

TOWN OF MOUNT PLEASANT

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING BOARD TOWN OF MOUNT PLEASANT WESTCHESTER COUNTY, N.Y. HELD JUNE 4, 2026

BUSINESS ITEMS

Minutes from 5-18-2026 Planning Board Meeting

Motion was made by Walter Hickey to adopt the minutes from the 5-18-26 Planning Board meeting, seconded by JD Summa. All members present voted in favor.

Adoption of resolution of approval for Site Plan Application # PSP 25-7 Renewal of Special Use Permit Gas Filling Station in accordance with Town [Code § 218-33](#), 361 Bradhurst Ave, Hawthorne, 112.9-1-4, HH Zone, Hawthorne Enterprises, LLC.

Motion was made by Eileen McClain to adopt the resolution, seconded by Jane Abbate, all members present voted in favor.

***** ADJOURNED *****

~~95 Bradhurst, Blythedale Children's Hospital, Adoption of SEQR Negative Declaration and determination of Zoning Board Referral for Site Plan Application # PSP 25-2 for the proposed three-phase improvement plan including expansion for long-term care, parking deck, and improvements to site utilities and infrastructure. 95 Bradhurst Avenue, Valhalla, 117.17-1-2, R-20 Zone, Blythedale Children's Hospital~~

226-228 Linda Ave, Cedar Knolls. Acceptance of SEQR [Scoping Document](#) for the proposed subdivision of a 126.5 acre parcel into 91 lots: 87 single-family residential lots, 3 conservation/open space lots and 1 lot to continue the school operations. 226-228 Linda Ave, Hawthorne, 112.10-4-26, R-40 Zoning, The Jewish Board of Family & Children's Services

Comments from Board Members:

- Mr Patrick Cleary commented there is one change in the Demographic Community Service section. We included all fire departments, police departments and EMS, but we had listed Valhalla as the principal fire district, but it is actually Hawthorne so we need to just flip that around. Both of them have always been in there, we just need to make Hawthorn the primary.
- Does the scope identify Westerly Lane to be studied? Reply from Mr. Cleary: The traffic impact analysis is done by intersections, not length of roadway. But the length of

roadway is in the intersection studies that are covered in a sense the intersection entering and around Westerly Lane. So yes, it will be studied.

- Could we even decide to extend that study all the way down Westerly should we see fit?
Reply by Mr Patrick Cleary, This is your requirement to do the first cut of traffic impact analysis, once they submit that analysis we may ask them to extend it or modify or revise it. This is intended to be an iterative process. This is the very first step in that process when we're creating a framework of study that you will then be in charge of evaluating, modifying, revising as you move forward through the process. It's a frustratingly prolonged process, and you have to sort of be patient in order to get to where decisions are made on issues like this and other issues. For example, we've seen lots of commentary about the applicant's lot count. That's an applicant's starting point. There is no decision with respect to the lot count, there is no count at this point and there won't be until you go through the process of studying the site and evaluating all these issues like traffic and wetlands and soon. So it's very likely the lot count will change.
- It is worth noting again though for the record that this is just the start of this process and there's a lot of things that will come out from the original documentation that we're going to want further studies on, there are required public hearings that the public will be engaged and all those documents will be shared publically.
- This is the first step in a long way to go, we may agree or disagree with some of the initial responses that they have and we will definitely provide our feedback if we do disagree along with the comments. A couple things that we did get back from the community one being was talking about taking no action on the site. Another one of them was theoretically if we did go through Summit Lake Drive or would that look like another one was looking at access from Westley Lane, or not looking at Westerly Lane. So there's a couple things of that nature that we've looked at. that the Ford provided for his extensive, extensive, extensive feedback from the public that I personally read, I know all the board member have done the same thing.
- Mr. Patrick Cleary commented for each of those alternatives. Every one of the issues in the document studied: community services, traffic and environment issues etc, each element gets studied, and that's for each of those alternatives.

Motion was made by JD Summa to adopt the scoping document with the previously mentioned change, seconded by Eileen McClain, all members present voted in favor.

NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. 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.

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

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

- Grading is proposed for this yard to make it more usable.
- At this point there is no fill being brought in or being delivered to his property.
- Looking for approval for the steep slopes permit this evening.

No comments from the Board.

No comments from the public.

Motion was made by Eileen McClain to close the public hearing and direct the preparation of a resolution of approval, seconded by Walter Hickey, all members present voted in favor.

2. Proposed: 388 Nannyhagen Rd, construction of a new Accessory 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.

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

- We presented a couple times, the plan complies with all the zoning accessory apartment requirements.
- The owners are looking to put their daughter and son-in-law in the apartment downstairs with their special-needs child, that's what we're trying to accomplish with this application.

Board member comments:

- So three people are going to be living in 569 Sq.Ft., it sounds tight. Reply, it is, but the owners of the house are the parents. They're proposing an addition so from a functional standpoint, they'll be spread out a little more in the basement. So simultaneously we're doing an accessory apartment and also putting an addition on the house. So there's going to be space to move out to, but all the criteria for the accessory department Bathroom, bedrooms, window egress, everything is compliant and is within that 559SqFt..
- Those three bedrooms and office proposed for the addition will not count for legal purposes? Reply by Mr. Patrick Cleary - That is correct, there is no foul in the families sharing space outside of the apartment. Any new owners would have to reapply for the special use so they can make it their own determination at that time.

No public comments

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

Motion was made by Walter Hickey to have the consultant draft a resolution of approval, seconded by Jane Abbate, all members present voted in favor.

CONTINUING APPLICATIONS

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

Landscape architect. Daniel Sherman appeared with homeowner Gerard Salvaggio to present the application, the following was discussed:

- We made some revisions for the plan, we removed the perimeter fence that was way up and all the way around.
- We are just putting a fence right around the pool and patio.
- To stop the balls from flying off we added more plantings
- To make a bigger play yard we also pushed the arborvitae hedge in line with the front of the house.

- We appreciate everyone's input and the compromise that was made. =

Comments from Board Members:

- Thank you for that change.
- You saved alot of money on fence.

Motion was made by Eileen McClain to have the consultant draft a resolution of approval, seconded by Walter Hickey, all members present voted in favor.

NEW APPLICATIONS

- 4. Proposed: 790 & 780 King Street, Chappaqua, The proposed lot line change contemplates the dedication of 0.23 acres of land in the Town of Mt. Pleasant to 780 King Street from 790 King Street, and, in return, the dedication of 0.22 acres of land in the Town of New Castle to 790 King Street from 780 King Street, which land has frontage along the western side of King Street.**

Application: Subdivision #PSD-26-6

Location: 780 & 790 King St, Chappaqua

Section/Block/Lot: 100.17-1-30, 31, 32 & 33 (Town of Mt. Pleasant)
108.5-1-10, 108.5-1-1 & 108.05-1-9 (Town of

New Castle)

Zone: R-40

Owners& Applicant: Laura & Michael Strober; Claire & Joseph Dunn

Engineer/Architect: Brendan Coleman, PLS, TC Merritts land Surveyors

Attorney: Cuddy & Feder, LLP

Attorney Danielle Cohen appeared on behalf of the Applicants/Homeowners to present the application, the following was discussed:

- This subdivision will eliminate the nonconforming side yard setback of the garage at 790.
- Just for a point of clarification. The original application was .33 of an acres for .22 , but since then i has been revised and now the amended proposal is a one for one .22 of an acre for .22 of an acre from 780 Hardscrabble in Newcastle going to 790 Hardscrabble in Mount Pleasant.
- Circa 2012 2013 the garage was built without permits and a good portion of it was built onto 790. As a compromise, the Strobers, the owners of 790, and the prior owners of 780 agreed that the garage could remain so long as the Strobers could build a little parking and turnaround area because they had that narrow driveway that made it dangerous.
- One thing I don't believe was captured in our application materials is an elevation

change. from 532 to 610 so that's an approximate 80 foot elevation change. It makes sense to have the property that is level and adjacent to 780 be conveyed to it as well for the Newcastle portion.

Comments from Board members:

- Mr Patrick Cleary commented, the only slight issue is what once was a straight line you have now made into a jagged lot line, this is less of a concern because the zigzag line is on the interior between the two lots. With one of the properties at 12+ acres in size, it is again less of an issue.
- It is a relatively minor action and it is legalizing those existing conditions. It is a one-for-one land swap that solves the problem.
- I did a drive by and it is understandable.
- Normal procedure on a minor subdivision is to go straight to final plat approval, however we still need to hear from the Town Engineer.

Motion was made by Eileen McClain to have the application proceed to a public hearing conditioned upon satisfaction of Engineering comments, seconded by Walter Hickey, all members present voted in favor.