

**MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
PLANDOME HEIGHTS VILLAGE HALL
September 14, 2026; 7:00 PM
MINUTES OF MEETING**

Present:	Mayor	Kenneth C. Riscica
	Trustee	Mary Hauck
	Trustee	Norman Taylor
	Trustee	Daniel Cataldo
	Trustee	Kristina Lobosco
	Trustee	Jerry Love
	Clerk	Marie Brodsky
	Village Attorney	Christopher Prior, Esq.

Absent:	Trustee	Eric Carlson
----------------	---------	--------------

Also Present:	Rosemary Mascali	Resident, Plandome Heights Civic Association
	Paul Mascali	Resident

At 7:00 p.m. Mayor Riscica called the meeting to order and called for the Pledge of Allegiance. The Mayor then asked for a moment of silence in memory of the 25th anniversary of all those who lost their lives in the September 11, 2001 attack on the World Trade Center.

The Mayor noted that the first order of business was the minutes of the Board of Trustees' August 10, 2026 Regular Meeting. The Mayor asked the Trustees to review the updated draft minutes. After discussion, upon motion by Trustee Hauck, seconded by Trustee Love, the following resolution was unanimously adopted by all Trustees present:

RESOLVED, that the minutes of the August 10, 2026 Regular Board of Trustees Meeting, as presented by the Village Clerk-Treasurer are hereby accepted and approved and the Clerk-Treasurer is hereby instructed to file the minutes in the minutes book of the Village.

The Mayor then discussed the 'Piggyback' exception to competitive bidding, which allows a municipality or public entity to purchase goods from a vendor under an existing contract awarded by another governmental entity, avoiding the need for the purchasing municipality to conduct its own competitive bidding process. The Mayor explained that the exception is restricted to certain types of contracts under New York General Municipal Law (GML) § 103(16). The exception allows the purchase of apparatus, materials, equipment, or supplies, alongside related installation, maintenance, and repair services under such contracts. Under a recently decided court case in New York, the court held that the exception is not available for public works contracts (such as construction, major renovations, or infrastructure improvements).

The Mayor noted that at this time the Financial Statements of the Village, as audited by Skinnon and Faber, independent registered public accountants/auditors, for the Fiscal Period 06/01/2025 - 05/31/2026, have been provided for the review and approval of the Board. The report contains the same financial information, plus footnotes and disclosures by Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP), as contained in the financial statements approved by the Trustee and filed with NY State in July 2026. The Mayor asked if the Board had any questions. There being none, upon motion by Trustee Cataldo and seconded by Trustee Love, the following resolution was unanimously adopted by all Trustees present:

RESOLVED, that the Village of Plandome Heights Financial Statement, for the Fiscal Period 06/01/2025 - 05/31/2026, is approved for publication.

The Mayor then reviewed with the Board the letter from the Village Auditors, Skinnon and Faber, Audit Matters for the attention of the Board containing routine matters that are annually reported to the Trustees. The auditors found no exceptions or matter requiring attention and made certain non-material recommendations as contained therein. After some discussion, upon motion by Trustee Cataldo, seconded by Trustee Love, the following resolution was unanimously adopted by all Trustees present:

RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees accepts the Audit Matters for the attention of the Board letter and recommendations from Skinnon & Faber, CPAs as presented.

The Mayor then reported that 2027 brings some challenges for the Village, including the expiration of the Village's sanitation contract in the spring of 2027. The current sanitation contract, including initial term and subsequent extension at the option of the Village, has been in place for a 10-year term, which has given the Village a long period of certainty and relatively low increases. At 30% of the Village budget, sanitation is the largest cost. So, the Village is now exposed to increased cost in a market where providers have consolidated, fuel costs are temporarily high and interest costs to finance new equipment are increasing. The Mayor notes that the Board and the Village should recognize this upcoming challenge. The Mayor noted that, while the contract is of course subject to competitive bidding, he and Trustee Taylor plan to discuss the current market conditions with Jamaica Ash & Rubbish Removal Co., Inc. in October.

The Mayor reminded the Board that he recommended at the August meeting that it is time for the Village to move forward with its effort to establish a Landmark/Historical Preservation program in the Village. He then reported on his meeting with Nicholas Vetter, owner of the Duke home at Summit Drive. Nick and Laura Vetter expressed their interest in having their home be considered by the Village for landmark status if the Village enacts a new law establishing such a program. The Mayor shared with the Vedders the preliminary draft that the Village Attorney had provided some time ago to the Board when the concept was initially raised. Mr. Vedder provided the Mayor with his comments on the draft, and his point of view on the program. Mr. Vedder's email is annexed to these minutes as Exhibit 1. After some discussion, the board decided to continue to address this matter at the October 5, 2026 regular board meeting after the Village Attorney makes some proposed changes.

The Mayor then discussed his meetings with Andrew Cronson of the Manhasset Historical Society and with Mitchell Schwartz, Landmarks Commissioner for the Village of Flower Hill. The Mayor discussed how each may be a resource in assisting with writing the Village's updated history and adopting a Landmarking program.

Next, the Mayor updated the Board on New Matters of Village Operations

- a. IT support-after the death of Ken Lesser from Teletechie, who served as the primary IT support provider for the Village. - It has become necessary to search for a new IT service provider. The Mayor has reached out to several companies and will update the board when information becomes available.
- b. The Manhasset Bay Protection Committee Stewardship sign – At the Mayor’s request, the Long Island Sound Partnership has sent us Stewardship signs (see Exhibit 2). The sign, installed on the flagpole at the Plandome Heights preserve, recognizes efforts to preserve the Bay and the L. I Sound.
- c. Credit Card Fraud matter – The Mayor asked the Clerk-Treasurer to report to the Board an incident of fraudulent purchase made on the Village Visa credit card. The Clerk reports that the matter was promptly brought to the attention of the Village by the issuer bank and has been resolved.
- d. Annual Manhasset High School Spirit night – The Mayor reported that he has been in touch with Dr. Christopher J. Pellettieri, the Interim Superintendent of the Manhasset Union Free School District. Dr. Pellettieri has assured us that 1) Safety is a priority; 2) the students will not create issues for the community with inappropriate, disruptive, or destructive behavior; and 3) the school will notify the Nassau County Police Department (NCPD) Problem-Oriented Policing (POP) officers.
- e. Plandome Subdivision Application – Last month, the Mayor advised that a pending subdivision application before the planning board of neighboring Village of Plandome, may come before the Village of Plandome Heights under “concurrent subdivision jurisdiction” for neighboring villages pursuant to Nassau County law. That is likely to occur if the Plandome Planning Board approves the requested subdivision in light of the parcel’s proximity to the Village boundary. The Plandome Planning Board hearing was held on July 22, 2026. At its conclusion that evening, the record was kept open to be continued on September 24, 2026 at 7:30 pm. No further information is available at this time.
- f. Dead Tree - 26 Cove/35 Bay Driveway, reported to PSEG.
- g. Striping Plandome Court – completed by contractor Bob Keogh.
- h. 9 Bayview Circle pothole in street update – it was filled last year, by Keogh, and residents noticed that it seems to be sinking again. We will have Keogh return to fill it once again.
- i. Abandoned floating docks at Plandome Preserve – These were removed by the All Pro Marine Contracting Corporation.
- j. Shelter Rock Church – A meeting has been scheduled for September 25, 2026 with Church representatives to discuss the church’s compliance with applicable building and zoning rules, including conditions under a Village Board of Appeals variance decision.

Next, the Mayor updated the Board on the following matters of policy and reporting mandates. More information will be given to the Board as it becomes available.

- k. Prevailing Wage and Prevailing Rate Case Compliance Policy was tabled for the October meeting,
- l. New Elections Reporting Requirement, the Clerk will update when training becomes available,

- m. Form of Policy for Gender-Based Violence and the Workplace under NYS Finance Law 139-m amended 2025 4908-7059-0146.1, - Legal counsel has informed the Board that Villages are exempt from this requirement.

The Mayor stated that the next order of business was the approval of the Abstract of Claims. After discussion, upon motion by Trustee Cataldo, seconded by Trustee Hauck, the following resolution was unanimously adopted by all Trustees present:

RESOLVED, that the July Abstract of Claims Number 3 of the Budget Year 2026 – 2027 for claim numbers 98 - 129 in the amount of \$41,727.07, has been reviewed and approved by the Trustees, and is hereby accepted.

At 8:45 p.m., upon motion by Trustee Carlson, seconded by Trustee Hauck, the Board RESOLVED to enter into Executive Session to discuss personnel matters and to receive advice of counsel.

At 9:00 p.m. the Mayor announced that the executive session was ended, and that no action had been taken.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m. by motion of Trustee Love and seconded by Trustee Cataldo.

Respectfully submitted,

Marie Brodsky
Clerk-Treasurer

INDEX OF EXHIBITS

**THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
PLANDOME HEIGHTS VILLAGE HALL
SEPTEMBER 14, 2026
MINUTES OF MEETING**

Exhibit 1. Nicholas Vedder, resident and owner of 66 Summit Dr. email correspondence with Mayor Riscica

Exhibit 2. The Manhasset Bay Protection Committee Stewardship sign

Clerk

From: Kenneth C. Riscica
Sent: Tuesday, September 8, 2026 3:31 PM
To: Clerk
Subject: FW: Feedback on Historical Designation Law

For the BOT book. I will copy you on my response. Ken

From: Nick Vedder <nkvedder@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 8, 2026 2:31 PM
To: Kenneth C. Riscica <mayor@plandomeheights-ny.gov>
Subject: Feedback on Historical Designation Law

Mayor Riscica,

Thank you again for including me in the discussion around the Village's proposed historic-preservation law. I appreciate what the Village is trying to accomplish, and I am very supportive of preserving the character of the house and of Plandome Heights generally.

I have now had a chance to read through the draft more carefully. At a high level, I am very comfortable with what I view as the two main principles behind it: that a designated property should be maintained in good condition, and that significant exterior alterations should remain consistent with the home's existing historic architectural character.

Because this would be the Village's first historic designation, I did identify a few areas where I think some additional language would be helpful—not to change those principles, but to make sure the law doesn't create unintended consequences for this or other historic homeowners many years from now. Rather than try to work through legal wording, I thought it might be easier to send along the general concepts that you or the Village attorney could adapt as appropriate.

1. Owner consent for a residential historic designation.

Since this is intended to be a cooperative preservation effort, I think it would be helpful to make clear that a privately owned residence cannot be designated without the owner's consent.

This would also be consistent with the voluntary approach taken by neighboring Plandome Manor, where a designation proceeding does not continue without the owner's written consent.

2. Clearly define what on the property is actually historic.

I noticed that the draft raises the question of whether landscaping should be included within the scope of the law. My instinct would be to keep the historic-preservation review focused primarily on the house and any particular features that are identified as historically significant. I certainly understand an expectation that the grounds continue to be reasonably maintained and presentable, but landscaping is inherently more dynamic than the structure itself. Storms, severe weather and the natural life cycle of trees and plantings may require landscaping to be periodically replaced or redesigned for practical reasons. Given the size of some properties in the Village, I also think future homeowners should retain reasonable flexibility to change landscaping or make customary residential improvements over time, subject of course to the Village's normal zoning and building requirements.

3. Preserve reasonable ability to alter or expand the house

I completely understand and support requiring future alterations to respect the architecture of the existing house. I would just like the law to make clear that designation does not mean the house can never evolve, and that modern equivalent materials can be used where they preserve the historic appearance.

That seems to me to preserve the Village's objective without running the risk of requiring future owners to reproduce every original material or detail exactly.

4. Less subjectivity around required maintenance obligations

I agree that a historic designation should carry an obligation not to allow a home to fall into serious disrepair. I would just suggest clarifying that the standard is intended to address substantial deterioration or demolition by neglect, rather than ordinary aging, weathering or cosmetic deterioration that naturally occurs over time. My concern is leaving too much discretion to the Commission to determine what level of deterioration is detrimental to the historic character of the property, particularly as the composition of the Commission changes over time.

5. Notice, opportunity to cure ,and penalties

Given the significant penalties in the draft, I think an owner should receive written notice and a reasonable opportunity to cure a violation before penalties begin to accrue. I would also suggest reducing the proposed penalties, which range from \$10,000 for a first offense to as much as \$50,000 for subsequent offenses. Plandome Manor may provide a useful benchmark, as its historic-preservation law relies on a substantially more modest general penalty structure. A more proportionate approach would still provide the Village meaningful enforcement authority while being more appropriate for a residential preservation program.

There are a few other smaller procedural items that the Village attorney may want to consider—for example, coordinating historic review with the existing ARB process so homeowners aren't going through duplicative aesthetic reviews, and perhaps providing expedited or administrative approval for routine work. The draft already has a helpful provision deeming an application approved if the Commission does not act within 90 days, which I would certainly retain.

Finally, I think it would be worthwhile for the program to include whatever homeowner incentives the Village can offer. Historic designation creates an additional layer of restrictions on alterations, ongoing maintenance obligations and potential penalties that do not apply to other homes in the Village. Even if the practical burden of those requirements ultimately proves modest, there is a reasonable concern that designation could negatively affect a property's marketability or resale value, as some prospective homeowners may simply prefer the flexibility of a property without those additional restrictions.

Perhaps the Village could consider waiver of permit or review fees for preservation work, any available historic-rehabilitation assessment treatment, or whatever Village tax relief is legally feasible. I recognize that Village taxes are relatively small, so I don't view the financial piece as particularly important. I did notice that Plandome Manor's law allows the Village to formally recommend that Nassau County freeze a historic property's assessment at its present level or reduce it prospectively, although I understand that recommendation is advisory.

I hope these suggestions are helpful. I am certainly not wedded to any of the particular wording above and would defer to you and others on how best to incorporate the concepts. My main objective is simply to make sure that, as the Village establishes its first historic-preservation framework, we preserve the historic character everyone values while making the rules clear, reasonable and predictable for current and future homeowners. Ideally, the framework should make historic designation something homeowners view as an asset rather than a burden.

I'm very appreciative of the Village's willingness to pursue this and am happy to be part of it.

Best,
Nick Vedder

Exhibit 2. The Manhasset Bay Protection Committee Stewardship sign

