FINAL MINUTES
Regular Meeting of the
Historic District Commission of the Town of Greenwich
Wednesday, March 13, 2019, 7:00pm
Mazza Room, Town Hall

ATTENDEES PRESENT
COMMISSIONERS: STEPHEN BISHOP – CHAIRMAN, DARIUS TORABY, FI FI SHERIDAN, KATHRIN BROWN,

ALTERNATES: MARIE WILLIAMS (arrived 7:07), MARTIN KAGAN, SERENA BECHTEL, CYNTHIA SMITH,

ABSENT: ARIS CRIST, ANNIE MCGINNIS

Mr. Bishop called meeting to order at 7:04pm

1. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
301-309 Greenwich Avenue
Greenwich, CT 06830
Represented by Granoff Architects

Review window replacements on upper floors of street façade

Mr. Stresemann, architect of Granoff Architects, began his presentation by identifying the location of the building – present-day Starbucks on Greenwich Avenue. Mr. Stresemann stated that the present exterior air conditioners would be removed as central air conditioning is to be installed. Continuing, as the building wraps around (the corner of Greenwich Avenue and Havemeyer) and the back is where the brick is along with the fire escape – those windows will not be replaced (as they look onto an alley/parking spaces. The applicant is only renovating the windows facing the Greenwich Avenue and Havemeyer Avenue and the replacements are “in kind”. He further added that the present windows are not original ones but the replacements will be in keeping with the original look. Additionally, the Starbucks’ storefront will remain the same. The replacements are only occurring on the second and third floors and they are to be white Universal windows.

Mr. Kagan asked if the air conditioning will it be on the roof?
Mr. Stresemann responded yes and that there will be a separate application for that as the applicant is only doing work one step at a time.
Mr. Toraby asked if there were any details of the profiles of the windows. Mr. Streseman confirmed and guided Mr. Toraby to look at the last page of the application.

Mr. Streseman said that some interior wood molding would be replaced but that it would not affect the outside appearance.

Mr. Toraby commented that the details can make or break the fenestration

Mr. Streseman agreed that the devil is in the details.

Mr. Toraby asked if anyone has checked the window lintels? Mr. Streseman said yes there has been careful examination and there is no obvious deterioration.

Mr. Bishop stated that if there was a problem with the lintel then you would have to deal with it. Mr. Streseman confirmed.

Mr. Bishop asked for a motion.

Motion to approve the application as presented
Moved by Mr. Toraby
Seconded by Ms. Brown
Unanimous Vote

Voting in favor: Mr. Bishop, Ms. Brown, Mr. Toraby, Ms. Sheridan, Mr. Kagan, Ms. Smith, Ms. Bechtel, Ms. Williams

2. ADVISORY TO PLANNING & ZONING
101 West Putnam Avenue [Greenwich Library]
Greenwich, CT 06830
Represented by: Thomas J. Heagney, Esq., Heagney, Lennon & Slane, LLP

Review proposal of Greenwich Library expansion

Mr. Heagney began his presentation by describing his role with the Greenwich Library which is a volunteer capacity and a member of the Board of Trustees and Chair of the Building and Grounds Committee. Mr. Heagney described the project, a large $17 million dollar renovation -- identifying that most of the renovation is to the interior. It involves changes to the Cole Auditorium and finishes except for a few things and bringing some services from the basement to the first floor and introducing new access points.
Mr. Heagney stated that a new lower level entrance is to be created and the café will now be at the Baxter Courtyard with French doors to be opened to the courtyard. A small theater will be included and this will also have access to the Cole Auditorium. A new handicapped accessible entrance (closer to the handicapped parking spaces) will be installed. Mr. Heagney said that the Library is looking to utilize existing space for public use while not having the public go outside and then reenter.

Mr. Heagney said that he is here on behalf of the applicant to receive a favorable decision in regard to a section in the Building Codes regulations that states that a space that has (either) historical, cultural or architectural merit can additional footage based on an advisory opinion from the HDC. This application is following the same process that was used when the Peterson Wing was constructed in the 1990s. 325 square feet is to be added.

Michael Tribe (architect) identified that the building has three sides -- Putnam Avenue, Deerfield and the parking side. The Deerfield side will have a new delivery entrance and windows will be added (replacing those which are currently used as a marquee) that will now allow daylight for new offices. There are no changes being proposed to the West Putnam Avenue side. The Parking Lot side will show an extended piano room and additional windows at the mezzanine level (with the windows matching the ones on Deerfield).

Mr. Tribe further described that the courtyard will have glass to replace the lobby area and there will be columns to help define the courtyard area to help the circulation path. Three windows will be extended down to the French doors (where the café will be) and a two-story opening is to be created for the new entrance.

Ms. Smith asked if that is a part of the proposed square footage? Mr. Tribe confirmed. He continued to describe the project saying that the courtyard is being rebuilt and a new set of steps will be added. The vestibule will showcase the new staircase that connects that area to the first floor.

A brief history of the library was included and submitted.

Ms. Sheridan commented that she believed that Greenwich Library is the busiest one in the region. It is the second busiest library in all of New England – Boston Public Library is the busiest.

Ms. Smith asked the applicant where the stairway is to be added as she thought it was where there is a second check out book area on the first floor. Mr. Tribe confirmed the location and while a portion of that will remain it will also have a staircase.

Mr. Kagan asked for clarification of the plan and discussion revolved around the interior design.
Mr. Heagney outlined the construction plan and said that the applicant had filed for interior renovations with the Building Department and construction is to begin in early July (2019). Work is to be phased in and the Cole Auditorium will be out of commission for approximately one year.

Mr. Toraby asked to be reminded the additional square footage that is being sought. Mr. Heagney replied 325 feet and added that 40,000 square feet is permitted. Mr. Heagney continued saying that when the Peterson Wing was approved, that addition essentially doubled the size of the library and that was allowed due to the historical merit of the building.

Motion to approve application (specifically the addition of 325 square feet) and cite that the proposal which affects 101 West Putnam Avenue (“Greenwich Library”) has historical, cultural and architectural merit (note: HDC believes that all three are being applied in regard to 101 West Putnam Avenue).
Moved by Mr. Toraby
Seconded by Ms. Sheridan
Unanimous Vote
Voting in favor: Mr. Bishop, Ms. Brown, Mr. Toraby, Ms. Sheridan, Mr. Kagan, Ms. Smith, Ms. Bechtel, Ms. Williams

3. FOR DISCUSSION ONLY*
35 Strickland Road (C-Local Historic District)
Cos Cob, CT 06807
Represented by Claire Flouty [George Flouty, her husband] is actually speaking

Discussion of possible addition of garage for front house, window replacements, addition to barn on second lot, addition of garage for barn on second lot, rear-right corner of house to be squared
* No certificate of appropriateness will be issued at this meeting

Mr. Flouty began his presentation stating that his intention is to share some ideas and more importantly he wishes to receive feedback. Presently, he is considering keeping the division and exploring the bungalow property adding a garage and the “barn” (located behind the bungalow property) to be brought up to residential living regulations and having a garage structure added (or attached).

BUNGALOW
Mr. Flouty identified that the windows are in bad shape and need to be replaced. Mr. Bishop stated that HDC would need to see examples as they are very important architectural element. He further added that a “cut sheet” and a sample and color and
Mr. Toraby added said that he would want wooden windows.

Mr. Flouty commented that presently he is thinking of expanding the kitchen and adding a detached garage in the rear at the end of the ‘south’ driveway (the present ‘north’ driveway is a shared one) with its design being similar to the one owned by the adjacent property (south) Greenwich Historical Society.

A solution presented by the Greenwich Historical Society is to have the garage in the back of the house – in essence attached to the kitchen. Mr. Flouty responded that this idea would block two windows in the rear and reduce the amount of the backyard.

Mr. Carl Mecky (occupant) identified himself as a neighbor and commented that the garage (which is actually the barn located to the rear of the bungalow) is actually very old and built in 1848 and possibly used as a horse stable. So getting back to a detached garage there will be what is now two buildings, there will be 4 (detached). And to use the buildings as a garage as detached – it can be tiring.

Dr. Debra Mecky (occupant) stated that you should not be able to see the new structures from the road so tucking in a garage would be less intrusive.

Mr. Kagan asked if the idea is to keep the two properties separate? He continued offering, if you did it all together and got rid of one of the driveways you would give yourself more frontage for the house.

Mrs. Toraby (owner 31 Strickland road) identified the difficulties of the property and felt that the Flouty family are nice people and wants to have the property work and not have the barn fall to demolition by neglect. She added that she has no objection to a detached garage on the GHS (Mecky-occupied) side of the property and hopes to see the property well maintained. Mrs. Toraby suggested a smallish garage at the top of the driveway to serve the bungalow. She wants the house and the barn brought up to a standard that benefits the entire local historic district. Mrs. Toraby invited the HDC members to visit the property.

Ms. Williams said that having a garage on the front property sub-optimizes the charm and feels that when looking at the ‘whole’ it is only then that you can determine a unified character. Would the applicant consider one garage to serve both properties?

Mr. Flouty responded that the problem of a shared garage needs legal input but will consider it.

Ms. Brown inquired if the applicant is looking to keep the two properties separate? Mr. Flouty responded that at the present time, yes. He is open to ALL ideas.
BARN (former carriage house to 31 Strickland road)
Mr. Flouty presented that a foundation would be added as well as an addition to the rear of the barn (15x15) that would add significant living space and allow for a family. A garage would be added as far back as possible, match the roofline and therefore make it less visible from the front.

Mr. Mecky had suggested that the garage be placed on the side of the Barn.

Mr. Flouty responded that if the Commission felt it was worth considering (Mecky’s suggestion) then it can be developed further.

Mr. Bishop felt that the members understood that Mr. Flouty was eager to proceed with developing the property and asked members to visit the site to best determine whether the addition of detached structures was appropriate or to visualize extensions to the present structures. Mr. Flouty is to return to continue the conversation.

4. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
96 and 100 Maple Avenue  (96 Maple Avenue has Historic Overlay designation)
Owner: Greenwich Academy
Represented by: Bruce F. Cohen, Esq., Fogarty Cohen Russo & Nemiroff LLC and Tim Peck, project architect

Review plans for minor exterior work

Mr. Cohen began his presentation by referring to the application’s last meeting (brought to HDC in November – perform exterior work at 96 Maple Avenue to make it necessary to turn the building into a different use (which was subsequently approved by P&Z)) and this is a follow up to that meeting.

Mr. Cohen commented that at the said HDC November meeting, there was puzzlement in whether to comment upon a part of the application as the change of use had not taken place at that time. He further stated that the exterior changes that were approved by HDC (November) with comments will be discussed tonight by architect Tim Peck and also by landscape architect Bill Kenny.

Since the HDC hearing took place, the P&Z approved the change of use HO that was granted in 1979 that was for multi-family to now (2019) to include the Cowan Center (non-profit educational use) along with two faculty apartments. Also was the approval of the consolidation of two parcels into a single zoning lot but 96 by itself with the HO keeps the HO so 100 Maple Avenue retains its present R-20 zoning classification. P&Z also asked that the applicant come back to HDC (per the HDC request). One of the motions that if the P&Z granted change of use to 96 Maple Avenue, then HDC wanted to render an opinion on landscaping for said change of use.
Mr. Peck spoke to the building on 96 Maple Avenue and stated that the stair will be kept straight out and that the rise and run is code compliant; the roofing will continue to have slate (and will replace in kind where necessary); the Marvin-clad full frame windows will be used and window-opening sizes will not change and they will use the historic 5/8 muntins (with SDL); all woodwork and trim will be restored; the existing terrace in front will have its grade changed slightly and remain within the existing footprint.

Mr. Toraby inquired about the shutters. 
Mr. Peck answered that there are wood shutters there now and we are proposing a wood shutter composite and only on the front of the building and south side and will be white.

Mr. Kenny spoke and stated that starting with the public view, we are proposing to keep the major features - keep the front lawn and the grand beech tree will remain. A low evergreen hedge will be added to screen the cars. Today there are four spaces and it will be reduced to one space (handicapped) to add more planting and a walkway.

The foundation plantings are being pushed out. The lawn remains the same. Furniture (nothing permanent) for toddlers (approx. 24 inches high) is being proposed for the side lawn.

Ms. Williams said that the only access from the building to the play area are steps which seems uncertain. Is grading an issue?
Mr. Kenny responded saying the grading is relatively level but drops down in the back corner. The public experience – maintain the lawn, reducing the parking and increasing planting - tall plantings will screen the area to the side (with play area).

The back of the property – Mr. Kenny described the site to now have foundation plantings in the rear will help to define the space; screening will also be added. Parking is to be pulled back. Within the HO there was 8 spaces and now there are 3 spaces.

Ms. Smith asked regarding the parking that abuts Brunswick, has that been reduced?
Mr. Kenny said yes. What was once 21 spaces is now reduced 16 (this being outside of the HO).

Mr. Bishop asked for confirmation that the rear is not in the HO (in relevance to 100 and HDC does not have jurisdiction to 100 Maple Avenue). Mr. Cohen confirmed Mr. Bishop’s statement and said that a play area was moved to the 100 Maple Avenue area.

Ms. Smith asked about the toddler area and the reply was that would now be grass.

Mr. Toraby stated that he is excited that the parking is to be limited and in keeping with the residential context.

Mr. Bishop read aloud letters that were submitted (see at end).
Mr. Bishop invited the public to speak.

Mr. Bloom spoke:
We have lived in the rear of 96 maple Avenue for 46 years (92 Maple). Up until now, 96 has been a quiet neighbor. In 1979 the house was made accessible for two families. Subsequently the house began non-conforming in its use but it still remained quiet. I am concerned with the screening of the rear of the house. I want to know how high the screening will be. A 6-foot hedge is not going to be high enough. (note: Mr. Bloom owns 92 and 94 Maple and 3 Boxwood Lane). Further a 6 foot arborvitae will not work.

Mr. Kenny stated that an 8-10 foot hedge is being proposed. We have a fence around the playground with the arborvitaes.

Mrs. Bloom said that having two doors in the basement means a lot of children coming and going and wants a barrier/retaining wall . . . a stone wall to define the property line so children don’t wander onto their driveway. And then have trees put behind the stone wall. Mrs. Bloom went on to describe her appreciation of being able to look out from her property and see green space. Ms. Bloom then reiterated her previous statement of wanting to have a defined wall.

Mr. Bishop interjected and said that if you have a wall with trees behind it then you will not be able to see your green space and asked if she had a preference of one or the other.

Mrs. Bloom understood and stated that her concern for her property and the well-being of others she wants a definition.

Mr. Cohen interjected saying he has met with the Blooms several times and have tried to accommodate their requests. The idea of moving parking to the front is something that P&Z did not want to see (P&Z made them remove it). The green appearance of the front yard must remain. Mr. Cohen is waiting to hear the exact places where the Blooms want more plantings.

Mr. Toraby agreed that a physical barrier is necessary and it is not unreasonable to ask for a physical barrier as children do run around.

Mr. Kagan said there is a validity for having a retaining wall for safety should evacuation from the building become necessary.

Mr. Cohen said we will accede to having a retaining wall.

Mr. Bishop wants a barrier – a stonewall is “New England” in fashion and in keeping in the neighborhood.

Mr. Toraby said the landscaping plan could be improved by a retaining wall but otherwise it is a good ideal plan.
Motion to approve the entire plan as submitted with the condition that a physical barrier (in keeping with the general landscape) be installed on the shared property one between 96 and 94 Maple Avenue.
Moved by Mr. Kagan
Seconded by Mr. Toraby
Unanimous Vote

Voting in favor: Mr. Bishop, Ms. Brown, Mr. Toraby, Ms. Sheridan, Mr. Kagan, Ms. Smith, Ms. Bechtel, Ms. Williams

5. Demolitions

26 Chapel Lane
Riverside, CT 06878

24 Pecksland Road
Greenwich, CT 06831

6. Minutes

Motion to approve February 13, 2019 minutes
Moved by Mr. Kagan
Seconded by Ms. Brown

Voting in favor: Mr. Bishop, Ms. Brown, Ms. Sheridan, Mr. Kagan, Ms. Bechtel, Ms. Williams
(Ms. Smith, Mr. Toraby were absent for February meeting)

Motion to end meeting
Moved by Mr. Toraby
Seconded by Ms. Sheridan
Meeting adjourned at 10:05pm
LETTERS SUBMITTED RE: 96 MAPLE AVENUE AGENDA ITEM #3

Mr. Stephen Bishop
Chairman, Historic District Commission
265 Taconic Road
Greenwich, CT 06831
Cc: Ann Young anne_h_young@gmail.com

To: HDC

My name is Bart Osman and on behalf of my wife Kate, our three daughters and myself I am writing in support of the Cowan Center movement to 96 and 100 Maple Avenue.

By way of background I am a graduate of Brunswick School (1986). My wife and I moved to Greenwich in 2004 and currently live on Doubling Road. I have three daughters who are all attending or have attended Greenwich Academy. Eliza (22) started at GA in pre-connecting (PC) and graduated in 2015. Emma (19) started at GA in the Cowan Center. After three years in the Cowan Center she moved to PC and graduated in 2018. Eloise (15) started at GA in the Cowan Center and after three years moved to PC and is currently in 9th grade. We have been a part of the GA community for almost twenty years starting in 2001. Our older daughters who are now at Dartmouth College had an amazing 17 and 14 year experience and our youngest daughter has enjoyed 13 fantastic years on her way to 17 years at the school. It all started at the Cowan Center.

Cowan Center is an amazing gem in our community. The teachers are warm, friendly, upbeat and caring and truly lay the groundwork for instilling the values of Greenwich Academy in the girls at a very young age. They learn teamwork, character, importance of community and more. The diverse cross section of community and faculty children enriches the experience for everyone, and is an unusual model for the Greenwich community. To this day our daughters speak fondly of their days at the Cowan Center and their amazing teachers. They both have treasured friendships which began in their “Cowan days.”

In 2017 we purchased 171 North Maple (across the street from Greenwich Academy) and began building a home which will be complete in this spring. Now that we are 50+ years old, and 3 years from an “empty nest” we see this as our “dream home”, and hope to be here for a long time. Our family is extremely excited about it. We are moving to North Maple for a number of reasons. The proximity to town will enable us to have a short walk to town with all that offers, as well as a short drive to the train station. The other reason is proximity to Greenwich Academy. It will be convenient for our youngest for the remainder of high school but more importantly it will be a joy for us to continue to watch the GA girls come and go. From the little girls in Cowan Center all the way up to the high school students, they are an upbeat, polite, smart and interesting group of young woman. We look forward to remaining a part of that impressive, vibrant community of young women. I am sure my wife will continue to volunteer long after our last daughter has graduated.

I am certain the restoration of the structures at 96 and 100 Maple will be both tasteful, and of the highest quality, as are all capital expenditure projects at Greenwich Academy. In particular GA is committed to restoring the exterior of 96 Maple, a historic building that has not been well maintained over the years and was sitting on the market for quite some time. The restoration will result in a vast improvement which is a net benefit to the neighborhood. GA has also proposed significant landscaping improvements that maintain and enhance the view from Maple. The front lawn has been maintained and current parking in the front of 96 Maple has even been reduced. The landscaping improvements are in keeping with the historic character and are an improvement in our opinion. I also have have no concerns about the small screened toddler play area in a portion of the side yard. It will contain lower tables and playhouses suitable for toddlers and I appreciate that GA has chosen this location in order to maintain the view from Maple. Finally, as always, I am sure the school will invest in, and put in place the necessary resources to mitigate any impact of pick up and drop off times.
In summary, I believe Cowan Center will actually greatly enhance the neighborhood. The structures will be beautiful to look at and the smiling young children and faculty will be a pleasure to see come and go. I have every confidence that GA will work with the community in any way possible to make the transition a smooth one.

Sincerely,
Bart and Kate Osman
Hi Ms Young,

Can you please distribute to the Commission prior to tonight’s meeting or have it read aloud at the meeting? Sadly we can’t be there in person.

Best,
Miriam Kreuzer  

Miriam Kreuzer  
57 Maple Avenue Greenwich, CT 06830 March 13, 2018 

Historic District Commission 

anne_h_young@hotmail.com 

RE: 96 & 100 Maple Avenue 

Dear Historic District Commission:

I understand that at your meeting this evening you will be taking up the latest proposal put forth by Greenwich Academy with regards to 96 and 100 Maple Avenue. My husband and I wanted to show our full support for the Greenwich Academy proposal and its commitment to this historic building. Unfortunately, we aren’t able to make the meeting and so hopefully this email does the job. In full disclosure, we are parents of two Greenwich Academy students, though our sentiments would be the same regardless.

As I’ve noted in previous communications with this Commission, we are owners of the Historical Society plaqued “Elizabeth P. Hoyt House” from 1852, across the street from the parking lot of the Second Congregational church and 50 yards from the new GA property. We purchased our home in 2010 for its historical charm, as well as the proximity to all things in-town. When we renovated our home in 2014, we were told that we would be better off building anew. More practical minds might have done so, but some decisions you make with your heart. Rather than tearing down, we sought to add historical touches that had been removed in previous renovations of the last thirty years. Suffice to say, we love historic architecture.

We were heartened to hear that Greenwich Academy's plans for 96 Maple not only include maintaining the historical structure, but improving it - bringing it closer to its former glory.
through external repairs. The building has for many years been the least maintained on the street and saw a particular decline during last couple years as it sat on the market vacant.

We are very excited about Greenwich Academy’s landscaping proposal. The front lawn had not been nicely maintained and there was really no landscaping to speak of under previous ownership - a letdown not only to the neighborhood but to the stately building itself. The street scape will also be improved by the reduction of parking - though in truth nearly all the businesses, nonprofits AND residential buildings (ours included) on Maple Avenue have parking in front of the buildings.

The small screened play area is also not a concern. As parents of two small children, our own side lawn has a substantial playscape and zipline - we have to make use of our challenging grade plane. We are also across the street from the Preschool at Second Congregational Church’s toddler playground - therefore there is precedent and a more visible one at that.

We are fully supportive as we believe none of the current proposal is out of character for Greenwich Academy, nor the neighborhood. It is thoughtful in design and in scope - and understands the importance of Maple Avenue in the Town’s historic fabric and improves the neighborhood. As a District 7 RTM member and a neighbor, I believe these are of notable importance.

Thank you for reading and for the work you do in this very important Commission in our Town.
Sincerely, Miriam L Kreuzer

Sent from my iPhone
Mr. Stephen Bishop  
Chairman Historic District Commission  
265 Taconic Rd  
Greenwich, CT 06830  

March 9, 2019  

Dear Mr. Bishop,  

I write to you on behalf of myself and my family as residents of 115 Maple and proud parents of our daughters, 3 who currently attend GA and one who recently graduated. We have been in the Greenwich and GA community for 14 years having lived in Old Greenwich mid-country, and for nearly the last three years at 115 Maple, which is opposite the former Brunswick preschool and diagonal from the future home of the Cowan Center at 96 Maple.  

First with respect to the Cowan Center and GA. We were fortunate to have sent our younger two daughters to the Cowan Center. Our girls both had wonderful experiences at Cowan, benefiting from the caring staff, excellent instruction, and a sense of being a part of the GA community. We are very involved parents in the GA community as well. My wife Margaret served on the GA parents association for years and I am currently a Trustee on the board.  

Second as residents of 115 Maple. My wife and I chose to build our dream house as close to town and the school as possible. We both felt disconnected from our community at our previous house and wanted to be closer to the things that were most important to us in Greenwich. When we opted for 115 Maple, Brunswick had long been operating their preschool directly across the street. 96 Maple was in the same poor condition it is now, and the Inn was operating and appeared as it does now (rather old and tired although reasonably well maintained).  

My wife led the design of our new house with the intention of respecting the neighborhood but providing a more modern and open feel to our new home all the while fitting in with the charm and character of Maple Ave. Personally I think she achieved this goal and the house received two Homebuilder's awards, one HOMIS, in 2018.  

As 96 Maple continued to sit on the market, it became clear that the economics made a residential-only solution very unlikely. The property remained in disrepair and in major need of improvements. Consequently, when we heard GA had purchased the property, we were ecstatic. Already that side of the road is essentially serving mainly non-residential purposes so we believe it is a great outcome for the whole neighborhood that GA has become the new owner as we know GA will restore and maintain the property to a beautiful standard.  

Having spent a lot of time as a Trustee with GA reviewing the plans on behalf of my entire family we feel very confident this is a win for the community. The landscape, the reduced parking, and even the well-designed play areas will enhance every aspect of what we will see and experience as direct neighbors. On top of all of that, the significant improvements to the
building and GA's track record as a neighbor comforts us that the maintenance of the building and property will be first rate.

We appreciate the mandate and commitment you and your team have toward historic preservation and believe that what GA is doing offers the best of both worlds. The plan allows a building that is in disrepair and essentially not sellable to be enhanced, beautified, and restored for a purpose that both serves the community and is vital to attracting young families and teachers to the greater Greenwich community.

If there is any further information I can provide please feel free to call me at 203-517-7305. In the meantime, thank you for your consideration of our thoughts and support and as well for your service to our community.

Very truly yours,

Michael Schaftel
Historic District Commission
Town of Greenwich
101 Field Point Road
Greenwich, CT 06830

Edward & Eleanor Bloom
92 Maple Avenue
Greenwich, CT 06830

March 12, 2019

To: Members of the Historic District Commission:

We would like to comment on the Plan for 96/100 Maple Avenue submitted to the Historic District Commission for review, dated February 27, 2019.

We are the closest residential neighbors at 92 and 94 Maple Avenue and abut both 96 and 100 Maple Avenue. We were disappointed with the Planning & Zoning decision of February 21, 2019 allowing a daycare use in this R-20 and R-20-HO Zones. We would have preferred additional residential use.

In 1979 the Historic District Commission in granting the HO on 96 Maple stated that "the applicant's building is not surrounded by one family houses but by a school, Brunswick, The Stanton House Inn and The Woman's Club." That was not true. The backyard of 96 Maple had been divided into three residential lots and these lots were sold sometime in the early 1960s. Three homes were built. One home(100 Maple) was purchased by Greenwich Academy last summer. A playground for the daycare is planned for the rear yard. This neighborhood, in the rear of 96 Maple Avenue, also includes two homes on Boxwood Lane and the Stanton House property has a house lot overlooking the rear yard of 96 Maple. Brunswick School, The Stanton House and The Woman's Club are on much larger acreage with adequate parking and open space.

After the sale of its backyard lots 96 Maple was left with a tiny, sharply sloping, downward space as its backyard. The entrance for the 2, three bedroom residential apartments will be in the back and not in the front the home. The daycare program will use the front entrance. The back entrance was originally used to access the estate gardens where the 3 homes are now located. The two basement windows, again in the rear yard space will be converted to Entrance/Exit doors for daycare use. A ramp will connect to a path to the playground at 100 Maple. Two parking spaces for the apartments will be in this area. All of this activity will be abutting the 94 Maple Avenue driveway and home as well as the abutting driveways for 92 Maple Avenue and Boxwood Lane.

The North Side of the property will be cleared of trees and replaced with an asphalt driveway and parking area, a turnaround, queuing spaces for 6 cars at a time for daycare drop off and pick-up at the porte cochere, the path to the playground at 100 Maple as well as residential parking for 100 and 96 Maple. The higher elevation of the neighboring properties on the south will make it difficult to screen this motorized activity. This will be a challenge for everyone and especially impact this immediate neighborhood. Higher evergreen trees will be necessary.
Moving the residential parking spaces in the rear of 96 Maple to the North Parking Area or to the front yard of the house would provide more Greenspace in the rear of the house which has very little now. In 1979 the Planning & Zoning Commission allowed four parking spaces in the front yard. Moving the spaces would also allow for some sort of hedge to screen the turnaround in this area. A stone retaining wall along the 94 Maple Avenue driveway from the playground area along the rear yard property line of 96 Maple will prevent daycare and resident children from wandering onto the driveway. We feel this is a safety issue. We continue to be concerned that the amount of activity in this small area will be constant and intense with cars, children, staff, parents and residents. This is a lot to be added to this residential HO residence(96 Maple) and the residential home(100 Maple) in this R-20 Zone. Hopefully our suggested changes will be considered.

Respectfully Submitted,

[Signature]
[Signature]