




John Kellard, P.E.
David Sessions, RLA, AICP
Joseph M. Cermele, P.E., CFM
Jan K. Johannessen, RLA, AICP

MEMORANDUM

TO: Seamus O'Rourke, Chair

CC: Village of Mamaroneck Planning Board

FROM: John Kellard, P.E. 
KSCJ Consulting
Consulting Village Engineer

DATE: February 12, 2025
Updated June 11, 2025
Updated July 9, 2025

RE: Kevin Valles and Madely Moelis
1011 Greacen Point Road
Section 9, Block 49, Lots 230 & 12

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

At the request of the Village of Mamaroneck Planning Board, KSCJ Consulting has reviewed the site plan and supporting documents submitted in conjunction with the above-referenced application. The applicant is proposing modifications to the previously approved project to address concerns of Village staff and neighbors with regard to a retaining wall, stormwater mitigation and miscellaneous items associated with the project.

The previously approved project included a new residence, pool and driveway with two (2) curb cuts off Greacen Point Road, on Lot #12, which previously contained a single-family residence. The project included stormwater mitigation within four (4) separate treatment practices, a sewer connection to the public sewer system, floodplain compensatory storage and a new retaining wall along the southern boundary.

The original submission for the new residence included a retaining wall, which although not detailed, extended to a maximum height of approximately four (4) feet. During the review of the application, the floor elevations of the proposed structure was raised to elevate the lower floor a minimum two (2) feet above the Base Flood Elevation. This modification resulted in the raising of the garage slab, which subsequently raised the driveway and height of the retaining wall.

CIVIL ENGINEERING | LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE | SITE & ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING

Seamus O'Rourke, Chair
Kevin Valles and Madely Moelis – 1011 Greacen Point Road
February 12, 2025
Updated June 11, 2025
Updated July 9, 2025
Page 2 of 6

The October 8, 2024 approved plan set did not address the retaining wall design, nor did it provide a top of wall elevation. The applicant did not detail the retaining wall or the protective barrier above the wall when appearing before the Planning Board. Based on the Resolution of Approval for the original application and as outlined within my review memo for the previous project, the applicant was required to address the wall and barrier with the Village Building Department at the time of Building Permit. When details were finally submitted to the Building Department, Village staff raised a concern due to the height of the wall.

The amended plans, submitted at this time, proposes lowering the garage slab one (1) foot and lowering the driveway, which results in a wall with a maximum height of 3.5 feet and a length, which will be reduced from 60 to 42 feet. The submission includes a safety fence extending three (3) feet above the wall. The project amendments also include revisions to the stormwater mitigation system, revisions to the drainage system, modifications to the stairs and revisions to proposed grading between the driveway and rear yard.

I have updated my review comments to address modifications to the project plans during the Harbor & Coastal Zone Management Commission (HCZMC) review, as reflected within the Site Engineering Plans, last revised February 25, 2025.

I have updated my review to address the amended site engineering plans, dated last revised June 23, 2025 and revised Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan/Stormwater Management Report dated last revised June 24, 2025. Amendments include the removal of the previously proposed retaining wall located along the southern property line, elimination of Stormwater Mitigation Practice #3 located on the north side of the proposed residence, and the addition of stone edging, which is proposed along the perimeter of the northern planting bed.

GENERAL COMMENTS

1. The applicant proposes lowering the proposed garage by one (1) foot and regrading the driveway area outside of the garage, resulting in the lowering of the driveway grade approximately 1.35 feet in the vicinity of the southern boundary and a reduction in the height of the retaining wall.

The applicant has provided a retaining wall detail DS-1 on Sheet C-111. The detail reflects an existing grade at the bottom of the wall of 15.5 feet, a top of wall elevation of 19.0 feet, a driveway grade above the wall of 19.65 feet and a top of curb elevation of 20.0 feet. The distance between the curb and wall is not stated, however, it appears to be approximately only two (2) feet.

The limited distance between the curb and retaining wall does not provide sufficient room to have a change of grade, therefore, requiring that the top of curb and top of wall be set at identical

elevations. The shorter 3.5 foot high retaining wall would work under the current layout if the driveway was lowered an additional foot.

The proposed retaining wall along the southern property line has been raised to match the approximate elevation of the proposed curb within the driveway above. This has resulted in a maximum height of four (4) feet of exposed face of wall. The applicant has removed a corner of the driveway which permitted the applicant to angle the wall away from the southern property line, as the wall continued to the West. The wall presently extends along the southern property line for a length of approximately 37 feet. At its most extreme eastern corner, the wall is one (1) foot off the southern property line and is approximately 1.5 feet in height. The western corner of the wall which borders the southern property line is located two (2) off the southern property line and is proposed at a height of four (4) feet. The wall then continues north and west for an additional 13± feet to the most westerly corner which is located approximately nine (9) feet from the southern property line. The exposed wall face at this corner appears to be approximately 3.5 feet.

The wall length located directly along the southern property line has been reduced slightly since the applicant's last appearance before the Planning Board and the wall has been angled slightly back from the property line. The wall height has increased slightly since it is necessary to maintain a wall height equal to the driveway above.

Comment no longer applicable due to removal of retaining wall.

2. The applicant is proposing an iron railing system along the top of the wall, which includes four (4) inch square posts set within twelve (12) inch sonotube footings, extending to a depth of 42 inches. The railing will extend to a height three (3) feet above the wall, but only two (2) feet above the driveway. The bollards should extend to a height of three (3) feet above the driveway. The application should provide photos of the proposed railing and posts.

The applicant has raised the retaining wall and planter, between the wall and driveway to the elevation of the driveway above. The proposed protective barrier will extend three (3) feet above the pavement elevation.

Comment no longer applicable due to removal of retaining wall.

3. It appears that the proposed retaining wall and driveway revisions are being driven by an effort to lower the height of the retaining wall without sufficiently lowering the garage slab or driveway elevation. The Planning Board may wish to discuss with the applicant other layouts, which limits

the height of the retaining wall while maintaining the elevation of the garage. One option which could be explored would include a reduction in the backup area outside the garage from 29 feet to 25 feet. This would require the applicant to modify the landscaped island located between the garage and front driveway from its proposed 17.62 foot distance from the residence to a distance of approximately eight (8) feet from the residence. The modified island would permit vehicles leaving the garage to easily maneuver out with the shorter backup area.

The reduced driveway backout distance would relocate the curb nine (9) feet off the southern boundary, providing ample room to grade the area without the need for retaining wall or three (3) foot high fence above the wall, which would benefit both the applicant and the neighbor. The slope between the properties could then be well landscaped, which will stabilize the slope and provide screening between the two (2) properties.

The applicant has proposed the reduction of the backup area outside the most western garage bay from 29 feet to 25 feet, which would provide a ±9 foot planting strip between the proposed driveway and the southern property line and would eliminate the previously proposed retaining wall along the southern property line. The driveway modifications would maintain the previously proposed elevations, curbing and drainage along the southern curb. The applicant proposes a three (3) foot wide planting strip adjacent to the driveway, with evergreen screening and Juniper ground cover to stabilize the 1:1 slope, which would extend to the southern property line.

The 25 foot deep backout area, although less distance than may be desirable, would provide sufficient room to maneuver into and out of the western garage bay. The proposed 1:1 graded slope would be steeper than the typically preferred 1:2 slope, however, the incline is only four (4) feet at its maximum height and the 30 Junipers proposed should provide adequate stabilization of the slope.

I find the proposed amendment to the project an acceptable alternative to the previously proposed retaining wall along the property line.

4. The applicant has added two (2) additional catch basins within the driveway, which connect to an additional pre-treatment device prior to discharging to the stormwater storage system under the driveway. The additional drains are necessary due to the regraded driveway, which lowered the driveway elevation along the southern boundary. I have no objection to the drainage system modifications.

The applicant has added a slot drain along the southern curb, which connects to an additional pre-treatment device prior to discharging to the stormwater storage system under the driveway. The drain is necessary due to the regraded driveway, which resulted in a lower driveway elevation along the southern boundary. I have no objection to the drainage system modifications.

5. A curtain drain located behind the proposed retaining wall has been connected directly to the Cultec infiltration units at Stormwater Management Practice #1. Groundwater should not discharge to a stormwater practice, which has been sized and designed to treat runoff from surface sources only. I would therefore recommend that the curtain drain discharge at grade, perhaps at the proposed discharge point of the footing drain within the rear yard.

A curtain drain has been proposed behind the proposed retaining wall, which will discharge to the rear yard. I have no objection to the curtain drain or its point of discharge.

Comment no longer applicable due to removal of retaining wall.

6. The outlet control structure for Stormwater Management Practice #3 has been shifted slightly further away from the northern property line. I have no objection to this minor modification to the system.

The applicant has eliminated Stormwater Mitigation Practice #3, which was located on the north side of the proposed residence. The roof runoff, which was previously discharged to Practice #3, is now proposed to discharge to Practice #2. Practice #2 Cultecs were changed within the SWPPP from the 180 HD Unit to the 280 HD Unit, which almost doubles the storage volume within each chamber. The applicant also modified the detention system under the driveway from 166 l.f. of 36 inch pipe to 148 l.f. Peak rates of flow will be reduced between 5.66% to 22.38% below the existing peak flows leaving the site, depending on the storm event.

I find the proposed changes to consolidate the stormwater mitigation practices acceptable. The applicant, however, needs to update the SWPPP Narrative, SWPPP Tables, Stormwater #2 Details and the Project Plans (size of Practice #2) to reflect the 280 HD Units included within the stormwater calculations.

7. The applicant has regraded the area adjacent to the stairs between the driveway and rear yard. Approximately three (3) feet of fill is proposed against the driveway retaining wall, which fill will be graded on a 1 vertical on 2 horizontal slope. The fill appears to be proposed to reduce the visible face of the retaining wall. I have no objection to the regrading proposed.

Seamus O'Rourke, Chair
Kevin Valles and Madely Moelis – 1011 Greacen Point Road
February 12, 2025
Updated June 11, 2025
Updated July 9, 2025
Page 6 of 6

8. **The applicant has located a short retaining wall in front of the proposed garage for grading purposes. I have no objection to the proposed modification.**
9. **The applicant has proposed stone edging along the proposed landscaped bed located along the northern property line. The edging is proposed to direct surface runoff north of the proposed residence to the rear yard.**

I have no objection to the use of the stone edging.

As additional information becomes available, we will continue our review. It is noted that an itemized response to all comments will facilitate completeness and efficiency of review.

PLANS & REPORT REVIEWED, PREPARED BY ALP ENGINEERING, DATED JUNE 23, 2025:

- Overall Property Plan (C-100)
- Site Layout Plan (C-101)
- Grading and Utilities Plan (C-102)
- Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (C-103)
- Landscape and Mitigation Planting Plan (C-104)
- Sanitary Sewer Plan (C-105)
- Tree Removal and Preservation Plan (C-106)
- Maintenance and Protection of Traffic Plan (C-107)
- Construction Narrative/Stormwater Facilities Maintenance (C-112)
- Construction Details (C-111, C-113, C-114, C-115, C-116, C-117)
- Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan/Stormwater Management Report, dated June 24, 2025

PLANS REVIEWED, PREPARED BY CARDELLO ARCHITECTS, DATED JUNE 23, 2025:

- Architecturals

JK/dc