impact, the SEQR process does require a positive declaration. We have not reviewed this application, I would be happy to have the CAC review it.

Motion was made by Eileen McClain to close the public hearing and set a 10 day written comment, Seconded by Jane Abbate, all members present voted in favor .

NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 2. Proposed: 2 Walker Road, Proposed solar photovoltaic panels installed on the roofs of the UV treatment building and the generator building using a racking rail system; underground electric, and equipment pad.**

Application: Site Plan# PSP-26-3

Location: 2 Walker Road, Valhalla

Section/Block/Lot: 116.16-1-2

Zone: OB-2

Owner: Department of Water Sup G&E

Applicant&Engineer: Ameresco, Steven McDonough

Motion was made by Jane Abbate to waive the reading of the public notice and open the public hearing, seconded by Eileen McClain.

Steve McDonough of Ameresco appeared on behalf of the owner to represent the application, the following was discussed:

- There are two buildings that will be receiving the roof – mounted solar panel arrays the UV building and the generator building.
- Utilities will be underground.
- A 7 foot chain-link fence will be installed around the equipment pad.

Mr. Patrick Cleary commented there is one outstanding comment from my last memo to confirm the building height with the solar array on it. It needs to be below 40 feet. Reply, the current maximum height is 30.1 feet, with the solar arrays installed the average will height will be 38.9 feet. The maximum on any of the buildings is 39.9 feet.

No comments from the public.

Motion was made by Eileen McClain to close the public hearing, seconded by Steven Schwan, all members present voted in favor.

Motion was made by Eileen McCalin to instruct the consultant to draft a resolution of approval, seconded by Jane Abbate, all members present voted in favor.

3. Proposed: 50 Deerfield Lane S, Installation of a 35ft x 24ft pool with patio in the rear yard. Adjacent patio intrudes into the wetland buffer of the drainage ways.

Application: Wetland # W25-04

Location: 50 Deerfield Lane South, Pleasantville

Section/Block/Lot: 107.5-1-5

Zone: R-40

Owner: Gerard Salvaggio

Applicant&Engineer: Daniel Sherman

Motion was made by Jane Abbate to waive the reading of the public notice and open the public hearing, seconded by Steven Schwan, all members present voted in favor.

Landscape architect, Dan Sherman, and property owner Gerard Salvaggio appeared to present the application. The following was discussed:

- The main change to the plans was the relocation of the perimeter fence. The fence was brought in 10 feet between the pool fence and the edge of the water brook. It is a 6 foot fence with 4 inch slotted openings. It was brought in 15 feet at one location to go around a tree and existing plantings. It is 2 inches off the ground.
- The wetland consultant Kellan Cantrell commented because the waterways connect around the property lines, the animals can transverse around the property via that means.

- We sent in letters from three of our neighbors who are fully in support of this plan

Comments from board members:

- Can you align the 6 foot fence to the rear of your house rather than going to the front yard? It is out of the character of the neighborhood to have a fence in the front yard like that. Reply, we are a very active family and would like to use the whole yard and not cut it in half with a fence.
- There is a lot of paving for cars, your gorgeous front yard will be gone. Reply, we wanted visitors to park and still have our cars parked without moving them.
- The CAC and the wetland consultant both recommend native planting to screen the parcel. Reply, the arborvitae are the only ones designed to screen the fence. Everything else is pretty much native. We understand The CAC is concerned about the fence, but my kids often go into the wetland buffer to get balls and climb and things like that. That is an impact to the wetland, this will help to keep them out of it and support the wetland and the buffer much better.
- Steven Kavee, chair of the CAC made the following comments:
 - The Wetland code calls for a 50 foot buffer. This property has constraints the applicant bought it that way.
 - The pool to some extent is somewhat in the buffer and the fence is in the wetland buffer.
 - The fence should be put around the pool and away from the wetland buffer.
 - There was a previous applicant who had a very specific desire for a fence, they decided not to build it and kept it out of the wetland buffer, the same could happen here.
- Eileen McClain commented she completely agrees with Steven Kavee about the fence and the wetland buffer. This is a green lawn that is already taken care of. There are no critters crossing over that, it will most likely be in the wetland buffer.

Comments from the public:

Nancy Golodetz, 816 Sleepy Hollow Rd. – there is a town code, it should be abided by. If we need to change the code then change it, but why would we compromise? It's a code that should be abided by.

End of public comments

Motion was made by Eileen McClain to close the public hearing, second by Steven Schwan, all members present voted in favor.

Further board comments:

- Both the CAC and the town engineer recommend protecting the wetlands.
- The big struggle is with the fence in the wetland buffer, you want to use your property

the way you want to, but there are regulations to abide by.

- Were any alternatives proposed? Gerard Selvaggio replied we changed the pervious pavers to impervious, added plantings, moved the fence in 10 feet to reduce going into the wetlands. and the vertical slots were changed to allow wildlife to get through. I put a lot of money into my house to beautify it, this will look as good as the rest of my property.
- There is really no problem with the pool, it's the fence. Are we protecting the wetland to the max and what impact will a fence really have?
- Steven Kavee commented you may feel that this particular application will have a minor impact, but it is really death by 1000 slices where the code slowly gets diminished. This is not the best way to abide by the code.
- Mr. Patrick Cleary commented if you were to deny this application, I bet the applicant would come up with an alternative plan, perhaps a hedge to protect the wetland buffer as a more natural fence.

Motion was made by Walter Hickey to deny the application, seconded by James Collins..... Homeowner requested an adjournment to come up with another plan that will put the fence around the pool.

Walter Hickey withdrew, his motion, application will continue.

CONTINUING APPLICATIONS

4. Proposed: 11 Suzanne Lane, Grade rear yard to make more usable family space.

Application: Steep Slopes # SS-26-4

Location: 11 Suzanne Lane, Thornwood

Section/Block/Lot: 107.5-3-40

Zone: R-40

Owner: Tom Syku

Applicant and Engineer: Jonathan Villani & Associates, Inc.

Jonathan Villani appeared on behalf of the owner to represent the application, the following was discussed:

- Soil testing on the property revealed one contaminant, there should be a comment on the final CO, which creates a no-grow area.
- There will be no more soil brought in or removed from the property. It will all be re-graded.
- There is no additional impervious surface created with this application.
- All comments have been addressed from the town engineer.

Motion was made by Jane Abbate to schedule a public hearing, seconded by Steven Schwan,

all members present voted in favor.

NEW APPLICATIONS

5. Proposed: 388 Nannyhagen Rd, construction of a new Accesory Apartment on the ground level of existing home.

Application: Accessory Apartment # PAA-26-1

Location: 388 Nannyhagen Road, Thornwood

Section/Block/Lot: 107.17-2-12

Zone: R-40

Owner: Thomas M Carra

Applicant & Architect: Jonathan Villani & Associates, Inc.

Jonathan Villani appeared on behalf of the owner to represent the application, the following was discussed:

- The accessory apartment will be in the basement.
- It is intended for their daughter to live there with her child.
- All requirements of the accessory apartment code are complied to, the apartment is 569 ft.² in total.
- The building department inspection items have been addressed. We had to create an exterior access, that was added to the plans.
- There is an addition that will be going on the house. It is not part of this accessory apartment.

Motion was made by Jane Abbate to schedule a public hearing, seconded by Walter Hickey, all members present voted in a favor.

6. Proposed: Major Subdivision of two parcels of former Rockefeller property totaling 214.41 acres into 65 parcels to develop an 18-hole golf course, fully amenitized country club, a Village Green, and approximately 75 single-family homes and townhouses.

Application also includes a petition for a text amendment to change the language of Section 218-43 Nonprofit membership clubs.

Application: Subdivision PSD-26-4

Site Plan # PSP 26- 4

Steep Slopes #PLSS-26-7

Wetlands # PLW-26-1

Special Use # PLSU-26-2

Town Board Referral TB 26-1

Location: 835 & 855 Sleepy Hollow Road, Briarcliff Manor

Section/Block/Lot: 110.8-1-1, 104.20-1-1

Zone: R-40

Owner, Applicant & Petitioner: South Rock LLC D/B/A Fieldwood Club, LLC

Engineer/Architect: JMC Engineering Site Development Company, PLLC

Attorney: Zarin & Steinmetz, LLP

Attorney, David Steinmetz, engineers Diego Villareale and Steven Spina, Troy Miller of Southworth, AKRF, appeared with the owners to represent the application, the following was discussed:

- This property has been with the Rockefeller family for a century. The desire is to keep a substantial amount of this property as open space and with its original structures.
- The process has started in front of the Town board. Currently the code allows for up to 200 single-family dwellings. We are requesting a zone text amendment for the non-profit clubs to be a for-profit club. There are other amendments requested as well to allow the Planning board and Building Inspector to determine certain parking and greens locations.
- Five actions are in front of this board, therefore we suggested this board become lead agency. The only action tonight is to present and introduce the application and start the SEQR process.
- Most parcels are in the R 40 zone, some are R10. No portion of this parcel is part of the 1,707 acres of public park land that has been donated by the Rockefellers.
- Development is designed to preserve the sense of this place and the project itself.
- There are four special buildings that exist since the 1900s, they will all be preserved and reused.
- Buffers will be created around the adjoining Rockefeller Park and Aqueduct Trail.
- The development would be sort of the hole in the doughnut of the preserved land.
- Also being preserved is the highest ridge of the area, the rock outcroppings, the rolling topography, and the view of the Hudson.
- The idea is to be drawn to the center of the property preserving the exterior buffer.
- We invite the board to visit the site and to see the buildings to be preserved.
- We take this process very seriously and will be very transparent. The application will go through the full SEQR process, we request a positive declaration, the DEIS will cover, wetlands and other features identified.
- Access will be off of sleepy Hollow Road, the development for the residential area will be proposed as a cluster subdivision. Drainage, flooding will comply with state and town regulations.
- Water will be Briarcliff Manor water District and sewer is Westchester County sanitary sewer, we are already engaged in conversations.
- Christian Aldridge Rockefeller commented on his history with the parcel:
 - He grew up on Bedford Road, graduated from Briarcliff Manor High School and has been very grateful for this area. This parcel was the home of John D

Rockefeller III. Family events were hosted on this property, he has fond memories of utilizing the accessory structures still on the parcel and is thankful they will be preserved.

- When Miss Fern Rockefeller passed in 2024 this property became available. Their family is committed to maintaining the Rockefeller brand and intend to do well by the Town of Mount Pleasant.
- David Steinmetz asked for the board to take action tonight for their intent to serve as lead agency so to begin the SEQR process.

Motion was made by Eileen McClain to declare their intent to serve as lead agency for this type I action, second in by Steven Schwan, James Collins voted nay, all other members voted in favor.

7. Proposed: Grandview Farms, Major Subdivision three lots into 16 single-family residential lots and 1 conservation lot.

Application: Subdivision #PSD - 26-7

Location: Washburn Road, Briarcliff Manor

Section/Block/Lot: 98.11-2-37, 38 & 39

Zone: R-40

Owner& Applicant: Infinity Briarcliff, LLC

Engineer/Architect: Roy Fredriksen, P.E

Consulting Engineer Gregory Cacciapolli appeared on behalf of the owners to present the application, the following was discussed:

- This application picks up from a previous application from 2012 where a determination letter was issued.
- No zoning text amendments are required. This would be a cluster subdivision as was proposed originally, just slightly changed.

Patrick Cleary had commented that the original application had been approved, then there was litigation brought questioning the access. The litigation resulted in an overturn of the approval. The applicant at that point came back with a lesser plan, but never saw it through, this plan resembles that to some degree.

Comments from board members:

- We have not seen what was originally approved and then resubmitted, can we see that?
- If nothing changed from the original plan, would they still need to come before us?
Reply, there are changes from the original plan.
- We would like to compare the original application to this application.
- Mr. Cleary commented the action for tonight is if you would like to declare your intent to serve as lead agency.

Motion was made by Eileen McCalin to declare the board's intent to serve as lead agency, seconded by Steven Schwann, all members present voted in favor.