APPLICATION SUMMARY:
The applicant is requesting final site plan approval to address the connection of the Office Park Parcel interior roadway system to the driveway of the 581 West Putnam Avenue Parcel, in relation to PLPZ 2020 00281, on an 18.1-acres property located at 51 Weaver Street in the GBO zone.

ISSUES/COMMENTS:
The following items should be considered by the Commission and/or addressed by the applicant:

1. ZONING - Per the ZEO’s last comments, Lot coverage numbers for the proposed work on this parcel have not been provided.
2. The proposed action cuts through areas of existing rock outcropping, significantly altering the current landscape and topography. The Commission should review the proposed site work and determine if it complies with Sec. 6-15(3)(d), “Site Plan Standards”.
3. The applicant has received approval from the IWWA for the work within the upland review area. Please see the IWWA’s approval to perform regulated activities attached.
4. It is recommended that comments from all other departments be received prior to the Commission rendering a decision.

DEPARTMENT COMMENTS:

ZEO –
CONSERVATION –
ENGINEERING – see attached
TRAFFIC – see attached

ZONING:
The proposed action would add lot coverage to the subject parcel. Staff notes that a fair amount of cut, to the existing topography is proposed as the installation of this driveway removes rock outcroppings, and removal of mature trees. The overall affect would change the existing environmental features of the site. The Commission should refer to Sec. 6-15(3) of the BZR to determine if the proposed work meets the intents and purposes of the “Site Plan Standards” Section. Lot coverage for this parcel is missing and needs to be provided.

TRAFFIC:
New traffic analyses were provided with the application for final site plan / special permit approval filed in the end of 2019 and then withdrawn in early 2020. Comments from the
Commission’s Traffic consultant were provided at that time. Post the January 5, 2021 meeting, the applicant responded to comments received.

DPW has indicated that the following comments be addressed prior to final site plan approval:

1. The revised project should be submitted to the Connecticut Department of Transportation for the proposed changes to the driveways. Response letter from Maser Consulting dated November 18, 2020 is acceptable.

2. The P&Z Commission should discuss the consideration of putting a condition on the approval that if traffic issues arise at the driveway on West Putnam Avenue, the driveway will be modified to a right turn in and right turn out or other configuration approved by DPW.

In review of the site plans, staff notes that some of the comments provided by the Commissions traffic consultant and staff, could be answered with pavement markings, and directions signage installed on site. In particular, the turnaround loop in the northern portion of the site, could be better explained with a solid center line, to clearly indicate lanes and direction of traffic. Furthermore, if the turnaround, is to be used intermittently, or just for buses, delivery, and public safety vehicles, perhaps a distinctive pavement treatment and/or signage would help to better define its intent.

Additionally, BETA, the Commission’s traffic consultant has again responded with the following issues and comments for consideration.

1. Show proposed signing and pavement markings on the site plan. Adding those devices would help clarify the proposed operation in that area (and throughout the site).

2. Dimensions of aisles, parking spaces, and travel lanes would clarify circulation throughout the site for both vehicular traffic as well as pedestrians.

3. Add curb ramps and a crosswalk at the intersection between the main access roadway and the parking lot driveway aisles where pedestrians may cross to travel between the Building 9 lot and the proposed residential building (581 West Putnam Ave). Also, pedestrian accommodations in the vicinity of Building 9 and its adjacent parking lot are lacking. Can some facilities be added to provide connectivity between Building 9 and sidewalks along West Putnam Avenue and Valley Drive?

4. Although not being proposed with this project, the combined 500/600 West Putnam Ave. proposed had some improvements to Valley Drive that seem to be relevant for this project. (See BETA comments for greater detail).

5. Crash data seems to indicate a traffic concern. (See BETA comments for greater detail)/

6. Questions over the lack in internal connectivity of both sides of the site and the idea that this is a “shared” parking situation. (See BETA comments for greater detail).

The Commission should direct the applicant as to how they want to address traffic and parking concerns.

**DRAINAGE:**
Engineering has some lingering issues, but had indicated that the drainage design comments
could be addressed prior to zoning permit issuance. The intersection of Valley Drive and the traffic light was proposed when the work at 500/600 West Putnam Ave was being considered at the same time as this application. That proposal has not been submitted at this time, but comments for a coordinated traffic review for this intersection have been noted by DPW.

**OTHER AGENCY APPROVALS:**

**IWWA:** The applicant has received approval from the IWWA for the work within the upland review area.

**APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:**

§§6-13, 6-14, 6-15 (Site Plan Procedure and Standards) and 6-106 (Use Regulations for the GBO zone), 6-154 thru 6-158 (Parking and Loading requirements) and 6-205 (Bulk, Coverage and Height)
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE
Regular Meeting

Wednesday, February 3, 2021, 7:01pm – 11:14pm

Zoom Virtual Meeting
Action Agenda

Members Present: Richard Hein, Chairperson; John Conte, Vice-Chairperson; Graziano Meniconi, Secretary; Rhonda Cohen; Heidi Brake-Smith (left at 8:54pm); Louis Contadino; Leander Krueger; Katherine LoBalbo; Paul Pugliese (arrived at 7:02pm); Peter Boldt (arrived at 7:03pm)

Staff Present: Marisa Anastasio, Senior Planner; Jacalyn Pruitt, Planner II

I. Exterior Alteration Applications:
   1. 581 WPA Resi Jlofts, 581 West Putnam Avenue, Application PLPZ202100012 for Exterior Alteration review for construction of a new multi-family residential structure with 44 units, including moderate income units, with new drive and parking areas, roof plantings and lighting, and site lighting and landscaping at a property located at 581 West Putnam Avenue in the GBO zone.

Decision Status: Return to a Meeting
Motion: Hein Second: LoBalbo Vote: unanimous 10-0 (Hein; Conte; Meniconi; Boldt; Brake-Smith; Cohen; Contadino; Krueger; LoBalbo; Pugliese)

The applicant shall submit construction documents to reflect the following:
   a. The ARC finds the building looks more like an office than residential which is not a successful outcome. ARC is especially concerned as this building may be the gateway to changes at the Greenwich Office Park (G.O.P.) and West Putnam Ave.;
   b. Both the massing and articulation of the building is in question with the ARC. The massing was described by an ARC member as “a collision of blocks that don’t relate to each other”;
   c. ARC recommends that the applicant explore underground and off-site parking options to limit surface parking;
   d. An additional level of detail is needed for the windows, brick, etc.;
   e. ARC has concerns about the entrance into the lobby, the unadorned lower level garage and the pedestrian experience in general—these do
not feel warm or inviting;

f. The applicant should try to preserve significant trees on the site; Trees along West Putnam Ave. should be preserved;

g. More greenspace and exterior common spaces are needed to serve a variety of tenants, i.e. the roof top is not optimal for families with children. There was discussion of use of G.O.P. for walking /dog walking - ARC finds that more green and recreational spaces on the subject site are still warranted.

h. The architecture proposed in the previous application was more successful as it related to the buildings along West Putnam Ave. more successfully;

i. Is the rock ledge a natural outcrop, or is it a manmade element? In the last application the recommendation was to preserve the outcrop, but it depends on how valuable this feature is to the site;

j. Provide more photos of the site and surrounding sites to help with context;

k. Provide street elevations and views of the proposal from Route 1;

l. Provide a diagrammatic sketch (doesn’t have to be a dimensioned site section) to show context with neighbors to the North, up to Alden Road;

m. Public comment was provided – concerns: design, color and materials / should be more residential, noise from rooftop, need for lighting and landscaping details, influence on future development of West Putnam Ave., adequate green space and recreation space for tenants. Letters were submitted to the file.

2. Eastern Greenwich Civic Center, 90 Harding Road; Application PLPZ202000263 for Exterior Alteration review to demolish the existing civic center including removal of asphalt parking areas, drives and walkways, removal of 18 trees, and stripping and stockpiling of soil and construction of new civic center building, restripping of parking area, and new driveway and parking areas with timber guiderails, new light posts, bollards and protection of trees throughout the site., tennis court and play area will remain on a property located at 90 Harding Road in the R-7 zone. Last reviewed at the 1-6-21 meeting at which members Hein, Conte, Meniconi, Brake-Smith, Contadino, Krueger, LoBalbo, and Pugliese were present.

Decision Status: Return with Construction Drawings (CDs) showing final exterior details and materials as noted below.

Motion: Hein Second: Conte Vote: unanimous 9-0 (Hein; Conte; Meniconi; Cohen; LoBalbo; Contadino; Krueger; Boldt; Pugliese)
ZONING ENFORCEMENT

Project No.  PLPZ202000281-284  Preliminary  Final  X

Reviewed for Planning and Zoning Commission.

TITLE OF PLAN REVIEWED:  J Lofts

LOCATION:  581-585 West Putnam Ave.

PLAN DATE:

ZONE:  GBO

☐  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. Lot coverage per section 6-110(g)(5) for 581-585 West Putnam.

Reviewed by: Jodi Couture  Date:  2/26/2021

Note:  These comments do not represent Building Inspection Division approval. Plans subject to review by ZEO at time of building permit application.
### DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS – ENGINEERING DIVISION

### SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engineering Project No.</th>
<th>Department Project No.</th>
<th>Submittal Received Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-4(14)</td>
<td>PLPZ202000281, 282, 283, 284</td>
<td>2/22/2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submittal Reviewed For:</th>
<th>Traffic Review Requested:</th>
<th>Review Type:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Zoning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Final Site Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLAN SET INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Title:</th>
<th>Project Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Development</td>
<td>581 &amp; 585 West Putnam Avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engineering Firm:</th>
<th>Original Plan Date:</th>
<th>Latest Plan Revision Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rocco V. D'Andrea, Inc.</td>
<td>1/10/2020</td>
<td>12/4/2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DRAINAGE SUMMARY REPORT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engineering Firm:</th>
<th>Original Report Date:</th>
<th>Latest Report Revision Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rocco V. D'Andrea, Inc.</td>
<td>1/10/2020</td>
<td>12/4/2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviews provided by the Engineering Division are for compliance with the Town’s “Roadway Design Manual and Standard Construction Details” and “Drainage Manual” as amended. Reviews are based upon the information and plans provided. Comments pertaining to the Town’s manuals are not all encompassing. Other reviewing entities may provide additional comments regarding consistency with these manuals in accordance with their jurisdictions. Review of sanitary sewer and septic systems are not reviewed by the Engineering Division.

All New Submittals for Commission Meetings must be received by the Engineering Division four weeks before scheduled Commission Meeting.

All Revised Submittals for Commission Meetings must be received by the Engineering Division three weeks before scheduled Commission Meeting.

---

**COMMENTS AND CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

Resubmit Prior to Zoning/Building Permit Approval

The following traffic comments must be addressed prior to final site plan approval:

1. The revised project should be submitted to the Connecticut Department of Transportation for the proposed changes to the driveways. Response letter from Maser Consulting dated November 18, 2020 is acceptable.

2. The P&Z Commission should discuss the consideration of putting a condition on the approval that if traffic issues arise at the driveway on West Putnam Avenue, the driveway will be modified to a right turn in and right turn out or other configuration approved by DPW.

The following traffic comments must be addressed prior to final site plan approval for any future submittals for 500-600 West Putnam Avenue projects:

1. The Traffic Impact Study (traffic volumes, signal times, exclusive and concurrent pedestrian phases, etc.) will need to be updated using the final approved future development for 500 & 600 West Putnam Avenue and 581-585 West Putnam Avenue. This must be submitted and approved prior to the Traffic Signal Improvement Plan submittal and review.
The preliminary Traffic Signal Plan from Maser Consulting dated April 3, 2020 is acceptable in concept. The Traffic Signal Plan must be completed and submitted for review and approval by The Connecticut Department of Transportation (CTDOT), BETA Group, Inc, and the Department of Public Works prior to zoning/building permit approval. The review by CTDOT may require alignment modifications between Valley Drive and the entrance of 500-600 West Putnam Avenue.

The project site comments:

1. A revised Form SC-100 needs to be submitted.
2. A revised Form SC-107 needs to be submitted.
3. The Drainage Summary Report is acceptable for the proposed BMPs. The following revisions and additional information must be submitted:
   a. The pipe invert elevations for the 48” pipe used for existing and proposed conditions for the Pond Outlet Structure, SDMH#1, and Storm Drain Chamber do not match or are not shown on the existing conditions survey. The actual elevations must be obtained in the field and added to the existing conditions survey, design plans, and revised for the existing and proposed conditions in HydroCad. All invert elevations used in HydroCad must be obtained in the field at the necessary structures.
   b. Area 10 shows CB#11 goes to an existing CB that will be changed to a JB. The discharge from this structure must be shown where it connects to the 48” pipe. This discharge must be shown as it receives the discharge from Porous Asphalt #1.
   c. The minimum elevation of the overflow for the rain garden is 74.50 (6” minimum). Revise the elevation on the plans and in the report.
   d. Revise the conveyance computations as needed based on any revisions for the above comments.
   e. Review and revise all other computations and information as needed.
4. The construction plan shall be revised as follows:
   a. The submitted plans were difficult to read in areas. If the plans are scanned please scan at a higher DPI in the future.
   b. Existing Conditions Survey Sheet
      i. The pipe invert elevations for the 48” pipe used for existing and proposed conditions for the Pond Outlet Structure, SDMH#1, and Storm Drain Chamber do not match or are not shown on the existing conditions survey. The actual elevations must be obtained in the field and added to the existing conditions survey, design plans, and revised for the existing and proposed conditions in HydroCad. All invert elevations used in HydroCad must be obtained in the field at the necessary structures.
   c. Site Plan Sheets
      i. The installation of new catch basins at the corners of the Valley Drive and West Putnam Avenue shall be discussed with CTDOT to correct the flooding issues that impact the pedestrian ramps. If the plans do not show the reconstructed catch basins to address the flooding issues a letter from CTDOT not requiring the improvements must be submitted.
      ii. The bottom of stone elevation for Porous Asphalt #2 needs to be revised to 73.50 to match the report.
      iii. The distribution pipe from SDMH#1 needs to be revised to invert elevation 74.50 so it is the required 1-foot above the bottom of stone of Porous Asphalt #2.
      iv. The minimum elevation of the overflow for the rain garden is 74.50 (6” minimum). Revise the elevation on the plans and in the report.
      v. The discharge pipe and rip-rap apron for the building discharge must be added to the rain garden.
      vi. Show the entire pipe network from the starting point for the building to its outfall.
      vii. The plans must show the building drainage system and its discharge into the rain garden.
      viii. Show the footing drain network from the house/sump pump to the outfall.
      ix. Show all permeable pavements with the following in the callout:
         1. Permeable Pavement surface thickness.
         2. Bottom of no.57 stone elevation.
         3. Bottom of no.2 stone elevation.
   d. Driveway Profile & Sight Distance Sheet
      i. The profile for the driveway from Sta. 0+00 to Sta. 5+20 shall include spot elevations.
   e. Construction Details Sheets
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS – ENGINEERING DIVISION
SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

i. Add Town of Greenwich Standard Construction Detail for Reinforced Concrete Driveway Ramp.

f. 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.

5. The draft Operations and Maintenance Plan Report shall be revised as needed and submitted for review.

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.

Standard Conditions of Approval

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).
Date: February 24, 2021

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: PLPZ202000281,282,283,&284: 581-585 West Putnam Avenue, 0 & 51 Weaver Street, 18 Valley Drive, Putnam 600 Acquisition LLC, 585 West Putnam LLC, Greenwich Park LLC

We have prepared the following comments and questions regarding the proposed P&Z applications for Greenwich Office Park and combined 581-585 West Putnam Avenue, 51 Weaver Street, 18 Valley Drive, and 0 Weaver Street/West Putnam Avenue.

Project Summary:
- Demolition of all buildings on-site, and construction of a four (4) story residential building containing 44 residential units including 9 "Moderate Income" units and a lower level parking garage. The office building on-site will remain.
- Address the removal of the West Putnam Avenue driveway and the connection of its parking area to the 581 West Putnam Avenue driveway.
- Address the connection of the Office Park Parcel interior roadway system to the driveway of the 581 West Putnam Avenue parcel.
- Address the proposed drop off lane being added.

Sewer Division Comments:
As indicated in the Sewer Division’s prior comments dated November 12, 2020, March 3, 2020, and January 23, 2020, the following comments still apply and need to be addressed:

Comments to be addressed during P&Z phase:
- The applicant/owner has previously been working in good faith with the DPW regarding the existing sewer capacity issues downstream of this proposed development. Based on an e-mail from the applicant’s attorney received March 5, 2020, the applicant/owner has confirmed that they are still committed to proceed with installing the sanitary sewer improvements downstream of this proposal to facilitate this proposed development. All sanitary sewer work must be completed, inspected, approved by the Sewer Division and fully functional PRIOR to the proposed development making any sanitary sewer connections to this sewer system. Should the applicant pursue this commitment, the sewer line construction details (e.g. line size, specific segments, etc.) would be handled through the sewer permitting process. The sewer design documents are nearing completion and the correct sizing of the sewer improvements is currently being finalized, however we need some additional information from the proposed development team on flows listed in the comments below. Please include this commitment for the downstream sewer improvements as part of any approval of this application.
• As revised site plans have not been submitted, we cannot confirm whether this comment is still necessary or not. If the applicant provides updated Site Plans for the revised building, we can determine if this is still required or not. Since we cannot confirm, we are including the prior comment. PRIOR COMMENT: As the applicant is now proposing porous/permeable pavement and storm drainage (including rain gardens, etc.) above the Town’s sanitary sewer main, the applicant/owner will be required to perform work on the Town’s sanitary sewer main, using a Town Sewer Division approved contractor, etc. This will need to be coordinated with the Sewer Division. A written commitment by the applicant/owner is required prior to P&Z approving this application.

• As requested in our prior comments, we requested sanitary sewer flows. The applicant’s engineer provided proposed sewer flows and estimated existing flows for prior development, but did not include water usage data as requested. We previously requested this water usage data. The applicant/owner is required to provide a minimum of 2-years’ worth of water usage data from the existing properties. In addition, please have the developer’s engineer clarify the following:
  1. Clarify the type / number of bedrooms for the 44 proposed residential units
  2. Total square footage of the proposed office space
  3. Existing water usage data (listed above)

This will be helpful for us to determine and finalize design related to the downstream sewer improvements required to facilitate this development. We believe that as long as the developer performs the required offsite sewer improvements (increasing size of downstream sewer segments as outlined in the first bullet), the sewer capacity concerns should be alleviated and would not have objection to the proposed development. However, the above information would help us confirm the true impact (flow increase) from the proposed development. This can be provided during the Building Permit and Sewer Permitting phases, however, it should be submitted as soon as possible, as it will result in additional review times and can impact length of time to obtain the Sewer and Building Permits.

• It appears that applicant has made revisions to the proposed building footprint. It appears the proposed building revision is now not within the sewer easement although the northwest corner of the edge of the proposed building is right on the edge of the easement. It is also not clear if the proposed building foundation is proposed within the easement area. While it is not required during the P&Z phase, during the Building Permit and Sewer Permitting phases a more detailed plan with an actual field surveyed plan will be required to confirm that the proposed building, or any building foundation is not within the sewer easement footprint. In addition, we will require confirmation that the building foundation in the northwest corner (where it is along the edge and within 5-feet of the outer edge of the sewer easement), the applicant must provide written confirmation that the proposed foundation is designed to be self-supporting and will not rely on the surrounding soil. This is due to that fact that at some point in the future, the existing sanitary sewer main may require repair or replacement via open cut excavation.

We previously included this requirement in our prior comments that the applicant/owner will be required to design their foundation such that it is completely self-supporting and does not rely on the surrounding soil to support it, so that when the Town has to excavate for the sanitary sewer replacement there is not potential for damage to the
applicant’s structure, etc. Please coordinate directly with the Sewer Division regarding this. This can be provided during the Building Permit and Sewer Permitting phases, however, it should be submitted as soon as possible, as it will result in additional review times and can impact length of time to obtain the Sewer and Building Permits.

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.

- Any sewer lateral(s) that are proposed to be installed within 10-feet of any drainage area, such as, but not limited to permeable pavement, biofiltration areas, drain lines, etc., will be 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.

Also, please note, the applicant should NOT submit for Sewer Permits until the project has received approval from P&Z.
Date: February 25, 2021  BETA Project #: 4972

To: Ms. Katie DeLuca, Planning Director

From: Kaethe V. Podgorski, PE, PTOE

Subject: 581 West Putnam Avenue, Greenwich, C T

BETA submitted a memo on January 24, 2020 providing a traffic review of the site plan and operational analysis for the proposed development at 581 West Putnam Avenue. Note that this site, as well as the site(s) at 500-600 West Putnam Avenue have been proposed for redevelopment for several years and there have been many plans, reports, and documents regarding these projects which are not specifically listed here, although have been considered as part of this project’s history. Most recently, the Applicant has provided the following additional information relevant to traffic operational, circulation, and safety considerations for the site:

- Memorandum Re: 581 West Putnam Avenue (Responses to DPW Comments); Maser Consulting; January 12, 2021
- Memorandum Re: 581 West Putnam Avenue (Parking); Maser Consulting; January 12, 2021
- Development Plan; 581 & 585 West Putnam Avenue; Rocco V. D’Andrea, Inc.; February 22, 2021

Following are the string of BETA’s 1/24/20 comments, Applicant responses, and additional BETA commentary:

Comment #1 (1/24/20 BETA Memo): It is not clear how the proposed traffic circle is supposed to operate. Vehicles are likely to travel straight through the middle. Is the pick up/drop off loop necessary on the Eastern half of the roadway?

Response: No response provided, although it is now our understanding that the traffic circle is intended to operate as a truck turn around with a pick-up/drop-off area on the west side of the loop and is not for general traffic use.

Additional BETA Comment: Please refer to comment #2 below to show proposed signing and pavement markings on the site plan. Adding those devices would help clarify the proposed operation in that area (and throughout the site).

Comment #2 (1/24/20 BETA Memo): Show proposed signing and pavement markings. Additionally, please add notes and dimensions to the plans to clarify widths of parking spaces and drive aisles.

Response: No response provided

Additional BETA Comment: This comment should be incorporated to clarify circulation throughout the site for both vehicular traffic as well as pedestrians.

Comment #3 (1/24/20 BETA Memo): Add curb ramps and a crosswalk at the intersection between the main access roadway and the parking lot driveway aisles where pedestrians may cross to travel between the Building 9 lot and the proposed residential building (581 West Putnam Ave). Also, pedestrian accommodations in the vicinity of Building 9 and its adjacent parking lot are lacking. Can some facilities be added to provide connectivity between Building 9 and sidewalks along West Putnam Avenue and Valley Drive?
Response: No response provided

Additional BETA Comment: This comment should be incorporated.

Comment #4 (1/24/20 BETA Memo): That traffic study does not account for the proposed changes to the property for 500-600 West Putnam. The narrative for that application states "...it is the intention of the owner to undertake the construction of the [581] project prior to development of the 500 West Putnam Avenue" while both studies include future build years of 2022. Between these two studies neither of them correctly reflects the future condition accounting for both developments.

Response: No specific response provided, although it is our understanding now that there is no longer a pending application for the 500-600 West Putnam Avenue development.

Additional BETA Comment: See the response below to previous comment #5. Additionally, over the several years that these projects on West Putnam Avenue have been proposed, wasn’t there a plan to extend the southbound right-turn lane on Valley Drive at the West Putnam Avenue intersection? When and why was that improvement removed from the project? The existing striping configuration on the southbound Valley Drive approach to West Putnam Avenue does not provide much storage for the left and right turn lanes (approximately 25 feet), and the lanes appear to be slightly less than ten feet wide. The traffic signal plan developed for 500 & 600 West Putnam Avenue (by Maser Consulting dated 4/3/2020) was conceptual and showed Valley Drive curb lines in their existing locations, although the final layout may require revisions to the existing alignment and lanes on Valley Drive. Was any feedback from CTDOT obtained for this intersection that would indicate if modifications to Valley Drive would be needed to accommodate a fourth leg?

Comment #5 (1/24/20 BETA Memo): The traffic study for 500 & 600 West Putnam Avenue (Revised October 8, 2018) in Section B states that an internal connection from the 600 property to the 500 property will be provided and that “the existing 600 exit only driveway and 500 westerly driveway will be eliminated.” Can the Applicant confirm that the existing two (poorly aligned) driveways across West Putnam Avenue from the 581 driveway will be closed? That will be an important change to improve safety by eliminating conflicting movements from these offset driveways. Additionally, per comment 4, it will be important to document and review capacity analysis for the 581 driveway intersection with West Putnam Avenue for the final condition.

Response: No specific response provided, although it is our understanding now that there is no longer a pending application for the 500-600 West Putnam Avenue development.

Additional BETA Comment: Since there is no upcoming plan to reconfigure the driveways for the 500-600 West Putnam Avenue properties, the existing safety concerns in this section of West Putnam Avenue will continue. The following crash data was obtained for the most recent available five years in the vicinity of the existing driveways, which indicate a high number of angle crashes at existing driveway intersection locations:
Additionally, the operational analysis from the most recent Traffic Impact Study (dated December 18, 2019) indicates poor Levels of Service for the northbound approach to the intersection which is expected to continue with the 581 site development and is not conducive to improved safety conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>YEAR 2018 EXISTING</th>
<th>YEAR 2022 NO BUILD</th>
<th>YEAR 2023 BUILD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WEST PUTNAM AVENUE &amp; 600 BUILDING EAST DRIVEWAY / 581 OFFICE DRIVEWAY</td>
<td>UNsignalized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST PUTNAM AVENUE NEBL</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500BLDG EAST DWS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600BLDG EAST DWS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>581 DRIVEWAY</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eliminating the adjacent driveway (for Building 9) is helpful, although the safety and operational benefits that would have been achieved by reconfiguring the driveways for the 500-600 West Putnam Avenue property will not be realized. Therefore, a modification of the 581 driveway to a right-in right-out operation should be considered in the future if traffic/safety conditions continue to indicate the need for improvement.
Comment #6 (1/24/20 BETA Memo): The narrative states that “the Regulations technically require 44 parking spaces for the Residential Building.” It is probably not appropriate to apply the mixed-use standard for this development since there may not be much mixing between the residential and office uses. (The narrative also states that “no physical connection between the two underlying parcels is proposed.”) The number of parking spaces that would normally be required for this type of residential development is 97. To encourage the use of alternative transportation modes and decrease vehicular trips and parking demand generated by the residential units, the Applicant could develop a Transportation Demand Management plan that includes strategies such as unbundling parking spaces from lease agreements, subsidizing train/bus passes, providing parking spaces for a shared car service, etc. Bicycle parking (preferably indoors for the residential units) should also be provided on site.

Response: No specific response was provided, although a memorandum was prepared by Maser (dated 1/12/21) to investigate potential parking demand.

Additional BETA Comment: Given the thoughts listed in the original comment #6 above regarding characteristics of the proposed land use and layout of the site, it is unclear whether the minimum Town Code criteria for a mixed-use development for parking spaces should be applicable. However, the 84 proposed parking spaces may be appropriate. Can the applicant provide information on if and how the travel demand and parking supply on site will be managed (i.e. issuing permits for parking spaces or leasing spaces separately from rental units, promoting use of active transportation modes with secure bicycle parking, etc.)?

CC: Patrick LaRow, Town of Greenwich
    James Michel, Town of Greenwich
    Scott Marucci, Town of Greenwich
February 25, 2021

Re: Housing Comments for 581-585 West Putnam Avenue, PLPZ202000281

The development at 581-585 West Putnam Avenue has provided a draft Affordability Plan and Declaration of Restrictions and the comments from the Housing Specialist are as follows:

Affordability Plan
- Remove any 6-110(g) and replace with 6-110.

- C) Prioritization of Applicants – In reference to the priority group, remove 6-110(g)(4)(B) and replace with 6-110(h)(2).

- D) Selection of Prospective Purchaser – In reference to a lottery, remove 6-110(b)(3) and replace with 6-110(h)(6)(i).

Declaration of Restrictions
- Remove any 6-110(g) and replace with 6-110

Thank you,
Crystal Berry
Housing Specialist
Planning and Zoning Department
Hi John,

The ARC action agenda from 2/3 has been posted and can be viewed at the following link:

https://www.greenwichct.gov/AgendaCenter/ViewFile/Item/5962?fileID=85798

From my review of the P+Z 1/5 meeting audio, there was certainly discussion in regard to the acceptance of the current design and the idea of limiting ARC’s scope of review to just landscaping and lighting. But I do not find that the Commission came to a final decision or consensus to indeed limit ARC’s review. By the end of the project discussion, it sounds to me like PZ wants ARC to review the current proposal in the usual way. But you have the option of going back to PZ directly or returning to ARC to try to address their concerns first. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Marisa Anastasio, Senior Planner
Town of Greenwich
Planning and Zoning
Ph. 203-622-7894

---

From: Tesei, John <JPT@gtlslaw.com>
Sent: Friday, February 5, 2021 9:18 AM
To: Anastasio, Marisa
Cc: Kevin Molnar; DeLuca, Katie; john@fareriassociates.com
Subject: RE: 581

[EXTERNAL]

Marisa,

I do not see that happening. Mr. Fareri is done with the ARC when it comes to this property. He has proven his commitment to both below market housing and improving this area western Greenwich. He has earned the right to construct this building with the design/architecture of his choice as fundamentally accepted by the PZ Commission members on a consensus basis. The building essentially is to be part of Greenwich Park; it is surrounded by Mr. Fareri’s buildings on three sides and is substantially removed from the West Putnam Avenue streetscape as Mr. Macri noted and even demonstrated during the last hearing. This building does not intrude upon or otherwise adversely affect to any degree anyone.

He will now deal with the PZ Commission only.

The ARC members are certainly entitled to their opinions and we respect them, but the redesigning of the building and site are non-starters.
He would like to be on the next available Commission meeting and have the Commission render a decision. The only issue outstanding is the sewer department and we will work that out with them one way or the other. Katie is copied as you can see. Please share with all Commission members the ARC memo as soon as available also.

Thank you for your assistance.

John

---

John P. Tesei | Partner | Gilbride, Tusa, Last & Spellane LLC
jpt@gtlslaw.com | Bio www.gtlslaw.com

This e-mail, and any attachments thereto, is intended only for use by the addressee(s) named herein and may contain legally privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail, and any attachments thereto, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify me by telephone and permanently delete the original and any copy of any e-mail and any printout thereof.

Any tax advice provided herein (including any attachments) is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of avoiding penalties that may be imposed on any taxpayer.

---

From: Anastasio, Marisa [mailto:Marisa.Anastasio@greenwichct.org]
Sent: Friday, February 5, 2021 8:57 AM
To: Tesei, John <JPT@gtlslaw.com>
Cc: Kevin Molnar <kmolnar@fareriassociates.com>
Subject: Re: 581

Hi John,

I will let you know when the notes from the meeting are ready. I talked with Katie and we think the best way to proceed is to have you go back to ARC before returning to P+Z. I am going to review the transcripts from the P+Z meeting(s) in case they can offer some clarification / direction. Thank you,

Marisa Anastasio, Senior Planner
Town of Greenwich
Planning and Zoning
Ph. 203-622-7894

---

From: Tesei, John <JPT@gtlslaw.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 4, 2021 10:26:06 AM
To: Anastasio, Marisa <Marisa.Anastasio@greenwichct.org>
Cc: Kevin Molnar <kmolnar@fareriassociates.com>
Subject: 581

[EXTERNAL]
Well, that was an experience – leaving it at that.

Appreciate you sending us the minutes when available to share with Mr. Fareri so that we can plot our course forward as soon as possible.
Thanks much,

John

John P. Tesei  |  Partner  |  Gilbride, Tusa, Last & Spellane LLC
jpt@gtlslaw.com  |  Bio  www.gtlslaw.com

This e-mail, and any attachments thereto, is intended only for use by the addressee(s) named herein and may contain legally privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail, and any attachments thereto, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify me by telephone and permanently delete the original and any copy of any e-mail and any printout thereof.

Any tax advice provided herein (including any attachments) is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of avoiding penalties that may be imposed on any taxpayer.

From: Anastasio, Marisa [mailto:Marisa.Anastasio@greenwichct.org]
Sent: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 7:08 PM
To: Tesei, John <JPT@gtlslaw.com>
Subject: Do you want to call into ARC ?

https://www.greenwichct.gov/AgendaCenter/ViewFile/Agenda/_02032021-4526?html=true

Marisa Anastasio, Senior Planner
Town of Greenwich
Planning and Zoning
Ph. 203-622-7894

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the Town email system. Do not click links or open attachments unless you have verified the sender and know the content is safe.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the Town email system. Do not click links or open attachments unless you have verified the sender and know the content is safe.
Town of Greenwich
101 Field Point Road
Greenwich Connecticut 06836
Attn. Mr. Patrick LaRow. Deputy Director / Assistant Town Planner

February 23rd 2021

Re. Application No. PLPZ 2020 00281
585 West Putnam LLC and Putnam 600 Acquisition LLC c/o Fareri Associates
2 Dearfield Drive, Suite 3, Greenwich CT
(Moderate Income Multi-Family Unit Building aka Jlofts)

Dear LaRow,

As per your email communication on February 23, 2021, please find the attached:

A-100 Proposed Floor Plan Parking Floor Level (dated 02.22.2021)
A-101 Proposed Floor Plan First Floor Level (dated 02.22.2021)
A-102 Proposed Floor Plan Second Floor Level (dated 02.22.2021)
A-103 Proposed Floor Plan Third Floor Level (dated 02.22.2021)
A-104 Proposed Floor Plan Fourth Floor Level (dated 02.22.2021)

Thank you,

Kevin E. Molnar, AIA
Director of Design
Fareri Associates
MEMORANDUM

To: John P. Tesei
From: Ronald P. Rieman, Project Manager
       John T. Collins, Ph.D., P.E.
Date: January 12, 2021
Re: 581 West Putnam Avenue
     Town of Greenwich, Connecticut
     MC Project No. 19005590A

As requested Maser Consulting has provided a parking comparison of the required parking as per the Town’s Parking Code and recommended current industry standards. The redevelopment of the 581 property is proposed to consist of 44 residential units consisting of 18-1BR, 13-2BR and 13-3BR units with 84 parking spaces (+3 ADA spaces).

Town Regulation
- Based on the Town Code for a mixed-use development, the 44 residential units would require 44 parking spaces (1.0 space per unit) unless a greater or lesser number is deemed appropriate by the Commission.

Town Code
- Based on Town Code for a stand alone residential project, the 44 residential units (and bedroom mix) would require 96 parking spaces (2.0 spaces/1BR unit, 2.0 spaces/2BR unit, 2.6 spaces/3BR unit).

Current Industry Standards
- Based on studies prepared by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) as contained in their “parking Generation Manual”, 5th Edition, January 2019, the recommended Average Weekday Peak Parking rate for residential is 1.21 spaces per unit and would require 53 spaces and using the “higher” ITE 85th percentile Peak Parking rate of 1.52 spaces per unit would require 67 spaces which would be satisfied by the proposed 84 parking spaces.
The above parking information is summarized in the Table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town Code Mixed Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

84 parking spaces are proposed

In addition, it should be noted that there are some 39 overflow parking spaces at the adjacent office building 9 which would be available if needed as well as available parking at the GOP Office Park which has in excess of 1,400 parking spaces.

Notwithstanding any shared parking at the adjacent office building 9 and GOP Office Park, there will be adequate parking for the proposed 44 residential units based on current industry standards.

If you have any questions on the above or need any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us.
MEMORANDUM

To: John P. Tesei

From: Ronald P. Rieman, Project Manager
       John T. Collins, Ph.D., P.E.

Date: January 12, 2021

Re: 581 West Putnam Avenue
     Town of Greenwich, Connecticut
     MC Project No. 19005590A

The following are responses to the DPW Staff Report dated December 31, 2020 and comments from the Planning & Zoning Commission Public Hearing on Tuesday, January 6, 2021. It should be noted that many of these comments have been previously addressed, however are summarized below for ease of review:

DPW Staff Report dated December 31, 2020
(Traffic page 5)

1. As noted the revised Project will be submitted to the Connecticut Department of Transportation for the proposed changes to the driveway. “Response letter from Maser Consulting dated November 18, 2020 is acceptable”.

2. Access to the 581 property is currently provided via a full movement driveway to West Putnam Avenue (with no turn restrictions). It should be noted that the operation of this driveway would be enhanced by the elimination of the adjacent GOP exit driveway. As analyzed in the Traffic Impact Study, the existing 581 driveway is projected to operate at a Level of Service “C” during the Weekday Peak AM and Weekday Peak PM Hours.

   Based on the results of the analysis and anticipated traffic volumes, the driveway would operate at acceptable Levels of Service and there would be no need to restrict the driveway to right turns in and right turn out. However, the Applicant is agreeable to such condition if chronic traffic issues arise at this driveway warranting the undertaking of such mitigation measures.

As noted in Response 1, the Connecticut Department of Transportation will review this driveway as part of the Highway Work Permit process.
It should be noted that the redevelopment of the 581 Site for the previously approved 30,000 s.f. Office Building (which was approved twice), would result in significantly more traffic than the proposed 44 residential units (an additional 15 vehicles during the Weekday Peak AM Hour and an additional 11 vehicles during the Weekday Peak PM Hour).

Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting – January 5, 2020

3. The Traffic Impact Study dated December 18, 2019 used a conservative total background growth factor for the future traffic projections and the analysis are more than representative of future traffic conditions with and without the proposed Project. In addition as noted in Response 2 above, the “net” additional traffic of the redevelopment of the 581 Site for the previously approved 30,000 s.f. Office Building when compared to the 44 residential units would result in an additional 15 vehicles during the Weekday Peak AM Hour and an additional 11 vehicles during the Weekday Peak PM Hour.

4. As outlined in the Maser Consulting November 18, 2020 Response Memo, based on traffic counts conducted at the existing driveway to Valley Drive, there are 18 vehicles entering and 4 vehicles exiting during the Weekday Peak AM Hour and 4 vehicles entering and 19 vehicles exiting during the Weekday Peak PM Hour.

5. The operation of the existing 581 Driveway to West Putnam Avenue is address in DPW Response 2.

If you have any questions on the above or need any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us.

R:\Projects\2019\19005590A\Correspondence\OUT\210112_RPR_581 - PB&Z 01.05.21.docx
MEMO TO: Richard Hein, Chairman and Members of the Architectural Review Committee  
Marisa Anastasia, Planning and Zoning

FROM: Diane W. Fox, AICP, LLC

DATE: February 3, 2021

RE: Review of plans for 581 West Putnam Ave; Residential JLofts;

PLPZ202100012 for Exterior Alteration review for construction of a new multi-family residential structure with 44 units, including moderate income units, with new drive and parking areas, roof plantings and lighting, and site lighting and landscaping at a property located at 581 West Putnam Avenue in the GBO zone.

I am submitting this statement on behalf of property owners on Alden Road who are represented by the law firm of Whitman Breed Abbot and Morgan, LLC. Alden Road immediately abuts the applicant’s property at the Greenwich Office Park. There are several issues that need to be addressed regarding the size, mass, height and design of the residential building that we want to bring to your attention. There are also concerns and issues over landscaping and lighting and their impact upon the nearby residences.

1 - **Size and Mass of the Residential Building and Number of Stories**. This new 44-unit residential building is proposed at 65,491 sf which is only slightly smaller by 2,000 sf than the 2018 plan with the 67 units. The design, size and mass of the building does not reflect a "residential" feel but rather appears more commercial/office in design. Its scale and mass—especially from the rear which is what the Alden Road residences will see—appears to be a very long and "box-in-a-box" design building not reflective of surrounding buildings or materials.

2 - **Materials, Colors and Horizontal Dimensions**. The materials, colors and horizontal dimensions of the building were not shown in detail at the P&Z meeting. It is very difficult to read the plans submitted to your Committee to identify what materials and colors will be on each façade. If any are of reflective material they could pose a problem for the residences on Alden Road with glare at various times of the day. We hope that samples of the materials and colors will be present at your meeting so that those of us on the Zoom meeting can see them.

3 - **Detailed Lighting and Landscaping Plans**. No detailed lighting or landscaping plans were shown or otherwise conveyed at the P&Z meeting and there is strong concern that up-lighting of landscapes or the building will directly and negatively impact the Alden Road neighbors. There are an insignificant number of evergreen and deciduous trees which could otherwise help soften the building and provide screening not just for the neighbors but the residents of the building, especially in the rear of the building which will oversee the office buildings and parking areas. A living wall (such as at J House) might also be employed on some of the facades of the building to soften its impact and create a more fitting and appropriate exterior.

4 - **Rooftop terrace, Noise and Lighting are Serious Concerns for the Neighbors**.

a) The rooftop terrace is showing a pavilion, bar and 3 barbeque grills along the North side of the building – closest to the Alden Road residents. These activities are highly likely to involve partying, music, noise, fumes and lighting that will carry up the hill and into the Alden Road neighborhood. The Alden neighbors “look down” on the development...
geographically and will be adversely affected by noise and light pollution. With 44 units there is bound to be ongoing use for this terrace during at least 3 seasons during the day and night. There is strong neighborhood concerns and opposition to noise and lighting, especially at night.

i- These active areas should be relocated to the south side of the roof terrace along West Putnam Ave to ensure more privacy for both the building residents and for the Alden Road residents. This would potentially lessen the impact of rooftop activities on Alden Road neighbors and ensure a higher quality of life for the building residents.

ii- There is a need to control the hours of operation of this terrace to restrict any uses that involve excessive lighting, noise, smells or other disturbances to the neighborhood.

b) There is inadequate landscaping on the rooftop. We suggest a "living wall with evergreen plantings "along with planters along the north and southwest areas of the rooftop facing Alden Road.

c) There appears to be no playground or other useable or suitable outdoor recreation area on site for residents' children to engage in outdoor activities. The rooftop terrace is not a safe area for children to use as a play area. The applicant states that the residents can use the Office Park property and sidewalks. However, Greenwich is not a concrete jungle and such areas are woefully insufficient as children will need grassed areas to play ball and run around. Surrounded by offices and parking lots is not a "park like setting" for residents as advertised by applicant and there are no nearby parks or recreational activity areas provided by the town within the immediate walking area.

We appreciate this opportunity to address the ARC with the concerns of the Alden Road neighbors and hope you can help us remedy these deficiencies in the proposed design.