

DECISION  
Special Meeting  
Historic District Commission of the Town of Greenwich  
Wednesday, November 7, 2018, 7:00pm  
Employee Lounge, Town Hall

ATTENDEES: Stephen Bishop (Chairman), Darius Toraby, Martin Kagan, Annie McGinnis, Cynthia Smith, Marie Williams

ABSENT: Fi Fi Sheridan, Aris Crist, Serena Bechtel, Kathryn Brown

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS AND ADVISORY OPINION TO  
PLANNING & ZONING

226 and 230 Mason Street and 16 Havemeyer Place (buttressing  
Greenwich Municipal Center – NRHP); and 230 Mason Street (National  
Guard Armory Building – Contributing Structure to Greenwich Avenue  
District, NRHP)

Owner: GDC Havemeyer, LLC and GFC, LLC

Represented by Thomas J. Heagney, Esq., Heagney, Lennon & Slane, LLP

Review proposal to preserve the front portion of the Armory and construct a  
synagogue on the corner of Mason Street and Havemeyer Place  
[Continued from October 17, 2018 meeting]

On November 7, 2018 the Historic District Commission held a special meeting to review a proposal to preserve the front portion of the Armory and construct a synagogue on the corner of Mason Street and Havemeyer Place to determine a Certificate of Appropriateness and provide an opinion to the Planning & Zoning on said application's submission for Historic Overlay.

At said meeting a motion to send the following comments to the Planning & Zoning Commission was presented:

The Historic District Commission is supportive of Chabad Lubavitch of Greenwich and its desire to have a downtown location provided it can meet the criteria in regards size and preservation.

If the massing of the new structure, as presented, and its relationship to all of the structures and activities on the whole lot is addressed and preserving all of the

structures of the Armory is attained through appropriate preservation or an adaptive reuse plan, then the next issue of tying-in to the Armory architecturally, must be addressed.

Presently, the proposed structure's building mass is too great as the HDC sees 21,000 square feet concentrated into one corner of the lot which they believe amounts to 78% of non-parking square footage on 22% of land. This, as well as a visual component provided by the site's elevations, reveals that more open space is needed and deeper setbacks.

HDC realizes that the parking commitments the present owner is bound to, combined with what would be required for the programming of the new site along with its the intensive use, drives the size of the building to be considered massive and incompatible with the Armory building. As HDC was not given a design demonstrating underground parking as an alternative to alleviate the massing, there was no opportunity for its consideration although one would be welcome.

Further, in regards to the Armory which is one building that includes the Drill Shed (as designed), the HDC feels that no part of the entire Armory should be demolished as any part of its removal for granting Historic Overlay is a violation of the regulation's criteria and intent. As such, the entire Armory (which includes the Drill Shed) should be incorporated into the proposal with the intention of adaptive reuse. This would allow for de-massing as seen in the present design and fulfill the standards that are required to receive a Historic Overlay designation.

Moved by Darius Toraby

Seconded by Martin Kagan

Unanimous vote: Stephen Bishop, Darius Toraby, Martin Kagan, Annie McGinnis, Cynthia Smith, Marie Williams

Note:

The applicant appeared before the Historic District Commission four times. While there was demonstrated evidence that comments by the Commission were incorporated into the design, the attempts were not considered to be fully implemented by the applicant. The HDC's responsibility is to provide guidance and commentary, never to design a project for the applicant.

Additionally, the HDC is keenly aware that the site is a challenging one as it already contains a functioning organization with office and parking requirements and the site is now being asked to include another functioning organization with office and parking requirements and religious obligations. This combination may be too much for the site to bear as HDC witnessed each subsequent design growing larger in its massing than smaller. The HDC does believe that further discussions with the applicant could come to an agreeable resolution.