

TOWN OF MOUNT PLEASANT

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING BOARD TOWN OF MOUNT PLEASANT WESTCHESTER COUNTY, N.Y. HELD APRIL 2, 2026

BUSINESS ITEMS

Minutes from 3-16-2026 Planning Board Meeting

Motion was made by Jane Abbate to adopt the minutes, seconded by Eileen McClain, 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 Daniel Paesano, John Flanagan of Blythedale and traffic consultant Phillip Greeley appeared on behalf of Blythedale Children's Hospital to address comments from the board and public. The following was discussed:

- We were last here in October where the board asked us to reappear when all comments have been replied to. Our submission was made in early March covering those public hearing comments.
- Recap of application included:
 - Additional beds are needed to cover New York State projection.
 - Water and sewer will be coming from Greenberg.
 - We have received and replied to comments from the fire department, planning board, public, Town Engineer, and planning consultant.
 - Project will be developed in three phases: phase 1 is the parking structure with 132 spaces, phase 2 is the access road, phase 3 is the second-story addition.
- So far there have not been any significant impacts identified.
- Additional landscape has been proposed at the buffer areas.

- This property is not in a critical environmental area.
- There is no evidence of flooding within a quarter century, and not at all since the last addition.
- We have supplied a phone number for security that can be used 24/7.
- The maintenance complaints on Bradhurst Avenue are not relevant.
- There will be pedestrian improvements to the intersection with public cross ways.
- There will be an extended sidewalk from Bradhurst Ave to Grasslands Road
- Light projection is not calculated to exceed past the parcel line.
- Showed drainage improvements from the 2008 Building addition.
- There is a proposed drainage plan with this current application,
- General opposition from the public is not enough to merit an EIS.

Board member comments:

- Is there a maintenance plan for the upkeep of the parcel? Reply, we can provide that.
- Is there any new impervious surface with the parking garage? Reply, no, but the existing walkways and landscaping will result in new impervious surface.
- Is the garage an addition designed with potential for future expansion? Reply, not in our design, the intent is to not exceed the current plan.
- Is that the same for long-term care facility? Reply, it is not structurally designed to expand vertically.
- Another third-party review will be done on the traffic report. Miss. Giris questioned that as Labella has already been employed and reported on this as well as the town engineer, as well as DOT, why this additional one? We are paying for a third opinion, nothing has changed on the plans. Chairman Collins replied there is a lot of concern on the traffic from the public and this board.

Public comments

Michael Savino, one Lisa Lane – he read the applicant reply from March 2 to the public hearing comments.

- The 2008 flooding was on his property. They hired an engineer to work with the Blythdale engineer to rip up and redo the drainage plan.
- They project 75 new employees, how could that possibly not affect traffic?
- Lisa Lane is overlooked in their traffic report.
- Traffic counts were on a Tuesday, a Saturday and Sunday. this is not representative of their operation during the week.
- Property maintenance – compare their parcel to anyone nearby of similar size in that area, Blythdale is in worse condition.
- The trees they are proposing are not going to hide the new parking structure.
- Their grade is already elevated above ours on Lisa Lane, so the 44 ft proposed setback of the garage is way over our houses. I invite you to come to Lisa Lane.

- They have proposed no other alternatives other than slightly taller trees. No other changes have been made at all, they are continuing with their original plan. They have never changed it at all.
- Six residents of Lisa Lane met with Blythedale, they considered offering to purchase the lane.

Mrs. Chiappa, – 5 Lisa Lane.

- Their submission is not reality of what is happening.
- At what point does the development end?
- Current trees are dead or nonexistent, so the visual is already up to the building.
- Add the new 47 foot setback of the parking garage and I'm going to have a hard time selling my property. The code calls for a 200 foot buffer for a reason.
- The applicant is breaking the code and they know it and they don't care

Sean Quigley, Armond place

- The attorney claims that comments were sent in through an AI program, I have been filing foils, reviewing plans, pulling records from here and Greenberg. These were not AI-generated comments. a lot of time and research went into my submissions.
- The DOT is involved now because of a letter I wrote last week.
- Clearly comments dated April 3, 2025 asked for an alternative scaled-down plan, and yet they have not provided anything.
- All their previous applications throughout the years were all negative declarations and unlisted actions.
- They are proposing 250 truckloads of 10,000 yd.² of fill removal and yet their impact is none.
- I am not opposed to the work that they do, but they are asking for a lot.
- Why wouldn't they want a positive declaration, and an impact statement just to keep their own employees safer? I have sent in many pictures showing their employees crossing the street at night and evening pushing people in wheelchairs on this busy intersection.

Speaker number five

Glenn Accocella – Valhalla

- I spoke to Mr. Flanagan about his employees and how they cross the street at night. His reply was once they leave my property, they are on their own.
- 90% of the traffic that comes out of the south driveway makes a right turn and another right to get onto the parkway.
- In 2008 during their last expansion, I had asked them to do an interior road that goes around the parcel. They commented that they could not do it, yet now because they want it they can find a way to do it.

- That intersection of Grasslands and Bradhurst Avenue still needs to be looked at
- They should at least consider a right-turn in and a right-turn out option for traffic flow.

Chairman Collins thanked the public for their participation and comments and stated that he himself drives by there three times a week. He's very familiar with the intersection and the traffic.

Comments from Board members

- We have requested another traffic study to review what has been submitted by the applicant.
- Can you confirm that the traffic study was performed on a Thursday a Saturday and a Sunday? Mr. Philip Greeley, replied the traffic report had a second analysis and the study does include additional trips for this expansion. The dates were weekday peaks a.m. and afternoon. The state has its own data, we used that as well. We looked at weekends due to the parking issues. New York State DOT is an involved agency They reviewed and gave comments. Their data shows a lot of right-hand turns onto grasslands. The town engineer's letter from today states that he is leaving it up to the DOT. The DOT did review and they're not permitting a turn onto Grasslands Rd. Mister Cleary questioned if school was in session on the February 24 date?
- Chairman Collins commented the new analysis will be reviewed from a third-party traffic consultant. Miss Janet Giris stated she was disappointed that there is a need for additional traffic study, as this will be the third. She asked the board to carefully review their last submission, Blythedale is not required to correct the existing conditions in that area, they are only to be responsible for their own additional impact with this proposed application.

Motion was made by Eileen McLain to continue the public hearing until we hear from the traffic consultant, seconded by Steven Schwan, all members present voted in favor.

NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

2. Proposed: Vacant Parcel Bradhurst Ave/Jackson Ave, development of a new single-family dwelling on a vacant parcel,

Application: Steep Slopes #SS-25-17

Location: Vacant Parcel Jackson Ave

Section/Block/Lot: 112.9-1-2

Zone: R-10

Owner: Brighton Ave Properties, LLC

Applicant/ Contract Vendee: Coolen Homes, Inc.

Engineer: Caccioppoli Engineering, PLLC

Motion was made by Jane Abbate to waive the reading of the public notice and open the public

hearing, second in by Eileen McLain, all members present voted in favor.

Engineer Greg Cacciopole appeared on behalf of the owner to present the application, the following was discussed:

- This application is for steep slopes, which are present at the entrance of the parcel, you cross over them to access the parcel to get to the home portion.
- There are no wetlands or flood planes on this parcel.
- The parcel is fully compliant. No variances are required.
- The plans are designed to lesson the impact to the steep slope disturbance and to balance out the cut and fill. The driveway was moved.
- The engineering department has completed their review of our application.

Comments from the Public:

Hector Rivera – 344 Jackson Ave.

- My property is mainly adjacent to the west.
- The slopes on this side are pretty extreme.
- 150 truckloads of fill are going into the site. How will the trucks line up? On a daily basis do you know how many trucks will come in and what is the traffic management of that? Chairman Collins commented the Building department will get a construction management plan.
- Our street was newly paved, it is beautiful, what will 150 trucks due to that and who will fix it? Chairman Collins mentioned a bond will most likely be in place to cover any road costs.
- There are trees that are leaning over onto my property from his, who was responsible for those? Chairman Collins replied there is a tree management plan. Reply, they are not getting ripped out by the roots, the stumps can be ground.
- How will the noise from the construction site be monitored? Chairman Collins replied there is a code governing that as well. Building Inspector, Sal Pennelle commented fill is tested and certified to be cleaned by soil reports, 8 AM to 5 PM is construction time.

Scott Carr, 338 Jackson Ave.- what type of retaining walls are being constructed? Reply, they are Cambridge blocks gravity walls, geo grid, it is held up by the weight of the soil itself.

- Is this proposed construction, any relation to the other parcel below? Reply, no, there are two separate owners. This one is the house in the residential zone.

Greg Locaski, 336 Jackson Ave.- I am home all day, this is going to be a very difficult undertaking. How will the staging of the trucks be handled? This is a very narrow road, I can almost see eight dump trucks lined up on Jackson Avenue blocking our access. Building Inspector Sal Pennelle, replied did we can help regulate the trucks to a limit of 3 to 4.

- My wife and I have health issues and may need to get out of the house in a hurry, I don't want to be blocked by a truck. Mr. Cleary commented a construction plan will be set up to avoid blocking driveways. Chairman Collins commented this can be documented somewhere as well.

End of public comments.

Planning, board members had no further comments.

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

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

NEW APPLICATIONS

3. Proposed: 1 Maple Street Subdivision of one lot into two for the development of a Single-Family Dwelling.

Application: Subdivision # PSD 26-3

Location: 1 Maple Street, Valhalla

Section/Block/Lot: 117.11-4-14

Zone: R-10

Owner: Vernillo Gaicomo

Applicant & Architect: John Anastasiou

Architect John Anastascio appeared on behalf of the homeowner to present the application, the following was discussed:

- The property owners would like to divide this parcel into two lots so they can give one to their child.
- Lot one will have the existing house and will need a variance, as a corner it has two fronts so the mean width will need a variance.
- Lot two has access only from Columbus Avenue, a variance for mean width will be required as well. All other zoning regulations are compliant.
- The lot is drawn in an L configuration so to meet most of the zoning regulations.
- Cleary consultant memo recognizes the variances required.
- Water and sewer are on Columbus Avenue.

Comments from Board members:

- This is not a typical lot, It is kind of jigsaw looking.
- You are creating an additional access curb cut to Columbus. You should look at a

turnaround on the site, perhaps a K turn.

- Columbus Avenue is a County Road. They will have input on the new curb cut.
- What would you do if the County says no to a new curb cut? Reply, we would pursue some type of easement on the existing lot.
- County input will be critical. It wouldn't be shocking if they said no.
- Does the existing house have stormwater management? Reply, keeping the house is the obstacle that we are working around.
- Preserving an existing house is good green practice as you are saving a home, but not at the cost of noncompliance.
- How will the house be heated? Will an oil truck be backing up onto the parcel from Columbus Avenue?
- A K-turn is definitely needed on this parcel
- Comments from engineering are still to come, you also need to reply to Cleary comments as well. You may have to rework the plan.
- At this time, you are not ready for the Zoning Board.

4. Proposed: * ADJOURNED *** 625 & 635 Marble Ave Renewal of Special Use Permit, Gasoline Filling Station with convenience store and car wash in accordance with [§ 218-33](#)**

Application: Site Plan #PSP 25-8

Location: 635 Marble Avenue, Thornwood

Section/Block/Lot: 106.14-1-32

Zone: TH

Owner: Holden Stephen JR & James

Applicant & Attorney: Zarin & Steinmetz; LLC

5. 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

Architect.. Jonathan Villani appeared on behalf of the owner to present the application, the following was discussed:

- Applicant had already worked on the lot as he was adding a deck, during the inspection of the deck the inspector noticed the extra fill brought in.
- No drainage structures are in the area of disturbance.
- Soil contents contain a high value of a contaminant so no vegetation is able to be grown

on that portion.

- We are working with engineering and their existing records for a pre-existing grading plan.

Board member comments:

- Please show us pre-and post grading plans.
- Is this area prone to flooding? Reply, to be determined.
- Please continue working on the application and replying to all comments.

6. 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

Mr. Steven McDonough of Aresco company appeared on behalf of the owner to present the application, the following was discussed:

- Application is for rooftop solar on two of the existing rooftops of the generator building and the UV building.
- This will action is considered to be low impact to the site.
- The height is in compliance to the code.

Board member comments

- This is a very busy site. You should be coordinating with DEP as they have the tunnel work for the KEC project ongoing at the same time this will be constructed.
- This is a type 2 SEQR action.
- A special use approval from the Town Board is required for work in a watershed parcel, this is procedural.
- What is this powering? Reply, they are receiving credit for 10% to the facility then the rest of the power will go to the grid.

Motion was made by Steven Schwan to schedule a public hearing, seconded by Eileen McLain, all members present voted in favor.

Mr. Cleary commented the use is not permitted until the Town Board approval is granted, that can be conditioned with this approval.

7. Proposed: 28 Country Club Lane 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.

Application: Steep Slopes SS 26-3

Location: 28 Country Club Lane, Briarcliff Manor

Section/Block/Lot: 104.15-1-33

Zone: R-20

Owner & Applicant: David Eun & Rochelle Yu

Engineer: Daniel Collins, Hudson Engineering

Architect: RES4 Prefabs

Engineers Rob Long, and Daniel Collins appeared on behalf of the owner to present the application, the following was discussed:

- Background was given on the current conditions of the parcel and situation:
 - In 2023 there was a slope failure, resulting in a landslide that went onto four lanes of the MTA tracks.
 - At some point in time on this property, fill was brought in and three retaining walls were constructed.
 - When the slope failed the walls, landscaping, trees, all failed with the slope.
 - The building department and emergency service units responded immediately and helped to stabilize the slope.
 - The rails shifted on the tracks, MTA had to come and replace the rails.
 - REMUS has been working with the Building Inspector since on a plan to rebuild.
- 90% of this hill is Metro North property.
- This application will restore the entire slope for both parcels. There will be a temporary stabilization with Geo Tek to the Building department's satisfaction. Then we will work on the permanent stabilization.
- The client is going above and beyond to stabilize their property and the MTA slopes.
- 10 firms are currently working on this plan, it includes boring soil samples, soil nails into the slope with a meshed grid that will hold the soil back.
- 300 soil nails 25 foot long will go into a 4 inch hole that will hold a 1 1/2" inch bar mesh into place.
- We are estimating this to be six months worth of work.
- This is also an erosion control blanket, allowing permeability that slope will then be vegetated.
- It is a 70% grade on that slope. The top of the slope will be leveled 10 feet to help get it to the 70%.

- MTA has issued their entry permit. They are waiting on the approval to fund it. Sal Pennelle commented that the Metro North engineers went to the neighboring properties to evaluate the condition of their slopes.
- The existing house will be demolished with the foundation to remain to act as a retaining wall. Then they can grade the rest into the slope.
- A new smaller, modest single-family dwelling with a driveway will be built for the homeowners to reside in.
- The current homeowners bought this property a year before the slope failure. It was rented out the entire time, the owner has never lived in it.
- The cost to rebuild the slope itself is \$1.5 million.

Comments from board members:

- Will MTA track outages be required to perform any of this work? Reply, no, there is a 20ft hard barrier offset to the MTA. All logistics have been thought of and in great detail.
- You should be ready to address traffic with the truck loads. Reply, this will all be addressed at the beginning, so it does not go on for the entirety of the project. Sal Pennelle commented. This is a large cul-de-sac. There will be room for staging of a truck while one is on the parcel.

Motion was made by Eileen McLian to schedule a public hearing, seconded by Steve Schwan, all members present voted in favor.