

TOWN OF CORTLANDT
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARDS

BOARD MEETING

Town Hall
1 Heady Street
Cortlandt Manor, New York 1057

March 3, 2026

6:30 p.m. - 7:42 p.m.

March 3, 2026

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Steven Kessler, Chairman

Thomas A. Bianchi, Vice Chairman

Kevin Kobasa, Member

Peter McKinley, Member

Jeff Rothfeder, Member

Kellan Cantrell, Alternate

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Nora Hildinger, Member

ALSO PRESENT:

Chris Kehoe, AICP, Director of Planning

Michael Cunningham, Esq., Deputy Town Attorney

Heather LaVarnway, CNU-A, Planner

Chris Lapine, P.E., Engineer

Catherine Brosnan, P.E., Assistant Civil Engineer

1 March 3, 2026

2 (The board meeting commenced at 6:30 p.m.)

3 MR. STEVEN KESSLER: Welcome to the
4 planning board meeting of March 3rd. Please rise
5 for the pledge.

6 MULTIPLE: I pledge allegiance to the
7 flag of the United States of America and to the
8 republic for which it stands, one nation under
9 God, indivisible with liberty and justice for
10 all.

11 MR. KESSLER: Roll please, Chris.

12 MR. CHRIS KEHOE: Mr. Kobasa.

13 MR. KEVIN KOBASA: Here.

14 MR. KEHOE: Ms. Timko?

15 MS. KAREN TIMKO: Here.

16 MR. KEHOE: Mr. Rothfeder?

17 MR. JEFF ROTHFEDER: Here.

18 MR. KEHOE: Mr. Kessler?

19 MR. KESSLER: Here.

20 MR. KEHOE: Mr. Bianchi?

21 MR. THOMAS BIANCHI: Here.

22 MR. KEHOE: Mr. Cantrell?

23 MR. KELLAN CANTRELL: Here.

24 MR. KEHOE: Mr. McKinley?

1 March 3, 2026

2 MR. PETER MCKINLEY: Here.

3 MR. KEHOE: Ms. Hildinger noted as
4 absent.

5 MR. KESSLER: Thank you. We have a
6 change to the agenda tonight. There are two items
7 that'll be removed from the agenda per the,
8 excuse me. Excuse me.

9 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Sorry.

10 MR. KESSLER: We have two changes to the
11 agenda. We have two items that be removed per the
12 applicant's request. That is the public hearing
13 regarding VS Construction for Evergreen Manner,
14 and secondly, under old business, the application
15 of 70 Roa Hook Road Realty for a site development
16 plan by Annesville Circle for a former car wash.
17 Can I please have a motion for the adoption of
18 our minutes, the meeting of February 2nd?

19 MR. BIANCHI: So moved.

20 MR. MCKINLEY: Second.

21 MR. KESSLER: Second, thank you. One the
22 question, all in favor?

23 MULTIPLE: Aye.

24 MR. KESSLER: Opposed? All right. First

1 March 3, 2026

2 item is a letter dated February 20, 2026 from Jim
3 Annicchiarico requesting the fifth six-month time
4 extension for preliminary plat approval for the
5 Pomona Development, LLC subdivision located on
6 the south side of Revolutionary Road south of
7 Eaton Lane. Jeff?

8 MR. ROTHFEDER: Mr. Chair, I move that
9 we approve resolution 6-26. Is that right?

10 MR. KESSLER: Yeah, that's it.

11 MR. ROTHFEDER: Yeah.

12 MR. KESSLER: Second please.

13 MR. BIANCHI: Second.

14 MR. KESSLER: And on the question? All
15 in favor?

16 MULTIPLE: Aye.

17 MR. KESSLER: Opposed? Okay. All right,
18 the next item is a public hearing and it's an
19 adjourned public hearing. It is the public
20 hearing application of Yeshiva Ohr Hameir for
21 site plan approval, an amended special permit for
22 a university, college or seminary, and a wetland
23 permit for a proposed 51,730 square foot
24 dormitory building, the repurposing of other

1 March 3, 2026

2 buildings on site, site improvements including
3 storm water, landscaping, and building facade
4 renovations located at the existing Yeshiva Ohr
5 Hameir campus at 141 Furnace Woods Road, latest
6 drawings, February 18, 2026. Mr. Schwartz, good
7 evening.

8 MR. BRAD SCHWARTZ: Good evening,
9 Chairman Kessler, members of the board and staff.
10 For the record, Brad Schwartz from Zarin and
11 Steinmetz representing the Yeshiva, joined
12 tonight by Steve Marino, Dan Ciarcia, and my
13 associate Vincent Pedone. So were last here on
14 January 6th. That was the second public hearing
15 session. Tonight will be the third public hearing
16 session.

17 Since the last meeting our team met with
18 town staff to address certain outstanding
19 engineering items. We made a submission on
20 February 18th addressing those engineering items,
21 including a letter from Mr. Ciarcia. I'm not
22 going to run the table on all of them, but just
23 to highlight a few. As requested by planning, we
24 submitted a photometric plan that shows all dark

1 March 3, 2026
2 sky compliant lighting. Thanks to engineering's
3 assistance, we met on site with the fire
4 department and resolved all turnaround and
5 accessibility issues on the site with the fire
6 department and addressed all those outstanding
7 items. We also submitted a revised SWPPP and we
8 think we made a lot of progress as was mentioned
9 during the work session with respect to the storm
10 water design. The board had requested updated
11 architectural floor plans. We submitted those as
12 well. So you have all of this info that was
13 recently submitted. Our team is here to answer
14 any questions. Otherwise, we're happy to listen
15 to the additional public comment this evening and
16 hopefully your board will be in a position to
17 close the hearing at the end of the night.

18 MR. KESSLER: Okay. Well, the board has
19 I think, a number of comments, but let's wait
20 until after we hear from the public and then
21 we'll address them.

22 MR. SCHWARTZ: Perfect.

23 MR. KESSLER: With that, this is a
24 public hearing. Is there anybody that wishes to

1 March 3, 2026

2 comment on the application? Please come up, state
3 your name, address for the record. Yeah, please.

4 MS. LINDA MCMANN: Hi, good evening.
5 Linda McMann, 14 Lakeview Avenue West. Good
6 evening chair person and members of the planning
7 board. Thank you for the opportunity to speak
8 this evening. I'd like to emphasize the
9 importance of grounding this application review
10 of the town's established land use standards and
11 environmental protections. The Yeshiva's proposal
12 presents significant questions about code
13 compliance, neighborhood compatibility, and
14 potential impacts to sensitive wetland areas, all
15 of which require careful fact-based evaluation
16 under town codes and SEQRA. My comments this
17 evening focus on these core regulatory
18 responsibilities and why they should guide the
19 board's decision moving forward.

20 First, I respectfully urge the
21 board to apply chapter 307 of the Town Code,
22 which clearly establishes the standards governing
23 what may be built and how it must relate to its
24 surroundings. The code requires the new

1 March 3, 2026

2 development be compatible with the scaled massing
3 roof forms and materials of the neighborhood.
4 This property is located within and directly
5 adjacent to an established single family
6 residential neighborhood. Because of this, I
7 asked the board, I asked that the board require
8 any new buildings, including the proposed 51,000
9 square foot dormitory to be designed in a matter
10 that reflects the existing residential character
11 of both the campus and the neighboring homes.
12 Large multistory institutional structures are
13 markedly different in massing and appearance from
14 the existing buildings on the site and from the
15 surrounding residential area. Under chapter 307,
16 compatibility is not optional, it's a
17 requirement. RLUIPA does not override or displace
18 neutral general, applicable, applicable land use
19 regulations such as these. RLUIPA does not
20 prevent the board from enforcing objective zoning
21 criteria related to height, massing, neighborhood
22 character, aesthetics, and environmental
23 standards so as long as they're applied fairly
24 and uniformly. In this case, the board is acting

1 March 3, 2026

2 fully within its authority.

3 Second, I would like to address the
4 potential risk that the construction activity,
5 particularly any building expansion, may pose to
6 the wetlands. Any materials or runoff entering
7 the wetlands can travel through the Blue Mountain
8 Reservation, flow into Lake Rose, and ultimately
9 reach the field in front of the middle school. As
10 many of you likely know, that front field floods
11 during heavy storms. Given this downstream
12 vulnerability, especially in an area where
13 children are present, it is essential that a
14 thorough, well-documented, science-based
15 environmental investigation be conducted in
16 accordance with Chapter 179.

17 This need is heightened by the fact that
18 one of the stated justifications for the sewer
19 installation was concerns that nitrates and
20 pathogens could be present in the wetlands.
21 RLUIPA does not exempt any applicant from meeting
22 environmental requirements under Chapter 179, and
23 these obligations remain critical to ensuring the
24 protection of our wetlands and safety of our

1 March 3, 2026

2 community.

3 With that being said, under Chapter 179,
4 as well as SEQRA, I respectfully request that the
5 board require comprehensive groundwater sampling,
6 a downstream contamination, contamination
7 analysis, soil testing in the flood prone areas
8 of the middle school. Without baseline
9 groundwater data, a downstream impact assessment
10 and complete wetland studies, the board cannot
11 confidently make the legally required finding
12 that this project will not adversely affect
13 wetlands, public lands, or public health.

14 These are not extraordinary requests.
15 These are basic safeguards required when
16 development is proposed adjacent to protected
17 wetlands, known flood prone areas and public
18 facilities used by children.

19 Along these lines, it is essential to
20 recognized that large scale construction as well
21 as tree removal, can significantly alter
22 hydrology. Redirected storm water has the
23 potential to carry untreated runoff directly into
24 protected wetlands. At this time, it is not clear

1 March 3, 2026

2 that the applicant has demonstrated that these
3 impacts will be avoided or sufficiently mitigated
4 as required under Chapter 179.

5 Therefore, I ask that a wetlands
6 environmental analysis be submitted to the board
7 that evaluates the cumulative impacts of the
8 building. Expansion tree, tree removal
9 construction activity, alter drainage patterns,
10 changes to grading and storm water runoff.

11 In closing, I urge the board to ensure
12 that all applicable, applicable sections of town
13 codes and SEQRA are fully satisfied before any
14 special permit amendment or wetlands permit is
15 granted. These reviews are designed to protect
16 our environmental resources, public safety and
17 wellbeing of the entire community. Once again,
18 RLUIPA does not prevent the board from requiring
19 full compliance with these neutral standard
20 regulatory requirements. Thank you for your time
21 and for your thorough evaluation of this
22 application. I look forward to the forthcoming
23 results on the environmental impact analysis.
24 Thank you.

1 March 3, 2026

2 MR. KESSLER: Thank you. Anybody else
3 wish to comment?

4 MS. SHERRY ANN COOK: Good evening,
5 ladies and gentlemen. I am Sherry Ann Cook. I
6 reside within the town of Cortlandt, and I am
7 speaking regarding a great deal of work and
8 research I've done on this, the entirety of this
9 project, especially the records that I got from
10 the Department of Health as a result of my FOIL.
11 I believe that no matter what is said at any of
12 these public hearings, that the town undertaking
13 what the Yeshiva could not do for itself from
14 2007 until 2021 presents a specific question on
15 federal law of whether or not the town itself has
16 violated the establishment clause for separation
17 between church and state. Against the
18 representations for RLUIPA, also known by some as
19 RLUIPA or religious and institutionalized persons
20 land use act. I present that these questions can
21 be answered by a federal court.

22 I do not, I am personally very upset
23 that our tax dollars and public grants were used
24 to forward the interests of only a religious

1 March 3, 2026

2 entity. And the case law that I have researched,
3 which started out from a decision of 1994,
4 involving Kiryas Joel and the Woodbury school
5 district, gave me the trail of this case law
6 about the violation of the establishment clause
7 between separation of church and state. The town
8 has forwarded the interests of only the yeshiva,
9 no other entity.

10 The project that the town undertook does
11 not represent any secular or public purpose.
12 These 130 proposed or possible or potential
13 houses that might at some unknown future be
14 utilized, the town never even had those pieces or
15 parcels of property authorized for the wastewater
16 to go to the county trunk and the Peekskill
17 sanitary sewer district. Only the yeshiva is
18 allowed and authorized to ever use that facility.
19 No matter what sewer district you create here,
20 the Yeshiva is consistently mentioned as the only
21 customer.

22 I reviewed over 667 pages. I filed with
23 Chris Kehoe, David Steinmetz, because I expected
24 him to be here tonight. And Laroue Shatzkin, I

1 March 3, 2026

2 filed everything that I have given, that I have
3 received. I have given it to the town as well as
4 anybody who's authorized me to email the
5 documents to them. So the town, what they did in
6 creating the sewer district and only doing so
7 with public funds for the Yeshiva presents this
8 establishment clause issue. I'm not even going to
9 get into the merits because honestly, it seems
10 like no matter what anybody says or does, it
11 doesn't matter, because everybody just wants to
12 go forward with this. And I think that's
13 inappropriate.

14 I personally think Michael Cunningham,
15 copying Senator Harckham on correspondence, that
16 Michael Preziosi and Michael Cunningham were the
17 leads on what the town did, that Dr. Becker
18 started this whole thing in 2020 with a short
19 form EAF for a SEQRA, which was rejected. The
20 time, expense and money that has been put into
21 this, and there are documents from the county
22 legislators that says, the town has paid for all
23 of this, or gotten public grants from public tax
24 dollars.

1 March 3, 2026

2 So all of that, everybody can argue
3 about the separation of church and state issue
4 that is for a federal court determination in my
5 experience as paralegal working with federal
6 courts.

7 The second thing that I want to bring up
8 is that I think that I have more than established
9 to the planning board and the town that there are
10 multiple acts of what is known as bad faith in
11 legal terms. There's proof in the Department of
12 Health records that someone at the Yeshiva tried
13 to bribe a health inspector on February 1, 2024.
14 They are now going by the Yeshiva form
15 settlements since January of '25. You know,
16 they're working in New Jersey and not having any
17 kind of real legal, from what I understand, legal
18 standing here in New York for operating while
19 they're in New Jersey. The tax certificate I gave
20 to you guys, I've given this town a whole lot of
21 documents, well over a thousand pages at my own
22 expense. But I think that I have shown that for
23 the last, at minimum 15 years, and at least
24 almost 20, they have been incompetent in running

1 March 3, 2026

2 their own property that has led to the pollution
3 and the detriment of the community at large. Dr.
4 Becker is well aware that people had to pay to
5 install private aerators in lakes around their
6 homes because of the pollution they were dumping.

7 The Department of Health records bear
8 out multiple violations, multiple agreements that
9 they never stuck to. And when the Westchester
10 County Department of Health said that they had to
11 cease all actions in 2021 on that property, that
12 is when the town stepped in with the sewer
13 project that is almost identical to the one they
14 were trying to get approved with the Department
15 of Health prior. I think that speaks to their
16 very bad faith.

17 The issue of health inspector being,
18 attempting to be bribed, makes me have to wonder
19 who else have they bribed or tried to bribe. And
20 I'm not going to name names, but I have
21 suspicions, which is why I might suggest that
22 Michael Cunningham, and at least Michael Preziosi
23 recuse themselves from anything to do with these
24 projects immediately because there is more than

1 March 3, 2026

2 just an appearance of impropriety, as well as
3 that for Senator Harckham. He is central to any
4 funding that has been given to the town.

5 Taxpayer dollars have been used and will
6 be used in the future for the sewer pump station.
7 We're paying for that, not them, we are. The
8 value of the sewer district and the, and the
9 value of our town has gone up, therefore, more
10 taxes to be collected. We are bearing that
11 expense because they're getting the benefit of
12 all of that. This is truly upsetting. There are
13 plenty of people who are angry about it. And I
14 think I have demonstrated more than enough that
15 there is more than enough bad faith by all of
16 them to say that they are not deserving of any
17 consideration from this board for anything.

18 The other thing that I will bring up
19 here is that they keep classifying their
20 application as a type two proceeding or type two
21 action under SEQRA. On the research I have done,
22 because they are changing the use of student
23 dormitories for older buildings into private
24 residences, because they're expanding the

1 March 3, 2026

2 footprint of their sanctuary, because they're
3 putting up this new building and it encompasses
4 more than 10 acres of land on their 37 acres,
5 including the pathways, the walking pathways that
6 have to be put in that was added as a result of
7 concern for students' safety. Because of all of
8 these things affect more than 10 acres of land,
9 at minimum, there should be a type one
10 proceeding, and I respectfully request the
11 planning board force them into a full
12 environmental review for all of these things.

13 Dr. Becker's application in 2020 and Mr.
14 Preziosi's in 2021 and in 2022, clearly it could
15 be argued that there were less than the truthful
16 answers to the application. The fact that the
17 authorization that the county legislators gave to
18 the town for authorization to use the sanitary
19 sewer district, the Peekskill one, the mere fact
20 that the town has not accounted for any sort of
21 calculation for whether or not the Peekskill
22 sanitary sewer district can handle any uptick
23 from these potential 130 homes is a big omission.
24 And to me, it it's interpreted as this was only

1 March 3, 2026

2 for the yeshiva. Even the authorization to use
3 the Peekskill sanitary sewer district is solely
4 for the yeshiva. And our public dollars have been
5 used to accomplish this.

6 With those arguments in mind, if anybody
7 wants me to email everything to them directly
8 instead of Chris Kehoe and Laroue Shatzkin, I
9 will be happy to do so. I have literally
10 submitted over 1,000 pages of documents to you,
11 well, to the town. I don't think they should be
12 allowed to do this, especially on the public dime
13 with the town's consent. It is unfair to every
14 property owner in the district. It was unfair to
15 every property owner to create this Furnace Woods
16 sewer district when everybody else is on septic
17 just like they used to be.

18 And if I believe that there is talk
19 about court intervention, and I would hate to see
20 that play out with we have enough political angst
21 in the world right now. But I would request that
22 you respectfully, respectfully keep all of these
23 things that I have said in mind.

24 MR. KESSLER: Can I ask you a question?

1 March 3, 2026

2 MS. COOK: Of course.

3 MR. KESSLER: You really want to leave
4 on the record the accusations you made about
5 certain people in the town?

6 MS. COOK: I have said that --

7 MR. KESSLER: Without, without any
8 proof.

9 MS. COOK: No, no, no, no. It's based
10 upon what's in the Department of Health records.
11 There are main players who are constantly
12 involved.

13 MR. KESSLER: But you're accusing them
14 of wrongdoing.

15 MS. COOK: I have said that they should
16 recuse themselves because there's, in my
17 estimation, more than just an appearance of
18 impropriety. But even an appearance of
19 impropriety would warrant at least recusing
20 themselves from anything further to do with this,
21 if anybody wants to seek court intervention,
22 especially or if there's an investigation that
23 takes place. Whether Mr. Cunningham or anybody
24 else is directly involved, I can only go by

1 March 3, 2026

2 what's in the Department of Health records. And
3 there's a strong suspicion because Michael
4 Preziosi and Mr. Cunningham are key players for
5 what was done through the town and for the
6 yeshiva.

7 MR. KESSLER: Okay. I gave you an
8 opportunity. Let me ask you another question.
9 You've been posting things on Next Door?

10 MS. COOK: Yes.

11 MR. KESSLER: I'm curious why you
12 consider the Yeshiva a cult.

13 MS. COOK: Miriam Webster's --

14 MR. KESSLER: Yeah.

15 MS. COOK: -- Definition of any
16 organized religion is defined as a cult.

17 MR. KESSLER: Okay. Let me, let me read
18 you what the definition of a cult is, if you'll
19 give me one --

20 MS. COOK: Out of, if you would mind,
21 sir, out of which, out of which --

22 MR. KESSLER: Wait, let me, let me, let
23 me you, you --

24 MS. COOK: Okay.

1 March 3, 2026

2 MR. KESSLER: You're citing definition.

3 A cult is generally defined as a social group
4 with unorthodox, extreme or novel beliefs, often
5 characterized by intense devotion to a
6 charismatic leader, strict control and isolation
7 from society. Historically, the term stems from
8 Latin cultus, adoration and cultivation
9 originally referring to a system of religious
10 worship, of rituals. Modern usage often implies
11 manipulative, coercive, or dangerous behaviors.
12 Is that what you're claiming?

13 MS. COOK: I would ask you to direct
14 your attention to the fact that women are
15 discriminated in their, in their practice of
16 religion. It's their right to do so. But that
17 kind of fanaticism in this day and age for women
18 to not be educated on an equal level with men
19 goes towards that. And all the other words that
20 have commas in them. Fanatical, they exclude
21 everybody else. My definition that I got from
22 Merriam Webster dictionary is what I based the
23 word cult on.

24 MR. KESSLER: Okay.

1 March 3, 2026

2 MS. COOK: So I used a primary source.

3 MR. KESSLER: Okay. But you also then
4 withdrew that comment in subsequent posts, did
5 you not? Did you edit it out?

6 MS. COOK: No.

7 MR. KESSLER: No? Oh, okay. I just
8 wonder if, you know, using that kind of language
9 is, you know, creates --

10 MS. COOK: I'm using that word based
11 upon a primary source, the Merriam Webster
12 dictionary.

13 MR. KESSLER: Okay. All right, well
14 thank you for your comments.

15 MS. COOK: Thank you.

16 MR. KESSLER: Anybody else wish to
17 comment? [applause] Please, please, please.
18 Rather than applaud, why don't you comment?
19 Anybody else wish to comment? Sure.

20 MR. JOHN MUELLER: John Mueller 25
21 Lakeview Avenue West. I just want a
22 clarification. I'm, I'm not involved much, I
23 don't do much reading or so, I just hear, you
24 know, it's hearsay. But am I to believe that what

1 March 3, 2026

2 I just heard here, that us taxpayers are paying
3 for this sewer line for the yeshiva? Is that, is
4 that true?

5 MR. KESSLER: My understanding that the
6 sewer line was through a grant from the state? Is
7 that correct?

8 MR. MICHAEL CUNNINGHAM: There are a few
9 different grants. The only town funds, there was
10 500,000, because the pipe was upsized. So then
11 others along the route could connect. There's
12 about 130 other parcels that could connect.

13 MR. MUELLER: Yeah. But I'm
14 understanding that they cannot tie into it. So
15 \$500,000 of our money went into the pipeline?

16 MR. KESSLER: Any, anybody along the
17 sewer route is allowed to connect to the sewer.
18 They have to pay, admittedly, there's a cost to
19 doing so. But as long as the sewer line runs in
20 front of their houses they are allowed to connect
21 to that sewer line. So it is a fact that there
22 are 130 homes that have the potential to connect
23 to that same sewer line that the yeshiva will be
24 connected to. It's a question of whether they

1 March 3, 2026

2 choose to and if they choose to pay the cost to,
3 to provide that connection. The homeowner has to
4 provide that, has to provide, has to pay for the
5 connection.

6 MR. MUELLER: Okay. Thank you for the
7 clarification.

8 MR. KESSLER: Okay. You're welcome.

9 MR. EDDIE TATLIAN: Eddie Tatlian in
10 2146 Maple Avenue. So on that note where we've, I
11 know we've, I've been here before discussing the
12 cost of this and the costs are very astronomical.
13 And as --

14 MR. KESSLER: I'm sorry, the cost of?

15 MR. TATLIAN: The cost of tying into the
16 sewer.

17 MR. KESSLER: Oh, yes.

18 MR. TATLIAN: Okay, for a residence that
19 is along this pipeline. Okay. And it seems like,
20 like everybody's been saying, we are the
21 taxpayers and \$500,000 of our taxpayer money went
22 into the yeshiva. Where's, where, where do we get
23 a break to tie into that line? We had no input on
24 the design of that, where it could have been

1 March 3, 2026

2 designed a different way where it been more
3 affordable for the people that live there to tie
4 into. We had no say in that whatsoever. The cost
5 to be what, what we have to pay for is just out
6 of control. There are people whose their, their,
7 their houses are, they distribute their, their
8 their waste into their septic in the back of
9 their homes, which is in downward position. So
10 they need, they need a pump from their house just
11 to get to the pump that they have to buy in the,
12 for the sewer system. So you say that we're
13 allowed to tie into it, but at what cost? And why
14 don't we get any break? And we're the taxpayers
15 and they don't pay any taxes. So how does that,
16 that even fair?

17 MR. KESSLER: I mean, not, not to
18 minimize your, your concerns, but these are
19 really the town board issues. I mean, the town
20 board is the one that authorizes the sewer
21 district and, and the, of the sizes of that sewer
22 pipe. So why are, why isn't there a member here
23 from that board during these meetings? Why do
24 our, our, our concerns get pushed to the side

1 March 3, 2026

2 because they're not here?

3 MR. KESSLER: Well, I mean, the sewer, I
4 mean, that, that, that's a done deal. I mean,
5 that, that was done by the town board. We're now
6 here just to address their site plan, what they
7 wish to do on their site in terms of, you know,
8 building a dormitory and a and a number of other
9 items there. You know, that's our purview right
10 now. The sewer district is, is and, and and the
11 establishment of that district had nothing to do
12 with this board. So, you know, I hate to say it,
13 but the issues that you raise really belong with
14 the town board and not with this board.

15 MR. TATLIAN: But it's all tied into
16 this situation. It's all tied into this.

17 MR. KESSLER: Well --

18 MR. TATLIAN: Without, without that
19 sewer, we wouldn't be having these conversations
20 to begin with. That was, that's what led us to
21 the, to the development of these buildings was
22 that sewer.

23 MR. KESSLER: Yeah. And, and we've been
24 discussing that sewer for, I don't know, 20

1 March 3, 2026

2 years, 20 years now, this sewer has been an issue
3 until it finally got approved by the town board.
4 I mean, the site has always been problematic with
5 their septic system. And the sewer was proposed,
6 as I said, 20 years ago to alleviate that issue
7 with their septic system. And now it's finally
8 come to fruition or close to it. And, you know,
9 hopefully that will alleviate it. Now what we are
10 here to do is discuss what they want to what
11 they're proposing in terms of, you know, know,
12 modifying their site to build a dormitory and
13 make enhancements to their other buildings. I
14 mean, that, that's what we are here to decide on.

15 MR. TATLIAN: And what, what about,
16 where do we find out about the road itself, about
17 them repairing the road back to its original
18 condition? Because I, I would like to know if
19 they're going to do, if they're going to remove
20 the asphalt that's existing there, or they just
21 plan on going on top of it, because it's already
22 been, already had a project done about 15 years
23 ago where they just went on top of it and keep
24 raising the, raising the elevation, raising the

1 March 3, 2026

2 elevation.

3 MR. KESSLER: Right.

4 MR. TATLIAN: And, you know, the water
5 that pools in front of people's driveways and
6 then freezes up in the wintertime is hazardous.
7 So I want to know, you know, are they going to
8 rip, rip out what's there and reclaim that and go
9 down to a, a better elevation? Or are they just
10 going to keep going on top --

11 MR. KESSLER: Again, that's a town board
12 issue. Now, the town board, when they meet, they
13 do have the, help me out here. I'm not so
14 familiar with their processes, but don't they
15 have an open comment on their agenda at times at
16 the town board?

17 MR. KEHOE: Well, they do. But also, you
18 know, the engineering department is overseeing
19 that construction project. So you could always
20 speak to the town engineer, Mike Preziosi.
21 Katie's here. I don't know if you're comfortable
22 to speak on that, but the road will be redone.

23 MS. KATIE BROSNAN: Sure. Hello, Katie
24 Brosnan, assistant civil engineer with the

1 March 3, 2026

2 engineering department. So typically, I can tell
3 you, I do a lot of water main jobs. This is
4 obviously sewer. But whenever we come through,
5 usually we wait a season and then we mill and
6 pave, we typically mill two inches and then pave
7 over that the whole width of the road. That's
8 what we typically do for water main projects.
9 It's my understanding that that's what we're
10 going to do for sewer, once it's done. And we do
11 usually wait a season because we want the trench
12 to settle to make sure there's no waves in the
13 pavement.

14 MR. TATLIAN: Understood. So you are
15 milling?

16 MS. BROSNAN: Yes sir.

17 MR. TATLIAN: You are milling the whole,
18 the whole street.

19 MS. BROSNAN: That is, that's my
20 understanding.

21 MR. TATLIAN: Curb to curb?

22 MS. BROSNAN: That's my understanding.

23 MR. TATLIAN: Okay. Alright. Thank you.

24 MR. KESSLER: Okay. Thank you. Thanks,

1 March 3, 2026

2 Katie. Anybody else wish to comment on the
3 application? Okay. Let's talk, we had discussed
4 this at the work session. So Brad, why don't you
5 come back up? One of the ma major concerns, I
6 think was if this thing were to be approved, how
7 this construction would be phased, you know, over
8 what period of time, you know, how do you deal
9 with a cafeteria that's being fixed?

10 MR. SCHWARTZ: Yep.

11 MR. KESSLER: You know, while you have
12 students there, those kinds of things.

13 MR. SCHWARTZ: Sure.

14 MR. KESSLER: So why, can you discuss
15 that, please?

16 MR. SCHWARTZ: So, Mr. Chairman,
17 candidly, I don't have the answers to those
18 questions. I heard those questions. They're very
19 fair ones. And, and then we just need to, I
20 think, supply that information to you, to your
21 board in terms of phasing sequencing. Certainly
22 the students will be fed. So the cafeteria, I'm
23 sure will be constructed appropriately with
24 respect to the, to the dorm. I just don't, I

1 March 3, 2026

2 don't have that exact timing, but we'll get you
3 that information.

4 MR. KESSLER: And somebody else on the
5 board raised the issue about, you know, how do we
6 ensure that everything you say you're going to do
7 is going to be done as part of, you know, to
8 complete this project. You know, the re-facing of
9 the buildings and the building of the dormitory,
10 et cetera.

11 MR. SCHWARTZ: So what's shown on the
12 approved plans needs to be implemented. And then
13 the town, the building department has enforcement
14 authority over those plans. And I heard there was
15 some conversation about potentially tying CO to
16 those improvements, so I think that's something
17 else that we could discuss going forward as
18 conditions in the resolution.

19 MR. KESSLER: Comments from the board?

20 MR. BIANCHI: I want to revisit what we
21 discussed I think at the last meeting regarding
22 the student population.

23 MR. SCHWARTZ: Mm-hmm.

24 MR. KEHOE: Make sure you use your mic.

1 March 3, 2026

2 MR. BIANCHI: Is it on?

3 MR. KEHOE: Is it on?

4 MR. BIANCHI: I don't think it's on.

5 MR. MCKINLEY: Green, it's got to go
6 green.

7 MR. BIANCHI: How's that?

8 MR. KESSLER: Yeah.

9 MR. KEHOE: Yeah.

10 MR. KESSLER: There you go.

11 MR. BIANCHI: All right. Yeah, I want to
12 revisit the discussion we had at the last meeting
13 regarding the student population. And from my
14 notes, it indicates that you are proposing when
15 and if the facility is constructed and amended
16 that you would house five students or people per
17 room and there are 64 rooms, which equals 320
18 student population, total population, right? Is
19 that correct if I say that? Total population or
20 just students?

21 MR. SCHWARTZ: Correct.

22 MR. BIANCHI: Which?

23 MR. SCHWARTZ: Students, students.

24 MR. BIANCHI: Students. Okay. And I just

1 March 3, 2026

2 want to confirm, I think Mr. Steinzmetz indicated
3 that he would, his, his client would agree to
4 that as a cap.

5 MR. SCWARTZ: Right. While not legally
6 required, Mr. Bianchi, our client is amenable to
7 a student cap of 320 students.

8 MR. KESSLER: Okay. I thought we had
9 conversations that, you know, the maximum allowed
10 is 320, but perhaps there'd be some lesser number
11 that would get approved. And if you wanted to
12 increase that number, you would come back and
13 make that request.

14 MR. SCHWARTZ: So I am covering for, for
15 David tonight. I heard that that was a
16 conversation, but again, our voluntary suggestion
17 is a 320 cap and, and how that condition in the
18 resolution gets fleshed out and finalized is
19 something that I think we'll be happy to continue
20 talking to the board and staff in the ensuing
21 months.

22 MR. KESSLER: Yeah. I think, you know,
23 the thinking, at least my thinking, I can't speak
24 for the board obviously you know, is that, you

1 March 3, 2026

2 know, if we're talking about four people to a
3 room, that should be the initial cap. And if you
4 then come want to increase that to five people
5 per room, you would come back and make the case
6 for that.

7 MR. SCHWARTZ: I think that's --

8 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's correct.

9 MR. SCHWARTZ: I think that's, that's an
10 on, that's an ongoing discussion

11 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

12 MR. KESSLER: I know. I said it.

13 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I want him to know.

14 MR. KESSLER: Oh, okay. I'm sure he
15 knows.

16 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It doesn't sound
17 like it.

18 MR. KESSLER: Well.

19 MR. SCHWARTZ: Again, Mr. Chairman, the
20 details of that condition can be fleshed out. Our
21 offer remains the 320. Again, we submitted a
22 letter that frankly sets forth what we believe is
23 the legal standards that no cap is required and,
24 and can be required by your board. But

1 March 3, 2026

2 voluntarily we offer the 320. If you're thinking
3 a different number, that's a conversation that we
4 can continue to have.

5 MR. KESSLER: And we will have that
6 conversation, absolutely.

7 MR. BIANCHI: Just to follow up on that,
8 what's the number of non-students that are going
9 to be housed there approximately?

10 MR. SCHWARTZ: I'll get you that answer
11 as well. I don't know.

12 MR. KEHOE: While, while they're looking
13 for that, Tom, one thing that the attorney wanted
14 to make clear that. Within the architect's
15 building elevations and floor plans they now
16 clearly depict what a four-bedroom unit would
17 like look like and what a five-bedroom unit would
18 look like. And they did that in general, but
19 partially in response to some of your comments.

20 MR. BIANCHI: Okay.

21 MR. KEHOE: So they wanted to make it
22 clear that in those drawings they do show what a
23 five-bedroom unit would look like.

24 MR. KESSLER: My understanding from the

1 March 3, 2026

2 last meeting was that they said there were 75
3 additional, 75 additional people beyond the
4 student population. That's what my notes say
5 currently.

6 MR. SCHWARTZ: I'll have to verify that.

7 MR. KESSLER: Okay.

8 MR. CHRIS LAPINE: Mr. Chairman, their
9 plans show up to 86 on their bulk table.

10 MR. KESSLER: Okay.

11 MR. BIANCHI: I'm sorry, 86?

12 MR. LAPINE: Eighty-six on their bulk
13 table of staff and family members.

14 MR. BIANCHI: Thanks.

15 MR. KESSLER: All right, any other
16 comments from the board?

17 MR. ROTHFEDER: And just that, as I
18 brought up about the work session, and I actually
19 mentioned it to David informally last month,
20 about the green building technology, which again,
21 has been in the, discussed since last July.
22 Westchester Planning Board brought it up, we
23 brought it up, and nothing's been done.

24 MR. SCHWARTZ: So I've talked to our

1 March 3, 2026

2 client about that. They're continuing to evaluate
3 Mr. Rothfeder. And so again, that could be
4 continued to be explored and evaluated in the
5 next couple of months. But they have not
6 forgotten about that comment and the yeshiva is
7 looking into it. We heard you on that one.

8 MR. ROTHFEDER: Thank you.

9 MR. KESSLER: Kellan?

10 MR. CANTRELL: Yeah. I just have a
11 couple of questions about the wetland area. So
12 how much of the wetland are you disturbing in
13 square feet?

14 MR. SCHWARTZ: So, Mr. Cantrell, what
15 I'm going to do is, is defer to Mr. Marino, our
16 wetlands --

17 MR. KEHOE: Yeah. I'd like, I'd like to
18 actually, if, if it's all right to have you make
19 sort of a formal presentation to remind us of
20 where we are with the wetlands and the DEC.

21 MR. STEVE MARINO: Sure. Okay. good
22 evening. Steve Marino, Tim Miller Associates. As
23 you know, there are wetlands on the site that are
24 regulated both by the town and by New York State

1 March 3, 2026

2 DEC. Those lines are not co-terminus, we ended up
3 with two separate lines. DEC delineated, the
4 official delineation for DEC is based on historic
5 delineation that was done about 20 years ago by
6 Steve Coleman. Paul Jaehnig has recently gone out
7 to the field on behalf of the town, as the town's
8 consultant and flagged the wetland, which in, in
9 his opinion, that's a different and slightly
10 smaller line than the DEC line. So there are two
11 lines that we're working with.

12 At this time, there is no impact to the
13 DEC wetland based on previous discussions and my
14 discussions with the DEC. A retaining wall has
15 been built at the edge of the existing parking
16 lot or is proposed to the edge of the existing
17 parking lot, which will then bring that
18 disturbance outside of the DEC wetland. So there
19 is no DEC wetland disturbance. There is a a minor
20 encroachment into the town wetland disturbance in
21 an area in town wetland in an area that is
22 currently maintained and has been for many years
23 as lawn.

24 The majority of the wetland area,

1 March 3, 2026

2 anywhere in close proximity to the existing
3 parking and buildings has been maintained as lawn
4 for many years. So there is some encroachment
5 into DEC and town buffers. We cover that. We did
6 provide a wetland narrative and description of
7 the wetland as well as of the disturbances to
8 both town and DEC wetlands as part of our recent
9 submission. There is buffer encroachment.

10 I had a sit down with the DEC and in New
11 Paltz, went over the plans with them as they
12 existed at that time. Their only comment was that
13 they would like to see the disturbance that we
14 had previously proposed in the wetland taken out
15 of the wetland so that there's no wetland
16 disturbance. They're well aware of the disturbed
17 nature of the site, the amount of impervious
18 parking lots and buildings, et cetera, that
19 already exist in the state buffer. But they did
20 have the comment please pull that parking area
21 out of the wetland. And Mr. Ciarcia has revised
22 the plans. This most recent submission now shows
23 all disturbance outside of the wetland. That was
24 the only significant comment that the DEC had.

1 March 3, 2026

2 MR. KESSLER: So you're saying that
3 there is now no disturbance in the buffer as
4 defined by the DEC?

5 MR. MARINO: No, there's no, no. There's
6 no disturbance in the wetland.

7 MR. KESSLER: In the wetland?

8 MR. MARINO: As defined by the DEC.

9 MR. KEHOE: And is that in the, the sort
10 of the turnaround area down below the building in
11 the gray?

12 MR. MARINO: Right, exactly.

13 MR. KEHOE: Right.

14 MR. MARINO: Yep.

15 MR. SCHWARTZ: It's for the fire --

16 MR. LAPINO: Is the DEC wetland or the
17 town wetland?

18 MR. MARINO: Both. Both. The most, the
19 area of largest wetland and buffer disturbance is
20 for the creation of this new fire access, fire
21 truck turnaround in the southwest corner of the
22 property. You can see it. It's shown on the
23 graphic that's shown right now, it's that gray
24 gravel, which is proposed to be a gravel or

1 March 3, 2026

2 pavers area for the turnaround of the fire
3 access.

4 MR. LAPINE: Steve?

5 MR. MARINO: Yes?

6 MR. LAPINE: Can I ask you a quick
7 question? I know we had met in early February and
8 you were going to seek documentation from the
9 DEC? Is what --

10 MR. MARINO: And we're expecting it
11 anytime. I didn't get it today. I expected to.
12 Sarah Pawliczak of the DEC is the person I sat
13 down with and went over the plans. She said she
14 would send us something, because I did make the
15 point to her that the town would like to get some
16 correspondence and I expect it any time.

17 MR. LAPINE: So the feedback you're
18 giving us tonight is based on your conversations
19 with her. So the current plans --

20 MR. MARINO: Conversations, phone calls,
21 like I say, sit down, but I don't have anything
22 in writing just yet.

23 MR. LAPINE: So, the current plan that's
24 before the board where there is some compensatory

1 March 3, 2026

2 excavation within a DEC wetland, that'll be --

3 MR. MARINO: Yes. That's also, yes --

4 MR. LAPINE: That'll be revised and the
5 grading taken out?

6 MR. MARINO: No, the, well, okay, Chris,
7 that's a good point. The, there is disturbance in
8 the DEC wetland for the floodplain compensation,
9 but they didn't really look at that in terms of a
10 disturbance rather than a remodel, remolding and
11 replanting of that area.

12 MR. LAPINE: Okay.

13 MR. MARINO: So yes, that is, that was
14 included in our discussion with that. They're
15 well aware of all these things that are going on.

16 MR. KESSLER: So the DEC has no concern,
17 you've taken the disturbance from the wetland
18 area to the satisfaction of DEC?

19 MR. MARINO: Yes. That's my
20 understanding. And we're still waiting to hear
21 that.

22 MR. KESSLER: Are they comfortable with
23 your disturbance in the buffer?

24 MR. MARINO: Yes. Yes.

1 March 3, 2026

2 MR. KEHOE: And they need --

3 MR. KESSLER: That'll also be in the
4 correspondence?

5 MR. MARINO: That will also be in the
6 correspondence. That was also, I, just so I can
7 make it very clear. I went to DEC with the plan
8 as it existed in December of 2025. That was the
9 last plan that had been submitted. I sat down
10 with them and discussed that plan. Their only
11 comment on that plan was, can you get the
12 disturbance out of the wetland entirely? And so
13 we subsequently revised the plan. I sent that to
14 the DEC. She got back to me saying that that was
15 okay, but I'm just waiting for written
16 correspondence.

17 MR. KESSLER: So, and these, these are
18 the plans dated February 18th that show that?

19 MR. MARINO: Yes.

20 MR. KEHOE: And, and you will need a DEC
21 permit for the --

22 MR. MARINO: We will need a DEC, we'll
23 have to go, and, and I made this very clear when
24 I talked to Sarah at the DEC, we didn't, we don't

1 March 3, 2026

2 take anything she says right now as a permit, as
3 an absolute endorsement of the project, just I
4 wanted some immediate feedback that we're on the
5 right track and that we will be presenting them
6 with an application for a permit, and we will be
7 going through a full permit review with the DEC.

8 MR. KEHOE: Can you just explain your
9 experience? We have typically conditioned our
10 approvals on the ultimate issuance of the DEC
11 permit. There are --

12 MR. MARINO: It makes sense.

13 MR. KEHOE: -- there are other views
14 that the DEC permit should be in place first. My
15 impression is that the DEC probably won't issue
16 the permit until they know where the town stands.

17 MR. MARINO: Right. Well, for one thing,
18 they can't issue the permit until a SEQRA
19 determination has been made.

20 MR. KEHOE: So, if the town, if the
21 planning board did it differently and made a
22 SEQRA determination earlier in the process, which
23 isn't our normal way of doing it, we make the
24 SEQRA determination at the end of the process,

1 March 3, 2026

2 then they could issue the permit because SEQRA
3 would've been closed.

4 MR. MARINO: In advance of that, yes.
5 Okay. We just prefer, generally Chris, not to do
6 it that way, because if there are then plan
7 changes, it goes back that it has to go back to
8 the DEC, then it goes back to the town. It, it
9 makes it more difficult. So we'd like to have a
10 final plan from the, from the town before we go
11 to them with the --

12 MR. KEHOE: But that, but that's an
13 important nuance. And maybe that is we don't
14 typically adopt findings in environmentally, sort
15 of close SEQRA, earlier in the process, which is
16 what SEQRA wants you to do sometimes. So maybe
17 that's one of the reasons why historically we've
18 always conditioned the permit.

19 MR. MARINO: If we don't get, get the
20 permit from the DEC or there are changes to the
21 plan based on our application to the DEC, we
22 would have to come back to the board to finalize,
23 you know, those changes and details.

24 MR. KEHOE: Alright, Kellan.

1 March 3, 2026

2 MR. KESSLER: And and, and --

3 MR. KEHOE: Sorry.

4 MR. CANTRELL: Yeah, no, I, I've gotten
5 permits in Greenburgh and Scarsdale before and
6 we've done it the opposite. That's just, that's
7 my experience. Have you, have you ever had it the
8 opposite way, where you've gotten the DEC permit
9 and then gotten the local permit?

10 MR. MARINO: On larger projects like
11 this when there's a full SEQRA review, we
12 generally --

13 MR. CANTRELL: Full SEQRA, like a short
14 environmental assessment or a full EAF?

15 MR. MARINO: Well, well, we're going,
16 basically we're going through a part three
17 essentially right now, the long form EAF. And DEC
18 won't, will not issue their permit until we have
19 a SEQRA determination, which in Cortlandt, as
20 Chris mentioned, tends to come at the end of the,
21 of the process.

22 MR. CANTRELL: Maybe I've been working
23 with someone else, I don't know. It could be.

24 MR. KESSLER: And just also, I don't

1 March 3, 2026

2 know, we got this Chris, I don't know who wrote
3 this. I don't know if this is Jaehnigs or
4 whomever. But there's also a reduction in
5 impervious surfaces?

6 MR. MARINO: Yes. There's a reduction of
7 about 4,000 square feet in impervious surface in
8 the buffers.

9 MR. KESSLER: In the buffers?

10 MR. MARINO: In the buffers, yeah. I,
11 just as a reminder, at one point, you know, the
12 sanctuary building there on the south end of the
13 building was at one time proposed to be extended
14 about 85 feet --

15 MR. KESSLER: Right.

16 MR. MARINO: -- out. That would've been
17 significantly in the DEC buffer, that would've
18 been right up against the edge of the wetland. As
19 you know, that was removed and the sanctuary
20 improvements have now been installed inside the
21 new building.

22 MR. KESSLER: Right.

23 MR. MARINO: So that that disturbance is
24 not necessary. And as part of our submission, we

1 March 3, 2026

2 also have a long list, there's a diagram and a
3 long list of mitigation measures that are
4 proposed to offset some of these new buffer
5 impacts. But again, historically, for more than
6 40 years, most of the impacts in the buffers on
7 this site have existed and this is more
8 redevelopment than anything else.

9 MR. LAPINE: I just had a question about
10 how you chose the mitigation site. Does it
11 connect to the existing system?

12 MR. MARINO: Yes, it does.

13 MR. LAPINE: It does.

14 MR. MARINO: Yes, it does.

15 MR. LAPINE: And then that, so the way
16 that I'm looking at it on the site plan up here,
17 the grade kind of goes down towards the
18 buildings, right? So the grade to the right
19 slopes downward towards --

20 MR. MARINO: Not really towards the
21 buildings. You can see that there's that long
22 finger that goes up there, which is that black
23 line, that's the DEC wetland. And water, the
24 grade flows in that direction.

1 March 3, 2026

2 MR. LAPINE: Towards the wetland?

3 MR. MARINO: Towards the wetland.

4 MR. LAPINE: There's like a wetland you
5 know, connection there to other wetlands and
6 then, yeah.

7 MR. MARINO: Yes.

8 MR. LAPINE: And then the trail, what is
9 that going to be made of? Just wood chips?

10 MR. MARINO: Wood chips, yeah. And that
11 we, I spoke to DEC, I brought that up as well,
12 because they're aware of that. The trail is about
13 a half mile long. And, and as you know, it's, it
14 was proposed in response to neighbor concerns
15 about students walking on the road. We wanted to
16 give them another option on site to walk. So
17 we're proposing a four foot wide, we had
18 originally said four to six foot wide wood chip
19 trail from the building, looping around, crossing
20 the watercourse down there in the western part of
21 the site, coming back around and back to the
22 building again. It's about half a mile long. DEC
23 prefers four feet wide for a wood chip trail
24 rather than going six feet wide. So we've revised

1 March 3, 2026

2 it to be a four foot wide trail.

3 MR. LAPINE: No trees are to be removed?

4 MR. MARINO: No trees, because with a
5 wood chip trail, you can, you know, move in and
6 out of existing trees and not have to take any
7 down.

8 MR. LAPINE: Thank you.

9 MR. KESSLER: Any more comments?

10 MR. KEHOE: Just, just one other thing.

11 MR. KESSLER: Yeah.

12 MR. KEHOE: As this is getting fleshed
13 out, you have mentioned in recent correspondence
14 with respect to parking. Parking had never really
15 been an issue on this site in the past, but you
16 brought up that an interpretation of the yeshiva,
17 a seminary special permit would require a certain
18 number of parking spaces, which would over park
19 the site. And you've mentioned that the planning
20 board has the ability to waive that parking.

21 MR. MARINO: Yes.

22 MR. KEHOE: But you also mentioned that
23 the parking can be land banked on the site?

24 MR. MARINO: We do have there, yes.

1 March 3, 2026

2 MR. KEHOE: You would need to reflect
3 that on a future plan of where that, you don't
4 have to design it, but that needs to be shown
5 where it's going to be on the plan.

6 MR. MARINO: I know that we did describe
7 it as there's an existing concrete slab on the
8 site that was historically the site of a barn. It
9 remains on site and has been used, again
10 historically, as overflow parking when necessary
11 a couple times a year for holidays. And then
12 there are also basketball courts immediately
13 adjacent to that slab that can also be used as
14 overflow parking when necessary. But again, as
15 Chris said, historically, there, there aren't
16 that many vehicles coming and going from the site
17 so parking has never been an issue.

18 MR. KEHOE: I just want to mention one
19 other thing. Brad, could you address the type two
20 comment? I think some of the type two issues have
21 to do with respect to maybe bureaucratic
22 regulations with respect to district formation or
23 something having to do with the sewer, because
24 we're not processing this application as a type

1 March 3, 2026

2 two action. This is a long form EAF unlisted
3 action.

4 MR. SCHWARTZ: That's my understanding,
5 Mr. Kehoe. And, and I think the comment was with
6 respect to this application, I think that comment
7 was incorrect. This is not being treated as a
8 type two.

9 MR. KESSLER: Any more comments from the
10 board?

11 MR. BIANCHI: Just a clarification, on
12 the January narrative that you supplied for the
13 application for a town wetland permit, you
14 mentioned that there's a reduction in the
15 impervious service, this is for Dan. And so
16 there's a table in there that lists several
17 figures regarding proposed, existing impervious
18 surface and proposed wetlands disturbance and
19 proposed buffer disturbance. Have those numbers
20 changed with any of the architecture and
21 modifications to the building?

22 MR. MARINO: No. Not, no. I believe what
23 you're reading is the most recent submission. So
24 that would be the numbers that are reflected by

1 March 3, 2026

2 the --

3 MR. KESSLER: Well, I mean, this, this
4 what, what Mr. Bianchi's referring to is a
5 January 24th letter we received. I don't know who
6 wrote it.

7 MR. BIANCHI: Yeah, that's right. Yeah.

8 MR. KESSLER: But, you know, yet your
9 plans, the latest plans of February, what did I
10 say 18th? So I think Tom's question is
11 appropriate here. You know, do the 18th --

12 MR. MARINO: Okay. I will double check
13 that. I mean, Dan and I have been working very
14 closely on the development of the plans and, and
15 wetland impacts. I may have had some information
16 earlier --

17 MR. KESSLER: Okay.

18 MR. MARINO -- then the actual plans were
19 filed.

20 MR. KESSLER: You, you submitted this?
21 Is this yours?

22 MR. MARINO: Is it basic wetland
23 narrative and --

24 MR. KEHOE: Yeah, that's a detailed

1 March 3, 2026

2 wetland narrative dated January 24th. And I think
3 the concern is that the drawings are now dated
4 February 18th.

5 MR. LAPINE: For, for the board
6 understanding the most recent storm water
7 pollution prevention plan that was submitted, the
8 increase in onsite impervious for the total site
9 is 10,000 square feet. I think what Mr. Marino's
10 been referring to in terms of the reduction in
11 impervious area is the reduction of impervious
12 area, which was in the town wetland buffer
13 before.

14 MR. MARINO: In the buffers, yes.

15 MR. KESSLER: The wetlands and the
16 buffers?

17 MR. MARINO: Thank you, Chris.

18 MR. KESSLER: That's what the table
19 says. Okay. Well just --

20 MR. MARINO: Yeah, we will double check
21 to make sure that's still consistent with that
22 plan.

23 MR. KESSLER: -- that it's consistent
24 with the current plans.

1 March 3, 2026

2 MR. MARINO: But like I said, I was
3 working with him, I had those numbers while he
4 was tweaking other things on the plan, so.

5 MR. BIANCHI: All right. Thank you.

6 MR. KESSLER: All right, last --

7 MR. TATLIAN: And just for the board's
8 reference --

9 MR. KESSLER: -- yeah, sure. Any more
10 public comment before we figure out what to do
11 here.

12 MR. TATLIAN: So through a couple of
13 meetings I've been through, I realized that the
14 wetlands area has decreased. Am I correct in
15 that? From what it used to be? Wasn't there a map
16 that showed the wetlands a certain size and a
17 decrease? Okay. And how and when was that, that
18 last site survey done to show the decrease in
19 there?

20 MR. KESSLER: Let's let the expert
21 comment.

22 MR. MARINO: The town's consultant, Paul
23 Jaehnig, delineated the wetlands at the end of
24 2025, and the survey was done December, October,

1 March 3, 2026

2 in November, December of 2025. So the red line
3 that you see there is the most recent, oh no,
4 that's the floodplain line. There is, like I
5 said, there are two wetland lines on the plan. It
6 may not show up at this scale, but there's two
7 wetland lines. One is the town's line, but they,
8 they are the recent lines. DEC was out there with
9 me early last year and Paul Jaehnig did the
10 town's line towards the end of last year.

11 MR. KESSLER: All right.

12 MR. TATLIAN: So is it, is it true to
13 say that the weather patterns we've had these
14 past few years might've lent to that? Now here we
15 have two, two storms with about almost two feet
16 of snow that we received this winter, which we
17 haven't seen that in many, many years, probably
18 20 years. If we were to do a site survey after
19 this winter, would this, would this map change?

20 MR. MARINO: No, it wouldn't change, I
21 mean --

22 MR. TATLIAN: Why not?

23 MR. MARINO: Well, Mr. Jaehnig
24 specifically does his wetland delineation

1 March 3, 2026

2 primarily based on soils. And soils take a long
3 time to change. So one wet winter, a couple of
4 wet seasons, a couple of dry seasons don't change
5 the soil types significantly enough that that's
6 something that really changes.

7 MR. TATLIAN: So, so --

8 MR. MARINO: We don't, we don't re-
9 delineate wetlands every year. Generally, it's a
10 10-year limit on 10-year expiration on wetland
11 delineations.

12 MR. TATLIAN: Well, what if we're going
13 into another 10 years of, you know, the old
14 fashioned New York winters like we've had all of
15 our lives growing up and it's just been recently
16 that we haven't had these winters.

17 MR. MARINO: Well, the only thing to say
18 to that is what if we don't? So I, I don't know
19 the answer.

20 MR. TATLIAN: Well then maybe, maybe the
21 line shouldn't be changing. Maybe they shouldn't
22 be changing. I think it's something to consider
23 and maybe there should be an average taken where,
24 you know, we're, we're, we're pulling everything

1 March 3, 2026

2 back so quickly and so much, and maybe, maybe we
3 need to have more of a buffer there because I
4 can't imagine what's going to happen after the
5 snow melts and who knows how much more snow we're
6 going to get this year or the next 10 years. We
7 don't know that.

8 MR. KESSLER: Point noted, Thank you.
9 Last, again, last call for the public? Staff?
10 Board? All right, so let, let's discuss process
11 and how we proceed here. Our thinking is now that
12 this is, what our third public hearing?

13 MR. SCHWARTZ: Correct.

14 MR. KESSLER: That, you know, we've
15 heard from the public. and we'll take that under,
16 all under consideration, that we close the public
17 hearing, but clearly we want to keep the record
18 open here for at least, I'm thinking almost 45
19 days for the public to continue to comment. Now,
20 just because the public hearing is closed, that
21 doesn't mean we're making a decision. There's
22 still a lot of work to be done with the, with the
23 staff, engineering and others to flesh out a lot
24 of the issues that still exist with the layout of

1 March 3, 2026

2 the plan. So with your approval, we'd like to,

3 you know, once we close the public hearing, we

4 have a requirement, a state requirement that we

5 have to make a decision in 62 days, this board.

6 We do not want to do that. So we need the

7 applicant to grant us an extension of that 62 day

8 period for us to go through all the information

9 and for staff, as I said, to continue to work out

10 the details of the proposal. So, Brad, with, with

11 your, you know, we will close the public hearing

12 if you give us permission to extend that 62 day

13 clock until some point where we decide it's ready

14 to come back to the board for discussion. And,

15 and as was said during the meeting, you know,

16 there's still points that we have to discuss in

17 terms of student camp and other things, and the

18 designation of exactly what's going to happen in

19 each of the buildings, those kinds of things. And

20 this board will certainly do that and come to

21 hopefully some agreement with the applicant on

22 those issues. So, if we do close the public

23 hearing, do you agree to grant an extension of a

24 62 day clock?

1 March 3, 2026

2 MR. SCHWARTZ: We absolutely grant and
3 consent to the extension.

4 MR. KESSLER: Okay.

5 MR. SCHWARTZ: I heard the comment at
6 the works extension about in perpetuity, and if
7 that's the board's desire, you got it. As a
8 matter of practice, I, we typically extend to
9 some period of time. So understanding that the
10 board needs a good amount of time, I would
11 suggest six months, I think would be fair and
12 reasonable, but I defer to the board as to --

13 MR. KESSLER: I'm sure it's going to be
14 a reasonable amount of time.

15 MR. SCHWARTZ: Yeah.

16 MR. KESSLER: I just, you know, we just
17 want to make sure everybody has enough time to
18 look this over and for you to respond to the
19 issues. I mean, we've had, I don't know how many
20 revisions now, we've had now five revisions to
21 the plan to date, in the last, last 11 months. So
22 clearly this back and forth work with staff and
23 the board and, and the applicant is important
24 work to be done. So, you know, it, it's not

1 March 3, 2026

2 unusual for there to be continuing, continuing
3 amendments to the plan, to the to the plat. So if
4 there's no --

5 MR. KEHOE: And also the extension of
6 the public comment period.

7 MR. KESSLER: Oh, yes, yes. Well, we'll
8 make that part of the part of the motion, which
9 is going to be done by Kevin.

10 MR. KOBASA: I'd like to make, make a
11 motion to close the hearing.

12 MR. KESSLER: Oh, sure. Yeah. Okay.

13 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I just got kind of a
14 --

15 MR. KESSLER: Before we close it,
16 absolutely.

17 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This new
18 construction, is this building just for students
19 and staff or, because I heard something in the
20 pipe that it'd be for families or --

21 MR. KESSLER: There are a number of
22 buildings on the campus. The, the proposed
23 dormitory is just for students and they are,
24 they're what's the word, they're rehabilitating

1 March 3, 2026

2 the other buildings and repurposing the other
3 buildings for staff, weekend visitors, those
4 kinds of things.

5 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. So no, no
6 permanent families --

7 MR. KESSLER: For the rabbi and --

8 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Right. Right.

9 MR. KESSLER: -- and such.

10 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay.

11 MR. KESSLER: So, yes, but to answer
12 your question, the proposed dormitory is just for
13 students. They proposed four beds per room
14 initially, which would mean 256 students. And
15 they would like the potential to put five beds in
16 a room, which would meet 320 students.

17 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay.

18 MR. KESSLER: And that's what we're
19 going to be discussing with them in terms of a
20 cap.

21 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you very much.

22 MR. KESSLER: Okay.

23 MR. TATLIAN: There's also for teachers
24 families to live there, aren't there?

1 March 3, 2026

2 MR. KOBASA: Yes.

3 MR. KESSLER: There are other buildings,
4 as I said, there are buildings that are going to
5 be used for staff, office, weekend and staff,
6 there's one building for two families, there's
7 the sanctuary, the dorm, some storage areas. Yes.
8 The, there, there are a total of eight buildings
9 on the site. The one new one will be the
10 dormitory. The others will be repurposed for
11 various uses. That, that's the proposal.

12 MR. KEHOE: And, and the repurposing is
13 specifically called out in building floor plans
14 exactly what can happen in each room, in each
15 building.

16 MR. KESSLER: Right.

17 MR. LAPINE: Mr. Chairman they didn't
18 make a on a record, I forgot which particular
19 meeting, but some of these staff are married and
20 both themselves and their partner, their wives
21 will also be residing on campus. And if they had
22 a child, they would also be living in those units
23 that are being repurposed for them.

24 MR. KESSLER: Thank you.

1 March 3, 2026

2 MS. COOK: Hi. Sorry.

3 MR. KESSLER: That's okay.

4 MS. COOK: Thank you for a reminder. I
5 did put in further FOILS with the DEC,
6 Environmental Facilities Corporation, Departments
7 of Agriculture and Markets, and a couple of
8 others for documents that showed up in the
9 Department of Health records. Just, I will
10 provide whatever I get to the town

11 MR. KESSLER: Okay.

12 MS. COOK: And I'm sure there are a lot
13 of people who want discuss it.

14 MR. KESSLER: In the motion that we're
15 about to make, we're going to keep the period
16 open for, I think until, what do we say? May
17 15th. So May, you'll have until May 15th from the
18 time we close the public hearing tonight to
19 submit whatever information you think is relevant
20 for our deliberations.

21 MS. COOK: I appreciate that, Mr.
22 Kessler. Thank you.

23 MR. KEHOE: And also, along those lines,
24 what I received today from you will be directly

1 March 3, 2026

2 provided to all of the planning board members.

3 MS. COOK: That's cool. I really think
4 we're spinning our wheels here and a lot of
5 people feel that way. It's sad that we have to
6 get to this particular point, but I bear no
7 particular personal ill will against anybody or
8 any entity in general. I moved into this
9 neighborhood for a reason, but this particular
10 situation has become questioning, challenging and
11 it's made me wonder whether or not I'm going to
12 live here and who might be voted out the next
13 time the elections come around. It's very
14 upsetting. That's not intended as a threat
15 either.

16 MR. KESSLER: I understand. Thank you.

17 MS. COOK: Have a good day, evening.

18 MR. KESSLER: Alright Kevin, we were in
19 the process --

20 MR. KOBASA: I think there's one more.

21 MR. KESSLER: Oh, I'm sorry. Another,
22 one more comment. I'm sorry. We'll get there.

23 MR. STEVE ROTOLO: Thank you for hearing
24 me out. Steve Rotolo, 50 Lakeview Avenue. I don't

1 March 3, 2026

2 think that we should be closing this particular
3 public hearing at this point in time. There's a
4 multitude of issues that have not been answered,
5 particularly the number of people that are going
6 to be utilizing this facility on a massive scale.
7 Just going through some of the numbers here, this
8 place is almost doubling in size, literally
9 doubling in size, if you take a look at it.
10 They're going from 226 people, as noted on their
11 plans to 434. And that's not even talking about
12 the hotel, the accommodations for visitors and
13 all this other things that are going on here.
14 This is not the time to close this. It needs more
15 time to be reviewed, particularly by the public.
16 I mean, just look at the difference in buildings
17 in occupancy levels. You're going to tell me that
18 the Dakota building that has five sleeping rooms
19 is only going to operate only be occupied by two
20 people at any time into perpetuity? Look at each
21 one of those items. There's a potential of 600
22 people.

23 MR. KESSLER: Okay.

24 MR. ROTOLO: Okay. On a three-acre lot.

1 March 3, 2026

2 They may have a big footprint in the, in the
3 area, but they're putting the density of this is
4 an extremely large size. It's a three-story
5 building over 50 feet tall. You're not looking at
6 this right. And I have not seen the answers
7 coming through.

8 MR. KESSLER: Okay.

9 MR. ROTOLO: I don't know what you guys
10 are looking at. Maybe you have more information
11 than I do, that all these answers have come that
12 have been brought up by the public here, but I
13 don't see any of it.

14 MR. KESSLER: Okay. Let's, let's be
15 clear on the numbers. You threw out a lot of
16 numbers there. Let me tell you the reality here.
17 Right now, they have 217 students, and I'm not,
18 I'm not, you know --

19 MR. ROTOLO: Plus nine staff members.

20 MR. KESSLER: Wait, no. Plus 75 staff
21 members, that's what they have now.

22 MR. KEHOE: That's what they're
23 approved, approved for.

24 MR. ROTOLO: That's not what it says on

1 March 3, 2026

2 their plans.

3 MR. KESSLER: That's, that's what
4 they're approved for. And, okay, so they have 217
5 currently and they have 75 staff. Okay, so let's
6 see, what is that? That's 292. They're proposing
7 to go with four people in a room, It would be 256
8 students and with five people in a room, 320. So
9 if we were to allow five people in a room, you'd
10 be going from 217 to 320. As Chris said, their
11 plan shows 89 staff. Chris, is that the number?

12 MR. LAPINE: Eighty-six.

13 MR. ROTOLO: Eighty-six.

14 MR. KESSLER: Eighty-six. So the --

15 MR. ROTOLO: The staff's family.

16 MR. KESSLER: Correct. Staff and the
17 family.

18 MR. ROTOLO: Staff members are 28 going
19 from nine -- according to their charts on their
20 paperwork is going from 320 plus 28 plus 86. And
21 we don't know anything about the hotel, visitor
22 accommodations.

23 MR. KESSLER: No. That there's no, don't
24 forget a lot -- there's no hotel, but a lot, a

1 March 3, 2026

2 lot of these buildings are, you've got to put
3 them all together because they are people
4 scattered in all the buildings.

5 MR. ROTOLO: Yeah.

6 MR. KESSLER: So all I'm saying is that
7 217 and 75 is the number, the most that it could
8 possibly be if we were to approve what they're
9 asking for would be 320 plus 86. That would be
10 the most. I --

11 MR. ROTOLO: Okay. That's 500 people.
12 And then you get the visitors that come, holidays
13 --

14 MR. KESSLER: That's 400 people.

15 MR. ROTOLO: -- et cetera, and so on.

16 MR. KESSLER: That's 400 people. But
17 again, that's what they're asking for. That's not
18 necessarily what we're going to approve. We
19 haven't gotten to that point yet. But there's no
20 600 people. Let's be clear. I don't want, you
21 know, misrepresentations about what they're --

22 MR. ROTOLO: It can be that many. You're
23 not, you're not looking at the bigger picture
24 here.

1 March 3, 2026

2 MR. KESSLER: You can't accommodate,
3 there's no room to accommodate 600 people.

4 MR. ROTOLO: Apparently there is,
5 according to their charts. You got area, like the
6 Dakota building, five sleeping rooms. They're
7 saying there's only going to be two people in
8 those rooms ever, according to their charts.

9 MR. LAPINE: The Dakota building is
10 where they have a majority of their offices and
11 no sleeping rooms anywhere.

12 MR. ROTOLO: Well, it doesn't say that.

13 MR. LAPINE: Yes.

14 MR. ROTOLO: Believe me. If you look at
15 it properly, you'll see that it's being
16 particularly secretive about what's going on
17 there. You've got Texas building got eight, eight
18 sleeping rooms will never be occupied more than
19 four people.

20 MR. KESSLER: They, they're saying --

21 MR. ROTOLO: That's what it says on
22 their chart.

23 MR. KESSLER: They're representing the
24 Texas family will have two -- the Texas building

1 March 3, 2026

2 will have two families. That's what they're
3 saying.

4 MR. ROTOLO: That that's not what it
5 says on the plans.

6 MR. KESSLER: If we were to ever approve
7 this, we will make sure that each building is
8 clearly identified as to its use and its
9 occupancy.

10 MR. ROTOLO: Well, that's what we're
11 waiting for. We haven't seen any of that. As the
12 public, we haven't seen it. I've been to three
13 meetings so far and we keep asking the same
14 questions and we never get the answers.

15 MR. KESSLER: Well, there is --

16 MR. ROTOLO: That new report that just
17 came out, didn't answer, didn't answer a quarter
18 of the questions that were asked on that document
19 that just came through.

20 MR. KESSLER: As Chris pointed out,
21 there is a chart that shows what the occupancy is
22 for each of the buildings totaling 86 people. And
23 we will make sure that that is adhered to as part
24 of any, if we were to ever approve this.

1 March 3, 2026

2 MR. ROTOLO: I want to see the documents
3 to say, stipulate exactly what's going on there.

4 MR. LAPINE: It's on --

5 MR. ROTOLO: Because it's not happening.
6 We keep asking for it and it never comes. I'm
7 telling you it's a fact. Look at the new plans.
8 It just came out.

9 MR. KESSLER: Right.

10 MR. ROTOLO: February 15th.

11 MR. SCHWARTZ: Let me provide this to
12 you.

13 MR. ROTOLO: Yeah. Yeah. There you go.
14 Right there.

15 MR. SCHWARTZ: Here's a table on sheet
16 one. So all the information is documented on this
17 drawing.

18 MR. ROTOLO: I know, but you've got five
19 sleeping rooms and only two people are ever going
20 to occupy them. That's what you're telling me.

21 MR. SCHWARTZ: That's what's being
22 represented, correct.

23 MR. ROTOLO: So, the other four rooms
24 are going to sit empty forever, literally

1 March 3, 2026

2 forever. What are they being used for? What's the
3 storage shed being used for? What's actually
4 going in that proposed storage shed? You go to
5 every one of these rooms, there's a potential to
6 put multitudes of people in these rooms.

7 MR. LAPINE: Sir. What's also not being
8 noted here is there --

9 MR. ROTOLO: I kid you not.

10 MR. LAPINE: Yeah. What's also not being
11 noted here is there is an annual fire inspection
12 that takes place on the campus.

13 MR. ROTOLO: Listen, I know that. I've
14 been through this already. Okay. Thank you for
15 putting that out. But I know all about that.
16 There's still a bunch of questions that I brought
17 up.

18 MR. LAPINE: But that, that was --

19 MR. ROTOLO: Sprinkler systems --

20 MR. LAPINE: Sprinkler systems aside,
21 that fire inspection also includes occupancy of
22 each of these rooms. So, if there's an occupancy
23 greater than what was approved on this set of
24 plans that's before you, that would be a

1 March 3, 2026

2 violation that would have to be rectified.

3 MR. ROTOLO: Okay. I've heard all this
4 before. We've been fighting this thing for 20
5 years. Nothing has changed. The place is still a
6 dump. The wall outside is falling down. They
7 don't do any maintenance over there. This is a
8 serious potential hazard.

9 MR. LAPINE: This is an enforceable
10 document once they have this signed, campus
11 population table.

12 MR. ROTOLO: I'm still saying and
13 requesting that you keep this open for another
14 term. So you spend a little bit more time and
15 bring up more of these questions and they start
16 answering the questions that have already been
17 asked. Okay? It's not happening. It's simply not
18 happening. I know they're trying to push this
19 through in the dead of winter or whatever. A lot
20 of people couldn't come tonight because of the
21 weather outside. But I could go on for a week and
22 I'm not going to, but I'm seriously requesting
23 that you do not close this public hearing at this
24 time. Thank you.

1 March 3, 2026

2 MS. VALERIE FRISCIA: Good evening.

3 Thank you very much. I'm Valerie Friscia. I live
4 at 19 Shaw Highway. I have a letter and basically
5 what it says is that the Peekskill waterway
6 system, treatment system stated clearly that it
7 could not accept flows exceeding more than 10,000
8 gallons per day for this site. So if this cap is
9 not kept, we are going to be exceeding that
10 without even including the 135 houses that were
11 also stated that could be hooked up. Despite
12 these loads limitations, this facility has
13 continued operating, now with the septic system
14 reportedly failed, wetlands being impacted. The
15 proposal to expand operations raises serious
16 environmental, legal, and financial concerns for
17 the town. Approving expansion under these
18 circumstances would expose the town to potential
19 violations of state environmental conservation,
20 wetland protection laws, public health liability,
21 increased discharge beyond previously documented
22 capacity limitations, long-term environmental
23 remedial costs. Expansion should not even
24 considered until a full inspection of

1 March 3, 2026

2 environmental and health inspection is completed
3 and publicly released, independent confirmation
4 is provided that no untreated wastewater is
5 entering regulated wetlands, verify that the
6 infrastructure exists to handle all the
7 wastewater within legal limits, the town provides
8 transparency regarding what has changed since
9 2020 sewer district petition. As a resident, I'm
10 asking the board to pause any approval on
11 expansions until these issues are fully resolved.
12 Moving forward without addressing documented
13 septic failure and capacity limits would be
14 irresponsible. I respectfully request that this
15 letter be entered into the public record and that
16 the board provide a written response outlining
17 how it intends to address these concerns. The
18 community deserves transparency, environmental
19 protection, and responsible governance.

20 MR. KESSLER: Thank you. Okay. Can we
21 get from the Peekskill sewer district, because
22 I'm sure when they did the expansion, when they
23 did the sewer district, there was no sense as to
24 the number of people that potentially could be at

1 March 3, 2026

2 the yeshiva. So can we get something from the
3 sewer district that says if they were to put in
4 320 people, plus 86 staff, plus 140 houses along
5 the route, all hooking up that the Peekskill
6 Sewer District can accommodate that? Okay. And
7 that should hopefully answer all the questions,

8 MS. COOK: Excuse me. But then wouldn't
9 that require an amendment of the permit issued by
10 the Board of Legislatures that only included 141
11 Furnace Woods Road?

12 MR. KESSLER: It didn't only include 141
13 Furnace --

14 MS. COOK: Right. But if we are going to
15 talk about, and this is the main bone of
16 contention on some of the things I said tonight.

17 MR. KESSLER: The, the fact is anybody
18 can hook in if they want to. So it's not just the
19 yeshiva.

20 MS. COOK: Okay. Okay.

21 MR. KESSLER: If you have, if you have
22 something that says otherwise, please share that.

23 MS. COOK: I believe the permit --

24 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The wallet says

1 March 3, 2026

2 otherwise.

3 MS. COOK: I'm sorry?

4 MR. KESSLER: If you have documentation

5 --

6 MS. COOK: I'll, we'll take it up

7 elsewhere.

8 MR. KESSLER: Okay. Thank you. Where

9 were we? Okay, and again. Okay. Last call. Okay.

10 And I think we were about to make a motion. So

11 take two.

12 MR. KOBASA: I'd like to make a motion

13 to close the hearing with the comment period

14 extended to May 15th and a commitment from the

15 applicant to extend the 60-day time clock if

16 needed, which was given.

17 MR. KESSLER: Which he, which he did --

18 MR. SCHWARTZ: Consent granted

19 MR. KESSLER: -- in perpetuity.

20 MR. SCHWARTZ: Yep. In perpetuity.

21 MR. BIANCHI: Second.

22 MR. KESSLER: Okay, second. Thank you

23 Tom. On the motion, any question on the motion?

24 All in favor?

1 March 3, 2026

2 MULTIPLE: Aye.

3 MR. KESSLER: Opposed? Okay.

4 MR. SCHWARTZ: Thank you.

5 MR. KESSLER: Thank you all.

6 MR. SCHWARTZ: Goodnight.

7 MR. KESSLER: Thank you, public. Thank
8 you for participating. We appreciate it. Okay,
9 last item this evening is new business, the
10 application of Rafael Triana of High Q Electric
11 for renewal of a specialty trade contractor, a
12 special permit for an electrical contractor
13 located at 1 Dogwood Road. Drawings dated April
14 5, 2022. Good evening.

15 MR. RAFAEL TRIANA: Good evening.

16 MR. KESSLER: You are?

17 MR. TRIANA: Rafael Triana. Welcome.

18 MR. KESSLER: We're going to set a
19 public hearing on your application for the next
20 meeting.

21 MR. TRIANA: Okay.

22 MR. KESSLER: So we'll make it easy for
23 you. So with that, Karen?

24 MS. TIMKO: I'd like to make a motion on

1 March 3, 2026

2 item PB 2026-4, High Q Electric and the motion is
3 to set a public hearing for April 7, 2026.

4 MR. ROTHFEDER: Second.

5 MR. KESSLER: Second. Thank you. On the
6 question.

7 MR. KEHOE: On the question. So the code
8 requires a public hearing. We went through this
9 before. I'll be working with you. I'll send you
10 the list of abutters, I'll send you the public
11 hearing notice. You're responsible for sending it
12 out. There's not too many abutters. And then
13 we'll be back here in April to hold the hearing.

14 MR. TRIANA: Okay.

15 MR. KEHOE: Okay.

16 MR. KESSLER: All right, we're on the
17 question. All in favor?

18 MULTIPLE: Aye.

19 MR. KESSLER: Opposed? Thank you.

20 MR. TRIANA: I'd like to say something
21 too. Thank you to Michael and Chris. You guys
22 have been great. Appreciate the help. I know I've
23 been a little late, but I appreciate it.

24 MR. KESSLER: Okay. We'll see you next

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

March 3, 2026

month.

MR. TRIANA: Thank you.

MR. KESSLER: Thank you.

MR. KOBASA: All right. The time is
7:42. The meeting's adjourned.

MR. KESSLER: Thank you.

(The public board meeting concluded at
7:42.)

CERTIFICATE OF ACCURACY

I, Juliana Castano, certify that the foregoing transcript of the Planning Board meeting of the Town of Cortlandt on March , 2026 was prepared using the required transcription equipment and is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Certified By

Juliana Castano

Date: March 17, 2026

GENEVAWORLDWIDE, INC

228 Park Ave S - PMB 27669

New York, NY 10003