

TOWN OF CORTLANDT
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARDS

BOARD MEETING

Town Hall
1 Heady Street
Cortlandt Manor, New York 10567

June 2, 2026

6:30 p.m. - 8:30 p.m.

June 2, 2026

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Steven Kessler, Chairman

Thomas A. Bianchi, Vice Chairman

Nora Hildinger, Member

Kevin Kobasa, Member

Peter McKinley, Member

Jeff Rothfeder, Member

Kellan Cantrell, Member

ALSO PRESENT:

Chris Kehoe, AICP, Director of Planning

Michael Cunningham, Esq., Deputy Town Attorney (Zoom)

Heather LaVarnway, CNU-A, Planner

Catherine Brosnan, P.E., Assistant Civil Engineer

1 June 2, 2026

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

3 MR. STEVEN KESSLER: Good. Welcome to
4 the June 2nd planning board meeting. Please rise
5 if you're able to 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: Thank you. Roll, please.

12 MR. CHRIS KEHOE: Mr. Kubasa?

13 MR. KEVIN KOBASA: Here.

14 MR. KEHOE: Ms. Hildinger?

15 MS. NORA HILDINGER: 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: Ms. Timko?

23 MS. KAREN TIMKO: Here.

24 MR. KEHOE: Mr. McKinley?

1 June 2, 2026

2 MR. PETER MCKINLEY: Here.

3 MR. KESSLER: Thank you. Just in terms
4 of the agenda this evening, I just want to note
5 that there are, the first two public hearings are
6 going to be adjourned at the request of the
7 applicant, and that concerns the Alvarez
8 Specialty Trade Electrical Contractor yard and
9 the VS Construction's application for the
10 assisted living facility. And we have one
11 addition to the agenda, which we'll add to under
12 correspondence B, and that is a referral from the
13 town regarding a zoning omnibus regulation.

14 And one more addition to the agenda this
15 evening, and as many of you know, Chris Kehoe's
16 last meeting is tonight, as in 10 days he'll be
17 retiring as the director of planning after 30-
18 plus years with this town and the last 15-plus
19 years as the director of planning. I think it's
20 fair to say that Chris has been an integral part
21 of everything that's happened up here on this
22 board in these past 10 years when you look at the
23 things that we've dealt with that Chris has been
24 part of, ranging from the town center and the

1 June 2, 2026

2 expansion of town center, the hospital expansion,
3 the golf course, Valeria. We also get to blame
4 him for all the gas stations in the town.

5 But also behind the scenes, what he does
6 in terms of working with the town on the master
7 plan committee, on the medical-oriented district,
8 which of course is on the agenda this evening,
9 and the transit-oriented district, I mean it's
10 quite a resume of the things that he's worked on
11 over these 30-plus years.

12 But I also don't think people appreciate
13 what goes on behind the scenes. Chris has to
14 juggle a lot of things. It reminds me of the old
15 Ed Sullivan Show with the guy with the plates
16 spinning in the air, dealing with the applicants,
17 their attorneys, their lawyers, their
18 consultants, their engineers, their architects.
19 That's just one phase of this. It's really like a
20 five-legged stool.

21 And then you have the town departments
22 that he has to navigate between legal and the
23 supervisor's office and Department of Technical
24 Services and our outside consultants and the

June 2, 2026

Conservation Advisory Committee, the Architectural Review Committee, our own consultants that we bring in, the arborists, and others.

And of course, then there's the county and the state departments that you have to deal with, DOH and DEC and others, and of course, most importantly, the public.

I think it's fair to say, though, that what Chris does is very even-handed. He treats everybody with dignity and respect and is very generous with his time in everything that he's dealt with. And I don't think people appreciate, many of you are here before us quite often, but there are many people in this town who are here for the first time, and Chris really has to handhold them and walk them through the process, manage their expectations, small businesses, nail salons, you name it. All those little things that make this town what it is today.

So, the work for the board, the work for the town, and just how generous he is with his time with everybody is just truly something to

1 June 2, 2026

2 behold.

3 And on a personal note, Chris, I always
4 appreciated your advice, your counsel, your
5 insight, and for, more importantly, occasionally
6 making me look like I know what I'm doing up
7 here, and I think that's critically important. So
8 on behalf of the board and me, Chris, I just want
9 to thank you for your dedication to the town and
10 the residents. It's not often that people get to
11 retire knowing they've made an impact on
12 something, but I think it's very clear, Chris,
13 that you certainly made an impact on the town,
14 and we all thank you for that, and I hope you
15 have a long, healthy, and personally fulfilling
16 retirement. So thank you for everything that
17 you've done.

18 MR. KEHOE: Thank you.

19 (APPLAUSE)

20 MR. KESSLER: I think we have one other
21 addition to the agenda. Mr. Steinmetz?

22 MR. DAVID STEINMETZ: Sorry, Chris.
23 You're not getting rid of me so quickly. Chris,
24 for more than 30 years, you've had to listen to

1 June 2, 2026

2 me, my clients, and our various development teams
3 through a number of different applications and
4 multiple iterations of this board. From John Felt
5 to Ken Verschoor, to you as the director of
6 planning, you have done this truly, as Steve sort
7 of said, gracefully, with a smile, occasional
8 wit, and for the Cortlandt community, a sincerity
9 of concern that was always self-evident.

10 I'm here a lot, as we both know, so I
11 have dealt with you on a more regular, frequent
12 basis, literally over decades, than I have in
13 many other communities. You've consistently been
14 a pleasure to deal with personally and
15 professionally. You've always been a true public
16 servant, Chris. Someone who's there playing an
17 important role in government, who understands
18 that your job is to serve the public, and
19 sometimes that means competing interests. Again,
20 Steve implied, I know you've had people nipping
21 at your heels from different directions, and you
22 always seem to do this, Chris, in a real even-
23 handed, calm, and a pleasant way, and that's not
24 an easy thing.

1 June 2, 2026

2 You're unquestionably going to be missed
3 by all of us who deal with you and have dealt
4 with you regularly. But speaking for myself and
5 some of my colleagues and members of my teams, we
6 take great solace in knowing that you've had the
7 opportunity, literally, to sit beside Heather,
8 and model for her and others in your department
9 what it means to take on the leadership that you
10 have done.

11 So Chris, on a less serious note,
12 obviously I've always known that you were a
13 hockey fan. I don't understand how you've spent
14 your entire professional career in the penalty
15 box. Having said that, Chris, I wish you freedom
16 from the penalty box, freedom from town hall from
17 time to time. I hope you will still give all of
18 us your friendship and your wisdom and your
19 professionalism, and I wanted to make sure,
20 because I can't be there tomorrow night, Chris, I
21 wanted to wish you only the best, and
22 congratulations to you on your retirement.

23 (APPLAUSE)

24 MR. KESSLER: One more addition to the

1 June 2, 2026

2 agenda, Mr. Schwartz.

3 MR. BRAD SCHWARTZ: And I'll be brief.
4 But Chris, I obviously echo everything that David
5 said, except for the 30-year part. But what's
6 wild is I've been up here now 23 years. And I
7 learned land use coming before this planning
8 board and doing work in this town, and you were
9 instrumental in that. I will forever be grateful
10 to you. It was also very meaningful to get to
11 know you personally on the ice. And while David
12 says you've been in the penalty box your entire
13 professional career, in my book, you have the
14 highest hockey IQ of anyone that I've ever skated
15 with. So you've never been in a penalty box in
16 real life.

17 And I heard a rumor that in honor of you
18 last night, everyone here tonight is getting
19 approval. Is that right?

20 MR. KEHOE: Yes. Check marks for
21 everyone. Chris, congrats and good luck.

22 MR. KESSLER: Thank you.

23 (APPLAUSE)

24 MR. KESSLER: Okay. Let's move on to the

1 June 2, 2026

2 agenda. Okay. Okay with you, Chris?

3 MR. KEHOE: Yep.

4 MR. KESSLER: So the first item tonight
5 under correspondence, a letter dated May 15, 2026
6 from Martin Petrovic, and May 19, 2026, a letter
7 from Brian Minto, the Hollowbrook Golf
8 superintendent, requesting approval for a new
9 chemical at the Holbrook Golf Course. We have a
10 resolution prepared. I think the consultants that
11 we deal with have approved the use of this, so I
12 think it's pretty perfunctory here that we set
13 this as an approval. So Jeff?

14 MR. ROTHFEDER: I move that we approve
15 resolution 11-26.

16 MR. KESSLER: Second, please.

17 MS. HILDINGER: Second.

18 MR. KESSLER: And on the question. All
19 in favor?

20 MULTIPLE: Aye.

21 MR. KESSLER: Opposed? Thanks. The next
22 item is the addition to the agenda, which is the
23 referral from the town board regarding the zoning
24 omnibus ordinance. Can I have a motion, please?

1 June 2, 2026

2 MR. ROTHFEDER: I move that, what, we
3 have received this?

4 MR. KESSLER: Yeah.

5 MR. ROTHFEDER: That we've received
6 this.

7 MR. KESSLER: Okay. A motion to receive
8 a file, so we'll review this for the next
9 meeting?

10 MR. KEHOE: Yeah, and I think what
11 you've done in the past, you can send us emails.

12 MR. KESSLER: Okay.

13 MR. KEHOE: We can discuss it again.
14 Heather can discuss it again at the next meeting.
15 But if you have anything between now and then,
16 just send emails along.

17 MR. KESSLER: Okay. There's something we
18 received tonight in our mail, so we'll go through
19 that. So we have a motion. Second, please?

20 MR. BIANCHI: Second.

21 MR. KESSLER: And on the question. All
22 in favor?

23 MULTIPLE: Aye.

24 MR. KESSLER: Opposed? Okay. Thank you.

1 June 2, 2026

2 All right. Moving on, our first public hearing of
3 the evening is the application of 70 Roa Hook
4 Road Realty, LLC, for site development plan
5 approval to redevelop the site of the partially
6 constructed Crystal Clean Carwash facility to a
7 proposed vehicle showroom and service facility
8 for property located at 70 Roa Hook Road,
9 drawings revised March 25, 2026, except sheet two
10 of seven, which was revised on May 21, 2026. Good
11 evening, Brad.

12 MR. SCHWARTZ: Good evening, Mr.
13 Chairman, board members, and staff, so just for
14 the record, Brad Schwartz from Zarin and
15 Steinmetz on behalf of the applicant. We have our
16 full team here tonight, John Gilchrist, project
17 engineer, John Canning, traffic consultant. And
18 we'll get right into our presentation.

19 MR. JOHN GILCHRIST: Good evening. Okay,
20 just a quick rehash. We have the former car wash
21 that was constructed nearly complete and then
22 abandoned. We are reusing this building as a
23 truck service facility, repairing trucks up to 30
24 feet, not longer. The building will be increased

June 2, 2026

with an addition to the southwest and a little bit more to the north corner to make the building big enough to accommodate the trucks. The ceiling height of the car wash is not sufficient for what we need to do, so we're putting up a new building to replace part of the car wash to accommodate the higher ceilings and the bigger trucks.

The property is about two-thirds of an acre. It was, again, formerly developed with accommodations for vehicles to move around the building and through the building in the car wash. We are going to change the circulation through the site to have one-way in and one-way out driveways, so that the circulation will be around the back of the building and then back out to Roa Hook Road.

My drawing of -- I should say, the amount of impervious coverage does not change. We have more building, but less paving. The stormwater collection system doesn't change. We have a series of pipes that runs around the perimeter of the property and then discharges under the Roa Hook Road to Annesville Creek.

June 2, 2026

The change, the small changes I made to the site plan since our last meeting, one is to reconfigure the exit driveway. There is a pollution control device. After this whole stormwater collection system exits the property, I called it a oil water separator, but it's really a pretty sophisticated device. It uses a helix collector to get the stormwater to swirl and separate out the solids and the floatables and collect that, and also to separate out any oil that might be on the parking lot. So, I have that water quality device.

And then the other thing, so we reconfigured the driveway to preserve that, so I won't have to move it. And then after that and before the river, we've introduced a seepage pit that will allow a certain amount of flow to percolate back into the ground.

We did speak to the Department of Environmental Protection, DEC, Conservation. They say due to the fact that we're under an acre of property, they're not involved, and they were not involved in our car wash project. The water

June 2, 2026

quality device was installed at the request of the town of Cortlandt. We also have applied for a multi-sector general permit, no exposure certification, which is part of the SPDES application, and we anticipate that'll be approved shortly.

MR. KESSLER: And that's from whom?

MR. GILCHRIST: From Environmental Protection, Department of Environmental Protection. And basically, that says that all activities will be within the building, all industrial practices will be indoors and nothing will occur outside.

We are, in addition to the seepage pit, we are proposing solar collectors on the roof. Not determined how many or exactly what the function is. We are discussing retaining parts of our water recycling. We have water recycling from the car wash that the intent was to reuse the wash water. This water is, we don't have a particular use for it, but we think we can reuse it as irrigation water for our plantings. And the other one is, we will provide a electric car

1 June 2, 2026

2 charging station.

3 MR. KESSLER: Okay.

4 MR. GILCHRIST: That's about what I
5 have.

6 MR. KESSLER: Okay. I brought it up at
7 the work session, but in the upper left-hand
8 corner, I think on your map, you call it a
9 chambers something that we saw on the site visit.
10 Did we figure out what that was?

11 MR. GILCHRIST: I didn't figure out what
12 that is, I'm sorry. Let me see if I can see it on
13 here. I know it's on the survey.

14 MR. KESSLER: It was sort of in the, let
15 me get the, southwest corner of the building.

16 MR. GILCHRIST: Right. I'm sorry, I
17 don't know what they are. There's an aeration
18 system for the septic system, and that's not
19 installed. That may be part of that. I have to
20 put a air pump in, I know that's not in. And no,
21 I don't know. And I'm going to reach out to Steve
22 Auth, who installed those, and try to find out
23 what they are.

24 MR. KESSLER: Okay. I appreciate it. All

1 June 2, 2026

2 right.

3 MR. ROTHFEDER: I was just going to say,
4 so the oil water separator that you have on your
5 current drawing, is that the same one that you
6 had?

7 MR. GILCHRIST: That exists today, yes.

8 MR. ROTHFEDER: Okay. But the seepage
9 pit is new?

10 MR. GILCHRIST: Is new, proposed, yeah.

11 MR. ROTHFEDER: Uh-huh. And so again,
12 what are we waiting for in terms of approval for
13 that, Cathy, Catherine?

14 MS. KATHERINE BROSNAN: So we were
15 looking for a letter of no objection from the DEC
16 per a phone conversation, and it sounds like
17 you've obtained that in email form. Is that
18 correct?

19 MR. GILCHRIST: Yes.

20 MS. BROSNAN: Can you forward that?

21 MR. GILCHRIST: Yeah, I sent it to you
22 this afternoon. It was probably late.

23 MS. BROSNAN: Oh, this afternoon? Okay,
24 no problem.

1 June 2, 2026

2 MR. KESSLER: So that should close out
3 that issue?

4 MS. BROSANAN: Yes. I mean, I haven't
5 read it yet, but yes.

6 MR. KESSLER: Okay.

7 MR. ROTHFEDER: Okay, and then just one
8 other thing. So, I appreciate the photovoltaic
9 system. Thank you. But you say provisions, I'm
10 assuming that means you're going to do it, not
11 just providing for it.

12 MR. GILCHRIST: Yeah. We haven't studied
13 it at this point. We'll study it in the next, in
14 the architectural phase of the project.

15 MR. ROTHFEDER: Okay.

16 MR. GILCHRIST: And see what makes the
17 most sense.

18 MR. ROTHFEDER: Okay, thank you.

19 MR. KEHOE: But I think what we would do
20 though is we would condition the approval upon
21 that. And if it didn't work out because financing
22 or the roof, they'd have to come back, I would
23 think, because it's important enough to you.

24 MR. GILCHRIST: Sure, yes, exactly.

1 June 2, 2026

2 MR. KEHOE: So it'd be required, but if
3 it doesn't happen, you would have to come back to
4 the board and explain why. Okay.

5 MR. KESSLER: Okay. Before you open it
6 up to the public, anybody else on the board have
7 any comments?

8 MR. MCKINLEY: I'm good.

9 MR. KESSLER: So if not, anybody here
10 that wishes to comment on this application? No?
11 Oh, okay.

12 MR. SCHWARTZ: Would you like to hear
13 from Mr. Canning on traffic, or is the board good
14 on traffic?

15 MR. KESSLER: We had the, when we were
16 on the site, we had the trucks make the rounds
17 multiple times around the building. Everything
18 seemed to be fine. Is there anything that we
19 missed, John?

20 MR. JOHN CANNING: Just for the record,
21 Mr. Chairman, John Canning, with Kimbley-Horn.
22 Good to see everybody, and good luck, Chris. So
23 you know it's a built site. You know it was
24 studied extensively for a car wash. We provided a

1 June 2, 2026

2 letter that indicated that the truck service
3 facility is a much lower traffic generator,
4 almost 75 percent lower. It'll be 15 trips in the
5 peak hour, actually 14, which is one trip every
6 five minutes. We're not changing anything on the
7 site other than we're separating the driveway, so
8 it's an in and an out. We're going to retain the
9 previously required peak hour turn restrictions,
10 so we're not changing that. The previous
11 application was determined not to have a
12 significant traffic impact, so with 75 percent
13 less traffic, this will not have a significant
14 traffic impact. So I just wanted to put that on
15 the record.

16 MR. KESSLER: I appreciate it.

17 MR. CANNING: And thank you.

18 MR. KESSLER: Thank you, John. Again,
19 last call, anybody else wish to comment on this
20 application?

21 MR. BIANCHI: And the signage will be as
22 proposed?

23 MR. CANNING: Yes.

24 MR. BIANCHI: For turns.

June 2, 2026

MR. CANNING: Yes.

MR. BIANCHI: Yeah.

MR. KESSLER: Okay, so if there's no other comments, then Peter?

MR. MCKINLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion to close the public hearing, PB-2025-18, and refer back to staff for further development.

MR. KESSLER: Do we prepare a resolution? And prepare a resolution?

MR. MCKINLEY: And prepare a resolution.

MR. KESSLER: Okay. Second, please.

MR. BIANCHI: Second.

MR. KESSLER: And on the question?

MR. ROTHFEDER: Do we have to extend the

--

MR. KESSLER: Well --

MR. KEHOE: No, no.

MR. MICHAEL CUNNINGHAM: If you're closing tonight --

MR. KESSLER: If we've got the DEC stuff and it's satisfactory --

MR. KEHOE: Well, if something goes

1 June 2, 2026

2 wrong --

3 MR. KESSLER: -- if not, we won't vote
4 on it next time.

5 MR. ROTHFEDER: Okay.

6 MR. CUNNINGHAM: If there's a problem,
7 we can ask the applicants to extend the shot
8 clock later. But it seems like there aren't many
9 issues that are preventing a resolution.

10 MR. KESSLER: Okay, fine. So we're on
11 the question, all in favor?

12 MULTIPLE: Aye.

13 MR. KESSLER: Opposed.

14 MR. SCHWARTZ: Good night. Thank you.
15 Thank you. Thank you. All right, next item, a
16 second public hearing. It's the application of
17 New York Presbyterian Hudson Valley Hospital
18 Center for an amended site plan approval for a
19 proposed 1,877 square foot addition to the
20 existing medical office building for a linear
21 accelerator, for property located at 1980
22 Crompond Road, drawings dated March 12, 2026.
23 Good evening.

24 MS. KATHERINE ZALANTIS: Good evening.

1 June 2, 2026

2 Katherine Zalantis of Silverberg Zalantis LLC on
3 behalf of the applicant, New York Presbyterian
4 Hudson Valley Hospital. So the hospital is here,
5 as you said, Mr. Chairman, in connection with
6 site plan approval, or to obtain site plan
7 approval to construct a small 1,877 square foot
8 addition. And the addition will be to the
9 existing building in the center of the campus.
10 The addition will house a more advanced linear
11 accelerator or a LINAC system used to treat
12 cancer patients. The hospital currently has a
13 LINAC system, but it's at its end of life, and it
14 wants to replace this existing LINAC system with
15 a more technologically advanced LINAC system.

16 As the hospital regional medical
17 director will better explain, while both LINAC
18 systems treat cancer patients, the new
19 replacement LINAC system again, is more
20 technologically advanced and provides a broader
21 range of care to the hospital's patients.

22 From a planning perspective, and the
23 only reason that we're before this board is that
24 the new system, the new LINAC system, can't fit

June 2, 2026

in the existing room that currently houses the current LINAC system. But like the current LINAC system, the new LINAC will only continue to treat one patient at a time. So once the new LINAC system is installed, the existing LINAC system will be rendered inoperable and removed, and that space will be converted into storage. So there will not be two LINAC systems in use at the same time. To be clear, it's a straight one-for-one replacement.

Also, as part of this project, and if we can go to the next slide, please, one more. So you could see the proposed work area includes a parking area where the hospital's proposing to restripe the parking to avoid a loss of potentially three or four spaces, and as a result, there will only be a loss of one parking space.

The existing LINAC building's roof on top of the LINAC has a green roof, and for the proposed addition, it will continue to have a green roof, so the green roof will be extended from one area to the new area addition.

1 June 2, 2026

2 And I'd like to at this time to
3 introduce Dr. Lawrence Koutcher, the Regional
4 Director of Clinical Operations, Department of
5 Radiation Oncology, to better explain why having
6 this equipment is both a benefit to the community
7 and to the hospital and its patients.

8 DR. LAWRENCE KOUTCHER: Good evening.
9 Thank you for having us here tonight. My name is
10 Lawrence Koutcher. I'm a radiation oncologist.
11 I've been at Hudson Valley Hospital since 2014,
12 and I want to talk about briefly the benefits of
13 having a new linear accelerator would provide the
14 community. So our field is a very technologically
15 driven field, and we've had this machine since we
16 opened in the end of approximately 2011.

17 As you can imagine, a lot of advances
18 have happened over those years. And just to
19 highlight a few of them, these advances help us
20 deliver better patient care. Again, just to
21 highlight a few of them, the new linear
22 accelerator has a very sophisticated way of
23 setting up a patient in the exact same position
24 every day, which is what we always strive to do.

June 2, 2026

We simulate and plan a patient in a certain position, and we want to reproduce that every day the exact same way. It has what's called a six-degree couch, so we can use six dimensions to line them up in the same exact position. And now we don't have that six-degree couch that would line everyone, that line the patient up exactly, more precisely.

The type of imaging that we use, we use a CT scan before each patient is treated to make sure they line up in the exact same position. The CT scan that goes with this new linear accelerator is basically a sharper, crisper image that would allow us to better delineate exactly how to set them up.

Also, the current machine doesn't have certain modalities. One of them is called electrons, which basically allows us to treat very superficial lesions. So currently when I see patients, they are not -- a patient who needs that kind of treatment is not able to get their care here. So, we're trying to create, really, a state-of-the-art center so that patients can get

1 June 2, 2026

2 all their care at New York-Presbyterian Hudson
3 Valley Hospital and not have to leave the
4 community.

5 And then just a final reason, as I
6 believe the board knows, but just to make sure
7 everyone's on the same page, the NYP Hudson
8 Valley is part of the NYP system. So we have
9 really three facilities in the Columbia sphere,
10 as we call it, one at 168th, one here, and one in
11 Bronxville at NYP Westchester. The other two
12 locations have this. And again, we always want
13 uniformity throughout the whole system for more
14 seamless patient care. So, by having that, that
15 would also help us in that regard.

16 MR. KESSLER: Totally irrelevant, but
17 who makes this equipment?

18 DR. KOUTCHER: So Siemens is the Siemens
19 dominant manufacturer for this. The tomotherapy
20 that we have now is made by Accuray.

21 MR. KESSLER: By whom?

22 DR. KOUTCHER: Accuray.

23 MR. KESSLER: Okay. It's a public
24 hearing, but before we get to that, any questions

1 June 2, 2026

2 from the board? Anybody from the audience wish to
3 comment on this application at this time? No.
4 Just, you're reconstructing the building. Is
5 there anything special you have to do in that
6 construction just in terms of safeguarding, you
7 know, radiation or anything?

8 DR. KOUTCHER: Yeah, absolutely. I mean
9 anytime we have a linear accelerator, there's
10 always very significant shielding to make sure
11 that it's safe. And so, different machines,
12 they're slightly different. They all have their
13 own shielding requirements, and so we have, you
14 know, obviously when this would be built, it
15 would be built in a way that would be, of course,
16 safe for the public, that it would be shielded, a
17 physics team would test it, et cetera, yeah.

18 MR. KESSLER: Okay. Thank you. So last
19 call, any final words before we close the public
20 hearing?

21 MS. ZALANTIS: So your staff did prepare
22 a draft approval resolution --

23 MR. KESSLER: Yes.

24 MS. ZALANTIS: -- with us, and we had

1 June 2, 2026

2 requested some changes to that approval
3 resolution. Specifically --

4 MR. KESSLER: Yep.

5 MS. ZALANTIS: -- conditions five and
6 six.

7 MR. KESSLER: Let me get the resolution.

8 MS. ZALANTIS: We request that instead
9 of being a requirement of a building permit, they
10 be a requirement of certificate of occupancy. The
11 reason being, again, is that this equipment is
12 near end of life. The hospital hopes to be able
13 to pull a building permit to start construction
14 within a month, and it's just not possible to
15 complete all the ADA upgrades and the wetland
16 mitigation within that same month period of time,
17 but those will be completed prior to a C of O.

18 MR. KESSLER: Mm-hmm. Okay. Anybody have
19 any objections to that?

20 MS. BROSANAN: Does that include the
21 sidewalk project to be complete before a CO?

22 MS. ZALANTIS: So, with respect to the
23 sidewalk project, that's a condition of the
24 Citron lot and we still, right now, that's been

1 June 2, 2026

2 issued a temporary -- so there is the requirement
3 to close out all active construction permits, so
4 I --

5 MS. BROSANAN: Before CO?

6 MS. ZALANTIS: Before CO. I mean, non-
7 active construction permits. So we had asked just
8 some clarifying language to be added in there
9 that all open permits be closed out, but not the
10 ones that are in active construction.

11 MR. KESSLER: I'm sorry, but not the
12 ones that are in what?

13 MS. ZALANTIS: Are in active
14 construction.

15 MR. CUNNINGHAM: That phrase goes into
16 condition seven.

17 MR. KESSLER: Yeah, I'm looking at
18 condition seven.

19 MR. CUNNINGHAM: It says, applicant
20 shall not -- this is the applicant's attorney
21 suggestion. The applicant shall close out all
22 open permits on the site, and here's the new
23 language, "that are not in active construction."

24 MS. BROSANAN: So I guess my question is

1 June 2, 2026

2 the sidewalk project is considered active
3 construction? Correct?

4 MS. ZALANTIS: Yes.

5 MS. BROSANAN: Okay.

6 MS. ZALANTIS: Well, that's been issued
7 a TCO, so we are still waiting CO for that. So it
8 wouldn't be a condition of this. It's a condition
9 of the previous Citron lot approval. I mean, yes,
10 we hope to close that out very quickly, but it's
11 sort of out of our hands at this point, because
12 we're waiting for New York State DOT. They have
13 had all the relevant information that they need
14 to issue the required easement agreement and to
15 agree to all of that, but we understand it's now
16 in the legal, moving through the process, but
17 it's out of our hands.

18 MR. KESSLER: Is that okay? Adding the
19 language, "not in active construction"?

20 MR. CUNNINGHAM: I have no objection to
21 that.

22 MR. KESSLER: Okay. All right, so you
23 want six and seven modified from building permit
24 to C of O?

1 June 2, 2026

2 MR. CUNNINGHAM: That's five and six.

3 MS. ZALANTIS: That was five and six.

4 MR. KESSLER: I'm sorry, five and six,
5 to C of O, and then add the not in active
6 construction language to number seven.

7 MR. KEHOE: Yeah. And we need to correct
8 various references in a whereas clause --

9 MR. KESSLER: Okay.

10 MR. KEHOE: -- with respect to addresses
11 and section blocks and lots, and we'll check with
12 the applicant and make sure we have that right.

13 MR. KESSLER: Okay.

14 MR. KEHOE: We do want to keep condition
15 eight. A new site lighting plan was submitted,
16 but we haven't blessed it yet. I don't expect any
17 problems.

18 MS. ZALANTIS: Okay. That's acceptable.

19 MR. KESSLER: Okay, so let's get a
20 couple of motions on the table here. Who's got
21 it, Kevin? No, I'm sorry, Karen? Oh, no, I'm
22 sorry.

23 MR. KOBASA: I think you still need to
24 close the public hearing.

1 June 2, 2026

2 MR. KESSLER: Kevin. It is Kevin, isn't
3 it?

4 MR. KOBASA: First I'd like to make a
5 motion to close the public. Oh.

6 MR. KESSLER: Second, please.

7 MR. KOBASA: I turned my mic off, sorry.
8 First, I'd like to make a motion to close the
9 public hearing.

10 MR. KESSLER: Second, please.

11 MR. MCKINLEY: Second.

12 MR. KESSLER: And on the question, all
13 in favor?

14 MULTIPLE: Aye.

15 MR. KESSLER: Opposed? Okay.

16 MR. KOBASA: Second motion to adopt the
17 Resolution 12-26, approving the amended site plan
18 with the changes proposed to conditions five,
19 six, and seven or contingent, the changes
20 proposed by the applicant to conditions five,
21 six, and seven.

22 MR. KESSLER: All right. Second, please.

23 MR. ROTHFEDER: Second.

24 MR. KESSLER: On the question, all in

June 2, 2026

favor?

MULTIPLE: Aye.

MR. KESSLER: Opposed? Okay, good luck.
Thanks.

MS. ZALANTIS: Thank you.

MR. KESSLER: All right, onto old
business, the application of Yeshiva Ohr Hameir
for site plan approval, an amended special permit
for a university, college, or seminary, and for
wetland and tree removal permits for a proposed
51,730 square foot dormitory building, a 1,640
square foot storage building, and repurposing of
other buildings onsite, and site improvements
including stormwater, landscaping, and building
facade renovations, located at the existing
Yeshiva Ohr Hameir campus at 121 Furnace Woods
Road, drawings revised May 15, 2026. Good
evening, Mr. Steinmetz again.

MR. STEINMETZ: Good evening, Mr.
Chairman, members of the board. David Steinmetz
from the law firm of Zarin and Steinmetz, here on
behalf of Yeshiva Ohr Hameir. We obviously
listened to your work session. We are here

June 2, 2026

tonight with our team. There were a number of important meetings that took place that you heard Mr. Lapine talk about, as well as I think Chris mentioned as well, between our professional team of engineers as well as the town staff.

I'm delighted that Chris indicated that, I think his phrase was great progress was made. There was a lot of back and forth in addressing a number of technical issues. Mr. Chairman, I did hear you, in particular, raise a number of comments and questions at the work session relative to DOH, the Department of Environmental Facilities, DEF, the capacity of the sewer system.

I'm going to make one simple statement, not as an engineer, but just kind of watching this process as it has unfolded. I want to remind you and the board that that sewer line and that pump station are yours. They are the town's public system. They only came into existence after the town filed all of the necessary applications and materials with the county for the Peekskill Sanitary Sewer District and with

1 June 2, 2026

2 the Westchester County Department of Health and
3 Department of Environmental Facilities. So, the
4 system was designed by your engineers, it went to
5 bid for the town, and it is the town's project.

6 Having said all of that, you would not
7 have gotten your permits to build the system if
8 it was not appropriate and designed correctly.
9 But most importantly, there will be a condition
10 in any resolution that says before we can get our
11 building permit, we have to get, as you heard at
12 the work session, final sign-off from DOH and
13 DEF. So, while your questions, and going back
14 historically in the Marian Pompa email, are all
15 fascinating, the 16,000 versus the 23 gallons per
16 day, interesting. My position, our position is we
17 can't build until the county government signs
18 off. I think you know that. I know your staff
19 knows that.

20 MR. KESSLER: I guess the question is,
21 when you were looking for the approval for this,
22 what were the numbers of students and staff that
23 you represented as the requirement for that, to
24 the town to build the facility at its current

June 2, 2026

size?

MR. STEINMETZ: When you were looking, when you were, I want to go back to your question. When you were looking for this was your phrase.

MR. KESSLER: No, I'm sorry. When you went to the -- when you represented to the town that you needed this system, the sewer system, what was the representation you made in terms of the number of, the population of the yeshiva?

MR. STEINMETZ: So, I don't, I can't answer that definitively because I don't think we were asked to provide the town with a definitive number of individuals, because the town was building a sewer system. And Dan, Steve, Rabbi, you can all correct me if I'm wrong, we were representing that we were going to be doing what you all approved 15 years ago, building a dormitory. We were going to have students. There was no final number on students or staff.

But the town determined, and I think you have it in your materials, that there is a 10-million gallon capacity at the Peekskill Sanitary

1 June 2, 2026

2 Sewer Plant, and that the maximum that anybody
3 was talking about in the materials was six
4 million gallons. So, there's such an excess
5 capacity, nobody was in the weeds of the numbers,
6 Mr. Chairman, as you were during the work
7 session.

8 So admittedly, it wasn't like we backed
9 into the number of students, it was actually the
10 other way around. A sewer system was finally
11 designed by the town, funded in large part by the
12 yeshiva, as well as grants from the state, and
13 once that was completed and fundraising completed
14 for the yeshiva, the yeshiva determined it could
15 actually build a Dodge City dormitory that would
16 lawfully accommodate 320 students.

17 So, we came and we actually have been in
18 front of you for almost a year talking about
19 those numbers. I hope that answers your question.
20 We didn't come to the town. There was no
21 communication that said, there will be this many
22 people, please design a sewer system for that.

23 MR. KESSLER: Give me one second here.
24 I'm just trying to find it.

1 June 2, 2026

2 MR. STEINMETZ: And with all due
3 respect, Steve, turn to your left and ask Katie.
4 I mean, she's from the, she's from Dodge. Do you
5 have a piece of correspondence from me saying to
6 you or Michael that we need a sewer system for
7 320 students? I don't think you're going to have
8 that because that's not the way it unfolded.

9 MR. KESSLER: But in Dan's letter, he
10 says the original request initiated by the
11 yeshiva was 23,000 gallons per day.

12 MR. STEINMETZ: I believe, and Dan, help
13 me here. I believe that was from years ago with
14 the out-of-district user.

15 MR. DAN CIARCIA: That's correct.

16 MR. STEINMETZ: Steve, I want to remind
17 you and the board, we've been at this for
18 literally --

19 MR. KESSLER: I understand.

20 MR. STEINMETZ: And I mean no
21 disrespect, and I don't want to be impatient.
22 We've been at this for 15 years, and there have
23 been so many different iterations. This is a
24 critical point that Dan whispered to me during

1 June 2, 2026

2 your work session. You were looking at some
3 materials that related to a moment in time when
4 the yeshiva was going to be an out-of-district
5 user of the county's sewer system. Why? Because
6 if we're not in a town sewer district, we can't
7 be an in-district user. Years later, the town,
8 your town, in its wisdom, decided to form the
9 Furnace Woods Sewer District, which included our
10 property and has the potential, as you heard this
11 evening, for 135 other properties. So you can't
12 cite the 16,000 and the 23 because they're
13 historical numbers from literally, I think, 10
14 years ago, at a point in time when I was
15 negotiating. I think I actually got a written
16 out-of-district user agreement from the county,
17 but then we pivoted away from that.

18 MR. KESSLER: Okay. But a point in time
19 when the population was probably half of what's
20 being proposed, just --

21 MR. STEINMETZ: It was never half of
22 being proposed. I mean half of -- there's 225
23 now, and there's only 320 proposed, so where
24 would the half be?

1 June 2, 2026

2 MR. KESSLER: Well, plus staff. Let's
3 not forget the staff.

4 MR. STEINMETZ: Correct.

5 MR. KESSLER: You've got another 100-
6 plus people staff, right?

7 MR. STEINMETZ: Correct. It would never
8 have been half. Okay. 434 versus, I don't know,
9 maybe 300, so maybe --

10 MR. STEINMETZ: Regardless.

11 MR. KESSLER: Okay. Maybe --

12 MR. STEINMETZ: And to, to me, the
13 numbers --

14 MR. KESSLER: maybe a third.

15 MR. STEINMETZ: -- again, with all due
16 respect, Mr. Chairman, the numbers are largely
17 superfluous and irrelevant because the capacity
18 of the system, as you read in the record this
19 evening --

20 MR. KESSLER: Right.

21 MR. STEINMETZ: There is no cap on the
22 quantity of flow. That's what Mr. Pompa put in
23 his communication to Mr. Ciarcia.

24 MR. KESSLER: But there's also --

1 June 2, 2026

2 MR. STEINMETZ: Because he knows he's
3 got four million gallons of capacity.

4 MR. KESSLER: But there is a cap on a
5 per person per day.

6 MR. STEINMETZ: Based upon some act of
7 the county that's some kind of mathematical
8 construct. I don't believe that that's actually
9 an individual cap, but if there was an individual
10 cap of 150 gallons per day, I think the engineers
11 will tell you we don't -- nobody generates --

12 MR. KESSLER: Right

13 MR. STEINMETZ: -- 150 gallons per day.

14 MR. KESSLER: Unless you're filling a
15 swimming pool every day.

16 MR. STEINMETZ: Yeah, and each person on
17 the campus is doing it.

18 MR. KESSLER: Right. Okay, so what are
19 we waiting for then now on all this? What's left
20 over here?

21 MR. KEHOE: Well, with all due respect,
22 I think you should be looking to the engineers.

23 MR. KESSLER: Oh, I'm sorry.

24 MR. KEHOE: Isn't that what we're

1 June 2, 2026

2 waiting for.

3 MR. KESSLER: Yeah, Chris?

4 MR. CHRIS LAPINE: Yeah. It's kind of
5 been the sanitary aspect of this offsite, and the
6 pump station has pretty much been under the
7 review of DOTS. But as I stated during the
8 workshop session, as it relates to the onsite
9 facilities, they have been properly designed to
10 handle the expected flow of 320 students and a
11 staff member and family member population of 100.
12 They have eight-inch sewer lines on site, which
13 are more than adequate for what's being proposed.

14 MS. BROSANAN: And that's on the DOTS
15 side of things, but it would still need to be
16 proved out by the engineer here.

17 MR. STEINMETZ: And as we said, I agree
18 with Katie on that wholeheartedly. In my intro, I
19 said we know before we can get a building permit,
20 it will have to be proved out. Department of
21 Health and Department of Environmental Facilities
22 will have to sign off before we can connect.

23 MR. LAPINE: Mr. Chairman, the pump
24 station that's been installed has a -- there was

1 June 2, 2026

2 a capacity analysis that was done on that
3 originally when it was designed and approved by
4 the Department of Health. The engineer is going
5 to have to include in his engineering report and
6 review that what's being proposed for the yeshiva
7 project, plus the other offsite properties that
8 were originally considered, the total flow
9 associated with all those properties is not over
10 the capacity of what the pump station was
11 designed for, if that makes sense to you. So
12 that'll have to be proved out as well as part of
13 his engineering report.

14 MS. BROSNAN: In addition to an I&I
15 study, is typically what we request.

16 MR. STEINMETZ: In light of those
17 comments, Mr. Chairman and members of the board,
18 I would ask you to consider, and again, we're
19 patient and will allow you to go through your
20 analysis and your questions. I do believe, Mr.
21 Chairman, that you're in a position to ask staff
22 simply to draft a resolution for consideration at
23 the next meeting. You don't have to vote. If you
24 don't think you're ready and they tell you you're

1 June 2, 2026

2 not ready, you're not going to vote. I know that.
3 However, we've come this far and your outside
4 consulting engineer has told you both in this
5 session and in the work session that we've made
6 great progress, that he's been working hand in
7 glove with our engineer, which we very much
8 appreciate. And I'm convinced that if you get 10
9 more days out of Mr. Kehoe, you'll get a draft
10 resolution before he leaves.

11 MR. KEHOE: I don't think so.

12 MR. STEINMETZ: It was worth a try,
13 Chris.

14 MR. MCKINLEY: You put him in the
15 penalty box.

16 MR. ROTHFEDER: You're talking about
17 based on the latest site plan?

18 MR. STEINMETZ: Say, I'm sorry?

19 MR. ROTHFEDER: The resolution would be
20 based on the latest site plan, the March 13th?

21 MR. STEINMETZ: Correct. Yes.

22 MR. ROTHFEDER: Okay. I don't see any
23 solar.

24 MR. STEINMETZ: So --

1 June 2, 2026

2 MR. ROTHFEDER: We've talked about that.

3 MR. STEINMETZ: And we've talked about
4 it, and I'll do the best I can, Jeff, to answer
5 it, because I think we did put it in our most
6 recent letter to you. My client, and I reiterated
7 the question tonight, because I knew you'd ask it
8 again. If we were building right now, if we had a
9 building permit today, I'm told every building
10 would be solar. Why? Because right now there are
11 grant programs that make it economically feasible
12 for this not-for-profit religious institution to
13 put solar on every building. It would be a great
14 thing. They have consulted with a solar company.
15 They are committed to trying to do it. It is the
16 right thing to do if it works. This is not a for-
17 profit entity. This is a small campus with small
18 roofs, one good size roof on the dormitory. If it
19 makes sense economically, there's no reason not
20 to do it. So, I think we gave you the commitment
21 in writing in the letter. We're committed to
22 exploring it and making it happen if it can
23 happen, and not have a negative impact. The only
24 other thing that I would say, in fairness between

1 June 2, 2026

2 us, your code does not, in my opinion, allow you
3 to mandate, and I think you know that.

4 MR. ROTHFEDER: I know that.

5 MR. STEINMETZ: We've had this
6 discussion --

7 MR. ROTHFEDER: But that doesn't mean
8 I'm going to vote for it. No, I understand that
9 completely, but I still think that anything we
10 build at this point that doesn't have solar makes
11 no sense for the future. And yes, the economics
12 may not be there today, although they are --

13 MR. STEINMETZ: They are today.

14 MR. ROTHFEDER: They are, and they're
15 certainly going to be there in five years, in 10
16 years, and I assume you guys want to be here for
17 a while.

18 MR. STEINMETZ: We do.

19 MR. ROTHFEDER: That's where my vote's
20 coming from. I'm just saying, I can't, I can't
21 care about the code.

22 MR. KEHOE: But Jeff, we've done that in
23 the past. And I was only kidding, I'll be around,
24 and we'll figure something out. But we have put

June 2, 2026

language in resolutions to try to figure out a way to, not quantify, but figure out a way to give you a level of comfort that if it makes economic sense for them to do it.

MR. ROTHFEDER: Right.

MR. KEHOE: They would do it. I mean we'll try to figure out some language in the resolution.

MR. STEINMETZ: And we have no objection to that.

MR. KEHOE: Yeah.

MR. STEINMETZ: And Jeff, we would endorse that language. I'm aware that we have, I have used that language with Chris on other matters in other contexts, and I think that would work here.

MR. ROTHFEDER: Right. Okay. I'm fine with that. Thank you.

MR. KESSLER: I think there's one other issue we didn't address, and that is the staging of the construction.

MR. STEINMETZ: Absolutely. So we did submit, I think it's dated May 20th, a rather

June 2, 2026

extensive letter from Steve Marino of Tim Miller Associates, going through the phase one, phase two, and phase three aspects of construction. I'm not going to botch it, so I'm going to let Steve walk us through it so that you're all clear. We do believe, as he's coming up, that we got fair questions from your board and from DOTS to make sure that the campus can operate safely. It's their job to figure out how to operate it, but operating it safely is within your purview. We believe it can operate safely and lawfully during the construction period.

MR. STEVE MARINO: Thank you, David.

Steve Marino, Tim Miller Associates. If you could put up sheet 16, that should be the colored phasing plan. Somewhere in here there's another pair of glasses that I can actually read my notes. Damn it. I was so smooth walking up here, and now --

MR. SCHWARTZ: You want to borrow these?

MR. MARINO: Oh, I wonder where they went. Oh, here they are, another pocket, got it. Okay. Sorry about that. Okay. So, what we've done

June 2, 2026

is we've broken down the project into three separate phases, beginning with the construction of the new Dodge City building. That's the large building in the center of the site. So that's phase one. During construction of that building, public water and sewer mains will be connected. Obviously, sewer and water facilities will have to be approved by the other agencies prior to that, but we need that in order to get our building permit. So, that will be taking place. The stormwater basin will also be installed and will be used as a sediment trap during construction and excavation for the floodplain compensation.

So if you recall, a portion of the new building and parking area to the west of the building are in the floodplain. So in order to compensate for that fill, raising of the level on that part of the property, there'll be a floodplain compensation area excavated to make up the volume of water that would've been lost in the floodplain.

So, the large building will be

June 2, 2026

constructed. At the completion of that building, which we expect to take about two years, this campus can then safely accommodate up to 256 students.

Phase two. Now, with phase two, the previous dormitory building, one of the dormitory buildings which we've historically called the Pool Building, will undergo construction as well as renovations to the existing sanctuary, which you recall is that purple extension off the new building there. While this existing sanctuary is being built, sanctuary operations will be moved into the new building. There's a portion of the new building in the northeast corner on the first floor, which is dedicated in the future to the rabbi's offices and library. But during construction, during that second phase, that area will be used as the temporary sanctuary. And our architect has, based on square footage of that area, it can support a minimum of 256 students in that area for sanctuary operations. That should take about a year based on that.

MR. MCKINLEY: How long was that for

June 2, 2026

sanctuary?

MR. MARINO: That's about one year for that phase. During that time also, the Dallas building, the existing Dallas Building will undergo the cosmetic improvements that are proposed for the outside of that building.

In phase three, now that the sanctuary is completed, the sanctuary will be able to be used for sanctuary operations again. At that time, construction upgrades will occur to the dining building as well as the remaining staff buildings of Texas and Dakota. With the completion of the sanctuary renovations, the sanctuary functions will return to the Chalet Building, and the rabbi's lecture room will now function as a temporary dining hall. So when the existing dining room building is being renovated, dining will then take place in that same square footage in the new building, that northeast corner. And that, again --

MR. KEHOE: That northeast corner --

MR. MARINO: The northeast corner of --

MR. KEHOE: -- is sanctuary in phase two

1 June 2, 2026

2 and dining in phase three.

3 MR. MARINO: Oh, right. Exactly. And as
4 part of my report, I do include a sheet at the
5 end, which shows the new dormitory building with
6 that northeast corner of approximately 4,300
7 square feet being able to accommodate 256
8 students for the sanctuary in phase two, and then
9 256 students for dining in phase three.

10 MR. KESSLER: And where's the food
11 coming from?

12 MR. MARINO: Food's coming from the
13 kitchen building right next door, because the
14 kitchen building is --

15 MR. KESSLER: That's going to be under
16 construction?

17 MR. MARINO: Well, the dining hall
18 portion of that building, the north portion of
19 that building, will be under construction. The
20 kitchen itself will not be going under
21 construction.

22 MR. KESSLER: Nothing's changing with
23 the kitchen?

24 MR. STEINMETZ: We're going to change

1 June 2, 2026

2 maybe the fixtures, but there's no changes being
3 proposed in the kitchen.

4 MR. KESSLER: For the equipment or
5 anything?

6 MR. MARINO: Right. Yep.

7 MR. KESSLER: And code doesn't have an
8 issue with the dining hall being -- moved to the
9 dormitory?

10 MR. STEINMETZ: Could you repeat that
11 question?

12 MR. KESSLER: I'm asking if our --

13 MR. STEINMETZ: I just want to hear it

14 MR. KESSLER: -- if code would have an
15 issue with the dining facilities moving to the
16 dormitory.

17 MR. KEHOE: So the food would be brought
18 outside. I don't know if that matters or if
19 that's even correct. I don't know.

20 MR. STEINMETZ: So, I believe our
21 architect, Chana, who is our code compliance
22 consultant, is on. So if you can confirm that
23 she's on and can answer that question, while
24 we're trying to see if she's connected, I want to

1 June 2, 2026

2 make sure that it's clear that that northeast
3 corner of the building that Steve just walked
4 through, just to make it, to simplify it, it is
5 being used as what I've been calling flex space.
6 So in one section of the phase, it can be used as
7 sanctuary, and that exact same space, 2,800
8 square feet, can then be used for dining
9 purposes. I have not been told of any kind of
10 code violation. And if you guys could --

11 MS. CHANA WEISZ: David, I'm here. I
12 don't know if you can hear me.

13 MR. STEINMETZ: Perfect. Now we can. I
14 was delaying till I made sure you were there.
15 Chana, can you -- go ahead.

16 MS. WEISZ: Yeah, there would be no
17 issues from a code perspective to use the flex
18 space, as you're calling it, for dining. They're
19 both assembly for educational use, as are the
20 classrooms. So there would be no issue with that.
21 And of course, we'd be providing adequate egress
22 and all safety features required. That would all
23 be overlapping. So there's no code restricting us
24 from using that flex space as dining space.

1 June 2, 2026

2 MS. BROSNAN: It's my understanding that
3 the kitchen is going to stay where it is.

4 MR. STEINMETZ: Correct.

5 MS. BROSNAN: And that the other spaces
6 are just to eat. Is that correct?

7 MR. STEINMETZ: Correct. There'll be
8 tables like you're sitting at, with chairs like
9 you're sitting at, in a room that's larger than
10 this that can accommodate the tables and chairs.

11 MS. WEISZ: That's correct. We're not
12 looking to move the kitchen into this building
13 and start with any cooking or anything like that.
14 This is just a cafeteria for eating, not food
15 prep.

16 MR. KESSLER: And what does the space
17 become when all is said and done?

18 MR. STEINMETZ: Ultimately becomes --

19 MR. YAAKOV ROTHBERG: The rabbi's --

20 MR. STEINMETZ: It'll be the rabbi's
21 study, lecture area, and a library. Yeah.

22 MR. KEHOE: And that's the first floor
23 of the dormitory building?

24 MR. STEINMETZ: That's correct.

1 June 2, 2026

2 MR. KEHOE: Which will be classroom
3 space as well as this?

4 MR. MARINO: If we could bring up, I
5 think it --

6 MS. WEISZ: Yes, this area is right
7 opposite the kitchen.

8 MR. KOBASA: Yeah, I think it's only the
9 eastern end of the new dormitory.

10 MR. STEINMETZ: It's the northeast
11 corner.

12 MR. MARINO: With my report from May
13 20th, I think the final page shows a floor plan
14 of that building, and it highlights --

15 MR. KEHOE: Yeah, so it's this.

16 MR. STEINMETZ: There you go. You have
17 Steve's --

18 MR. MARINO: It highlights that corner
19 with approximately --

20 MR. STEINMETZ: In salmon. If you have
21 Steve's May 20th letter in front of you --

22 MR. KEHOE: That would've come in your
23 packets tonight.

24 MR. KESSLER: Is it one of the these?

1 June 2, 2026

2 MR. KEHOE: No, it would've come in your
3 packets that we handed you tonight.

4 MR. KESSLER: Okay.

5 MR. STEINMETZ: Chris, could you just
6 hold it up one more again?

7 MR. SCHWARTZ: Oh, there it is.

8 MR. KEHOE: Yeah. There it is.

9 MR. STEINMETZ: Just zoom in for just a
10 second.

11 MR. KESSLER: Give me one sec. Got it.

12 MR. MARINO: So that's the layout of the
13 first-floor layout of the new building.

14 MR. KESSLER: Got it.

15 MR. MARINO: You can see that northeast
16 corner there is in salmon. And that's what is
17 laid out during phase two, it'll be used for
18 sanctuary space, and during phase three, will be
19 used for temporary dining. And that's first
20 floor, you said?

21 MR. MARINO: First floor.

22 MR. KESSLER: And so going back to the
23 other one, so just give me the directions on this
24 one. So in the yellow, where is that located on

1 June 2, 2026

2 the yellow? It's that north --

3 MR. KESSLER: Right.

4 MR. MARINO: That corner right there.

5 MR. KESSLER: Right there? Okay.

6 MR. MARINO: And the kitchen's straight
7 across. Right there.

8 MR. KESSLER: And I assume there's a
9 walkway between the kitchen and that building? Or
10 --

11 MS. WEISZ: There's an ADA-accessible
12 route getting from one building to the other.

13 MR. MARINO: So that closes out phase
14 three then, with the completion of the
15 improvements to the dining hall and to Texas and
16 Dakota. At that point, the entire project is
17 essentially complete. And at that time, the
18 campus can then accommodate the 320 students.

19 MR. KESSLER: And I guess my last
20 question, is the engineering department
21 comfortable with the phasing? When I talked to
22 Mike, I thought there were some issues here
23 still.

24 MS. BROSANAN: So the last time we looked

1 June 2, 2026

2 at the phasing, was during the technical meeting.
3 And from that meeting, we did have a number of
4 comments which were discussed tonight.

5 MR. KESSLER: Oh, okay.

6 MS. BROSANAN: We'll look at it again,
7 just to really go through it, but the major ones
8 that we wanted was that the wetlands were
9 mitigated on the front end, in phase one, as
10 opposed to the original plan, which was phase
11 three.

12 MR. MARINO: Yes.

13 MS. BROSANAN: We didn't want to wait for
14 the wetlands to be mitigated.

15 MR. MARINO: Wetland mitigation and
16 floodplain compensation will occur in phase one.

17 MS. BROSANAN: Yes.

18 MR. MARINO: As well as abandoning the
19 existing septic systems, which again, is a big
20 contributor to any wetland problems out there on
21 the site. Those will be abandoned once the
22 connection to the pump station is complete.

23 MS. BROSANAN: Another major item was we
24 wanted to make sure that the students that were

1 June 2, 2026

2 there could safely eat their lunches and meals,
3 which we asked them to describe in written
4 narrative and to put on the plans as well.

5 MR. MARINO: Yes. It's on, this new
6 sheet, 16 of 17, now includes the same narrative
7 I just read is on that plan.

8 MR. KESSLER: Okay.

9 MR. LAPINE: Well, Steve, I do have one
10 question as you were proceeding with this review.
11 The pool building and the Dallas building
12 renovations are going to take place in phase two,
13 and that's primarily your staff housing. Where
14 will the staff be housed during phase two? Would
15 it make sense maybe to move the Dallas building
16 up to phase one so that you at least have a
17 portion of it?

18 MR. KESSLER: Go ahead. Please come up.

19 MR. ROTHBERG: Yaakov Rothberg from the
20 Yeshiva. Good evening. Chris, the pool building
21 is being renovated for new staff to move on
22 premises. They're not currently living on
23 premises.

24 MR. LAPINE: Correct.

1 June 2, 2026

2 MR. ROTHBERG: The Dallas building is
3 being proposed to give us the freedom of having
4 traveling staff be able to come on a weekend or a
5 holiday. So nobody's currently -- those students
6 that are living in the Dallas building, they're
7 going to be moved out into the new dormitory once
8 it's built. That building will be serving as,
9 like we discussed, weekends and holidays for
10 traveling staff who don't live on campus to be
11 able to move. So I don't see -- we have no
12 concern about currently housing any staff members
13 until the pool building is complete, and the
14 Dallas building is just cosmetic on the outside.
15 Otherwise, it's staying the same. We're not
16 changing anything on the inside.

17 MR. LAPINE: I think sprinkler systems
18 are getting installed as well.

19 MR. ROTHERBERG: I don't know if that
20 was determined. Chana would know better about
21 Dallas.

22 MS. WEISZ: Well, we determined that we
23 would not be sprinklering. Again, we could
24 discuss this further with the code analysis. But

1 June 2, 2026

2 per our last analysis, there's no sprinkler
3 proposed for Dallas.

4 MR. ROTHBERG: For the Dallas building?

5 MS. WEISZ: Correct.

6 MR. LAPINE: Yeah. I think just for the
7 Dallas, Chana, I still think DOTS has a different
8 perspective maybe as it relates to just the
9 Dallas building, but, so I think you answered my
10 question, though. So there'll be no overnight
11 staff during the construction of phase two.

12 MR. ROTHBERG: Correct.

13 MR. STEINMETZ: I think the short answer
14 --

15 MR. ROTHBERG: Correct. That's the short
16 answer. Yes.

17 MR. STEINMETZ: I think the short answer
18 is that staff is commuting today.

19 MR. ROTHBERG: That's right.

20 MR. STEINMETZ: And they will continue
21 commuting.

22 MR. ROTHBERG: Yeah. So they will
23 continue commuting --

24 MR. LAPINE: They're not going to have

1 June 2, 2026

2 to, yeah.

3 MR. ROTHBERG: -- until the building is
4 complete.

5 MR. LAPINE: Until phase three, they'll
6 be able --

7 MR. ROTHBERG: That's correct.

8 MR. LAPINE: -- to be there during,
9 yeah. I just, I wanted to clarify for the record.
10 Yes.

11 MR. ROTHBERG: Yeah. Am I good?

12 MR. KESSLER: Good.

13 MR. LAPINE: I think we're good.

14 MR. KESSLER: Okay. Any other comments,
15 concerns? Sure, Tom.

16 MR. BIANCHI: I want to go back to the
17 sewage flows again, because I'm really not clear,
18 as so many numbers have been thrown around. As
19 to, I'm not questioning so much the calculations,
20 and I think that was, like David said, was the
21 town's responsibility to design and calculate
22 what the flows would be. But there must be a, I
23 don't think I have it, a report that was issued
24 showing not only the Yeshiva's population

1 June 2, 2026

2 numbers, but the also potential residential
3 numbers that are going to be or could be
4 connected into the system. Does that exist?

5 MS. BROSANAN: Yes, that exists.

6 MR. BIANCHI: Could we get a copy of
7 that?

8 MR. STEINMETZ: So if I can speak to it,
9 Katie, because I lived through it, the duration.
10 I believe \$90,000 was spent on Woodard and Curran
11 doing consulting engineering work for the town.
12 Somewhere in that expenditure, Woodard and Curran
13 did that analysis, and it was submitted to the
14 Department of Health in connection with an
15 analysis of the size of the pipes and the size of
16 the pump station.

17 MR. BIANCHI: Okay. I understand that,
18 but I'd just like --

19 MR. STEINMETZ: So that's the report
20 you're looking for, Tom.

21 MR. BIANCHI: My concern, well, it's not
22 so much a concern, but I want to make sure that
23 the proper student population and the teaching
24 population are included correctly.

1 June 2, 2026

2 MR. LAPINE: Yeah, that's what I was
3 going to, I'm sorry.

4 MS. BROSNAN: That's okay. Yeah. So that
5 letter does exist, or the memo exists from
6 Woodard and Curran, so we have that. It was
7 recently revised yesterday.

8 MR. BIANCHI: Okay.

9 MS. BROSNAN: From Woodard Curran. So
10 DOTS has that to share.

11 MR. BIANCHI: Okay. Thank you.

12 MR. KESSLER: It's okay.

13 MR. LAPINE: So Tom, the applicant's
14 engineer will be responsible for preparing the
15 engineer's report to show that their proposed
16 flows are less than what the capacity of that
17 pump station is.

18 MR. BIANCHI: Okay. Okay.

19 MS. BROSNAN: But it's up to the
20 Yeshiva's engineer to also prove out that the
21 expansion of the yeshiva sewer system can
22 withstand that as well.

23 MR. KESSLER: And I assume we'll see a
24 copy of that?

1 June 2, 2026

2 MS. BROSNAN: Mm-hmm.

3 MR. STEINMETZ: And Tom, just me to you,
4 I want you to hear, the yeshiva has no desire to
5 spend \$25 million to improve its campus and not
6 be able to flush its toilets and run its showers.

7 MR. BIANCHI: Hopefully not.

8 MR. STEINMETZ: So, I can assure you
9 that they share the concern that the town's
10 system has adequate capacity.

11 MR. BIANCHI: Okay.

12 MR. KESSLER: Are any other comments,
13 questions? So, well, we still haven't -- I mean
14 understand your concern to prepare a resolution.
15 The question now becomes, you're obviously
16 looking for us to approve your 350 --

17 MR. STEINMETZ: Twenty.

18 MR. KESSLER: -- 320, right.

19 MR. STEINMETZ: So all we're asking, Mr.
20 Chairman and members of the board, as we enter
21 the summer months and we have been at this for a
22 while, and I believe you know, my team has
23 responded to everything that has come at us as
24 quickly as they can. We're asking simply for the

1 June 2, 2026

2 preparation of a resolution. I think that will
3 create the catharsis for us to look at the words
4 and the language and the conditions that you need
5 and satisfy Jeff on the solar language, and
6 satisfy all of you on the various issues that
7 warrant appropriate disposition. But it's June.
8 We had to take a couple of months off because of
9 holidays, et cetera. We spent a lot of time with
10 staff. Let's get to work on a resolution. I know
11 you will not vote on that resolution until the
12 people sitting to my right, your left, are
13 comfortable that you're ready to vote.

14 MR. KESSLER: Yeah. I'm just wondering,
15 is there some condition that determines to go
16 from student population A to B?

17 MR. STEINMETZ: So --

18 MR. KESSLER: And I know your position,
19 David.

20 MR. STEINMETZ: Yeah. All right. But I -

21 -

22 MR. KESSLER: We have no right to do
23 that. I understand that.

24 MR. STEINMETZ: No, no, no. But that's

1 June 2, 2026

2 not fair to say it that way, because you're
3 right, you have no right. But we've offered to
4 voluntarily, we've offered voluntarily to allow
5 that to be a condition. You know that. We've
6 discussed this together repeatedly. So while you
7 can't mandate it, we've offered it.

8 MR. KESSLER: Okay.

9 MR. STEINMETZ: I've discussed it
10 extensively with the town attorney's office about
11 the language. So --

12 MR. CUNNINGHAM: But just as a caveat,
13 too, if there's a health, safety, or welfare
14 issue, then the board could have some sort of
15 student cap.

16 MR. STEINMETZ: And there, in one year,
17 Mr. Cunningham, in one year, I've heard no
18 health, safety, and welfare legitimate concern
19 raised by anyone on the planning board or town
20 staff that has not been addressed. So if there is
21 a health, safety, and welfare concern tell us.

22 MR. KESSLER: Well, again, that may come
23 up when you go from four to five in a room,
24 potentially. I'm not saying it -- that's, I

1 June 2, 2026

2 think, the issue that's being brought up. First
3 of all, we're only proposing four.

4 MR. KESSLER: I understand that.

5 MR. STEINMETZ: And five is lawfully
6 allowed. Check it with your code people. We know
7 that. We've learned that in this process.

8 MR. KESSLER: Right.

9 MR. STEINMETZ: Five individuals are
10 lawfully, beyond your jurisdiction, under New
11 York State Code, five individuals are allowed in
12 each of those dorm rooms. So --

13 MR. KESSLER: Assuming, yeah. Are you
14 referring --

15 MR. KEHOE: But according to your own
16 phasing report, Steve says, and maybe phase one
17 takes two years, maybe phase two takes one year.
18 It says, based on available square footage, the
19 maximum student population during this time could
20 continue to be safely and lawfully at 256.

21 MR. STEINMETZ: After phase one is
22 completed, yes.

23 MR. KEHOE: So maybe something gets
24 worked in that 256 is the number until a certain

1 June 2, 2026

2 point, then it can go up to 320.

3 MR. STEINMETZ: I've offered, just again
4 --

5 MR. KESSLER: I know. Okay.

6 MR. STEINMETZ: -- I feel like we miss
7 each other because I'm having conversations with
8 staff that are, I think, designed to protect what
9 you've asked me to protect.

10 MR. KESSLER: Right.

11 MR. STEINMETZ: We are not seeking 320
12 boys, 320 students, until all of the
13 improvements, phases one, two, and three, are
14 completed and administratively reviewed by the
15 building department and the engineering
16 department. Period, the end. We are asking that
17 after the dormitory building is completed, the
18 wetlands that Katie reminded us of, and whatever
19 else Steve said and read to you from phase one,
20 that's when we would be allowed to go to 256.
21 Allowed. Who knows whether there'll be any demand
22 for the 256, and that's not until 2029 probably.

23 MR. LAPINE: And I think the caveat with
24 that, and as we spoke at the meeting, is that

June 2, 2026

you're going to demonstrate during phase one that you have the onsite capabilities for the dining that's going to be temporary and the onsite capabilities for the studying when the chalet becomes there as a temporary --

MR. STEINMETZ: Certainly.

MR. LAPINE: When that's under construction.

MR. STEINMETZ: Yes, the flex space will be built, and it has a lawful occupancy limit.

MR. LAPINE: And that'll be reviewed during the building permit phase.

MR. KESSLER: All right. So, okay. Obviously, there's language that needs to be worked out to the satisfaction, obviously, of the seven members of the board.

MR. STEINMETZ: Absolutely. That's what I want to get to.

MR. KESSLER: Okay. So, yeah. So I have no problem with starting that process, again, not knowing how long it'll take. So I'm amenable to that, to start, as long as the clock remains open.

1 June 2, 2026

2 MR. STEINMETZ: So stipulated. Whatever
3 extensions Mr. Cunningham needs, he knows he will
4 get.

5 MR. KESSLER: Okay.

6 MR. CUNNINGHAM: When closing the public
7 hearing, it was adjourned. The --

8 MR. STEINMETZ: We extended there.

9 MR. CUNNINGHAM: The shot clock was
10 adjourned without date.

11 MR. STEINMETZ: Yeah, I thought we did.

12 MR. CUNNINGHAM: So we don't need
13 another course on that.

14 MR. KESSLER: Any final words? So if
15 not, Karen, anything on --

16 MR. STEINMETZ: May the Knicks get as
17 much latitude on the shot clock as Cunningham
18 got.

19 MR. KEHOE: Just on the record, too, we
20 mentioned at the work session, the response to
21 all public comments --

22 MR. KESSLER: Oh, yes

23 MR. KEHOE: -- that the applicant put
24 together, just so that's on the record, that's in

1 June 2, 2026

2 the file.

3 MR. STEINMETZ: Okay.

4 MR. KESSLER: Okay. Thank you. You'll
5 get that to us. Great.

6 MR. LAPINE: Perhaps between now and the
7 next meeting, the applicant's engineer can work
8 with our office and DOTS at vetting out the
9 capacity of the sewer pump station, so when it's
10 time, you all feel comfortable with that.

11 MR. KEHOE: Yeah, that'll work itself
12 into either whereas clauses and/or conditions.

13 MR. LAPINE: Right.

14 MR. ROTHFEDER: And just one other
15 thing, just to get that on the record. So in
16 terms of the trees that are being taken down,
17 there are going to be more planted than are
18 necessary. That's what I saw in the notes.

19 MR. STEINMETZ: Correct. That was seven
20 months ago we did that.

21 MR. ROTHFEDER: Well, I just wanted to
22 get that on the record.

23 MR. KEHOE: It may have been seven
24 months ago, but it was just really sort of

1 June 2, 2026

2 quantified, at least to my knowledge. So we are
3 sending our arborist out there. Steve did a
4 thorough job, 29 trees are going to be removed,
5 he's got a replanting plan but we're having our
6 arborist go out to confirm that.

7 MR. ROTHFEDER: Okay, great. Yeah, I
8 hadn't seen that, that way before, but so I
9 appreciate that.

10 MR. KESSLER: Okay, so why don't we get
11 a motion on the table. Karen?

12 MS. TIMKO: I'd like to make a motion on
13 PB 2025-7, Yeshiva Ohr Hameir, to refer this back
14 to staff for additional technical review and to
15 commence preparation of a draft resolution.

16 MR. KESSLER: Perfect. Second, please.

17 MR. BIANCHI: Second.

18 MR. KESSLER: And on the question, all
19 in favor?

20 MULTIPLE: Aye.

21 MR. KESSLER: Opposed?

22 MR. STEINMETZ: Thank you, all. I
23 appreciate that.

24 MR. KESSLER: Thank you. Okay, next item

1 June 2, 2026

2 under old business, the application of VS
3 Construction Corporation for site development
4 plan approval and for steep slope and tree
5 removal permits for a proposed 9,600 square foot
6 commercial building located on future parcel
7 three within the medical-oriented district for
8 property located at 2003 Crompond Road, drawings
9 revised March 25, 2026. Good evening.

10 MR. STEINMETZ: Good evening, Mr.
11 Chairman, David Steinmetz from the law firm of
12 Zarin and Steinmetz, here on behalf of VS
13 Construction. And this parcel three or lot three
14 commercial building, I'll be very brief on this.
15 Obviously, you all went out, and many of you went
16 out and conducted a site inspection. Once again,
17 much like the last application, there have been a
18 number of meetings with staff, and we appreciate
19 all of the time that we've gotten from Katie and
20 Michael, and DOTS, and from Chris Lapine, as well
21 as Chris, Heather, and MC.

22 There have been a number of different
23 iterations of the commercial building that we
24 have analyzed. Heather talked a little bit about

1 June 2, 2026

2 that, I think, this evening at the work session.
3 I'm going to let Matt Steinberg walk us through.
4 As you asked, there is a retaining wall that, in
5 essence, and I can allow the technical folks to
6 explain it, essentially remains where it is in
7 order to develop the site. That retaining wall
8 will remain in its location just outside the 30-
9 foot buffer area.

10 The building itself, as you saw, for
11 those of you that went out there, there's some
12 latitude to move it around. We expect this to be
13 an attractive commercial building, exactly like
14 what we had talked about throughout the full
15 comprehensive SEQOR process with the town board as
16 lead agency. I remind your board simply that the
17 findings statement adopted pursuant to SEQOR
18 acknowledged that this building would be there,
19 that there would be an access to this building,
20 there would be parking associated with it, and
21 that there were no significant adverse
22 environmental impacts.

23 Having said that, I know you all did the
24 site walk. I know you saw the neighboring

1 June 2, 2026

2 property. We're prepared to mitigate the views of
3 and from that property to the maximum extent
4 practicable. We think our building does that, and
5 I'll let Matt walk us through the different
6 iterations.

7 MR. MATT STEINBERG: Thank you. Good
8 evening. Matt Steinberg, DTS Provident. Heather,
9 I guess if you bring up the first one. So at our
10 previous appearance, there were some questions
11 about the size and location of the proposed
12 commercial building. And this board obviously had
13 an opportunity to walk the site as well. So this,
14 we want to take a few moments just to go through
15 some of the, as David mentioned, some of the
16 iterations of this.

17 So this image is essentially our current
18 proposed site plan. This is the full-size set of
19 plans that we submitted. This is what we walked
20 around with on the site, holding onto. In this
21 case, the building is acting as a part of that
22 retaining wall system, the back of the building
23 that is, with the parking along the Crompond Road
24 side of the plan. We had previously submitted a

June 2, 2026

site section. This is a version of that that cuts through, essentially, that building. We've kind of broken that to get you the view of to the neighboring property as well.

This is a 9,600 square foot building, so during the SEQR process and the findings, we evaluate up to a 10,000 square foot commercial building. As part of this plan, we've reduced that somewhat to try to get a better fit on the property. So this is a 9,600 square foot building, single story with approximately 44 parking spaces.

And since our original submission to this board, what we managed to do was pull this building forward by a few feet just to give a little bit more space between the back of the building and the retaining wall, and that 30-foot non-disturbance buffer.

Heather, if you could go to the next. So this is one of the iterations that we had discussed with staff. This is about showing approximately a 10,000 square foot building. Roughly the same number of parking spaces as the

June 2, 2026

other plan. This would still require a retaining wall. In this case, the retaining wall would run the entire length of the parking lot. The building obviously isn't in that place to make up part of that wall. And the building is pushed forward closer to Crompond Road. Essentially, the rear of the building would be facing towards Crompond Road with the parking between it and the neighboring property. We've included a site section, and we can obviously submit this to the board as well.

So essentially, the layout, it's flipped, but has the same components, same parking lot, just on the other side, same retaining wall. The building, as you can see from the neighboring property, while there's some vegetation and trees in that 30-foot non-disturbance area, the owner would be looking out over to this building. Although, instead of looking completely over it, there may be views to it since it's further in that line of sight.

MR. KESSLER: How many feet does it move forward in this rendition?

1 June 2, 2026

2 MR. STEINBERG: In this one, it's about,
3 essentially it's 25, about 35 feet.

4 MR. KESSLER: Thirty-five feet closer to
5 Crompond Road?

6 MR. STEINBERG: Yep.

7 MR. STEINMETZ: Satisfying setbacks on
8 that?

9 MR. STEINBERG: Yes. So you can kind of
10 see the setbacks. It's a dashed line between
11 Crompond Road and -- so essentially, it's the
12 width of the -- the length of the parking space
13 and the width of the aisle.

14 MR. KEHOE: And a while ago, very
15 preliminarily, you talked to staff about these
16 options, and we were a little concerned that that
17 would be the back of the building facing Route
18 202.

19 MR. STEINBERG: Correct.

20 MR. KEHOE: And then you provided some
21 renderings or images of what that would look
22 like? I can't remember.

23 MR. STEINBERG: I don't think we had
24 images of that building in that location, showing

1 June 2, 2026

2 the rear of it.

3 MR. KEHOE: We --

4 MR. STEINBERG: But we did discuss that,
5 yes.

6 MR. KEHOE: But maybe you showed the one
7 -- you did get something if you were standing in
8 Route 202 looking up through it.

9 MR. STEINBERG: Right, and that is of
10 the current proposal with the building to the
11 back.

12 MR. STEINMETZ: The original proposal.

13 MR. KEHOE: Okay, so you have that
14 somewhere in your packets.

15 MR. STEINBERG: Yeah.

16 MR. KEHOE: Okay.

17 MR. STEINMETZ: But Chris, we're
18 prepared to do the same kind of architectural
19 treatment.

20 MR. KEHOE: Okay.

21 MR. LAPINE: How high is the wall in
22 this alternative?

23 MR. STEINBERG: So in this alternative,
24 it's still about 16 feet in the center.

1 June 2, 2026

2 MR. STEINMETZ: At the highest
3 point. Right, the highest point.

4 MR. STEINBERG: Right, the highest
5 point. So, closer to Lafayette, it goes down to,
6 kind of peters out to about two feet, and then
7 kind of in the center portion, so I guess if you
8 look at the center of the building across from
9 that, you're at about 16 feet in height, and then
10 it gradually goes down again to about 12 feet in
11 height on the western side. So, in the version
12 with the building as the retaining wall, it
13 would, the parapet would rise above that, in that
14 case.

15 MR. LAPINE: And that's keeping the same
16 finished floor elevation in this model of 377?

17 MR. STEINBERG: Yes, because it's really
18 based off of that, trying to set that parking
19 lot, so it's about the same.

20 MR. LAPINE: If you raised that finished
21 floor, though, then we can lower that wall in
22 this alternative?

23 MR. STEINBERG: It's possible. Then it
24 starts having some, obviously trying to get the

1 June 2, 2026

2 grading to work with the Lafayette access and the
3 access road into it, but, yeah.

4 MR. STEINMETZ: Remind everyone that's
5 the emergency access.

6 MR. STEINBERG: Correct. Right. So this
7 parcel itself also serves as an emergency access
8 point. So the entry road, the main entry road to
9 that lollipop that everyone kind of refers to,
10 this driveway comes off of that. A fire truck or
11 emergency vehicle could circulate through this
12 parking lot and in and out from Lafayette as
13 another point of access to the overall
14 development. And during this process, we did try
15 to raise the building a little bit to reduce not
16 only cut and fill, but also to try to reduce the
17 height of that wall.

18 I guess, Heather, if you'd go to the
19 next one, I'll show this one as well. So this is
20 a little bit less developed of a plan because
21 this generally comes from an earlier version of
22 the master plan that we had been reviewing during
23 the end of the SEQR process. This represents
24 essentially a two-story version, so it's

June 2, 2026

approximately 5,000 square foot footprint, so 5,000 on each level. In this scenario, retail on the second level doesn't really work for an operator, especially the type of retail that's permitted in the mod. So most likely it would be all medical office on that second level. So it's additional parking that's required for that. And then the retail space, obviously, is much more limited on the first level because this building would also be required to have some kind of an entry lobby for the office, an elevator, and a staircase. So it wouldn't actually be 5,000 of retail most likely. So, this was previously evaluated, but it just, for the applicant, it wasn't really a feasible option compared to the one story.

MR. KESSLER: Feasible for tenanting purposes?

MR. STEINBERG: For their tenant, right, right. So obviously you can see that we've got the site plan to work, but from looking for a tenant, the interest that was out there, it wasn't feasible for them.

1 June 2, 2026

2 MR. KEHOE: I think this is always the
3 point where they want you to tell them what to
4 do.

5 MR. KESSLER: Well, the main concern was
6 obviously the proximity to the neighbor, even
7 though we know that the neighbor's going to be
8 looking at the roof of the building, right, that
9 we've established that on the site visit.

10 MR. STEINBERG: Right.

11 MR. KESSLER: But I guess now, I didn't
12 realize that we're talking such a significant
13 retaining wall going up there as well. And that's
14 represented by the red? Where's the retaining
15 wall, up against the --

16 MR. STEINBERG: So if you look at this,
17 there's kind of a darker line along the back of
18 the parking there. That is essentially --

19 MR. KESSLER: Okay.

20 MR. STEINBERG: -- the retaining wall.

21 MR. KESSLER: Abutting the parking.

22 MR. STEINBERG: Yeah.

23 MR. STEINMETZ: Abutting the parking.

24 MR. STEINBERG: Right. Essentially, that

1 June 2, 2026

2 creates the pad for the parking.

3 MR. KEHOE: But I think you touched upon
4 it, Matt. If the building is -- it depends what
5 the view from the neighbor's house is going to
6 be. If the building is pushed way back, they may
7 be overlooking the roof of the building. If it's
8 pushed forward, they may be seeing the roof of
9 the building.

10 MR. STEINBERG: They may be seeing the,
11 right. So obviously, the closer something is,
12 they would potentially be looking over it. We've
13 proposed -- the architects have proposed like a
14 parapet wall at the top of the back. We can also
15 install, between the back of the building, there
16 would have to be a fall protection fence. So that
17 could be a solid fence. It could definitely be
18 solid so that it provides additional screening as
19 well.

20 MR. KESSLER: So the choice is looking
21 over the top of the building or looking over the
22 parking lot.

23 MR. KOBASA: Well, sorry. No.

24 MR. KESSLER: Is that what it comes down

1 June 2, 2026

2 to?

3 MR. KOBASA: Can you go back to the
4 first, yes, plan? The current proposal. Yeah.
5 It's not looking at the parking lot. You'll never
6 see the parking lot from the standpoint.

7 MR. KESSLER: No, these other two,
8 though, you look at the parking lot.

9 MR. KOBASA: You, no.

10 MR. STEINBERG: You probably look over
11 the parking lot.

12 MR. KOBASA: You'll never see the
13 parking lot.

14 MR. STEINBERG: You likely would not see
15 the parking lot.

16 MR. KOBASA: In this view right here --

17 MR. STEINBERG: Right.

18 MR. KOBASA: They will never see the
19 parking lot.

20 MR. STEINBERG: Right.

21 MR. KOBASA: Not possible. And if a
22 solid screened fence goes up, they probably won't
23 see most of the building unless they're up in the
24 dormer floor of that building, but even then

1 June 2, 2026

2 they're looking through canopy trees. So maybe
3 that's your winter --

4 MR. KEHOE: Well, and you don't have
5 these in paper copy, correct, right?

6 MR. STEINBERG: Not the second two,
7 correct.

8 MR. KEHOE: Right. And so it's hard to
9 see, but the bottom of that image really is what
10 I think Kevin's talking about. It's giving you
11 the view from the neighbor's house out across the
12 property.

13 MR. KOBASA: Mm-hmm.

14 MR. KEHOE: So we'll get you the hard
15 copies and you can easily see.

16 MR. KOBASA: Yeah. Can you, when you
17 send us these copies, can you just do a vision,
18 right?

19 MR. STEINBERG: We can do that. Yeah.
20 And I think in one of our earlier --

21 MR. KOBASA: What someone would be
22 looking at?

23 MR. STEINBERG: Yeah. Like that we add
24 that back on.

1 June 2, 2026

2 MR. KOBASA: So you'll be able to see
3 that if they give you a sight line cone. So what
4 someone will be looking at, what gets caught in
5 that. Of these three plans, this is, in my
6 opinion, the most preferable because you're only
7 putting parking adjacent to two sides. One of
8 those sides is a much lower wall probably, right?
9 That's the side where it's almost two feet, the
10 Lafayette side

11 MR. STEINBERG: The Lafayette side, it
12 does, yeah. And that's --

13 MR. KOBASA: So then it's just the other
14 side where you're closer to like a 12-foot wall.
15 But most of that 16-foot wall that are in these
16 other two plans are, they disappear by the
17 building. So the building becomes the retaining
18 wall. You'll never see the 16-foot high retaining
19 wall if the building goes where it's in this
20 thing, because the building becomes the retaining
21 wall.

22 MR. STEINMETZ: So, Mr. Chairman, we
23 agree with Kevin's request. Allow us to do that
24 visual assessment. I think it makes a lot of

1 June 2, 2026

2 sense. And I think the other thing that we're
3 looking for some guidance on, we don't believe as
4 a team that the two-story building makes sense.

5 MR. KESSLER: Right.

6 MR. STEINMETZ: And unless you want,
7 unless you disagree, we don't want to spend time,
8 money, and effort studying it because it just
9 doesn't work there --

10 MR. KESSLER: Right.

11 MR. STEINMETZ: -- from our standpoint.

12 MR. KESSLER: Right. If it's not
13 commercially feasible, then yeah, absolutely.

14 MR. STEINMETZ: Okay. So, I think the
15 issue is we will do a visual assessment of the
16 building where we'd like it, sort of towards the
17 back of the lot, up against the retaining wall,
18 and then we will do a further visual analysis
19 pulling it forward. And to your point, Kevin, we
20 will look at it, and I want to look at it, with
21 all due respect, to studying it from the
22 neighbor's vantage point, which is fine, and we
23 will do that. There are thousands of passersby on
24 202, and seeing, understanding what that view is

1 June 2, 2026

2 for a commercial building is a very important
3 analysis. So I want to make sure we're giving you
4 that, too.

5 MR. KESSLER: Okay.

6 MR. KOBASA: When you do it, not just a
7 person standing at grade, but also assume
8 someone's looking out that dormer window up
9 there.

10 MR. STEINMETZ: Yeah, we can cut it,
11 what that looks like, so the site view from both
12 sides, both heights.

13 MR. KOBASA: Yes.

14 MR. STEINBERG: All right.

15 MR. ROTHFEDER: I was just going to,
16 that issue about the trees that came up in the
17 work session.

18 MR. STEINBERG: Yes.

19 MR. ROTHFEDER: Yes. So you said you had
20 a different number, that the number from Save a
21 Tree is the whole property?

22 MR. STEINBERG: It is the whole
23 property, right. So, it's for this parcel, and
24 we'll talk later this evening about the town

1 June 2, 2026

2 owned parcel.

3 MR. ROTHFEDER: Right.

4 MR. STEINBERG: It covered that as well.

5 So they did the whole balance of the site that
6 wasn't previously done. So it's a big number in
7 the report you got. So what we can do is we can
8 parse out --

9 MR. ROTHFEDER: Okay

10 MR. STEINBERG: -- parcel three, parcel
11 two. We started doing that. We can provide a tree
12 map. We have the trees in that buffer area that
13 we looked at when we were on the site, walked
14 together, so --

15 MR. ROTHFEDER: Okay. So you'll provide
16 that?

17 MR. STEINBERG: So provide that with
18 some additional detail.

19 MR. ROTHFEDER: Okay. Thank you. Yep.

20 MR. STEINBERG: And it's all based on
21 Save a Tree.

22 MR. ROTHFEDER: Thank you.

23 MR. KESSLER: Okay. Any other comments
24 from the board or staff? Hearing none, Nora?

June 2, 2026

MS. HILDINGER: I'd like to make a motion for PB 2026-3 to refer this back to staff for additional technical review.

MR. KESSLER: Thank you. Second?

MR. MCKINLEY: Second.

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

MULTIPLE: Aye.

MR. KESSLER: Opposed? Okay. Moving on. Next item is the application of John Lentini for the property of J Glamour Nails and Spa for site development plan approval and for conversion of the former La Valetta Restaurant into a nail salon for property located at 3172 East Main Street. Drawings revised February 13, 2026. Good evening, Mr. Lentini.

MR. LENTINI: Good evening, Mr. Chairman, members of the planning board, town staff, and Mr. Kehoe.

MR. KESSLER: So we had a site visit last Thursday.

MR. LENTINI: Yes. I'd like to say, first of all --

1 June 2, 2026

2 MR. KESSLER: Yeah

3 MR. LENTINI: -- I heard everything that
4 was said about Chris. I'd like to second it. I
5 have nothing to add, but I have had one problem
6 with him now that he's leaving. And I wonder if I
7 can get your home number.

8 MR. KEHOE: Sure.

9 MR. LENTINI: I need him. I don't know
10 how I'm going to do this without him. Well, we'll
11 work it out. Okay. As far as the Glamour Nail
12 goes, I know that one of the things we discussed
13 at length was the amount of seats, and I'm
14 working on a plan to reduce them by 40 percent,
15 maybe 50 percent. I'm reminded by the former
16 owner, who was just here a moment ago, that there
17 were like 40 or 50 seats in La Valletta. So I'm
18 going to keep it to that. I also want to explain
19 what the owner was trying to explain in her
20 broken English, that she wants to show she has a
21 big place, not that she planned on populating it,
22 which might sound a little inefficient, but I'm
23 reminded of my history. I worked at a drafting
24 office in Brooklyn in the '60s, and we had 16

1 June 2, 2026

2 drafting tables and four draftsmen. So when
3 people came in, we were courting big work, and
4 they would look all, where are all the draftsmen?
5 Well they're out measuring. You know, but the
6 fact is, that was part of the sales pitch. But
7 they have no intention, or they don't have any
8 dream that they'll ever fill up 56 seats.

9 MR. KESSLER: Well, you have nine
10 parking spaces that you're proposing, so I guess,
11 you know.

12 MR. LENTINI: Right.

13 MR. KESSLER: You know, 54 doesn't go
14 into nine.

15 MR. LENTINI: Well, the building was
16 designed so that it fell within the zoning code
17 for the amount of spaces per square feet. It's
18 always nice to have more parking, but I believe
19 we are conforming with the code.

20 MR. KESSLER: Understood.

21 MR. LENTINI: Another thing that was
22 discussed with the engineering department,
23 actually with the planning board, that my plans
24 are a little unclear now because I originally was

1 June 2, 2026

2 adding to this building to make it look like
3 something. Obviously, it's going to be a new
4 building, so I'm going to take reference off the
5 plans. I tried to get it in before tonight, but
6 it wouldn't have been circulated anyway. But
7 it'll be presented as a completely new building.

8 MR. KESSLER: Okay.

9 MR. LENTINI: Herein, going forward. The
10 other issue that we discussed briefly, but that
11 the engineering department has had a problem
12 with, is the three curb cuts. And the prior owner
13 was telling me that when they had a taking on
14 Route 6, this was a big issue with the Department
15 of Transportation, and they came up with this
16 configuration as being the best for the use at
17 the time, which was the same thing, a multifamily
18 house and a pizza shop. So, besides, we're
19 looking at it as a drop-off point for first
20 responders to be able to get emergency vehicles
21 around the building. We don't want to cut access
22 to the building.

23 I'm not sure how I'm going to resolve
24 that with the engineering department, but the one

1 June 2, 2026

2 issue about the two properties with the one
3 driveway, we will provide whatever easement is
4 required that will legally allow people to come
5 into both properties, even though they're under
6 the same ownership. So I'm here to request that
7 we can advance this to possibly a public hearing.

8 MR. KESSLER: You think we're ready for
9 a public hearing on this?

10 MR. KEHOE: I hate to do this to John at
11 my last meeting, but I would think we'd like to
12 see the revised plan --

13 MR. KESSLER: Yeah

14 MR. KEHOE: -- first.

15 MR. LENTINI: I'd like to get more
16 comments so I don't keep on drawing. If any
17 comments come out from the public, I'll be back
18 to the drafting table.

19 MR. KESSLER: I don't think we'll hear a
20 lot from the public. I think the issue still
21 remains the --

22 MR. MCKINLEY: Parking.

23 MR. KESSLER: -- capacity and the
24 ability of the parking to accommodate the

1 June 2, 2026

2 proposed capacity.

3 MR. LENTINI: Understood.

4 MR. KOBASA: What is the amount of
5 parking required for the two-story dwelling?

6 MR. LENTINI: Nine spaces. It's for the
7 first floor, every square foot, 300 square feet
8 per car.

9 MR. KOBASA: No.

10 MR. KEHOE: The house next door.

11 MR. KOBASA: The house, right? Because
12 part of this issue with this site plan is you
13 have -- there's existing parking that's shown in
14 the middle of your drive lane that you want to
15 keep.

16 MR. LENTINI: I'll move it. That's where
17 I see cars parked. There's no striping, but I'll
18 move that parking over towards the other parking.
19 And I understand there's three families there,
20 two spaces per family, I believe is what the code
21 would require, that we have six spaces.

22 MR. KOBASA: Yeah, I think we need to
23 see how you park that out.

24 MR. KESSLER: Are you going to be

1 June 2, 2026

2 striping those parking spaces as well?

3 MR. LENTINI: I think we should.

4 MR. KESSLER: I think you should, too.

5 MR. LENTINI: Yeah. And I think the
6 whole parking lot's going to have to get repaved
7 anyway.

8 MR. KESSLER: Yeah.

9 MR. LENTINI: Both of them.

10 MR. BIANCHI: You mentioned the code.
11 You meet the code, but the code is based on, as I
12 understand, it's square footage, not clients --

13 MR. LENTINI: Right.

14 MR. BIANCHI: -- which is the problem
15 here. How do you fit, even if you cut it in half,
16 how do you fit that many potential clients at one
17 time into nine parking spaces?

18 MR. LENTINI: And the workers, and the
19 employees.

20 MR. BIANCHI: Excuse me?

21 MR. LENTINI: And the employees. We have
22 the customers and the employees. Well, the
23 employees are driven there by bus. Most of the
24 families are from Queens, I understand. They

1 June 2, 2026

2 actually commute up for other businesses from
3 Queens. And I explain my own family situation. My
4 wife, daughter-in-law, and two granddaughters get
5 their nails done regularly as an ordeal. And
6 either they'll drive in one car or my son drops
7 them off and picks them up. So there's ways of
8 getting there, and if you are used to not getting
9 enough parking, I believe you won't just try to
10 park at the ShopRite. I think that's one of the
11 concerns, that everybody will start parking at
12 ShopRite.

13 MR. BIANCHI: Well, yeah or parking
14 adjacent to the neighboring houses there.

15 MR. LENTINI: Well --

16 MR. BIANCHI: And there, right in front
17 of their house, you know, just fitting in
18 whatever they can.

19 MR. LENTINI: Well, they can't park on
20 Route 6, so it would be --

21 MR. BIANCHI: That I know, yeah.

22 MR. KESSLER: Or parking in the front,
23 where there's room.

24 MR. BIANCHI: The front.

1 June 2, 2026

2 MR. LENTINI: No, we prohibited parking
3 in the front.

4 MR. KESSLER: I understand that.

5 MR. LENTINI: That would be --

6 MR. BIANCHI: You've got to, go ahead,
7 I'm sorry.

8 MR. LENTINI: The town would have -- I
9 once saw Eddie Brexa giving tickets out in front
10 of NAPA Auto Parts. So the town would actually
11 have the ability to ticket vehicles if they were
12 parked in the front.

13 MR. KEHOE: You'll flesh out some more
14 parking, both with respect to the house next
15 door, figure out what you're going to do with
16 those spots, because there was some parking
17 shown, I guess, right in front of that other curb
18 cut, which doesn't work.

19 MR. LENTINI: Yes.

20 MR. KESSLER: Yeah. Right.

21 MR. LENTINI: Well, I could park more in
22 the back where the septic system's getting
23 abandoned, but then we start losing the
24 impermeable to the ratio for landscaping.

1 June 2, 2026

2 MS. LAVARNWAY: I think you're also
3 going to want to just be careful with your site
4 circulation, where you're putting the spaces,
5 because if the spaces right now that are sort of
6 shown in the entrance, obviously, if cars were
7 parked there, it would impede --

8 MR. LENTINI: Well, for the residents,
9 yes.

10 MS. LAVARNWAY: -- it would impede
11 circulation for a fire vehicle or -- so, you have
12 to keep that into consideration if all those
13 spaces are filled with cars, what does --

14 MR. LENTINI: Absolutely.

15 MS. LAVARNWAY: -- it do to the
16 circulation?

17 MR. LENTINI: That was a bad choice on
18 my part, drafting error. Because I just, I really
19 wasn't involved with the house until the
20 engineering department asked me to draft it. And
21 I used a survey and Google Images, and I found
22 after year after year, that's actually where the
23 cars parked. So we'll prevent them from parking
24 in front of the curb cut.

1 June 2, 2026

2 MR. BIANCHI: I just think you need to
3 prove, to me especially, how you're going to fit
4 whatever number of clients you expect to have
5 there at one time into the number of parking
6 spaces that you make available.

7 MR. LENTINI: I'd like to say it's --

8 MR. BIANCHI: That's the bottom line.

9 MR. LENTINI: Yeah. I'd like to say it's
10 their problem, but I understand completely. And
11 unless I -- we need a variance for the side yard,
12 too. That's something else I'd have to get
13 referred to. So perhaps we could increase the
14 parking lot and request a variance for lack of
15 landscaping.

16 MR. KEHOE: But John, if you're going to
17 start from scratch, tear the building down and
18 start over.

19 MR. LENTINI: We have to --

20 MR. KEHOE: You sure you're still going
21 to need a variance?

22 MR. LENTINI: Yes.

23 MR. KEHOE: Okay.

24 MR. LENTINI: Because there's no way

1 June 2, 2026

2 we're going to get entrance to the building with
3 the side yards that are required. We're hugging
4 that one corner. It's only five feet from the
5 Crossings property, and if we moved it 30 feet
6 over, we lose the driveway.

7 MR. KEHOE: Well, you would need to get
8 the drawings a little more fleshed out to figure
9 out the coordination between the planning board
10 and the zoning board.

11 MR. CUNNINGHAM: And John, if you're
12 going to ask for at least one variance anyway,
13 why don't you design it in a way, even if you
14 need extra variances to put more spaces on, it
15 might improve the site plan overall.

16 MR. LENTINI: I will do that.

17 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Even if you need all
18 the variances.

19 MR. LENTINI: I'll do that.

20 MR. ROTHFEDER: How many spaces are we
21 looking for, though? I mean --

22 MR. LENTINI: It's many more than nine.

23 MR. ROTHFEDER: Well, yeah.

24 MR. KOBASA: I don't want to just all of

1 June 2, 2026

2 a sudden build a giant parking lot.

3 MR. BIANCHI: Right.

4 MR. KOBASA: Like I understand
5 everyone's concerns, right. But, well, how many
6 more do we want?

7 MR. LENTINI: Well, here was the
8 landscape requirement.

9 MR. KOBASA: If we put in 16 spaces,
10 right?

11 MR. BIANCHI: Give us some kind of
12 guidance.

13 MR. KOBASA: We're putting in more
14 asphalt, we're putting in more, like it's, is it
15 worth it?

16 MR. KESSLER: It's got to be on the
17 other side. It's not the parking issue, it's the
18 number of --

19 MR. ROTHFEDER: Yeah, clients.

20 MR. KESSLER: -- yeah, clients, proposed
21 clients.

22 MR. ROTHFEDER: Yeah.

23 MR. LENTINI: Well, we're reducing the
24 seating, and I wish there was a way I could offer

1 June 2, 2026

2 you the volume of a business like this, but most
3 of the nail salons I've done have been a quarter
4 of this size. I don't think I've ever done
5 anything quite this large. I've worked on beauty
6 shops where there's hair cutting and everything
7 that aren't even this big, but --

8 MR. ROTHFEDER: Which is the problem,
9 though? I mean that ultimately becomes the
10 problem, right. If it were a smaller one like
11 normal, then the parking would be okay. You've
12 even cut it back, but that gives the capacity
13 then to include all of those people in there, and
14 the parking just doesn't work out.

15 MR. KEHOE: But once again --

16 MR. ROTHFEDER: But that's ultimately --

17 MR. KEHOE: -- is it still sort of tied
18 to this? Does your client still have this idea
19 that she needs to be working from the footprint
20 of the existing building?

21 MR. LENTINI: Yeah.

22 MR. KEHOE: You could build an any size
23 new building you want.

24 MR. ROTHFEDER: If you're building --

1 June 2, 2026

2 MR. LENTINI: Well, that's true. That is
3 what crossed my mind, except that we still need a
4 variance, and the foundation is there, and it's
5 good. We're going to take the building down to
6 the foundation. The foundation under the kitchen
7 isn't very good, but the rest of it is actually
8 suitable for what we're doing.

9 MR. KEHOE: But that's just something to
10 think about. You're in charge of the size of that
11 building.

12 MR. LENTINI: Well, I got them to lower
13 it a little bit because they wanted two 12-foot
14 floors, and now we're down to 11.

15 MR. LAPINE: Could you also maybe, if
16 you're taking a building down, and you're
17 replacing a part of a foundation, why not
18 reorient the building somewhere onsite so that
19 the parking's more suitable for the particular
20 use? You may be able to increase your parking by
21 relocating the building.

22 MR. LENTINI: That's a good, it's a
23 luxury to have, to actually be able to do that,
24 but --

1 June 2, 2026

2 MR. LAPINE: Well, if you look at, and
3 I'm not the engineer in charge of the review of
4 this, but as I look at this and I see what your
5 slopes are on the backside of where your parking
6 is, they're a little steep. Maybe it also affords
7 you the opportunity to provide some less steep
8 slopes for your patrons as well.

9 MR. LENTINI: Well, I think we got a
10 survey based on one of our earlier meetings that
11 proves that there was, I think a four percent or
12 five percent slope. I think it's well within the
13 accessible route from anywhere in the parking lot
14 to the building right now.

15 MR. KOBASA: Yeah. I guess if you're
16 ripping this whole building down, why not look at
17 a different configuration for where that building
18 sits on the site that works better with all of
19 your curb cuts --

20 MR. KESSLER: Yeah. It seems like you're
21 --

22 MR. KOBASA: -- the flow of traffic. It
23 seems like you're tying yourself to the fact that
24 there's a good foundation there, but maybe that's

1 June 2, 2026

2 what you got to ignore.

3 MR. LENTINI: I'm sure you'd want to
4 keep it parallel to Route 6, though, and that's
5 what it essentially it is.

6 MR. KOBASA: But you could twist your
7 building so it runs lengthwise and you're still
8 parallel to Route 6. Like --

9 MR. LENTINI: Well, there's another
10 component too. He wants to put solar cells on the
11 roof, and this works out pretty good. I'm not
12 sure --

13 MR. KOBASA: That works out good on one
14 side, not the other.

15 MR. LENTINI: Well, I don't think we can
16 get it on the whole building unless we put a flat
17 roof in, but he also wanted a gable roof. He
18 wants to look at kind of residential. It's a
19 transition area. We're coming from residential to
20 commercial.

21 MR. KOBASA: Okay.

22 MR. LENTINI: But I take it all. I
23 actually agree with everybody, and it's much
24 easier for me to detail a brand new building than

1 June 2, 2026

2 all the stuff I've been working on with this
3 shape.

4 MR. KESSLER: Okay. I think we're --

5 MR. BIANCHI: Yeah.

6 MR. KESSLER: -- grasping at straws
7 here.

8 MR. LENTINI: I'll be back with plans
9 that will allow me to get on the next --

10 MR. KESSLER: Before I pull my nails
11 out, yeah.

12 MR. LENTINI: -- [unintelligible]
13 [01:36:18] possibly [unintelligible] [01:36:18]
14 somewhere.

15 MR. KESSLER: Yeah.

16 MR. ROTHFEDER: Exactly.

17 MR. KESSLER: Okay. So, all right. Work
18 to be done, John, clearly.

19 MR. LENTINI: Always. Thank you.

20 MR. KESSLER: All right. So Tom?

21 MR. BIANCHI: Mr. Chair, I move to refer
22 this back for further review and await further
23 development of plans for alternatives.

24 MR. LENTINI: Thank you.

1 June 2, 2026

2 MR. KESSLER: Second, please.

3 MR. ROTHFEDER: Second.

4 MR. KESSLER: On the question? All in
5 favor?

6 MULTIPLE: Aye.

7 MR. KESSLER: Opposed? All right.

8 Thanks, John. All right, Next item, the
9 application of Joel Greenberg on behalf of Robert
10 Fucci for preliminary plat approval for a two-lot
11 minor subdivision of an approximately 22,000
12 square foot parcel of property located at 12
13 Putnam Park Road, drawings revised May 20, 2026.
14 Mr. Greenberg, good to see you.

15 MR. JOEL GREENBERG: Good evening. I'd
16 just like to make a statement before I go into
17 the project --

18 MR. KESSLER: Sure.

19 MR. GREENBERG: -- and to wish Chris a
20 happy retirement.

21 MR. KEHOE: You came back specifically
22 after years of being away just for tonight,
23 didn't you, Joel?

24 MR. GREENBERG: Right.

1 June 2, 2026

2 MR. KEHOE: You organized your plan
3 resubmittal.

4 MR. GREENBERG: I did. It was done
5 purposely. And also, I must --

6 MR. KESSLER: Pull the microphone down a
7 little bit. Yeah.

8 MR. GREENBERG: -- I must compliment
9 Chris too. Over the years, I've been here on and
10 off, but Chris always reminds me, he says, don't
11 forget to wish the board a good holiday, whatever
12 that next holiday is.

13 MR. KESSLER: I'm sure he did that.

14 MR. KEHOE: Steve and I talked. We were
15 guessing which one you were going to say but
16 we'll wait till you say it and see.

17 MR. GREENBERG: Oh, we'll wait. Yes.

18 MR. KESSLER: Okay.

19 MR. GREENBERG: Anyway, as you can see,
20 we're proposing a two-lot subdivision right off
21 Oregon Road, Putnam Park Road. Mr. Fucci has a
22 house on the right side of the lot, and we're now
23 proposing a two-lot subdivision, and the other
24 lot will probably be a new lot for a house for

1 June 2, 2026

2 his daughter. So, this basically is a family
3 operation, but we obviously want to have two
4 separate lots. We meet the code as far as area
5 and setbacks are concerned. If you've been to the
6 site, the street is perfectly level. The new
7 driveway will be perfectly level, as you can see
8 from the topo. And we'd like to -- we've been to
9 the health department. We've done all our testing
10 for the septic for the new house, and that's all
11 been submitted to the health department, just
12 waiting for their final approvals, and we'd just
13 like to proceed with the subdivision.

14 MR. KESSLER: Yeah. Pretty
15 straightforward, you're really threading a needle
16 here with these two lots, though, right?

17 MR. GREENBERG: What's that?

18 MR. KESSLER: You're threading a needle
19 here with, what is it, 10,000 --

20 MR. GREENBERG: Yeah, but it --

21 MR. KESSLER: It works.

22 MR. GREENBERG: -- it does meet the
23 code. We have the 75-foot frontage, and we have
24 at least 10,000 square feet per lot.

1 June 2, 2026

2 MR. KESSLER: Okay. Is there, is it
3 ready?

4 MR. KEHOE: It's a minor thing, but in
5 looking at Joel's plan, there's like six things
6 on the plan, and one of the smaller things is the
7 actual plan. So, if you could enlarge that so
8 it's an entire sheet --

9 MR. GREENBERG: Okay.

10 MR. KEHOE: -- rather than sort of just
11 as an inset, and make the zoning compliance table
12 and the location map smaller because it is hard
13 to see some of the details on that plan.

14 MR. GREENBERG: Sure.

15 MR. KEHOE: And Heather reminded me that
16 even though you may be compliant with respect to
17 lot area, there is probably a variance going to
18 be required. For width?

19 MS. LAVARNWAY: Yeah.

20 MR. KESSLER: Right. So, I think in your
21 zoning chart, you --

22 MS. LAVARNWAY: Lot A.

23 MR. KEHOE: Yeah.

24 MR. KESSLER: A width variance, you're

1 June 2, 2026

2 saying?

3 MS. LAVARNWAY: For lot width of lot A.
4 The chart indicates a variance would be required.

5 MR. KESSLER: Okay.

6 MR. GREENBERG: Okay, so can we go to
7 the zoning board and see if we can get the
8 variance so we can proceed?

9 MR. KESSLER: Okay. Yeah. It seems
10 pretty straightforward, but send us the enlarged
11 plan.

12 MR. GREENBERG: Yes, of course.

13 MR. KESSLER: We wrote a review memo,
14 you responded to the review memo?

15 MR. GREENBERG: Yes. You have a letter.
16 I responded to all the items on the review memo.

17 MR. KESSLER: And you're satisfied with
18 the responses?

19 MR. KEHOE: I think we want another
20 technical meeting.

21 MR. KESSLER: Okay, fine. All right, so
22 we'll refer this back, and hopefully we'll get
23 you back on in July. All right?

24 MR. GREENBERG: Okay. But in the

1 June 2, 2026

2 meantime, can we apply to the zoning board?

3 MR. CUNNINGHAM: So, with that, Joel,
4 you don't even need the planning board's
5 permission. You'd have to just submit to code
6 enforcement, they'll have to give you a denial
7 letter, and then you can get onto the ZBA agenda.

8 MR. GREENBERG: Okay. Well, thank you
9 very much. And there's several holidays we have
10 to talk about. There's Father's Day, 250th
11 anniversary, and July 4th. So, happy, happy,
12 happy.

13 MR. KESSLER: Thank you, Joel.

14 MR. GREENBERG: Thank you very much.

15 MR. ROTHFEDER: I move that we refer
16 this application back to staff for further
17 review.

18 MR. KESSLER: Second, please?

19 MR. BIANCHI: Second.

20 MR. KESSLER: On the question? All in
21 favor?

22 MULTIPLE: Aye.

23 MR. KESSLER: Opposed? Okay, thanks.

24 MR. GREENBERG: Thank you very much.

1 June 2, 2026

2 Good night.

3 MR. KESSLER: Okay, last item under old
4 business is the application of Mike Miele for
5 property at 56 Mistis Roa Hook Road Corporation
6 for site development plan approval and for a
7 steep slope permit for a proposed 16,000 square
8 foot indoor multi-sports facility for property
9 located at 56 to 64 Roa Hook Road, drawings dated
10 February 22, 2025. Pretty straightforward. Peter?

11 MR. MCKINLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to
12 declare the planning board as lead agent for PB
13 2026-8 at 56 Mantis Road Hook Road Corporation.

14 MR. KESSLER: Second, please.

15 MR. KEHOE: Declare your intent.

16 MR. BIANCHI: Second.

17 MR. MCKINLEY: Intent.

18 MR. KEHOE: You're not lead agent, yet.
19 You have to declare your intent.

20 MR. MCKINLEY: Intent. Thank you, Chris.

21 MR. KESSLER: So amended. Second,
22 please?

23 MR. ROTHFEDER: Second.

24 MR. KESSLER: And on the question? All

June 2, 2026

in favor?

MULTIPLE: Aye.

MR. KESSLER: Opposed?

MR. KEHOE: So, just the purpose of that is we have to circulate it to other agencies, and until they object or don't object, you're not actually lead agent.

MR. KESSLER: Okay. Final item this evening is new business. It's the application of VS Construction Corporation for preliminary plat approval, steep slope, wetland, and tree removal permits to permit the construction of 96 townhomes, including 10 percent affordable units, with associated site improvements on an approximately 17.6 acre portion of the Evergreen Manor project site. The subdivision proposes 99-lot subdivision of the approximately 21-acre parcel two of 2023 Evergreen Manor subdivision to create 96 individual townhome lots, a common homeowners' association lot, a commercial lot, and an open space non-building lot parcel containing the existing wetland adjacent to Crompond Road. The project is located within the

1 June 2, 2026

2 medical-oriented district on property located at
3 2003 Crompond Road. Drawings dated May 20, 2026.
4 Mr. Steinmetz, good evening again.

5 MR. STEINMETZ: Good evening, Mr.
6 Chairman, members of the board. David Steinmetz
7 from the law firm of Zarin and Steinmetz here
8 with regard to VS Construction. Now, kicking off
9 on our, what we refer to as lot two, or the
10 townhouse project.

11 I'm extremely pleased to announce that
12 with me this evening are two representatives of
13 Lennar Homes, Bob Geiger and Jake Gunning. For
14 those of you that don't know, Lennar Homes, a
15 division of US Homes, is one of the nation's
16 largest home builders. We are extremely pleased
17 that they are the contract vendee to implement
18 and develop the 96 proposed residential
19 townhouses. And they are here and have been
20 coordinating with our team as we're now ready to
21 advance this.

22 As you heard from the chair and as the
23 agenda indicates, the proposal tonight is for 96
24 townhouse lots, two lots associated with the HOA

June 2, 2026

and the project itself, and then an additional lot to finally create the lot that the chairman and I have discussed, debated, and disagreed on relative to whether or not I could advance the commercial application without a lot. So now, that lot line has been drawn as well. Okay. So, that is why we end up with 99 lots.

You did ask the question, and I didn't respond during your work session, but I agree with Mr. Kehoe. The road is a parcel. It is not a lot, and that's why it's 99 lots. The project itself, the reason we're here talking about a subdivision, and the reason I'm using the phrase lots with regard to townhouses, reminding your board when the town board adopted the MOD, the medical-oriented district, the town mandated that the townhouses or development in the MOD would require fee simple lots.

So, just so that we're all clear, I can build a townhouse attached to another townhouse unit, and I can develop them and sell them as condominiums. I can also build the exact same structure with one townhouse next to another

June 2, 2026

townhouse, and I can create lot lines and sell them as fee simple HOA lots. They're different forms of ownership. It's the exact same unit or dwelling. Your town decided in its wisdom that it wanted fee simple lots. By creating fee simple lots, it allows the developer to create lot lines where driveways, patios, backyards are actually owned by the individuals acquiring the unit, as opposed to the same exact dwelling where the condominium allows you to own the interior skins of your unit and everything else you actually don't own.

Regardless, there would still be a homeowners' association. The homeowners' association would be responsible for the exterior maintenance as prescribed in the declaration of covenants and restrictions. Certainly, all snow plowing would be done, and general open space maintenance would all be done by the HOA.

And this is not Lennar's first rodeo. Lennar, if you're not aware and you look into it, you will see that Lennar is building residences throughout the nation, throughout the region.

June 2, 2026

They have some rather large projects not far away, and they're very excited to be coming into New York and coming into Westchester, in particular, coming into the town of Cortlandt.

We have in front of you tonight the initial subdivision layout. You can see what Matt referred to earlier, and you've heard us throughout our deliberations and discussions with you on other matters. That's the top of the lollipop road with the cul-de-sac. So we have our main road coming into Evergreen Manor. That is a public road culminating in a cul-de-sac. Off of the cul-de-sac, we have two other private roads that service different units, and there are two other connections to the road itself.

The property would have 96 townhouses developed in different groupings. They would be what we refer to as four-packs, five-packs and six-packs, if I'm not mistaken. The largest grouping would be six units together, and there would be some others that are somewhat smaller. And you can see the distribution of the units.

We are required to have 10 percent

June 2, 2026

affordable under the MOD, so there would be 10 percent affordable housing units. The exact locations and distribution have yet to be finalized, but it's essentially contemplated that the affordable units would likely be distributed along the main artery on the left-hand or eastern side of the property.

The property is proposed to be developed respecting the 100-foot buffer. There may be some work that has to be done in reforestation behind it, but the units have all been pulled forward to respect that buffer. We do have a wetland area in the southwest corner that you can see, a wetland area. There have been reports and studies that have been submitted on that. Steve Marino and Matt Steinberg can speak to that if you have questions.

There are no amenities. There is no clubhouse or pool. Again, there's been a fair amount of discussion about that. Lennar's position is a development of this size, it's really not large enough to warrant some larger public amenity or community amenities. They've

1 June 2, 2026

2 done enough of these projects where if you have a
3 community that is a little bit on the smaller
4 side, it saddles residents with a rather sizable
5 common area maintenance charge for something that
6 they may not actually make sufficient use of. So
7 there would be recreation fees paid to the town
8 in connection with this development.

9 We are happy to walk you through any
10 further details. We actually have some proposed
11 architectural renderings. Chris, I think you've
12 got that. These are all early, just conceptual
13 designs. There's nothing that's been finalized.
14 This is a six-pack that we're looking at here,
15 where you can see six different units with
16 different roof lines and articulations so that
17 you're not looking at one straight building.
18 That's essentially the design concept. Lennar
19 spent a fair amount of time looking at
20 architecture throughout Cortlandt and trying to
21 come up with a design concept that they felt not
22 only fit the site, but fit the community at
23 large.

24 You can see that the units vary in size

June 2, 2026

here. The end units both have garages that would accommodate two side-by-side cars. The middle units are smaller and would accommodate, I believe those are both Bob and Jake, one-car garages, right.

We have sufficient driveway space in front of every unit to accommodate guest parking. So we do believe that we can adequately park the site, and stormwater management for the driveways, the roads, the roof areas have all been taken into account. And Matt and DTS and their group have designed the drainage for the overall project.

We've got some iterations of the rear of the property, with the rear of the six-pack building and the side of the six-pack building, you can see here. And just another, these are some floor plans. The units vary in size from --

MR. GUNNING: Approximately 2,200 square feet, and then the two-story --

MR. STEINMETZ: The units vary in size from the smaller ones from 2,200 square feet to the larger ones being 2,700 square feet. Again,

1 June 2, 2026

2 everything is for sale. Steve, questions?

3 MR. KESSLER: Just so I'm clear, there
4 are basically three models of homes that are
5 being proposed. Is that correct? Three models,
6 Emory, Yorktown, and Chase?

7 MR. STEINMETZ: Models? Yes. Somebody
8 want to just --

9 MR. GUNNING: Yes, three separate
10 models?

11 MR. KESSLER: Three separate models.

12 MR. KEHOE: And so no on-street parking
13 or guest parking is proposed?

14 MR. STEINMETZ: I believe that that is
15 correct. No, Matt? No. There is some guest
16 parking in a pull off.

17 MR. KESSLER: Yeah, you've shown on the
18 plan, there's guest parking.

19 MR. STEINMETZ: Right. Oh, okay.

20 MR. KESSLER: And this includes the
21 relocation of wetland mitigation?

22 MR. STEINMETZ: Matt, you want to speak
23 to the mitigation?

24 MR. STEINBERG: Yeah. So it's, we've got

1 June 2, 2026

2 it on this illustrative plan. You can see the
3 wetland at the south, that's that lighter green.
4 So along this, essentially it expands that
5 wetland, is the mitigation.

6 MR. KESSLER: So that is an expansion of
7 the existing wetland to compensate for the
8 wetland that's being lost on other parts of the
9 property?

10 MR. STEINBERG: Correct. Yes.

11 MR. KESSLER: Okay.

12 MR. STEINMETZ: That's what you meant by
13 relocation?

14 MR. STEINBERG: Yes.

15 MR. STEINMETZ: Got it.

16 MR. STEINBERG: So replacement.

17 MR. KESSLER: Remediation.

18 MR. STEINMETZ: The relocation was what
19 threw me. The replacement or --

20 MR. LAPINE: Mitigation.

21 MR. STEINMETZ: Yeah.

22 MR. KOBASA: Are you proposing a
23 walkway, a walking trail? Is that what that is?

24 MR. STEINMETZ: There is a walking trail

1 June 2, 2026

2 around the wetland area.

3 MR. STEINBERG: Yes.

4 MR. KOBASA: Okay.

5 MR. STEINBERG: There would be a walking
6 trail around the wetland area that was studied.
7 Most likely, this would be a -- it wouldn't be a
8 paved path. It would be something more of a
9 mulch.

10 MR. KOBASA: Are you proposing lighting
11 along it? Is that what the black dots are?

12 MR. STEINBERG: I think we'll have to
13 take another look at that. I don't think it's
14 necessary.

15 MR. KOBASA: Nope.

16 MR. STEINBERG: Yeah, we'll --

17 MR. STEINMETZ: I didn't think we were
18 doing that lighting like that.

19 MR. KOBASA: Nope.

20 MR. STEINBERG: Yeah. We'll, I think --
21 yeah, that's fine.

22 MR. KOBASA: But also you're showing it
23 in your 100-foot no disturbance area. That would
24 be a disturbance. That's supposed to be

June 2, 2026

untouched.

MR. STEINBERG: We'll take another look at that, and how much we'd previously proposed.

MR. KESSLER: I'm sorry, which one are you talking about?

MR. KOBASA: Go, Do you have a site, I'm looking at the site plan.

MR. STEINBERG: It's at the, I guess the top of this plan.

MR. KOBASA: It's at the top, but yeah. So you can see, It's this part ... there's a 100-foot no disturbance line, basically. The walking trail goes up and into that 100-foot disturbance area.

MR. BIANCHI: I'm not sure if this has been done yet, but have any traffic studies been done? Was it part of the original --

MR. STEINMETZ: Yes.

MR. BIANCHI: -- MOD?

MR. STEINMETZ: Important question, and I appreciate you making sure we hit that for the record, Tom. The 96 townhouses were studied as part of the FEIS, and were determined, pursuant

June 2, 2026

to the findings statement, to have been adequately studied and no significant adverse environmental impacts associated with the traffic here. So this project and its traffic was studied.

MR. KESSLER: So the impacts in terms of the operation of intersections and everything, were you saying was no impact?

MR. STEINMETZ: Yes.

MR. KEHOE: But they are making improvements.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: There are going to be significant improvements on the corridor. So this build-out is included in what's required for the improvements on the corridor, so --

MR. KEHOE: New traffic lights.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Right.

MR. KEHOE: New timing of traffic lights.

MR. KESSLER: Oh, okay.

MR. KEHOE: Turning lanes.

MR. STEINMETZ: These 96 townhouses are part of the underpinning of the several million

1 June 2, 2026

2 dollars of offsite mitigation that's required
3 together with Gyrodyne, et cetera.

4 MR. KESSLER: And fire has no issue
5 getting to all these homes, right? I guess when
6 you studied this under SEQR?

7 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, I think this
8 layout itself has probably not been studied. So
9 we'd have to review that, obviously.

10 MR. STEINMETZ: Yeah. And I agree with
11 MC on that. We expect to be meeting with the fire
12 department and reviewing all of that. We believe
13 it does. It's been templated out by our traffic
14 engineer, but obviously your fire department
15 needs to review it.

16 MR. KESSLER: So just when the town
17 board approved the maximum of 96 townhomes, they
18 saw a rendition of it?

19 MR. STEINMETZ: They saw an early
20 rendition. They saw a general concept that wasn't
21 that different from this.

22 MR. KESSLER: Okay.

23 MR. STEINMETZ: But the details of fire,
24 K-turns, and turnaround obviously needs to be

1 June 2, 2026

2 examined.

3 MR. KESSLER: Got it.

4 MR. STEINMETZ: Private roads, private
5 maintenance, private curbing.

6 MR. KESSLER: And then just to bring it
7 full circle, the road on the bottom right there,
8 that's the one that goes to the commercial
9 property?

10 MR. STEINMETZ: That is correct. If one
11 of you guys can just cursor over that so we make
12 sure we're not talking about the wrong
13 connection. Close. Down.

14 MR. KESSLER: I see it.

15 MR. KEHOE: The one down there.

16 MR. STEINMETZ: So it's behind that
17 lower row of townhouses.

18 MS. BROSNAN: It's at the bottom of it.

19 MR. STEINMETZ: All right. Anyway, I
20 think you guys --

21 MR. KOBASA: It's the one that doesn't
22 have any color on it.

23 MR. STEINMETZ: That's exactly right.
24 There's no color, and it is lower than where we

1 June 2, 2026

2 are right now. Bingo, right there.

3 MR. KESSLER: Yeah.

4 MR. STEINMETZ: You got it. So yes, it
5 is shown on there.

6 MR. KESSLER: Okay.

7 MR. STEINMETZ: I guess the best way to
8 answer it to make sure we don't miss each other,
9 there are no townhouses accessed off of that
10 driveway connection to lot three, the commercial
11 lot. Thank you for putting the blue in there.

12 MR. KEHOE: And you can't really see on
13 that rendering, you can barely see, though, below
14 the blue line is actual water, and then I think
15 the water crosses the access road, and so some of
16 those units are actually in a wetland. Now, the
17 debate will be that the town board
18 environmentally cleared this through SEQR.

19 MR. KESSLER: Right.

20 MR. KEHOE: But you still have to issue
21 the wetland permit. So you would be within your
22 rights to analyze that, and that's why they have
23 Steve Marino on board, and --

24 MR. STEINMETZ: Correct

1 June 2, 2026

2 MR. KEHOE: That's mitigated in other
3 places on the site.

4 MR. KESSLER: Right.

5 MR. STEINMETZ: So everything Chris
6 said, it took him 30 years, but I finally agree
7 with him.

8 MR. KESSLER: It took you 30 years.

9 MR. STEINMETZ: All right. All kidding
10 aside, he accurately reports. We knew there was
11 going to be a wetland crossing. It was studied
12 pursuant to SEQR. And again, going back to the
13 commercial building that we talked about on the
14 earlier application, even just to build the
15 emergency access that the town board wanted from
16 the Lollipop cul-de-sac out to Lafayette, was
17 going to necessitate some degree of wetland
18 buffer and wetland crossing and disturbance. So,
19 this driveway connection was studied. That area,
20 we knew was going to be, the area Chris was just
21 referring to, where there are about four to six
22 townhouses that have buffer or some piece of
23 wetland on it, that was studied.

24 And it is, we believe, Steve believes,

1 June 2, 2026

2 and DTS believes, adequately built into our
3 mitigation proposal. But if you have questions on
4 that, we want to know what they are, and we want
5 to make sure we answer that, because those are
6 very important townhouses, and we do not want to
7 lose the density.

8 MR. MCKINLEY: What school district does
9 this reside in? Is this Lakeland or --

10 MR. STEINMETZ: This is Hen Hud, Matt,
11 correct?

12 MR. STEINBERG: It's Lakeland.

13 MR. STEINMETZ: Lakeland, sorry, my bad.
14 Thank you.

15 MR. BIANCHI: So all of that's been
16 analyzed as well?

17 MR. STEINMETZ: Yes

18 MR. BIANCHI: Tax receipts?

19 MR. STEINMETZ: Yes.

20 MR. BIANCHI: Real estate taxes, and all
21 the other?

22 MR. STEINMETZ: Yes.

23 MR. BIANCHI: School population impact
24 and all that stuff has all been done already?

1 June 2, 2026

2 MR. STEINMETZ: Correct. SEQR is done.

3 MR. KESSLER: So our job is permits.

4 What about landscaping? Was that done or --

5 MR. STEINMETZ: I mean there were
6 conceptual landscape, but no, you get to look at
7 the -- we invite you and hope you will look at
8 and comment on the green areas, the street trees,
9 the lighting. We've been told, we know from
10 Heather, that we've got to pay close attention to
11 the new lighting requirements and I believe we
12 have hopefully done that correctly. So, those are
13 the issues.

14 This is, though it's 96 townhouses, and
15 I kind of foreshadowed this a year ago, and you
16 didn't want to hear it then, but we knew this was
17 not -- we don't believe this is a big lift. We
18 believe that this, the SEQR issues have been
19 addressed, thankfully, so the largest lift of
20 this has been addressed. There are some wetlands
21 technical details now that we have to look at.
22 But the density was addressed. The fact that this
23 was going to be townhouses has been addressed.

24 And you're really commenting on our

1 June 2, 2026

2 subdivision layout because we're going to need
3 preliminary subdivision approval with a public
4 hearing under Section 276 and the town
5 subdivision regulations, and then final
6 subdivision approval. And we're hoping to go
7 through that fairly quickly. I can tell you --

8 MR. KESSLER: And the permits.

9 MR. STEINMETZ: Right, and the permits.

10 MR. ROTHFEDER: And that includes the
11 buildings?

12 MR. STEINMETZ: Lennar is anxious to get
13 in and file and start the building permit review
14 process with the building department. The market
15 is strong. The community is presently quite
16 desirable. And they're ready to get going as soon
17 as we have everything fully baked here. So, the
18 good news for the town is there is a builder
19 here, anxious and ready to proceed. And from all
20 the data that we get from not just clients, but
21 from the State of New York and from the Regional
22 Planning Association, there is still tremendous
23 housing demand in our state that we are hopefully
24 going to hit and try to satisfy.

1 June 2, 2026

2 MR. KESSLER: Okay. So, you know the
3 routine. So we'll refer this back. We'll get some
4 review memoranda, and we'll proceed without
5 Chris.

6 MR. STEINMETZ: The only thing that I
7 would ask, to kind of cut to the chase,
8 especially in light of the questions, if you're
9 going to bring a wetland person in to look at
10 that one area, let's do that sooner rather than
11 later. And let's confront that. I think we've
12 addressed --

13 MR. KESSLER: Well, let's get the review
14 memoranda first, and then we'll make
15 determinations.

16 MR. STEINMETZ: Fair enough.

17 MR. KESSLER: You know, whether it's --

18 MR. STEINMETZ: Start thinking about who
19 you want to bring in.

20 MR. KESSLER: Yeah. No, but I think
21 that's definitely going to happen.

22 MR. KEHOE: Yeah, you did fund --

23 MR. STEINMETZ: What's that?

24 MR. KESSLER: -- fund a very large

1 June 2, 2026

2 escrow account.

3 MR. STEINMETZ: We did?

4 MR. KEHOE: Yes.

5 MR. STEINMETZ: Then tell that to the
6 chairman.

7 MR. KEHOE: Yeah. So, we have a huge pot
8 of money to hire necessary consultants.

9 MR. KESSLER: Is that paying for your
10 party tomorrow night?

11 MR. KEHOE: No.

12 MR. STEINMETZ: Nice. Inappropriate, but
13 nice. I did have some town officials say to me
14 that the application fee that was paid on this
15 was one of the larger application fees that you
16 all have received in quite some time. So, every
17 single lot is a different fee. So, we're ready to
18 rock and roll.

19 MR. KESSLER: All right. So we will get
20 the ball rolling on this. So, Kevin?

21 MR. KOBASA: I'd like to make a motion
22 to refer back to staff for review.

23 MR. KESSLER: Second, please.

24 MR. ROTHFEDER: Second.

1 June 2, 2026

2 MR. KESSLER: And on the question, all
3 in favor?

4 MULTIPLE: Aye.

5 MR. KESSLER: Opposed? Okay. Chris,
6 again, thank you for all, everything you've done.
7 And Kevin?

8 MR. KOBASA: The time is 8:30, meeting
9 adjourned.

10 MR. KESSLER: Okay.

11 (The public board meeting concluded at 8:30.)

CERTIFICATE OF ACCURACY

I, Juliana Castano, certify that the foregoing transcript of the Board meeting of the Town of Cortlandt on June 2, 2026 was prepared using the required transcription equipment and is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Certified By

Juliana Castano

Date: June 18, 2026

GENEVAWORLDWIDE, INC

228 Park Ave S - PMB 27669

New York, NY 10003