


**MEMORANDUM**

TO: North Castle Planning Board

CC: Adam Kaufman, AICP  
Daniel Ciarcia, P.E.  
Wael Alesawy

FROM: John Kellard, P.E.   
Kellard Sessions Consulting  
Consulting Town Engineers

DATE: April 20, 2023  
**Updated September 8, 2023**

RE: Wael Alesawy Subdivision  
32 Orchard Drive  
Section 108.01, Block 6, Lot 1

---

As requested, Kellard Sessions Consulting has reviewed the site plans submitted in conjunction with the above-referenced revised project. The applicant is proposing to subdivide a 12.9 acre parcel with an existing residence into seven (7) building lots which will be accessed along a new 500 foot long cul-de-sac roadway. Proposed building lots would range between 43,788 s.f. and 145,874 s.f. in size.

**The applicant has submitted a revised subdivision design which now includes five (5) building lots which are accessed by a 575 foot long cul-de-sac roadway which is designed to private roadway standards. Proposed building lots range between 71,544 s.f. and 194,508 s.f. in size.**

The applicant has submitted a preliminary layout and roadway profile. Our preliminary comments follow below. As the applicant progresses through on-site testing and detailed design of stormwater collection and treatment, septic and well design, detailed site development with grading and drainage profiles, more substantive comments can be provided.

**Preliminary comments on our review of the revised subdivision design follow below. As additional detail is provided, more substantive comments can be provided. Future submissions should include driveway profiles, site grading on the individual lots, house sizes more typical of what is being built and potential pool sites should be provided on each lot.**

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

1. In general, it appears it will be a challenge to develop seven (7) building lots on the parcel once the proposed roadway is designed to comply with Town standards, septics are tested and designed in conformance with Westchester County Department of Health (WCHD) regulations, realistic houses are shown on each lot, stormwater mitigation is provided on each lot, driveway profiles and site grading is provided and not buildable area and contiguous buildable area is established for each lot. The applicant should provide such details within future submissions.

**The revised five (5) lot subdivision accessed by a private roadway is a much improved plan compared to the previous submission. The applicant has provided an evaluation of net lot area and contiguous buildable area for each lot. A detailed review of each lot will be performed upon agreement of the lot arrangement.**

**Lot #3 however does not appear to be a complying building lot. In accordance with Section 355-14(G), no building permits shall be issued for any structure unless the lot built has at least the amount of frontage required in the District in which it is located on a street which has been suitably improved to Town Road or Private Road standards. Lot #3 as proposed has no legal frontage on the proposed roadway.**

**The Alternate Plan provides an irregular shaped access strip for Lot #3, which is 15 feet wide and 900+ feet long around Lot #2 in an effort to establish frontage on the private roadway. The lot is not accessible through this access strip. Furthermore, when evaluating conformance to the Bulk Zoning Requirements for the District, a lot with a total depth of 1,200+ feet would need to be at least 150,000 s.f. (3.44 acres) in size to conform to the width requirements (125 feet) of the District. The applicant should reevaluate zoning compliance of Lot #3.**

2. The applicant will need to prepare a roadway design in conformance with Town Roadway Standards.

**The revised roadway represents a much improved design which complies with all aspects of the Town's private roadway standards, except the entry grade and Vertical Curve #1. The maximum entry grade of 4% must extend 10 feet beyond the right-of-way boundary or 35 feet of roadway centerline, whichever is greater. The minimum vertical curve should be 75 feet.**

3. Sight line information should be provided at the proposed roadway intersection with Orchard Drive. Sight lines should also be provided at the proposed driveway intersections with Orchard Drive.

**The applicant should consider off-setting the driveway to Lot #5 not to have both driveways intersecting Orchard Drive adjacent to each other. The applicant should also consider the best sight distances when locating the Lot #5 driveway.**

4. A stormwater collection and mitigation system should be prepared for the project.

**The applicant is proposing a stormwater basin along the easterly side of the entry road to mitigate stormwater runoff from the project. Discharge from the stormwater basin is directed to a stone lined gutter along the western side of the private roadway. The stone line channel discharges onto Orchard Street.**

**There are no existing storm drainage facilities within Orchard Street to accept the proposed discharge. The Town Highway Department experiences continual problems and maintenance issues along the roadway after significant rainfall events. A point discharge of runoff from the stormwater basin is not acceptable since it will add an additional concentrated flow to this problem area. The applicant should examine extending the drainage system from the proposed stormwater basin along Orchard Drive to Whippoorwill Brook.**

5. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) should be prepared which addresses erosion and sediment controls, water quantity and water quality.

**The applicant has submitted a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for the project. The plan indicates that runoff leaving the property will be reduced to pre-development conditions. A detailed review of the SWPPP will be provided as the project progresses.**

6. Site development design for each building lot should be provided. Designs should include a realistic house size, septic location based on soil tests, well location, stormwater treatment, erosion and sediment controls, site grading and driveway profiles. It is advisable to consider pool sites if available.
7. The applicant should explain whether on-site soil testing was performed and the likelihood of obtaining compliant septic systems and stormwater treatment systems on each lot.
8. The applicant should avoid locating retaining walls within the road right-of-way.

**Comment addressed.**

North Castle Planning Board  
Wael Alesawy Subdivision – 32 Orchard Drive  
April 20, 2023  
**Updated September 8, 2023**  
Page 4 of 4

9. The applicant should prepare a steep slope plan for the property. The plan should be used to establish the net buildable area and contiguous buildable area required for compliance with zoning.

**Comment addressed.**

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 RALPH G. MASTROMONACO, P.E., P.C., DATED AUGUST 7, 2023:**

- Preliminary Plat (1 of 3)
- Erosion Control Plan (2 of 3)
- Details/Notes/Road Profile (3 of 3)
- Alternate Preliminary Plat (1 of 3)
- Alternate Contiguous Buildable Area/Slope Map
- Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (Preliminary), dated July 11, 2023

JK/dc