PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN
PLPZ201900450
SPECIAL PERMIT PLPZ201900451

Fried and Taylor LLC
Mixed use building with twenty-two (22) units where
five (5) of the units (20% of the total) would be
"Moderate Income" Dwelling units

LOCATION: 100 East Putnam Avenue
ZONE(S): LBR-2 and PRIOZ
PARCEL SIZE: 33,077 sq. ft.

**ZONING STATISTICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
<th>PERMITTED/REQUIRED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Floor Area:</td>
<td>2,581 sq. ft.</td>
<td>28,436.51 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial:</td>
<td>2,581 sq. ft.</td>
<td>4,633.82 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential:</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>23790.51 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area Ratio:</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces:</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49 +2 ADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Dwelling Units:</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MID units:</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of bedrooms:</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>7 One-BR 15 Two-BR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Stories:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height:</td>
<td>15 ft.</td>
<td>34 ft. 7.5 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Area Coverage:</td>
<td>7% (2,488 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>45.3% (14,982 sq. ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Coverage:</td>
<td>72.4% (23,958 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>80.3% (26,555 sq. ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks:</td>
<td>Front: 25.55 ft. to EPA lot line 40 ft. to Taylor Dr. Lot Line</td>
<td>10.9 ft. 10.13 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Side: 33.34 ft.</td>
<td>6.83 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rear: 130 ft.</td>
<td>46.17 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A waiver may be granted per Sec. 6-110(g)(6)

**A waiver of maximum coverage may be granted per Sec. 6-110(g)(5)
STAFF REPORT UPDATE:
The applicant was last before the Commission at their March 10, 2020 meeting. At that time the Commission left the item open to allow the applicant to address the following:

- Revise the location by possibly moving the building further away from East Putnam Ave.
- Revise the architecture at the corner as the last version did not seem to work. *The request to make the changes in the Architecture were so that the Commission would be comfortable sending the applicant to the ARC with a direction on the design.*
- Provide logistics for construction.
- Show more context of the proposed building and grade to the adjacent buildings and topography.

In addition, the Commission heard from a northern neighbor to the site who raised issues of rock removal and concerns for tree loss.

The applicant has responded by revising their proposal as follows:

- New footprint. The majority of the proposed building is now 15-feet from the East Putnam Avenue lot line and +/-28' from the same curb line, except for the corner feature which is about 10.9-feet from the property line.
- Floor and roof plan have been revised to reflect the new footprint.
- Revised elevations in color have been provided for the South & East facing facades.
- Colored elevations of the North & West facing facades have now been provided.
- Revised Streetscape & context diagram/rendering has been provided.
- Revised Sections drawings and additional cross section drawings have been submitted to help demonstrate the existing vs. proposed grade at parking level and across the site.
- Zoning information and diagrams have been updated to reflect these revisions.
- The applicant has also provided a tree assessment of trees on the property.
- Staff notes that the unit mix has changed where before eleven (11) 1-bedroom and eleven (11) 2- bedrooms were proposed, the current revision proposes seven (7) 1-bedroom and fifteen (15) 2-bedroom units.
- The building coverage has been reduced by about 400. Sq. ft. and lot coverage by just over 1,700 sq. ft.

The following is an updated staff report.

APPLICATION SUMMARY:
The applicant is requesting preliminary site plan and special permit approval, to construct a mixed use, Moderate Income Housing Development of three (3) stories with twenty-two (22) units where five (5) of the units (20% of the total) would be "Moderate Income" units as described in Section 6-110 of the Greenwich Building Zone Regulations; 4,633 sq. ft. of commercial space, for two tenants on the first floor, and parking for 49 vehicles plus 2 ADA
parking spaces on a 33,077 sq. ft. property located at 100 East Putnam Avenue in the LBR-2 and PRIOZ zones.

Access to the site is proposed as an improved, two-way, curb-cut onto Taylor Drive. The existing curb cut onto East Putnam Avenue, would be closed and the sidewalk extended across the entire East Putnam frontage and up Taylor Drive to the proposed driveway entrance. Properties to the north of the site are in the R-7 residential zone.

This preliminary proposal is submitted as a way to obtain guidance from the Commission as to compliance with primarily Sections 6-13 through 6-15, 6-17, 6-103, 6-110, 6-141, 6-158, and 6-205 of the Town of Greenwich Building Zone Regulations (BZR).

**COMMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. **PARKING** – Staff notes that some of the end parking stall widths are not 10 feet as recommended by Sec. 6-185. The Commission may allow the lesser width if they make a determination that a use subject is one that can be considered to be non-transient (greater than 3-hour turnover) parking.
2. **ZONING** – The ZEO no longer has any outstanding comments.
3. **ENGINEERING** – The Engineering Division has noted a number of items to be address before final site plan approval.
4. **SEWER** – The Sewer Division has again commented and noted that there are sewer capacity concerns in this area. Existing flows for the past two years, and proposed flows are requested and to be provided in the P&Z phase.
5. **CONSERVATION** – Conservation staff noted that this type of development represents many “smart growth” principles. They note, in their memo of 12/30/19, several improvements to the plans that could further improvements to the environment. It is also noted that the increase in building envelope and removal of existing trees and ledge should be reconsidered and greater balance between paved areas and green space should be sought.
6. **HOUSING SPECIALIST** - The applicant has not provided a Declaration of Restrictions or a marketing plan yet so there are not comments, the Commission should ask the applicant to indicate the units to be designated Moderate Income on the floor plans.
7. **IWWA** - green sheet noting no IWWA permit is required, has been provided.
8. **PRE-APPLICATION WORKSHOP** - As required per Sec. 6-110(e) and pre-application workshop was convened on October 29, 2019, and the following was discussed:
   1. Comments were made about the ingress and egress as proposed. The following suggestions/questions were posed:
     i. Look to possibly add a right-turn only lane on Taylor Drive to facilitate traffic going west and not make them wait at the light with vehicles queued to go east.
ii. Concerns about the lack of ability for SU-30 sized vehicles to enter and circumnavigate the site.

2. Is there enough recreational space for tenants?
3. Impact onsite parking and traffic may have if the second commercial tenant is one with a high customer turnover (i.e. national chain coffee shop, fast food.)
4. Sewer flows were needed for analysis.

9. If the Commission moves this proposal forward, it is recommended that the Commission require at least the following additional information to be addressed under a final site plan /special permit application:
   1. Address Engineering comments related to compliance with the Town’s Drainage Manual.
   2. Address outstanding Department comments.
   3. Pursuant to Section 6-6110(h)(5), a Declaration of Restrictions stating the covenants and restrictions that will run with the land for all current and future owners of the four units must be provided for review and acceptance. Prior to the issuance of any C.O., the Declaration will need to be filed on the Greenwich Land Records. This section states:
      “The developer/owner of moderate-income dwelling units shall submit to the Planning and Zoning Commission a Declaration of Restrictions and Lien adopted by the Town of Greenwich, as to the ownership, use, occupancy, and resale of such moderate-income dwelling units. This declaration of restrictions shall be binding upon such developer and all succeeding owners of the moderate-income dwelling units and shall incorporate the provisions of this Sec. 6-110 therein by reference hereto. Final site plan approval shall be given by the Commission only after it has been satisfied that the Declaration of Restrictions binds the developer and all succeeding owners of the moderate-income dwelling units and duly restricts the ownership, use, occupancy, and resale thereof, and requires adherence to established sales and rental guidelines and administrative procedures, all in accordance with the provisions of this Sec. 6-110. The Commission may cause any such Declaration of Restrictions to be reviewed by the Town Attorney. Each deed for a moderate-income dwelling unit will indicate the restrictions on such unit and refer to the Declaration of Restrictions and Lien, which shall be on file with the Town Clerk as part of the Town’s land records.”

4. In order to ensure the building "requires adherence to established sales and rental guidelines and administrative procedures" (6-110(h)(5)), the Town has required a Marketing Plan that outlines the specific units designated as moderate income, the specific entity responsible for administration that must be established prior to CO, and how the application and general administrative process will work in order to ensure the regulations are met.
10. A construction phasing plan should be submitted to accompany the soil and erosion control plan. The parking of construction vehicles and access in and out of the site will be of paramount importance.

11. A photometric plan should be submitted.

12. A detailed landscaping plan should be provided. The Town Tree Warden will need to review any proposed tree removal or planting within the Town right-of-way.

13. Compliance with Section 6-161 should be ensured, for example that the proposed perimeter plantings (buffers) are a continuous planted screening that would adequately screen parking in all seasons with a mix of evergreen and deciduous plant materials.

14. The Commission should provide guidance to the ARC for their review of the details including the landscaping, lighting, and signage.

15. The noise specifications and location of all mechanical equipment proposed should be submitted.

16. Bike racks, if required to be provided, should be shown on the plans.

DEPARTMENT COMMENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZEO</td>
<td>Attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPW ENGINEERING</td>
<td>Attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPW SEWER</td>
<td>Attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSERVATION</td>
<td>Attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC</td>
<td>Attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRE</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSING SPECIALIST</td>
<td>- Not yet received (a marketing plan has not yet been provided)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWWA</td>
<td>Green sheet provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPLICATION DETAILS:

The applicant proposed to remove the existing 2,581 sq. ft., 1 story building on site and construct a new 29,559 sq. ft. three-story mixed use building on the site. The ground floor is proposed to be 4,633 sq. ft. of commercial space, divided into two tenant spaces, one space for the existing bank tenant, the second, a tenant yet to be identified. The Commercial space would extend along the sites frontage along East Putnam Ave. closing off the current driveway. To the rear of the commercial space would be at grade parking which would extend up to and underneath the building’s upper floors. Vehicle access would be only from Taylor Drive. The upper two floors would be 23,790.51 sq. ft. of residential space. Each of the upper floors would have 11 units, per floor, and a mix of seven (7) - one (1) and fifteen (15) - two (2) bedroom units would be spread over the upper two (2) floors.

The top floor (roof level) is proposed to be approximately 461 sq. ft. of floor area, to house a roof deck, elevator and stair bulkheads, and mechanical equipment.

ZONING:

Per the regulation in the LBR-2 Zone the first floor is required to be retail uses. Banks are currently not a permitted use on the first floor in the zone. However, the site currently operates a bank on site which is a legally non-conforming use. The applicant has expressed their intent to
continue this non-conformity and indicated the State Public act to transfer this non-conforming right to the proposed new building.

The ZEO had previously raised an interpretation question regarding whether this parking under the upper floor was a parking structure. The Commission indicated to the applicant at the last meeting that they did not see this as a parking structure and therefore its design would appear to meet the intent of the regulations of the LBR-2 zone.

The ZEO had also noted that the proposed stair and elevation bulkheads above the roof height do not appear to meet the definition of Sec. 6-127(d) which reads, “Stair and elevator access to the roof on commercial, institutional and multi-family developments: Shall be set back one (1) foot from the roof’s edge for each one (1) foot of height above the roof level on all sides of the building. These requirements do not apply to the side of structures in CGBR and LBR-1 and LBR-2 where no side yard setback exists. The height of a stair access shall not exceed nine (9) feet. The height of an elevator enclosure shall not exceed fifteen feet, six inches (15’6”). If there is a common lobby for stairs and elevator, the combined area shall not exceed 300 square feet in size.”

The proposed stair bulkhead on the western side of the roof have a sloped roof extending towards the center of the building. It was the ZEO’s opinion that this sloped roof, since it starts at the roof’s edge, did not meet the intent of the language.

The ZEO has revised their comments and have not noted any outstanding zoning issues at this time.

TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION:
Tighe and Bond prepared a traffic analysis dated 11/11/19, which concludes that, “...the additional traffic expected to be generated by the site is not expected to have a significant impact to traffic operations within the study area. In addition, the closure of the existing site driveway on East Putnam Avenue will improve traffic operation and safety adjacent to the site.”

The analysis notes that the Peak Hours are as follows:
- Weekday Peak AM - 8:00a.m. to 9:00a.m.
- Weekday Afternoon Peak - 4:15p.m. to 5:15p.m.
- Saturday Midday Peak -11:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

The Level of Service (LOS) analysis indicated that:
- The intersection of East Putnam Avenue and Taylor operates at a LOS D under the existing condition except for three peak hours when it operates at a LOS E. Those were:
  - The Cross Lane northbound for the shared left during all peak periods.
  - Taylor Drive southbound making during the Friday PM and Saturday Midday peaks.
  - Strickland Road, northbound, left onto East Putnam during the weekday AM peaks and the Friday Peak.
- In all those cases the average delay was around 60 seconds per vehicle during the three peak periods, respectively.
• The report notes that this is expected due to the heavy traffic volumes and the 6-phase operation of the traffic control signal at the five-leg intersection.

• The applicant’s Traffic professional notes that restriping Taylor Drive to provide a dedicated left turn and right turn lane on to East Putnam Ave., with minor timing adjustments to the signal, may improve operations on East Putnam, eastbound to a LOS D at all peaks, but may not make improve the right turn out onto East Putnam in the weekday peaks.

The proposed redevelopment is expected to generate a total of 180 new trips in the weekday AM trips (89 in / 91 out), 75 new trips (39 in / 36 out) during the weekday PM peak, and 112 new trips (58 in / 54 out) during Saturday midday peak.

The Applicant has expressed the desire to not install a “right turn only lane” out of Taylor Drive, out of respect for the wishes on the public and that their consultant does not believe its inclusion would improve operations on East Putnam Ave. and through the intersection.

**PARKING:**

The applicant is proposing 22 residential units. Pursuant to Section 6-155, multi-family residential development requires 44 parking spaces per Section 6-155(1). Per Section 6-155(3), “Dwelling units in mixed-use residential-commercial development: One space per dwelling unit unless a greater or lesser number is deemed appropriate by the Commission.” That would reduce parking on the site to 22 parking spaces for the residential use. The proposed bank (office) use, would require one parking space per 150 sq. ft. of usable floor area (75% of gross) as would the proposed retail space. Based on 4,288 sq. ft. of commercial space, an additional 21.44 parking spaces would be required. 49 spaces exclusive of 2 ADA spaces are proposed.

The following table illustrates the math related to the Town’s Parking requirements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Parking</th>
<th>Number of units</th>
<th>Required Parking Per Unit Type</th>
<th>Number of Parking Spaces Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-bedroom</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-bedroom</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office Parking</th>
<th>Gross Sq. ft.</th>
<th>Usable Sq. ft.</th>
<th>Number of Parking Spaces Required (1 per 150 sq. ft. of Usable floor Area)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,633.82</td>
<td>3475.37</td>
<td>23.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>45.17</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staffs notes that some of the end parking stalls widths are not 10 feet as Recommended in t Sec. 6-185 of the BZR. The Commission may find these to be acceptable if a determination is made that the use is one that can be considered to be non-transient (lower turnover, 3-hours or greater) parking.
APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:
Section 6-15, 6-17, and 6-110(g), 6-103, 6-141, 6-155, 6-158 (parking), 6-185 (Site Plan), and 6-205.
ZONING ENFORCEMENT

Reviewed by: Jodi Couture
Date: 4/14/2019

Note: These comments do not represent Building Inspection Division approval. Plans subject to review by ZEO at time of building permit application.

Project No. PLPZ 201900450, 451

Reviewed for Planning and Zoning Commission.

TITLE OF PLAN REVIEWED: Fried & Taylor, LLC.

LOCATION: 100 East Putnam Ave.

PLAN DATE:

ZONE: LBR-2

☐ Ok for Zoning Permit Sign-off with the following revisions:

☐ Resubmit the following prior to Site Plan/ Subdivision approval:

☒ The subject site plan/subdivision meets the requirements of the Building Zone Regulations, excluding sections 6-15 and 6-17, and is Ok for Zoning Permit Sign-off. Building height, coverage and FAR are compliant, with incentives.
The submittal was only reviewed in concept.

1. The Traffic Impact Study from Tighe & Bond; dated November 11, 2019 shall be updated to address the comments from Beta; dated January 3, 2020.
2. Form SC-100 needs to be submitted.
3. Form SC-107 needs to be submitted.
4. The drainage design was not included in the submittal. A review of the Drainage Summary Report will be completed once submitted.
5. The construction plan set was only reviewed in concept. The following are some initial comments:
   a. Site Plan Sheets
      i. The following needs to be added along the property frontage on East Putnam Avenue:
         1. The plan shall show the installation of granite curb along the entire property frontage. The callout shall say the following: Granite curb shall be constructed to TOG Standards along the entire property frontage or as directed by the Highway Division.
         2. The plan shall show the installation of a minimum 5-foot concrete sidewalk along the entire property frontage. The 5-foot concrete minimum width must be maintained with all
obstructions (trees, poles, etc.). The callout shall say the following: A minimum 5-foot concrete sidewalk shall be constructed to TOG Standards along the entire property frontage or as directed by the Highway Division.

3. The plan shall show the installation of a minimum 3-foot grass strip along the entire property frontage if possible (narrower grass strip can be considered). The callout shall say the following: A minimum 3-foot grass strip shall be constructed to TOG Standards along the entire property frontage or as directed by the Highway Division.

4. The plan shall show the installation of a new pedestrian ramp on East Putnam Avenue near the existing traffic signal pole. The callout shall say the following: A pedestrian ramp shall be constructed to TOG Standards or as directed by the Highway Division.

5. The plan shall show the installation of a new pedestrian ramp on East Putnam Avenue at the intersection with Taylor Drive. The callout shall say the following: A pedestrian ramp shall be constructed to TOG Standards or as directed by the Highway Division.

ii. The following needs to be added along the property frontage on Taylor Drive:

1. The plan shall show the installation of granite curb along the entire property frontage. The callout shall say the following: Granite curb shall be constructed to TOG Standards along the entire property frontage or as directed by the Highway Division.

2. The plan shall show the installation of a minimum 5-foot concrete sidewalk along the entire property frontage. The 5-foot concrete minimum width must be maintained with all obstructions (trees, poles, etc.). The callout shall say the following: A minimum 5-foot concrete sidewalk shall be constructed to TOG Standards along the entire property frontage or as directed by the Highway Division.

3. The plan shall show the installation of a minimum 3-foot grass strip along the entire property frontage if possible (narrower grass strip can be considered). The callout shall say the following: A minimum 3-foot grass strip shall be constructed to TOG Standards along the entire property frontage or as directed by the Highway Division.

4. The plan shall show the installation of a reinforced concrete driveway ramp. The callout shall say the following: A reinforced concrete driveway ramp shall be constructed to TOG Standards or as directed by the Highway Division.

iii. Any proposed sidewalk within the Town of Greenwich Right-of-Way not meeting Town of Greenwich Standards will require a maintenance agreement from the property owner and review and approval of the agreement and sidewalk design by the Commissioner of Public Works and Highway Division.

iv. A sidewalk detour plan must be developed and submitted with the Highway Permit.

v. A callout saying the following shall be added: Pedestrian access to the sidewalk must be maintained throughout the project.

vi. A callout saying the following shall be added: The concrete sidewalk shall be constructed to ADA standards (A maximum 2% cross slope and a maximum 5% longitudinal slope where possible, or as directed by the Highway Division).

vii. The plans must have callouts added stating all of the existing plantings along Taylor Drive shall be removed so the sight lines for the proposed driveway are not blocked.

viii. All proposed plantings shall not block the driveway and intersection sight lines.

ix. The proposed parking end spaces shall be 10-feet. The Commission should determine if the proposed 9-foot and 9.5-foot end spaces are acceptable.

x. Additional comments to be added with the review and submittal of the drainage design.

b. Low Impact Development Plan Sheet:

i. Comments to be added with the review and submittal of the drainage design.

c. Erosion & Sediment Control Sheet

i. Comments to be added with the review and submittal of the drainage design.

d. Driveway Profile & Sight Distance Sheet

i. Show profile from the driveway entrance through the garage and to the driveway exit. The profile shall include slopes, spot elevations and if porous pavement is used the entire porous pavement section to the bottom of stone shall be included with elevations.

ii. Show slope of driveways for first five feet on profile (required minimum slope is +3% to 6%).

iii. Show slope of driveways for next twenty feet on profile (required maximum slope is 4% when remaining slope ≥ 10%).
iv. Show slope of driveways for the remaining distance to garage on profile (required maximum slope is 8% for commercial, 12% residential (two or more family), and 15% for residential).

v. Show all vegetation (trees, bushes, shrubs, etc.) along the property line and within the Right-of-Way.

vi. Show all structures (utility poles, walls, fences, etc.) along the property line and within the Right-of-Way.

vii. Callout all vegetation (trees, bushes, shrubs, etc.) to be removed for the required sight distance to be met.

viii. Additional comments to be added with the review and submittal of the drainage design.

c. Traffic Signage, Pavement Markings, and Parking Space Layout Sheet (Required for Commercial Projects)

i. Show all traffic signs.

ii. Show all pavement markings (stop bar, arrows, etc.).

iii. Show all parking space pavement markings.

iv. Show all parking space and travel lane dimensions.

v. Additional comments to be added with the review and submittal of the drainage design.

f. Construction Details Sheets

i. Remove the Town of Greenwich Bituminous Concrete Driveway Entrance detail and replace with the Town of Greenwich Reinforced Concrete Driveway Entrance detail (attached to previous submittal).

ii. The Town of Greenwich SCD No. 921.10 and 921.11 need to be added (attached to previous submittal).

iii. Additional comments to be added with the review and submittal of the drainage design.

g. Building/House Section or Elevation Sheet

i. Show one section or elevation of the building/house.

ii. Show all elevations to the deepest footings on section/elevation.

iii. Show existing and proposed grade elevation on section/elevation.

iv. Show existing mottling elevation on section/elevation.

v. Show existing groundwater elevation on section/elevation.

vi. Show existing ledge elevation on section/elevation.

vii. Sheet shall be sealed and signed by a State of Connecticut Professional Engineer or Architect.

6. The Operations and Maintenance Plan Report must be a separate document and include the following:


b. Exhibit A: Long-term Maintenance Plan that prescribes those activities that must be carried out to maintain compliance with this Declaration. A maintenance log form must also be included. A draft must be completed prior to Final Site Plan Approval. The final version must be submitted with the request for Certificate of Occupancy.

c. Exhibit B: Improvement Location Survey showing a location of the Property and an accurate location of each stormwater management practice affected by this Declaration. This must be submitted prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy.

d. The Maintenance Declaration will need to be filed on the Town of Greenwich Land Records prior to a Certificate of Occupancy. A review of the documents above must be completed before filing on the Town of Greenwich Land Records.

**Standard Conditions for Each Submittal**

1. The Engineering Division will no longer keep any records for the submittals. All records for the submittal shall be obtained from the Town of Greenwich Department/Division that has taken in applications and/or submittals. These documents are maintained within each office (e.g. P&Z, IWWA, and DPW Building and Highway Divisions).

2. All revisions to the reports and plans must follow the requirements in the Town of Greenwich Drainage Manual February 2014 as amended.

3. All revisions must be accompanied by a point-by-point written response to the Engineering Division’s comments.
Std 1. The Operations and Maintenance Plan Report must include the following for the Certificate of Occupancy:
   b. The final completed Exhibit A, and B
   c. The Maintenance Declaration needs to be filed on the Town of Greenwich Land Records prior to a Certificate of Occupancy. A review of the documents above must be completed before filing on the Town of Greenwich Land Records.

2. The Town of Greenwich – Standard Construction Notes for Site and Subdivision Plans are conditions that must be met.

3. All requests for a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy (T.C.O.) or a Certificate of Occupancy (C.O.) shall be submitted one month before the T.C.O. or C.O. is required.

4. The submittal for a Temporary or Final Certificate of Occupancy must include the following:
   c. Field Inspection Record (All required photos) – Form SC-106 – Sealed and Signed by a Connecticut Licensed Professional Engineer.
   d. Bioretention Soil Testing Certification Sign-Off (as applicable with the bioretention soil gradation test and the phosphorous test for the mixed soil) – Form SC-104 – Sealed and Signed by a Connecticut Licensed Professional Engineer.
   h. A Letter discussing all the work that remains to be completed (Only for a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy Submittal).
BETA Group, Inc. (BETA) has reviewed the materials provided for the proposed preliminary site plan application for the mixed-use development at 100 East Putnam Avenue. The following documents have been reviewed for traffic operational, circulation, and safety considerations:

- Site Plan Application; Johnson, Haslun & Hogeman, LLP; November 26, 2019
- Engineering Plans; Mills Engineering; November 23, 2019
- Architectural Plans; Granoff Architects; November 26, 2019
- Traffic Impact Study; Tighe & Bond; November 11, 2019

The following comments/questions are offered for consideration:

1. Town regulations state that one parking space per residential unit can be provided for the residential portion of a mixed-use residential-commercial development. However, based on the proposed size of the residential units (most of them have two bedrooms) combined with some potential uses for the commercial area on site, there could be insufficient parking supply during periods of peak demand. For this site, increasing the parking supply somewhat to account for the larger units should be considered. Additionally, the applicant should develop a Transportation Demand Management program to encourage the use of alternative transportation modes and decrease vehicular trips and parking demand generated by the residential units on site. Strategies could be used such as unbundling parking spaces from lease agreements, subsidizing train/bus passes, providing parking spaces for a shared car service, etc. Bicycle parking (preferably covered for the residential units) should also be provided on site.

2. To perform a conservative analysis, the Traffic Impact Study assumes a land use of “Coffee/Donut Shop without Drive-Through window” for the proposed 1,872 square feet of commercial/retail space on site. Does the applicant have any updated information on a likely use for that part of the site?

3. The site-generated trip distribution seems to be overestimating the percentage of site traffic traveling to and from the west. Based on existing turning movement volumes at the intersections of Cross Lane at East Putnam Avenue and Strickland Road at East Putnam Avenue, the distribution should be more evenly split between areas East and West of the site, if not favoring areas to the East.

4. Please clarify the sources used to model signal phasing and timing for the cluster of signalized intersections along East Putnam Avenue at Cross Lane, Taylor Drive, and Strickland Road (existing signal plans, timing sheets, etc.) and provide that information in an Appendix to the Traffic Impact Study.

5. The site plan does not show the proposed restriping of the southbound Taylor Drive approach to East Putnam Avenue to include separate left and right-turn lanes as recommended in the Traffic
Impact Study. As that is being done, the stop bar location should be verified to ensure inbound turning movements can be accommodated with the revised lane widths. Additionally, the detection zones for the traffic signal will need to be adjusted. OSTA would need to review and approve any modifications to the signal plan.

6. Sections of the paved parking areas are directly adjacent to the building with no curbing, bollards, or landscaping to prevent contact from vehicles.

7. The site plan in the engineering plans varies from the site plan in the architectural plans in terms of pavement markings. The drive aisle width is labeled as 22 feet at its narrowest point on the Mills Engineering site plan. The dimension is shown between a curb and the face of the building, which ignores the proposed striping. The minimum width should be 23 feet. Also, it is unclear what design is intended in the vicinity of the rubbish container area (i.e. curbed islands, flush textured pavement, or pavement markings).

8. One handicapped parking space should be placed in the surface lot so there are accessible spaces in both of the parking areas on site and so that an accessible spot is more visible upon entry to the site.

9. Curb ramps should be added to provide accessible routes from both the outside parking area and the garage parking area to the adjacent walkways. Additionally, if it is raised, a curb ramp is needed to access the sidewalk in front of the lobby in the garage area.

10. Accesses to one of the lobby entrances and a mechanical room from the garage area are blocked by a parking space.

11. The sidewalk connecting the bank building to the parking area should have a minimum width of six feet.

12. A consistent material should be used for the sidewalk along East Putnam Avenue. The site plan shows a portion of the sidewalk as a patio material, which should be corrected.

13. The sidewalk along the west side of Taylor drive should not be interrupted by curbing at the proposed site driveway.

CC: Patrick LaRow, Town of Greenwich, James Michel, Town of Greenwich, Scott Marucci, Town of Greenwich
MEMORANDUM

TO: Jacalyn Pruitt, Planner II
FROM: Aleksandra Moch, Environmental Analyst
DATE: December 30, 2019
RE: Fried and Taylor LLC, 100 East Putnam Avenue, PLPZ 201900450 and PLPZ 2019 00451.
Site plan by Mills Engineering, LLC, submitted on November 27, 2019

I have reviewed the above-referenced plans and visited the site. The following comments are offered for your consideration:

1. The proposed mixed-use development will utilize the area of existing hard surfaces. Redevelopment of existing hardscape within the densely developed neighborhood is consistent with the principles of “smart growth.” Increased density is preferred within the areas conveniently located to the transportation hubs, shopping, libraries, and schools.

2. The proposed plan is preliminary and the list below provides direction for the further plan improvement and detailing we hope the P&Z Commission will support:

- In recognition of the growing electric vehicle market, the parking areas should include charging stations.

- The site is located close to the Mill Pond. Therefore, the storm water management plan should address not only storm water quantity but quality, as well.

- The proposal seeks to expand the construction envelope over the steep sloping ledge outcrop. Blasting and rock chipping put the trees growing along the site perimeter at risk. Further, deep cutting into the ledge may result in interception of ground water table increasing the overall storm water runoff from the site. For these reasons, the applicant is requested to provide alternatives to expanding the limit of disturbance due to ledge removal.

- Green infrastructure, consisting of trees, shrubs, herbaceous ground cover, roof gardens and/or green walls, should be incorporated into the design to provide a meaningful area active in air purification, noise absorption, and storm water management.
• If the depth to the ledge allows, a permeable asphalt should be used for the entire parking area.

3. While redevelopment of hardscape is desirable, this planned development is too intensive for the site and does not reach the proper balance between green space and the paved areas.

cc: Conservation Commission
Date: April 13, 2020

To: Katie Deluca, Director, Planning & Zoning

From: Richard C. Feminella, Wastewater Division Manager

Copy: Chris Mandras, Maintenance Manager - Sewer Division
Al Romano, Environmental Asset Engineer – Sewer Division

Re: PLPZ201900450&451: 100 East Putnam Avenue, Fried & Taylor

We have prepared the following comments and questions regarding the proposed application.

Project Summary:
- Moderate Income Housing Development of 22 units.

Sewer Division Comments:
As indicated in the Sewer Division’s prior comments dated December 31, 2019, the following comments still apply and need to be addressed:

Comments to be addressed during P&Z phase:
- As discussed at the pre-application meeting on October 25, 2019, the Sewer Division indicated that there are sewer capacity concerns in the downstream sewer system. As we requested at the meeting, please provide both the existing sewer flows (with water usage data for a two-year period) and proposed sewer flows for the proposed development, as well as the backup info to support those calculations.

Comments to be addressed during Sewer and Building Permit phase:
- The applicant/owner will be required to obtain all necessary Sewer Permits. Please coordinate directly with the Sewer Division for permitting.
- Due to the site location, the proposed development is required to utilize low flow plumbing fixtures.
- As this parcel is in the flood zone, if there are any revisions to the site layout that puts any part of the proposed dwelling within any part of the flood zone, the Sewer Division requires the applicant submit the necessary information for our review and approval to confirm that any plumbing fixtures are a minimum of 1-foot above the flood elevation.
- The applicant must show all sanitary and drainage infrastructure for any plans submitted for the sewer permitting. This should be located during the CCTV inspection and included on future sewer permit applications so that any additional comments/conditions related to sewer can be made at that time. This can be done during the Sewer and Building Permit phase of the process.
- Any application to the Sewer Division must include the location of the existing sanitary sewer lateral and its connection to the sewer main. Please be sure to show on plans submitted for Sewer Permitting.
- The applicant/owner will be required to perform CCTV inspections of all of the sanitary sewer laterals and private mains that serve the existing buildings to confirm there are no issues with the existing sanitary sewer lateral. Any televising of sanitary sewer laterals must be performed in the
presence of the Sewer Inspector. Please coordinate with Sewer Division – Environmental Asset Engineer (203) 622-0963 extension 5. Make a DVD of this inspection. Submit a copy of the DVD to the Sewer Division. Failure to have the Environmental Asset Engineer present during the TVing will result in the Sewer Division not accepting the DVD. Note: VHS format is not accepted. Only DVDs are accepted. Make a copy of the DVD for your records. The Town will not return DVDs. The Town cannot make copies of DVDs. The DVD should be submitted along with a site plan that identifies each investigation run on the DVD.

- Please coordinate directly with the Sewer Division on how the connection to the Town sanitary sewer main will be made. The proposed connection to the main is not acceptable, the Sewer Division will not approve cutting out a section of the sewer main for the lateral installation. Please coordinate with the Sewer Division for further details.

- It appears from the plans that the proposed driveway will be constructed of permeable pavement. Currently the sanitary sewer line is not in this area, however, if it were to be moved and lies beneath the driveway, only then it is required to be encased in concrete to the nearest upstream and downstream joints at least 10-feet from the edge of the drainage area to inhibit infiltration. Should this be required, please coordinate directly with the Sewer Division.

- Please note, sanitary sewers are designed for first floor elevations. Therefore, any plumbing fixtures in lower levels (basements) could be subject to sanitary sewer backups/overflows. The property owner is strongly recommended to consider and review this and plan accordingly to protect themselves in those situations. The Town is not responsible for damages as a result of these connections/installations. Please consider this and revise accordingly.

- Please note, in accordance with Town regulations and standard practice, all clear water sources cannot discharge to sanitary sewer. This includes air conditioning and high efficiency heating system condensate lines. Please confirm that the new development will not discharge any clear water sources to sanitary sewer.

Please NOTE: These comments are intended for P&Z review only. These comments do not take the place of Sewer Permit(s). Any Sewer Permit Applications receive thorough reviews and may result in additional comments/requirements at that time. In addition, please be reminded that in order to receive Building Permits, the applicant must have secured all other necessary permits, including, but not limited to, Sewer Permits PRIOR to obtaining their Building Permits.
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April 5, 2020

Town of Greenwich
Department of Public Works
Division of Building Inspection
Zoning Enforcement Division
Town Hall
101 Field Point Road
Greenwich, CT 06830
Attn.: Jodi Couture, Zoning Enforcement Officer

RE: Property of 100 East Putnam LLC
100 East Putnam Avenue
Cos Cob, CT

Dear Sir,

Mills Engineering, LLC has determined the Proposed Grade Plane for the above referenced project to be at elevation 20.88, for a first floor elevation of 20.5 as shown on the enclosed calculation sheet and sketch prepared by Mills Engineering, LLC, and based on the Building Zone Regulations Sections 6-5 (a) (26), 6-5 (45.2) and 6-134 (d), (e), (f), & (g). We have also determined that at no point is the finished floor more than 12 feet above the adjacent grade.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns regarding this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Mills Engineering, LLC

Charles A. Mills, P.E.

Enc.: Grade Plane Calculation Sheet and Sketch
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIDE</th>
<th>LENGTH WITHIN 6'</th>
<th>ENVELOPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>25.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>22.03</td>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>31.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>14.82</td>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>41.48</td>
<td>34.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>55.50</td>
<td>36.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>26.05</td>
<td>19.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>18.08</td>
<td>19.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>28.53</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>21.59</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>40.97</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>88.82</td>
<td>15.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>19.48</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>37.51</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>38.63</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>43.89</td>
<td>12.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>13.15</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>32.03</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>44.41</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>15.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>16.16</td>
<td>19.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>12.21</td>
<td>22.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**  703.56  XXXXXX  14688.71

| COLUMN 3 / COLUMN 1=GRADE PLANE = | 20.88 |

MILLS ENGINEERING, LLC
SECOND FLOOR ZONING KEY PLAN

[Diagram of the second floor zoning key plan with dimensions and zoning information]
April 15, 2020

Mr. Andrew Toth
AFT Management LLC
4 Ridgeview Circle
Armonk, NY 10504

Re: Tree Assessment Services
100 East Putnam Avenue, Cos Cob, CT

Dear Mr. Toth:

As requested, we visited the referenced property to conduct a tree inventory and perform a condition and risk assessment of the trees. This letter includes the methods and results of our investigation, which we completed on April 10, 2020. In summary, 50 trees were assessed, 31 of which are in poor condition and 18 are in fair condition. One tree is in good condition. We recommend 27 trees be removed based on their condition and/or risk and ten of these trees are considered priority removal trees due their risk level.

**Methodology**

Trees with a diameter at breast height greater than or equal to 6 inches were assessed in the western portion of the property. Two types of tree assessment were completed – a Condition Assessment and a Risk Assessment. Assessments were performed by an International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) Certified Arborist holding the Tree Risk Assessment Qualification (TRAQ) credential.

A Condition Assessment was performed consistent within the standards of the “Council of Tree and Landscape Appraiser’s Guide for Plant Appraisal”. Condition indicates the current state of a tree’s health and soundness and is determined through a visual evaluation of the roots, trunk, and scaffold branches, as well as branches, twigs, foliage and buds. The overall health of any given tree is the sum of the condition for all of these woody and vegetative components. The Council’s condition rating system returns a numerical value (1-4) that can then be adapted to “Dead”, “Poor”, “Fair”, and “Good”.
A Risk Assessment was performed in accordance with the Level 2 tree risk assessment (ANSI A300-Part 9) standards. The assessment includes a 360-degree ground-based visual inspection of the crown, trunk, trunk flare, above ground roots, and site conditions around the tree in relation to targets. Each tree is assigned a qualitative risk rating of “Low”, “Moderate”, “High” or “Extreme” using the risk categorization matrices found in the International Society of Arboriculture Best Management Practices: Tree Risk Assessment (Smiley, Matheny, and Lilly 2017). Various and multiple failure scenarios helped determine the tree’s risk rating. The tree defect (i.e., branch, whole tree, codominant stem) with the greatest risk served as the overall tree risk rating. Refer to “Assumptions/Limitations” below for limitations of the tree risk assessment.

**Results**

Due to existing tree conditions, 31 of the 50 assessed trees are in poor condition. One tree is in good condition and 18 trees are in fair condition. The majority of trees are on a steep slope on the western side of the property that has been historically disturbed for development. The invasive Norway maple trees dominant this slope. Due to a lack of maintenance, many of the trees suppressed by the mature trees. English ivy vines are dense at the base of most trees. In some cases, the vines extend the length of tree trunks and are in the tree canopy, further suppressing the trees. The ivy also limits the extent of the visual assessment (i.e. decay in trunks may be hard to detect during a Level 2 risk assessment). Some of these trees show signs of basal and/or trunk decay (as observed through sounding and visual observation). As such, 27 trees are recommended for removal. Ten of these trees are considered priority trees for removal as they carry a moderate or high risk.

**Assumptions/Limitations**

Data provided by WKA are based on observations made at the time of inspection and considers only known targets and visible/detectable conditions of the tree and site consistent with a Level 2 assessment per ANSI A300 (Part 9) standards, the ISA Best Management Practices (Tree Risk Assessment). This level of assessment is consistent with the client solicitation. WKA is not responsible for discovery or identification of hidden or otherwise non-observable hazards. Observations do not include individual testing or analysis and do not include aerial or sub-soil inspection. Any reference to time frame is not a guarantee for tree stability. Records may not remain accurate after inspection due to variable deterioration of the inventoried material. Extreme weather or unforeseeable events may cause tree failure. WKA provides no warranty with respect to the fitness of the tree for any use or purpose whatsoever.
Conclusions

We conducted a tree inventory and condition and risk assessment at 100 East Putnam Avenue in Cos Cob, Connecticut and determined that 31 trees are in poor condition and 18 are in fair condition. We recommend 27 trees be removed based on their condition and/or risk and ten of these trees are considered priority removal trees due to their risk level. If you should have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

Carolyn H. Matthews
ISA Certified Arborist
Tree Risk Assessment Qualified

Ref. No. 4480