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ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE
FINAL AGENDA
Wednesday, January 8th, 2020

Mazza Room, 1st floor (enter through Law Dept.)
Town Hall, 101 Field Point Road, Greenwich

Sign reviews: 7:00 PM
Regular Meeting (Exterior Alteration reviews): 7:45 PM

NOTE to applicants: Applicants or their representatives must be present at the meeting for which their item is scheduled. A laptop and screen will be available for applicants who wish to show a digital presentation of their documents –the presentation must be in Power Point format. Sign/Awning applicants are required to provide samples of colors and materials at the meeting. Exterior Alteration applicants are required to bring eight (8) sets of all plans to the meeting, along with color and material samples. Full sized plans are preferred, and required for large scale projects. If legible and to scale, reduced sized plans can be provided for small scale projects.

I. Committee Business:
   1. Review of Minutes of 12-11-19 meeting.
   2. Any other Business.

II. Sign/Awning Reviews:
   1. Lynnens Inc., 276 Greenwich Avenue; Application: PLPZ201900509 for a Sign /Awning review for one façade sign and one window sign on a property located at 276 Greenwich Avenue in the CGBR Zone.

   2. Orienta, 55 Lewis Street; Application: PLPZ201900515 for a Sign/ Awning review for one sign on a property located at 55 LEWIS STREET in the CGB Zone.

   3. Blo - Blow Dry Bar, 2 Greenwich Avenue; Application: PLPZ201900518 for a Sign /Awning review for one new façade sign with halo letters on a property located at 2 GREENWICH AVENUE in the CGBR Zone.

III. Exterior Alteration Applications:
   1. Greenwich Academy - Main Campus - Master Plan II - Visual Arts Center, 200 North Maple Avenue; Application: PLPZ201900460 for an Exterior Alteration review for a proposed addition to school's existing Performing Arts Center and to construct a new, attached Visual Arts Center on a property
located at 200 NORTH MAPLE AVENUE in the RA-1 Zone. Last reviewed at the 11-20-19 meeting at which members Hein, Strazza, LoBalbo, Brake-Smith, Cohen, Conte, Krueger, Meniconi and Pugliese were present.

2. The Field Club of Greenwich, Inc., 276 Lake Avenue; Application: **PLPZ201900495** for an Exterior Alteration review **to modify a 2014 approval for a new tennis building including shifting its location, adding new 1 ½ story component to building, replacing existing garage with a new garage, relocating maintenance drive and associated landscaping** on a property located at 276 LAKE AVENUE in the Zone RA-2. Last reviewed at the 12-11-19 meeting at which members Hein, Strazza, LoBalbo, Boldt, Brake-Smith, Cohen, Conte, Krueger, and Meniconi were present.

3. Greenwich Water Club, 50 River Road; Application: **PLPZ201900510** for an Exterior Alteration review **for proposed landscaping and lighting at the Squash House** on a property located at 50 RIVER ROAD COS COB in the R-7-HO Zone.

4. Giancarlo DeBerardinis, 20 Georgetowne North; Application: **PLPZ201900499** for an Exterior Alteration review for **replacement of exterior deck (retroactive approval requested for work already completed)** on a property located at 20 VALLEY DRIVE in the R-C12 Zone.

5. Edge Fitness, LLC, 1333 East Putnam Avenue; Application: **PLPZ201900492** for an Exterior Alteration review to **enclose a 6-yard trash disposal bin as well as moving it from a parking lot space to a space less visible to the road** on a property located at 1333 EAST PUTNAM AVENUE, RIVERSIDE in the LB Zone.

6. The Hill House, Inc., 10 Riverside Ave.; Application: **PLPZ201900049** for an Exterior Alteration review for **replacement of: bollards, and cooling tower in existing mechanical enclosure, and replacement of flat roof, cedar shingles, trim, and windows, to match 2015 addition, and associated site work** on a property located at 10 RIVERSIDE AVENUE RIVERSIDE in the R-12 Zone. Last reviewed at the 12-11-19 meeting at which members Hein, Strazza, LoBalbo, Boldt, Brake-Smith, Cohen, Conte, Krueger, and Meniconi were present.

The Town complies with all applicable federal and state laws regarding non-discrimination, equal opportunity, affirmative action, and providing reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities. If you require an accommodation to participate, please contact the Commissioner of Human Services at 203-622-3800 or alan.barry@greenwichct.org as soon as possible in advance of the event.
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE
ACTION AGENDA
Wednesday, January 8th, 2020

Mazza Room, 1st floor (enter through Law Dept.)
Town Hall, 101 Field Point Road, Greenwich

7:00 PM – 10:50 PM
Sign reviews started: 7:00 PM

Members Present: Richard Hein, Chairperson; Mark Strazza, Vice-Chairperson; Katherine LoBalbo, Secretary; Peter Boldt (7:45), Heidi Brake-Smith; Louis Contadino; John Conte; Leander Krueger (7:30); Graziano Meniconi (7:45); Paul Pugliese.
Members Absent: Rhonda Cohen
Staff Present: Marisa Anastasio, Senior Planner and Bianca Dygert, Planner II.

7pm
I. Sign/Awning Reviews:
   1. Lynnens Inc., 276 Greenwich Avenue; Application: PLPZ201900509 for a Sign/Awning review for one façade sign and one window sign on a property located at 276 Greenwich Avenue in the CGBR Zone.

      Status: POSTPONED

   2. Orienta, 55 Lewis Street; Application: PLPZ201900515 for a Sign/Awning review for one sign on a property located at 55 LEWIS STREET in the CGB Zone.

      Decision Status: Approved as submitted.
      Motion: Hein Second: Brake-Smith Vote: 4-1 (Hein, Strazza, Brake-Smith, Pugliese. LoBalbo abstained)
      Notes:
   a. Applicant provided color and material samples of awning color – 4674 and 4603 as foreground and stripe.
   b. Letters are stencil cut, 2” deep with LED’s behind and will be located to the right of the door.
3. **Blo - Blow Dry Bar, 2 Greenwich Avenue;** Application: **PLPZ201900518** for a Sign/Awning review for **one new facade sign with halo letters** on a property located at 2 GREENWICH AVENUE in the CGBR Zone.

Decision Status: **Approved as submitted.**

Motion: Hein Second: Strazza Vote: 4-1 (Hein, Strazza, Brake-Smith, Pugliese. LoBalbo abstained)

Notes:

a. Sign attachment must be into mortar joints and not the actual brick.

**7:12pm**

**II. Committee Business:**

1. Review of Minutes of 12-11-19 meeting. **Correct LoBalbo spelling starting on page 4.** Page 4 of 9: Change the wording in “compensate the neighborhood...” to “accommodate the neighborhood” or the like to eliminate any inference of financial compensation (review the tapes). On Page 5 of 9: correct the duplicate note regarding the traffic study. Add “the” to the phrase “Questions of (the) appropriateness”. Change “not recommend...” to “Strongly oppose the tower elements”. Change “considered intense” — to use a better word than intense. Should be more like the size, color, scale for high school is “Too professional in scale / too oversized / bold looking / not in character with school” (review the tapes.)

Change language regarding parking concerns to better reflect ARC’s actual concerns which are increasing green space, reducing pavement and having green areas that effectively blend into the existing landscape. So eliminate the phrase “…ARC questions if all the new parking is needed...” and add “increase green space” “reduce pavement”. Regarding the pedestrian bridge, change phrasing to “ARC recommends that P+Z take into account the existing pedestrian bridge.”

ARC is also concerned with qualifying the proposed grassed and landscaped areas to confirm they will be realities in the field, i.e., does the design of the cul de sac provide a large enough turning radii for all vehicles including emergency vehicles to allow for a viable grassed/landscaped area in the middle of the circle as proposed on plans?

Page 7 of 9 — “protect the trunk” not “service the truck” and “Unsheared” not “unseared”

Page 6 of 9 —Field Club —Graziano and Mark talked about the look at roof line — try a different roof line —so at 2nd to last bullet— add “to review massing and roof scape”

Motion to accept minutes with the proposed amendments: HBS 2nd: KL – unan (Hein, Strazza, LoBalbo, Brake-Smith, Contadino, Pugliese)
2. Any other Business.

Chairman Hein requested that ARC members be provided with a hard copy of the POCD for their review. It’s an important document that spells out goals that are germane to ARC. The POCD green plan subcommittee includes himself and John Conte and will be asking for ARC members’ contributions as spelled out in the POCD. Staff handed out hard copies of POCD to each member in attendance.

Chairperson Hein reminded the ARC that there were instructions from the P+Z Commission for ARC to review the enabling legislation and update it to show how we want to function more effectively.

Chairperson Hein proposed a subcommittee to rewrite the Regulations and nominated Paul because he has experience with the functioning of the committee. Paul was okay with being a member but doesn’t want to be chairman of subcommittee. Secretary LoBalbo offered to head that subcommittee. Issues to address: “What you like/ what you don’t like/ and what you see you want to change.”

Vice Chairperson Strazza stated that before big projects ARC should get to have a briefing just like P+Z gets to have a briefing instead of walking into a meeting and just looking at the plans and not knowing what’s going on unless you have read the newspapers. He stated that a sign meeting should be held separate from the regular meeting and that he has asked for this for a while and that Rhonda could be involved in that meeting.

Chairman Hein noted that the POCD specifically calls for a rewrite of the sign and lighting regs and noted that Paul has had experience reviewing the Regulations. Heidi and Katherine noted they have both done research and have folders full of information. Staff informed them that the intent was to hire a consultant to compile all of their information and get input from all of ARC and the community and have the same or different consultant do the actual rewrite.

Staff asked for clarification on subcommittees for enabling legislation vs Regulation rewriting.

Paul says that ARC should perform an analysis of how we interact with P+Z and a critique of current regulations and how they have worked. Second part is how we can improve regs. And then implementing change and how it interacts with applicants. With the result that the applicant will have better idea of expectations. Develop templates for applications / approvals so ARC can spend more time on quality control.
III. Exterior Alteration Applications:

1. Greenwich Academy - Main Campus - Master Plan II - Visual Arts Center, 200 North Maple Avenue; Application: PLPZ201900460 for an Exterior Alteration review for a proposed addition to school's existing Performing Arts Center and to construct a new, attached Visual Arts Center on a property located at 200 NORTH MAPLE AVENUE in the RA-1 Zone. Last reviewed at the 11-20-19 meeting at which members Hein, Strazza, LoBalbo, Brake-Smith, Cohen, Conte, Krueger, Meniconi and Pugliese were present.

Decision Status on Ruth West Campbell (RWC) Courtyard: Return to a meeting.

Motion: Hein  Second: Strazza  Vote: unanimous (Hein, Strazza, LoBalbo, Boldt, Brake-Smith, Contadino, Conte, Krueger, Meniconi, Pugliese)

ARC’s recommendations and notes:

a. Applicant submitted new plans and a copy of the digital presentation for the file.

b. Accessibility is a primary concern in courtyard and it’s not reasonable to exclude ADA accessibility from the center core of the campus. (applicant stated that buildings are ADA accessible, and plaza area is accessible from building, but ADA accessibility to circular grassed areas [located between sets of stairs] is unfeasible because a ramp would need too much concrete to make the pitch.)

c. ARC finds the palette conflicting—brick, stone, some matches existing building, some matches new palette — return with a new palette and better graphics.

d. Tree replacement is emphasized, applicant should make serious effort to compensate for removed trees with significant amount of additional trees.

e. The geometry of the pathways seems arbitrary and the layout should be reviewed and updated.
**Decision Status on Visual Arts Center (VAC) and VAC courtyard:** Return to a meeting.

Motion: Hein
Second: Brake-Smith
Vote: unanimous (Hein, Strazza, LoBalbo, Boldt, Brake-Smith, Contadino, Conte, Krueger, Meniconi, Pugliese)

ARC’s recommendations and notes:

a. ARC identified big improvements to architecture.
b. ARC identified some concerns with details of architecture with regard to the lobby and skin of building.
c. Applicant emphasized they are trying to make simple boxes that are connected with a skin — good premise but needs to be built upon.
d. Language of architecture — members spoke eloquently about the extra language that is being applied to the premise — heavy base with glass box, then glass skin, then brick piers — all of those need to be organized and clarified — clarify the vision and execution.
e. Eclectic grouping of buildings — have to be sensitive to fact that their own project is eclectic architecture on eclectic landscape on eclectic campus.
f. Simplify landscaping. Simplify grades and contours and lines so that landscaping can be more connected to the campus.
g. The connectivity of the VAC courtyard and RWC courtyards should be improved by revising pathways in between the two areas.
h. Using applicant’s vocabulary “perforated masonry skin” but ARC finds it’s really a skeleton — but between the slender disproportionate brick piers and the massiveness of building next to it is where solution lies or taking metal wall and making that into something special and eliminating brick completely.
i. Distinguish the detail between the storefront and the lobby elements — (accentuate entry without creating a third element).
2. **The Field Club of Greenwich, Inc., 276 Lake Avenue**: Application: **PLPZ201900495** for an Exterior Alteration review to modify a 2014 approval for a new tennis building including shifting its location, adding new 1 ½ story component to building, replacing existing garage with a new garage, relocating maintenance drive and associated landscaping on a property located at 276 LAKE AVENUE in the Zone RA-2. Last reviewed at the 12-11-19 meeting at which members Hein, Strazza, LoBalbo, Boldt, Brake-Smith, Cohen, Conte, Krueger, and Meniconi were present.

Decision Status: **Return to a meeting.**

Motion: Hein Second: LoBalbo Vote: unanimous (Hein, Strazza, LoBalbo, Boldt, Brake-Smith, Contadino, Conte, Krueger, Meniconi, Pugliese)

ARC’s recommendations and notes:

a. Arc asked that applicant pay attention to graphic scale of building, scale of building is so big and material may have to be scaled up (as a possibility).

b. Submit detailed drawings of section – in plan section, and elevation, that articulate use of materials, trim, siding, roofing, fenestration.

c. Submit dimensioned renderings / drawings that prove composition will stand on its own on this extensive building.

d. Siding may need to be larger / jumbo brick is a visual cue.

e. Not satisfied that warming house glazing is appropriate — it is too ski lodge — Victorian /shingle style is assumed.

f. Architecture of the warming hut has to agree with language of building.

g. Discussion of stronger landscaping and re-grading retaining wall to stabilize site of building.

h. Break down visual mass to be in context with neighborhood.

i. Submit Samples of materials.

j. Submit Section and elevation.

k. Bollards: research more styles in order to find one in 2700K and below 30 inches. There is big difference from 3000 K to 2700 K.

l. Submit Photometric plan.
3. Greenwich Water Club, 50 River Road; Application: PLPZ201900510 for an Exterior Alteration review for proposed landscaping and lighting at the Squash House on a property located at 50 RIVER ROAD COS COB in the R-7-HO Zone.

Status: Applicant did not attend / application was not discussed.

4. Giancarlo DeBerardinis, 20 Georgetowne North; Application: PLPZ201900499 for an Exterior Alteration review for replacement of exterior deck (retroactive approval requested for work already completed) on a property located at 20 VALLEY DRIVE in the R-C12 Zone.

Decision Status: Approved as submitted.
Motion: Strazza Second: LoBalbo Vote: unanimous (Hein, Strazza, LoBalbo, Boldt, Brake-Smith, Contadino, Conte, Krueger, Meniconi, Pugliese)

5. Edge Fitness, LLC, 1333 East Putnam Avenue; Application: PLPZ201900492 for an Exterior Alteration review to enclose a 6-yard trash disposal bin as well as moving it from a parking lot space to a space less visible to the road on a property located at 1333 EAST PUTNAM AVENUE, RIVERSIDE in the LB Zone.

Decision Status: Return to a meeting.
Motion: LoBalbo Second: Brake-Smith Vote: unanimous (Hein, Strazza, LoBalbo, Boldt, Brake-Smith, Contadino, Conte, Krueger, Meniconi, Pugliese)

ARC’s recommendations and notes:

a. Submit a site plan to show where the rubbish area is currently and where it is proposed.
b. Submit plans showing dimensions of the door and size of enclosure.
c. Submit elevation drawing showing 6 feet of height and the building in background.
d. Submit photo / image of proposed PVC grey fencing for enclosure.
e. ARC strongly recommends you add planting to aide in screening such as a tree or hedge. Explain in a narrative as to why you can or can’t plant a new tree or hedge.
f. Applicant indicated that there is one rubbish enclosure now. Any information regarding Walgreens’ trash enclosure should be provided. Is there one rubbish area on the site or more?
6. The Hill House, Inc., 10 Riverside Ave.; Application: PLPZ201900049 for an Exterior Alteration review for replacement of: bollards, and cooling tower in existing mechanical enclosure, and replacement of flat roof, cedar shingles, trim, and windows, to match 2015 addition, and associated site work on a property located at 10 RIVERSIDE AVENUE RIVERSIDE in the R-12 Zone. Last reviewed at the 12-11-19 meeting at which members Hein, Strazza, LoBalbo, Boldt, Brake-Smith, Cohen, Conte, Krueger, and Meniconi were present.

Decision Status: Submit revisions electronically (email: manastasio@greenwichct.org).

Motion: Hein Second: Meniconi Vote: 9-1 (Hein, Strazza, Boldt, Brake-Smith, Contadino, Conte, Krueger, Meniconi, Pugliese. LoBalbo abstained.)

ARC’s recommendations and notes:
   a. ARC agrees that the siding should be clapboard to match addition that was done recently. Applicant to match in color and exposure and spec.
   b. New bollards to be 36” in same style as existing (existing are 42”)

*The Town complies with all applicable federal and state laws regarding non-discrimination, equal opportunity, affirmative action, and providing reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities. If you require an accommodation to participate, please contact the Commissioner of Human Services at 203-622-3800 or alan.barry@greenwichct.org as soon as possible in advance of the event.*
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE
ACTION AGENDA final
Wednesday, January 8th, 2020

Mazza Room, 1st floor (enter through Law Dept.)
Town Hall, 101 Field Point Road, Greenwich

7:00 PM – 10:50 PM
Sign reviews started: 7:00 PM

Members Present: Richard Hein, Chairperson; Mark Strazza, Vice-Chairperson; Katherine LoBalbo, Secretary; Peter Boldt (7:45), Heidi Brake-Smith; Louis Contadino; John Conte; Leander Krueger (7:30); Graziano Meniconi (7:45); Paul Pugliese.

Members Absent: Rhonda Cohen

Staff Present: Marisa Anastasio, Senior Planner and Bianca Dygert, Planner II.

7pm
I. Sign/Awning Reviews:
   1. Lynnens Inc., 276 Greenwich Avenue; Application: PLPZ201900509 for a Sign/Awning review for one façade sign and one window sign on a property located at 276 Greenwich Avenue in the CGBR Zone.

      Status: POSTPONED

   2. Orienta, 55 Lewis Street; Application: PLPZ201900515 for a Sign/Awning review for one sign on a property located at 55 LEWIS STREET in the CGB Zone.

      Decision Status: Approved as submitted.

      Motion: Hein Second: Brake-Smith Vote: 4-1 (Hein, Strazza, Brake-Smith, Pugliese. LoBalbo abstained)

      Notes:
       a. Applicant provided color and material samples of awning color – 4674 and 4603 as foreground and stripe.
       b. Letters are stencil cut, 2” deep with LED’s behind and will be located to the right of the door.
3. **Blo - Blow Dry Bar, 2 Greenwich Avenue**: Application: PLPZ201900518 for a Sign /Awning review for **one new facade sign with halo letters** on a property located at 2 GREENWICH AVENUE in the CGBR Zone.

Decision Status: **Approved as submitted.**

Motion: Hein Second: Strazza Vote: 4-1 (Hein, Strazza, Brake-Smith, Pugliese.
LoBalbo abstained)

Notes:

a. **Sign attachment must be into mortar joints and not the actual brick.**

7:12pm

II. **Committee Business:**

1. Review of Minutes of 12-11-19 meeting. **Correct LoBalbo spelling starting on page 4. Page 4 of 9:** Change the wording in “compensate the neighborhood...” to “accommodate the neighborhood” or the like to eliminate any inference of financial compensation (review the tapes). On Page 5 of 9: correct the duplicate note regarding the traffic study. Add “the” to the phrase “Questions of (the) appropriateness”. Change “not recommend...” to “Strongly oppose the tower elements”. Change “considered intense” — to use a better word than intense. Should be more like the size, color, scale for high school is “Too professional in scale / too oversized / bold looking / not in character with school” (review the tapes.)

Change language regarding parking concerns to better reflect ARC’s actual concerns which are increasing green space, reducing pavement and having green areas that effectively blend into the existing landscape. So eliminate the phrase “...ARC questions if all the new parking is needed...” and add “increase green space” “reduce pavement”. Regarding the pedestrian bridge, change phrasing to “ARC recommends that P+Z take into account the existing pedestrian bridge.”

ARC is also concerned with qualifying the proposed grassed and landscaped areas to confirm they will be realities in the field, i.e., does the design of the cul de sac provide a large enough turning radii for all vehicles including emergency vehicles to allow for a viable grassed/landscaped area in the middle of the circle as proposed on plans?

Page 7 of 9 — “protect the trunk” not “service the truck” and “Unsheared” not “unseared”

Page 6 of 9 —Field Club —Meniconi and Strazza talked about the look at roof line — try a different roof line — so at 2nd to last bullet— add “to review massing and roof scape”

Motion to accept minutes with the proposed amendments: HBS 2nd: KL – unan (Hein, Strazza, LoBalbo, Brake-Smith, Contadino, Pugliese)
2. Any other Business.

Chairman Hein requested that ARC members be provided with a hard copy of the POCD for their review. It’s an important document that spells out goals that are germane to ARC. The POCD green plan subcommittee includes himself and John Conte and will be asking for ARC members’ contributions as spelled out in the POCD. Staff handed out hard copies of POCD to each member in attendance.

Chairperson Hein reminded the ARC that there were instructions from the P+Z Commission for ARC to review the enabling legislation and update it to show how we want to function more effectively.

Chairperson Hein proposed a subcommittee to rewrite the Regulations and nominated Paul because he has experience with the functioning of the committee. Paul Pugliese was okay with being a member but doesn’t want to be chairman of subcommittee. Secretary LoBalbo offered to head that subcommittee. Issues to address: “What you like/ what you don’t like/ and what you see you want to change.”

Vice Chairperson Strazza stated that before big projects ARC should get to have a briefing just like P+Z gets to have a briefing instead of walking into a meeting and just looking at the plans and not knowing what’s going on unless you have read the newspapers. He stated that a sign meeting should be held separate from the regular meeting and that he has asked for this for a while and that Rhonda Cohen could be involved in that meeting.

Chairman Hein noted that the POCD specifically calls for a rewrite of the sign and lighting regs and noted that Pugliese has had experience reviewing the Regulations. Brake-Smith and LoBalbo noted they have both done research and have folders full of information. Staff informed them that the intent was to hire a consultant to compile all of their information and get input from all of ARC and the community and have the same or different consultant do the actual rewrite.

Staff asked for clarification on subcommittees for enabling legislation vs Regulation rewriting.

Pugliese says that ARC should perform an analysis of how we interact with P+Z and a critique of current regulations and how they have worked. Second part is how we can improve regs. And then implementing change and how it interacts with applicants. With the result that the applicant will have better idea of expectations. Develop templates for applications / approvals so ARC can spend more time on quality control.
III. Exterior Alteration Applications:

1. Greenwich Academy - Main Campus - Master Plan II - Visual Arts Center, 200 North Maple Avenue; Application: PLPZ201900460 for an Exterior Alteration review for a proposed addition to school's existing Performing Arts Center and to construct a new, attached Visual Arts Center on a property located at 200 NORTH MAPLE AVENUE in the RA-1 Zone. Last reviewed at the 11-20-19 meeting at which members Hein, Strazza, LoBalbo, Brake-Smith, Cohen, Conte, Krueger, Meniconi and Pugliese were present.

**Decision Status on Ruth West Campbell (RWC) Courtyard:** Return to a meeting.
Motion: Hein Second: Strazza Vote: unanimous (Hein, Strazza, LoBalbo, Boldt, Brake-Smith, Contadino, Conte, Krueger, Meniconi, Pugliese) ARC’s recommendations and notes:

a. Applicant submitted new plans and a copy of the digital presentation for the file.

b. Accessibility is a primary concern in courtyard and it’s not reasonable to exclude ADA accessibility from the center core of the campus. Provide ADA access from the bottom level to the grass circles.

c. ARC finds the palette conflicting— brick, stone, some matches existing building, some matches new palette — return with a new palette and better graphics.

d. Tree replacement is emphasized, applicant should make serious effort to compensate for removed trees with significant amount of additional trees.

e. The geometry of the pathways seems arbitrary and the layout should be reviewed and updated.
**Decision Status on Visual Arts Center (VAC) and VAC courtyard:** Return to a meeting.

Motion: Hein Second: Brake-Smith  Vote: unanimous (Hein, Strazza, LoBalbo, Boldt, Brake-Smith, Contadino, Conte, Krueger, Meniconi, Pugliese)

ARC’s recommendations and notes:

a. ARC identified significant improvements to the architectural proportions and materials, in line with comments of the ARC from the previous meeting.

b. ARC identified concerns with the intersection of the architecture at the glass lobby and the brick massing of the rest of the building.

c. Applicant emphasized they are trying to make simple boxes that are connected with a skin — good premise but needs to be built upon.

d. Language of architecture — members spoke eloquently about the extra language that is being applied to the premise — heavy base with glass box, then glass skin, then brick piers — all of those need to be organized and clarified — clarify the vision and execution.

e. Eclectic grouping of buildings — have to be sensitive to fact that their own project is eclectic architecture on eclectic landscape on eclectic campus.

f. ARC recommends traditional and more formal organization of the pathways and a procession towards the rest of the campus and that the grading be raised to make additional even level courtyard space held by a retaining or knee wall facing the parking.

g. ARC finds the canopy at the lobby unbalanced at the lobby.

h. The connectivity of the VAC courtyard and RWC courtyards should be improved by revising pathways in between the two areas.

i. Using applicant’s vocabulary “perforated masonry skin” but ARC finds it’s really a skeleton — but between the slender disproportionate brick piers and the massiveness of building next to it is where solution lies or taking metal wall and making that into something special and eliminating brick completely. ARC finds that the brick piers don’t connect to any other architecture language of the building.

j. Distinguish the detail between the storefront and the lobby elements — (accentuate entry without creating a third element).
2. **The Field Club of Greenwich, Inc., 276 Lake Avenue; Application:**

   PLPZ201900495 for an Exterior Alteration review to modify a 2014 approval for a new tennis building including shifting its location, adding new 1 ½ story component to building, replacing existing garage with a new garage, relocating maintenance drive and associated landscaping on a property located at 276 LAKE AVENUE in the Zone RA-2. Last reviewed at the 12-11-19 meeting at which members Hein, Strazza, LoBalbo, Boldt, Brake-Smith, Cohen, Conte, Krueger, and Meniconi were present.

   Decision Status: **Return to a meeting.**

   Motion: Hein Second: LoBalbo Vote: unanimous (Hein, Strazza, LoBalbo, Boldt, Brake-Smith, Contadino, Conte, Krueger, Meniconi, Pugliese)

   ARC’s recommendations and notes:

   a. Arc asked that applicant pay attention to graphic scale of building, scale of building is so big and material may have to be scaled up (as a possibility).
   b. Submit detailed drawings of section – in plan section, and elevation, that articulate use of materials, trim, siding, roofing, fenestration.
   c. Submit dimensioned renderings / drawings that prove composition will stand on its own on this extensive building.
   d. Siding may need to be larger / jumbo brick is a visual cue.
   e. Not satisfied that warming house glazing is appropriate — it is too ski lodge — Victorian /shingle style is assumed.
   f. Architecture of the warming hut has to agree with language of building.
   g. Discussion of stronger landscaping and re-grading retaining wall to stabilize site of building.
   h. Break down visual mass to be in context with neighborhood.
   i. Submit Samples of materials.
   j. Submit Section and elevation.
   k. Bollards: research more styles in order to find one in 2700K and below 30 inches. There is big difference from 3000 K to 2700 K.
   l. Submit Photometric plan.
3. **Greenwich Water Club, 50 River Road**: Application: PLPZ201900510 for an Exterior Alteration review for proposed landscaping and lighting at the Squash House on a property located at 50 RIVER ROAD COS COB in the R-7-HO Zone.

**Status:** Applicant did not attend / application was not discussed.

4. **Giancarlo DeBerardinis, 20 Georgetowne North**: Application: PLPZ201900499 for an Exterior Alteration review for replacement of exterior deck (retroactive approval requested for work already completed) on a property located at 20 VALLEY DRIVE in the R-C12 Zone.

**Decision Status:** Approved as submitted.

**Motion:** Strazza Second: LoBalbo Vote: unanimous (Hein, Strazza, LoBalbo, Boldt, Brake-Smith, Contadino, Conte, Krueger, Meniconi, Pugliese)

5. **Edge Fitness, LLC, 1333 East Putnam Avenue**: Application: PLPZ201900492 for an Exterior Alteration review to enclose a 6-yard trash disposal bin as well as moving it from a parking lot space to a space less visible to the road on a property located at 1333 EAST PUTNAM AVENUE, RIVERSIDE in the LB Zone.

**Decision Status:** Return to a meeting.

**Motion:** LoBalbo Second: Brake-Smith Vote: unanimous (Hein, Strazza, LoBalbo, Boldt, Brake-Smith, Contadino, Conte, Krueger, Meniconi, Pugliese)

ARC’s recommendations and notes:

- Submit a site plan to show where the rubbish area is currently and where it is proposed.
- Submit plans showing dimensions of the door and size of enclosure.
- Submit elevation drawing showing 6 feet of height and the building in background.
- Submit photo / image of proposed PVC grey fencing for enclosure.
- ARC strongly recommends you add planting to aide in screening such as a tree or hedge. Explain in a narrative as to why you can or can’t plant a new tree or hedge.
- Applicant indicated that there is one rubbish enclosure now. Any information regarding Walgreens’ trash enclosure should be provided. Is there one rubbish area on the site or more?
6. **The Hill House, Inc., 10 Riverside Ave.; Application: PLPZ201900049** for an Exterior Alteration review for replacement of: bollards, and cooling tower in existing mechanical enclosure, and replacement of flat roof, cedar shingles, trim, and windows, to match 2015 addition, and associated site work on a property located at 10 RIVERSIDE AVENUE RIVERSIDE in the R-12 Zone. Last reviewed at the 12-11-19 meeting at which members Hein, Strazza, LoBalbo, Boldt, Brake-Smith, Cohen, Conte, Krueger, and Meniconi were present.

Decision Status: **Submit revisions electronically (email: manastasio@greenwichct.org).**

Motion: Hein Second: Meniconi Vote: 9-1 (Hein, Strazza, Boldt, Brake-Smith, Contadino, Conte, Krueger, Meniconi, Pugliese. LoBalbo abstained.)

ARC’s recommendations and notes:

a. ARC agrees that the siding should be clapboard to match addition that was done recently. Applicant to match in color and exposure and spec.

b. New bollards to be 36” in same style as existing (existing are 42”)

*The Town complies with all applicable federal and state laws regarding non-discrimination, equal opportunity, affirmative action, and providing reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities. If you require an accommodation to participate, please contact the Commissioner of Human Services at 203-622-3800 or alan.barry@greenwichct.org as soon as possible in advance of the event.*