**LOCATION:**

97 and 99 East Elm Street

**EXISTING ZONING:**

R-6

**PARCEL SIZE:**

9756 sf and 9281 sf

**UTILITIES:**

Public Sewer, public water

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Statistics</th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>PERMITTED</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GROSS SQUARE FEET:</td>
<td>3500 sf</td>
<td>5365 sf / 5104 sf</td>
<td>5102 sf / 5102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLOOR AREA RATIO:</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.52 / 0.549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN AREA:</td>
<td>60 %</td>
<td>35 %</td>
<td>37.5 % / 42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING COVERAGE:</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO. OF STORIES:</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEIGHT:</td>
<td>35’</td>
<td>34’ 3”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># OF RESIDENTIAL UNITS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># OF BEDROOMS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING SETBACKS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Front Yard Setback:</td>
<td>25’</td>
<td>49.8’ / 36.9’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Side Yard Setback:</td>
<td>15’ total (no less than 5’ each side)</td>
<td>6.5’ / 8.5’; 5’/10’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rear Yard Setback:</td>
<td>25’</td>
<td>34.4’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3rd UPDATE**

This staff report will refer to both 97 and 99 East Elm Street as the Commission has reviewed this project several times and has always discussed both sites simultaneously during meetings. The Commission last reviewed this project at the 4-27-2021 meeting. The outstanding issue was the access to the drive shared between 93 and 97 as the new proposed drive for 97 and 99 does not meet the 50’ foot separating distance per DPW Highway standards. DPW comments have indicated that if the applicant relinquished access to the existing drive, then the new driveway
would meet their standards. The hold up at the last meeting was that DPW anticipated that P+Z would condition and enforce such a requirement, which is generally not the standard. However, it is understood in this situation that the applicant is voluntarily relinquishing their rights to access. The P+Z Commission can accept such a relinquishment, and may include conditions in their decision that require the applicant to note such relinquishment on plans and/or post the Declaration of Restrictions language on land records.

The applicant has submitted Declaration of Restrictions language. Based on recent discussions with DPW, the language can read “vehicular access”. DPW has indicated that the relinquishment of access will result in the proposed driveway meeting their standard.

2nd UPDATE
This project was most recently reviewed at the March 30, 2021 meeting and was left open to allow for the applicant to submit language for the relinquishment of access over the existing shared driveway with 93 East Elm. The applicant has since submitted such language which has been forwarded to all applicable parties. A letter prepared by Tony D’Andrea dated 3-31-21 establishes that the applicant is amenable to relinquishing rights to access (egress/ingress) over the shared driveway in relation to the conditions of the Site Plan / Special Permit, but not to relinquishing rights of access over their property. DPW Engineering is hoping to submit comments in regard to the proposed language on Monday, 4-26.

There was discussion regarding screening along the west side. The consensus was that solid continuous fencing would be installed for screening purposes with emphasis on screening the carports with solid fence. The Commission established that the “good side” of the fence would face 93 East Elm. Staff asks if some plantings (arborvitae) will be planted on this western side or just the fence installed?

As this project has been reviewed several times, the Commission noted the following items have been addressed:

1. Zoning comments have been addressed.
2. Soils information for landscaping has been addressed.

UPDATE
This project, along with the project on the neighboring property of 99 East Elm St., were reviewed most recently at the 12-1-2020 P+Z meeting as preliminary site plans and special permits. The Commission issued a “move to final” on the preliminary site plan. The Decision included requirements for specific information to be submitted with the request for Final Site Plan. Some of that information has been submitted, and some has not. Staff has contacted the applicant, but with the time clock running, staff felt it important for the Commission to take an inventory and provide specific input to the applicant at this stage.

Due to the less than 50’ between two drives on one property (DPW Highway standard), DPW comments require the applicant to relinquish access over the shared 93 – 97 drive and to submit a legal document to be reviewed by Law, P+Z and DPW. This can be reviewed prior to Zoning Permit sign off. The Semenuks at 93 East Elm St. to the west are concerned that the
relinquishment of the use will adversely affect the shared maintenance of the subject driveway. The development plan shows a snow stockpile on the adjacent 99 East Elm St. site.

Landscaping plans show a proposed privacy fence and plantings. Dimensions have been added to this rendering but soil type / depth to ledge is still needed to confirm the plantings will fit and survive. The Commission also requested a grading detail for the area between the new house and the existing drive on the western property line. Additional cross sections were added to the landscaping plans however the cross sections need to show the numeric elevation for the final grade at 97 along with the existing grade of the shared driveway with 93.

The development plan has been updated to show AC units as requested by the Commission. Plans confirm that a basement is proposed – techniques to ensure no damage is incurred to the shared drive with 93 should be used during excavation. DPW requires that the carport be closed off to the west -- the carport cross section on plan A402 shows a 1.5’ wall with lattice above to close off the carport.

Per Zoning comments, the decks cannot encroach on setbacks including the setbacks between the two new structures.

Conservation comments dated 3/23/21 request submittal of additional storm water information to determine if groundwater infiltration can be achieved with revisions. No comments were offered on the landscaping plans as they thought no plans had been submitted. P+Z staff re-forwarded the landscaping plans to Conservation on 3/25 for their review. Comments further point out that it is very important to maintain a proper construction entrance to avoid any sediment running off into storm drains.

Sewer comments from the preliminary site plan do not require any information prior to approval.

APPLICATION SUMMARY
Applications for final site plan and special permit were submitted to demolish the single family residence and detached garage and construct a new two family residence with attached garages, carport, outdoor parking space, shared driveway and retaining walls on a 9756 sf property located at 97 East Elm Street in the R-6 zone. The applicant requests approval from the Planning and Zoning Commission for the final site plan and special permit per Sections 6-5, 6-9, 6-13, 6-14 - 6-17, 6-98, 6-155 and 6-205 of the Building Zone Regulations (BZR).

ISSUES / COMMENTS
1. DPW Engineering – DPW will accept the relinquishment of access as volunteered by the applicant and conditioned by the P+Z Commission. The language can read “vehicular access”.
2. Screening along west side shall include solid fencing, good side facing 93 East Elm St. Will some plantings (arborvitae) be planted, or just the fence installed on this western side?
3. Sewer – Comments dated 3/26/2021 detail items to be addressed during the Building Permit phase with no requirements prior to Site Plan / Special Permit approval.
4. **Zoning** – Zoning comments dated 4/22/21 indicate compliance with applicable BZR.
6. **IWWA** – The Inland Wetlands Department determined no IWWA permit was required per a greensheet sign off dated August 2019.

**DEPARTMENT COMMENTS**
Zoning Enforcement – 4/22/21 comments attached
Sewer – 3/26/21 (from prelim. Site plan) attached
Conservation – 3/29/21 email attached
DPW Engineering – 3/15/21 comments attached – awaiting updated comments on proposed Declaration language

**EXISTING CONDITIONS**
The 9756 sf and 9281 sf properties are located on the north side of East Elm Street in the R-6 zone. The overall site moderately slopes toward East Elm Street. The site was previously improved with a single family houses on each property. There is a shared 10’ wide drive on the westerly boundary, five feet of which is located on the 93 East Elm Street property and five feet on 97 East Elm Street. There are single family residences to the west and north with condominium developments across the street to the south.

No previous applications such as site plans, subdivisions or Zoning variances were found for 97 East Elm Street via a search of databases and archived files.

**Site Plan**
Two new two family dwellings are proposed with attached garages, shared carport, and outdoor parking spaces. Retaining walls are proposed along the front of the property and in the northwest corner and along the rear of the property. A total cut of 331 cubic yards is proposed with no filling over the two properties of 97 and 99 East Elm Street. A sidewalk will be constructed to DPW Highway standards and a 3 foot grass strip established along the front of the property on East Elm.

97 East Elm will not be permitted to use the existing driveway shared with 93 East Elm for access per the DPW Engineering comments due to the deficient distance between two drives. The property is proposed to be accessed via a shared driveway between 97 and 99 East Elm Street. The curb cut and drive already exist on the 99 East Elm Street site and will be expanded and upgraded for access to both new two family dwellings on 97 and 99 East Elm properties. The language to relinquish access over the shared drive with 93 is required to be reviewed before being recorded on land records.

The Drainage Summary report indicates that the existing drainage pattern of the site, which slopes toward East Elm and drains to the Town system, will be generally maintained post construction. The central driveway court is proposed to be porous asphalt and a series of new catch basins are proposed to catch runoff throughout the site. DPW has accepted the Drainage Summary Report and Plan in concept with revisions required prior to Zoning Permit sign off.
Conservation comments request that the drainage system be updated to achieve groundwater infiltration. The sight distance plans and traffic report have been submitted and were accepted by DPW.

Per Section 6-155 of the Building Zone Regulations, five parking spaces are required on each lot based on two dwelling units containing four bedrooms each. Two of the spaces are required to be “garage” spaces while the remaining three may be outdoor spaces as follows:

\[(2 \text{ dwelling units with } 3+ \text{ bedrooms each} \times 1.6 \text{ outdoor spaces}) = 3.2 \text{ (round down to 3) outdoor spaces required.}\]
\[(2 \text{ dwelling units with } 3+ \text{ bedrooms each} \times 1 \text{ garage space}) = 2 \text{ garage parking spaces required.}\]

The attached garages and carport account for four spaces and there is one outdoor parking spot in the rear of the property.

Landscaping plans have been submitted and show two dogwood trees in the front of the property with a combination of plantings throughout the rest of the property. Arborvitae are proposed along the western boundary which will provide screening along with a privacy fence. Cypress are proposed along the rear of the property (northern boundary). Dimensions and additional cross sections have been added to landscaping plans.

Green area minimum for the R-6 zone is 35%, and calculations indicate proposed conditions will result in 37.5% of total green area on 97 and 42% on 99.

The FAR diagrams show the following calculations for each of the two family dwellings - 1288 sf of floor area on the first floor, 1263 sf on the second floor and the 461 sf third floor is not counted due to it being less than 40% of the floor below. The total FAR is 5102 sf on each lot.

Sedimentation and Erosion Control plans show the site to be protected with silt fencing, silt sacks to be used in catch basins, an anti-tracking pad will be established on the existing accessway and the road will be swept periodically to keep it free from mud. Two stockpile areas have been located and are shown to be surrounded with silt fencing. It appears a 14” diameter tree (“DW” on plans) will remain in place in the front of the property while a 16” (birch?) will be removed. Conservation notes the importance of maintaining a proper construction entrance in order to avoid sediment run off to catch basins / storm drains.

**Special Permit**

Since a cross easement is required for site access and drainage, the conversion from single family to two family requires a Special Permit application review per Section 6-98(a)(4)(A). The Special Permit use can be approved if the Planning and Zoning Commission determines that such use is appropriate to the neighborhood, having consideration for the number and proximity of single family dwellings and two-family dwellings, for the number, character, and proximity of other uses, for the amount and location of undeveloped land in the vicinity and the relationship
of such land to the pattern of open space in the neighborhood development scheme, and for the proximity to other zones, either more or less restrictive and other standards provided in this Article and the Standards contained in Sections 6-15 and 6-17.

**Pertinent Regulations:**
Sec. 6-155. PARKING AND GARAGES FOR TWO-FAMILY AND MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL PURPOSES.
1. Dwelling or group of dwellings to accommodate two or more families (9/28/2010)…
   (b) Dwelling with three or more bedrooms*: one garage space for each dwelling and 1.6 outdoor spaces for each dwelling…

**Applicable Regulations**
Sections 6-5, 6-9, 6-13, 6-14 - 6-17, 6-98, 6-128, 6-155 and 6-205 of the Building Zone Regulations (BZR).
DEPARTMENT COMMENTS
ZONING ENFORCEMENT

Project No.  PLPZ20210020  Preliminary  Final  X

Reviewed for Planning and Zoning Commission.

TITLE OF PLAN REVIEWED:  97 E. Elm Properties, LLC.

LOCATION:  97 East Elm Street

PLAN DATE:

ZONE:  R-6

☐ 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.

Reviewed by:  Jodi Couture  Date:  4/22/2021

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

From: Moch, Aleksandra
Sent: Monday, March 29, 2021 12:07 PM
To: Anastasio, Marisa
Subject: RE: 97 and 99 East Elm St.

Dear Marisa,

Thank you for sharing the attached plan with me. The proposed plants will help with the mitigation of the hard surfaces and storm water management at the site. The evergreen trees will provide structure for wildlife and screening for the neighborhood. It is recommended that the perennial/annual mix will include at least 30% native species. Leyland cypress is a fast growing and non-native tree. Its mature size may take up too much space and light. It would be beneficial if replaced with native American Holly (easy to trim) or spruces and/or a combination of native evergreens. This great addition of mix evergreens will improve the environmental values and function of this area.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Regards,

Aleksandra Moch
Environmental Analyst
Conservation Commission
Town of Greenwich
101 Field Point Road
Greenwich, CT 06830
Tel: 203 622 3822

From: Anastasio, Marisa
Sent: Thursday, March 25, 2021 9:14 PM
To: Moch, Aleksandra <Aleksandra.Moch@greenwichct.org>
Subject: 97 and 99 East Elm St.

Hi Aleks,

I noticed your comments for 97 and 99 East Elm indicate that no landscaping plan was submitted. The applicant submitted a plan with the Final Site Plan and I have attached the most updated version here. I thought we sent it to you but if you can review that would be appreciated. We have asked the applicant to submit soils types and better elevations to show that the plantings will survive in the narrow area between the house on 97 and the existing shared drive to the west. Thank you,

Marisa Anastasio, Senior Planner
Town of Greenwich Planning and Zoning
101 Field Point Road
Greenwich, CT 06830
We have prepared the following comments and questions regarding the proposed application.

Project Summary:
- 97 East Elm Street: Remove existing house and garage and replace it with a two-family residential building. This project will share a driveway with 99 East Elm Street.
- 99 East Elm Street: Remove existing house and garage and replace it with a two-family residential building. This project will share a driveway with 97 East Elm Street.

Sewer Division Comments:
As indicated in the Sewer Division’s prior comments dated July 28, 2020 and June 9, 2020, the following comments still apply and need to be addressed:

Comments to be addressed during P&Z phase:
- None.

Comments to be addressed during Sewer and Building Permit phase:
It does not appear that any of the Sewer Division’s comments from 2020 have been addressed. They are again repeated.
97 East Elm Street:
- Please coordinate with the Sewer Division for all necessary Sewer Permits. The existing Sewer Permit (PRSD201900903) obtained on January 09, 2020 is void, as this proposal differs greatly from what was already submitted and approved. Please coordinate directly with the Sewer Division regarding Sewer Permits.
- The proposed plan related to sanitary sewer infrastructure will need to be revised as follows:
  - Instead of an 8-inch diameter common private shared line, please use a 6-inch diameter common private shared line. We do not believe that four units will create enough flushing velocity in an 8-inch line.
  - The proposed sewer manhole on the Town’s sewer main in East Elm (SSMH #2) is not acceptable. The Sewer Division will not approve a sewer manhole structure on our main. The connection to the main will either require an 8” x 6” saddle fitting on the main or an Insert-A-Tee connection. The determination will need to be made in the field based on the as-built conditions (whether the main
was installed on a concrete cradle, etc.) with our Environmental Asset Engineer present. Please coordinate directly with the Sewer Division.

- The proposed laterals from each building can be 4-inch diameter that tie into the private common 6-inch diameter main.
- The proposed private sanitary sewer manhole structure (SSMH#1) will need to meet the Sewer Division standards, this will need to include proper boots to make the three pipe connections to the sewer manhole structure waterproof, the invert and bench constructed with red brick, a sewer manhole frame and cover that is heavy duty similar to a Campbell Foundry Pattern 1200 or similar, etc. The manhole structure will also require sufficient coating systems utilized to keep it watertight, as it is being proposed to be installed in a permeable pavement area. Please coordinate directly with the Sewer Division for details.

- The existing sanitary sewer lateral that serves this property will need to be capped at the Town sewer main in East Elm Street.
- The location of the proposed storm drain manhole (SDMH “B”) must be coordinated with the Sewer Division as well as the Engineering and Highway Divisions. Adequate space must be provided between the outside face of the proposed storm drain manhole structure and the existing Town sanitary sewer main. Please coordinate with the Sewer Division during sewer permitting. Plans submitted during sewer permitting must show the proposed clearances, etc.
- Any portion of sanitary sewer lateral that crosses under drainage areas, permeable paver or pervious pavement areas, or within 10-feet of storm drainage systems (such as cultecs) are required to be encased in concrete to the nearest upstream and downstream joints to inhibit infiltration. Please coordinate with the Sewer Division for details.
- 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/installation.
- 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.

99 East Elm Street:
- Please coordinate with the Sewer Division for all necessary Sewer Permits. The existing Sewer Permit (PRSD201900570) obtained on September 11, 2019 is void, as this proposal differs greatly from what was already submitted and approved. Please coordinate directly with the Sewer Division regarding Sewer Permits.
- The proposed plan related to sanitary sewer infrastructure will need to be revised as follows:
Instead of an 8-inch diameter common private shared line, please use a 6-inch diameter common private shared line. We do not believe that four units will create enough flushing velocity in an 8-inch line.

The proposed sewer manhole on the Town’s sewer main in East Elm (SSMH #2) is not acceptable. The Sewer Division will not approve a sewer manhole structure on our main. The connection to the main will either require an 8” x 6” saddle fitting on the main or an Insert-A-Tee connection. The determination will need to be made in the field based on the as-built conditions (whether the main was installed on a concrete cradle, etc.) with our Environmental Asset Engineer present. Please coordinate directly with the Sewer Division.

The proposed laterals from each building can be 4-inch diameter that tie into the private common 6-inch diameter main.

The proposed private sanitary sewer manhole structure (SSMH#1) will need to meet the Sewer Division standards, this will need to include proper boots to make the three pipe connections to the sewer manhole structure waterproof, the invert and bench constructed with red brick, a sewer manhole frame and cover that is heavy duty similar to a Campbell Foundry Pattern 1200 or similar, etc. The manhole structure will also require sufficient coating systems utilized to keep it watertight, as it is being proposed to be installed in a permeable pavement area. Please coordinate directly with the Sewer Division for details.

The existing sanitary sewer lateral that serves this property will need to be capped at the Town sewer main in East Elm Street.

The location of the proposed storm drain manhole (SDMH “B”) must be coordinated with the Sewer Division as well as the Engineering and Highway Divisions. Adequate space must be provided between the outside face of the proposed storm drain manhole structure and the existing Town sanitary sewer main. Please coordinate with the Sewer Division during sewer permitting. Plans submitted during sewer permitting must show the proposed clearances, etc.

Any portion of sanitary sewer lateral that crosses under drainage areas, permeable paver or pervious pavement areas, or within 10-feet of storm drainage systems (such as cultecs) are required to be encased in concrete to the nearest upstream and downstream joints to inhibit infiltration. Please coordinate with the Sewer Division for details.

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/installation.

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.
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS – ENGINEERING DIVISION
SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

Engineering Project No. 20-5(22)  Submittal Reviewed For: Planning and Zoning
Department Project No. PLPZ202100050, 51 Traffic Review Requested: No
Submittal Received Date: 4/7/2021 Review Type: Final Site Plan

PLAN SET INFORMATION

Plan Title: 97 & 99 E. Elm Properties, LLC Project Address: 97 & 99 East Elm Street
Engineering Firm: Rocco V. D’Andrea, Inc.
Original Plan Date: 3/6/2020 Latest Plan Revision Date: 4/12/2021

DRAINAGE SUMMARY REPORT INFORMATION

Engineering Firm: Rocco V. D’Andrea, Inc.
Original Report Date: 3/6/2020 Latest Report Revision Date: 2/11/2021

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.

Reviewed and Approved by: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________
Scott Marucci - Senior Civil Engineer

COMMENTS AND CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL: Resubmit Prior to Final Site Plan Approval

1. After further review, it was determined that the Department of Public Works would be responsible for enforcing the access of the shared driveway on 93 & 97 East Elm Street. The Department of Public Works does not have the necessary enforcement authority to enforce the access under the Town Municipal Code. Therefore, the proposed driveway for 97 & 99 East Elm Street cannot be recommended for approval as proposed.
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS – ENGINEERING DIVISION
SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

Submittal Reviewed For: Planning and Zoning

PLAN SET INFORMATION

Plan Title: 97 & 99 E. Elm Properties, LLC
Project Address: 97 & 99 East Elm Street

Engineering Firm: Rocco V. D’Andrea, Inc.

Original Plan Date: 3/6/2020
Latest Plan Revision Date: 2/11/2021

DRAINAGE SUMMARY REPORT INFORMATION

Engineering Firm: Rocco V. D’Andrea, Inc.

Original Report Date: 3/6/2020
Latest Report Revision Date: 2/11/2021

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.

Reviewed and Approved by: Scott Marucci - Senior Civil Engineer
Date: 3/15/21

COMMENTS AND CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL: Resubmit Prior to Zoning/Building Permit Approval

2. As discussed with the Deputy Commissioner of Public Works, the following are the requirements for the proposed shared driveway between 97 & 99 East Elm Street and the existing shared driveway as documented on the land records that will remain on 93 and 97 East Elm Street:
   a. The distance from the existing driveway on 93 & 97 East Elm Street that will remain is less than the minimum required 50-feet to the proposed second driveway on 97 & 99 East Elm Street. The following must be made conditions of the approval:
      i. No access to the existing driveway on 93 & 97 East Elm Street will be allowed for 97 & 99 East Elm Street. The proposed carport on 97 East Elm Street must have a solid wall between 97 East Elm Street and the driveway on 93 & 97 East Elm Street.
      ii. Given the driveway conditions as described above, DPW has determined that 97 East Elm Street must relinquish its rights to use the existing shared driveway for access (ingress/egress), filing the necessary documents on the Town’s land records.
      iii. The necessary documents to be filed on the Town’s land records must be submitted for review to P&Z, Law, and DPW.
iv. The submittal for the sign-off of the zoning/building permit must include a copy of the filed document with the volume and page on it.

3. The draft drainage maintenance agreement between the lots is acceptable to the Engineering Division. Planning & Zoning and Law Department should review and approve the draft prior to final site plan approval.

4. The draft driveway easement should be reviewed by Planning & Zoning and the Law Department prior to final site plan approval.

5. A revised Form SC-107 needs to be submitted.

6. The Drainage Summary Report is acceptable in concept. The following revisions and additional information need to be submitted:
   a. The RRV for POC A needs to be revised. Based on HydroCad the existing RRV = 834 CF and the proposed RRV = 386 + 1,774 + 491 = 2,651 CF. Review the HydroCad results and revise.
   b. The two catch basins at the end of the driveway must have stormwater filters added to them. The engineer must submit the manufactures cut sheets on the proposed product for review.

7. The construction plan set shall be revised as follows:
   a. Site Plan Sheets
      i. On Site Plan Sheet 1 of 3 and on the Pedestrian Bypass Plan add the following callout:
         1. Pedestrian access to the sidewalk must be maintained throughout the project.
      i. The sump elevation for CB#1 seems to be incorrect. Review and revise.
   b. Construction Details Sheets
      i. The Asphalt Profile A-A is a section and not a profile. The name needs to be revised to Porous Asphalt Section A-A. The following needs to be revised:
         1. The impermeable liner running down the edge of the buildings past the bottom of the footings needs to be clearly shown (building and garage footings need to be shown). No footing drains can be located within the stone bed of the porous asphalt system. See the attached marked up plan for how the impermeable liner needs to separate the footing drain from the stone bed of the stormwater BMP.

8. The draft Operations and Maintenance Plan Report for each lot needs to be revised as follows:
   a. A draft Stormwater Management Practices Maintenance Declaration must be submitted prior to Construction Plan Approval (Building Permit). The final version must be submitted with the request for Certificate of Occupancy.
   b. Exhibit A needs to have a maintenance item added for the following:
      i. The stormwater filters for the catch basins.
      ii. The gravel beds below the decks.

**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:
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS – ENGINEERING DIVISION
SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

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).
The impermeable liner must separate the stormwater BMP from the footing drain.
3-31-21 D'Andrea Letter
March 31, 2021

Scott Marucci
Town of Greenwich
Engineering Division
101 Field Point Road
Greenwich CT 06830

Re: 97-99 East Elm Street, Greenwich
PLPZ 2021 50, 51

Dear Mr. Marucci,

The purpose of this letter is to clarify the intent of Items 2.a.i, ii, iii included in your comments dated March 15, 2021, and to propose a response that will facilitate receipt of approval for the referenced application.

It is our understanding that your comments are based on your interpretation of the DPW Design Criteria – Driveway dated July 10, 2006 that requires driveways to be separated by 50 feet.

We accept your interpretation. However, we should note that prior to the recent construction of No. 93 East Elm Street, the driveways between No. 93 and the driveway serving No. 97 were not separated by 50 feet.

Also of note is that the proposed driveway serving No. 97 and 99 will be separated by a greater distance than currently exists.

2.a.i. The Site Plans that have been submitted have been designed with a centrally located driveway. Due to the proposed grading and location of the building on No. 97, it will not be possible to provide vehicular access from the driveway that currently serves No. 93 East Elm Street.

Current zoning regulations limit the height of a wall around a carport to 18 inches, and the architectural plans reflect compliance with that regulation.

We have proposed to the P&Z Commission that we will include a notation on the Development Plan and the Zoning Location Survey (ZLS) specifically documenting the
prohibitions against vehicular access for ingress and egress to 97 and 99 East Elm Street over the existing driveway serving No. 93.

We are writing to request your concurrence to that a notation on the ZLS and Site Plans is an appropriate means of addressing your concern.

2.a. ii. In this comment, you wrote that “DPW has determined that 97 East Elm Street must relinquish its rights to use the existing shared driveway for access (ingress / egress) filing the necessary documents on the Town’s land records”.

The owners of No. 97 will not relinquish their rights of access over their property as outlined in the easement documents filed on Book 671, Page 450 of the Greenwich Land Records (copy attached).

However, they have agreed to file a document on the land records stating their acceptance of a condition to the site plan approval that would prohibit vehicular ingress and egress specifically related to the referenced applications PLPZ 2021 50, 51.

In the event that the approval of PLPZ 2021 50, 51 were to become null and void, so would the prohibition.

We are writing to request your consent to filing a document that prohibits the use of the driveway serving No. 93 for vehicular ingress and egress as it relates to the approval of Site Plans PLPZ 50, 51.

2.a. iii. As described in 2.a.i and ii, the documents will be submitted to DPW, Law and P&Z for review and comment before filing. At their public hearing held on March 30, 2021, the Planning and Zoning Commission left their hearing open pending resolution of your comments. At prior hearings, the applicants had agreed to a condition imposed on the Site Plan approval that would prohibit vehicular access to No. 97 and 99 via the driveway serving No. 93 East Elm Street.

Pursuant to discussions with the Commission at the March 30, 2021 hearing, the applicant’s attorney agreed to file a document specifying the condition.

We believe that filing a document on the land records specifically related to prohibition of vehicular ingress and egress as it relates to the referenced Site Plans would be the most expedient path to final approval since it would address your concern, and it would preserve the rights of the owners to the reciprocal rights of access in accordance with the easement recorded in Book 671, Page 450.

Rocco V. D'Andrea, Inc.
Thank you for your consideration in this regard. We would appreciate the opportunity to discuss this issue either in person, via Zoom, or by telephone.

Sincerely,

ROCCO V. D'ANDREA, INC.

Anthony L. D’Andrea, PE&LS

cc: Krist Dodaro, AIA
Christopher Bristol, Esquire
Engineering Project No. 20-5(22)  
Department Project No.  
PLP202100050, 51  
Submittal Received Date: 2/24/2021

Submittal Reviewed For:  
Planning and Zoning

Traffic Review Requested: No  
Review Type: Final Site Plan

PLAN SET INFORMATION

Plan Title: 97 & 99 E. Elm Properties, LLC  
Project Address: 97 & 99 East Elm Street

Engineering Firm:  
Roeco V. D'Andrea, Inc.  
Original Plan Date: 3/6/2020  
Latest Plan Revision Date: 2/11/2021

DRAINAGE SUMMARY REPORT INFORMATION

Engineering Firm:  
Roeco V. D'Andrea, Inc.  
Original Report Date: 3/6/2020  
Latest Report Revision Date: 2/11/2021

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.

Reviewed and Approved by:  
Scott Marucci - Senior Civil Engineer  
Date: 3/15/21

COMMENTS AND CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:  
Resubmit Prior to Zoning/Building Permit Approval


2. As discussed with the Deputy Commissioner of Public Works, the following are the requirements for the proposed shared driveway between 97 & 99 East Elm Street and the existing shared driveway as documented on the land records that will remain on 93 and 97 East Elm Street:
   a. The distance from the existing driveway on 93 & 97 East Elm Street that will remain is less than the minimum required 50-feet to the proposed second driveway on 97 & 99 East Elm Street. The following must be made conditions of the approval:
      i. No access to the existing driveway on 93 & 97 East Elm Street will be allowed for 97 & 99 East Elm Street. The proposed carport on 97 East Elm Street must have a solid wall between 97 East Elm Street and the driveway on 93 & 97 East Elm Street.
      ii. Given the driveway conditions as described above, DPW has determined that 97 East Elm Street must relinquish its rights to use the existing shared driveway for access (ingress/egress), filing the necessary documents on the Town’s land records.
      iii. The necessary documents to be filed on the Town’s land records must be submitted for review to P&Z, Law, and DPW.
iv. The submittal for the sign-off of the zoning/building permit must include a copy of the filed
document with the volume and page on it.

3. The draft drainage maintenance agreement between the lots is acceptable to the Engineering Division. Planning &
Zoning and Law Department should review and approve the draft prior to final site plan approval.

4. The draft driveway easement should be reviewed by Planning & Zoning and the Law Department prior to final site
plan approval.

5. A revised Form SC-107 needs to be submitted.

6. The Drainage Summary Report is acceptable in concept. The following revisions and additional information need
 to be submitted:
   a. The RRV for POC A needs to be revised. Based on HydroCad the existing RRV = 834 CF and the proposed
      RRV = 386 + 1,774 + 491 = 2,651 CF. Review the HydroCad results and revise.
   b. The two catch basins at the end of the driveway must have stormwater filters added to them. The engineer
      must submit the manufactures cut sheets on the proposed product for review.

7. The construction plan set shall be revised as follows:
   a. Site Plan Sheets
      i. On Site Plan Sheet 1 of 3 and on the Pedestrian Bypass Plan add the following callout:
         1. Pedestrian access to the sidewalk must be maintained throughout the project.
      i. The sump elevation for CB#1 seems to be incorrect. Review and revise.
   b. Construction Details Sheets
      i. The Asphalt Profile A-A is a section and not a profile. The name needs to be revised to Porous
         Asphalt Section A-A. The following needs to be revised:
            1. The impermeable liner running down the edge of the buildings past the bottom of the
               footings needs to be clearly shown (building and garage footings need to be shown). No
               footing drains can be located within the stone bed of the porous asphalt system. See the
               attached marked up plan for how the impermeable liner needs to separate the footing drain
               from the stone bed of the stormwater BMP.

8. The draft Operations and Maintenance Plan Report for each lot needs to be revised as follows:
   a. A draft Stormwater Management Practices Maintenance Declaration must be submitted prior to
      Construction Plan Approval (Building Permit). The final version must be submitted with the request for
      Certificate of Occupancy.
   b. Exhibit A needs to have a maintenance item added for the following:
      i. The stormwater filters for the catch basins.
      ii. The gravel beds below the decks.

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:
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS – ENGINEERING DIVISION
SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

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).
AGREEMENT made this 29th day of June, 1962, by and between
EDNA B. FINCH, of the Town of Greenwich, County of Fairfield and
State of Connecticut, hereinafter referred to as "Finch", and
ARTHUR B. CALDWELL and ROSE CALDWELL, both of said Town of Green-
wich, County of Fairfield and State of Connecticut, hereinafter
referred to as "Caldwell",

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, Finch is the owner of a certain piece or parcel of
land situate in the Town of Greenwich, County of Fairfield and
State of Connecticut, bounded and described as follows:

All that certain tract, piece or parcel of land and
known as Lot No. 6 on a certain plan made by S. E. Minor, Civil
Engineers, and filed or to be filed in the Town Clerk's Office
of said Greenwich, entitled, "Property of J. Frederick Bain,
Greenwich, Conn.". Said lot is bounded Northerly 45 feet by
land of William E. Anthony and Frank Johnson; Easterly 213.35
feet by Lot No. 7 on said map; Southerly 50 feet by the high-
way known as East Elm Street and Westerly 223.25 feet by Lot
No. 5 on said map. Together with all right, title and in-
terest of the Releasor in and to highway in front of said
premises to the center line thereof; and

WHEREAS, Caldwell is the owner of premises immediately adjacent
to the above described property on the easterly side, which
premises are bounded and described as follows:

ALL that certain tract, piece or parcel of land with
the buildings and improvements thereon, situated in the Town
of Greenwich, County of Fairfield and State of Connecticut,
known and designated as Lot #7 on map entitled, "Property
of J. Frederick Bain at Greenwich, Conn.", numbered 295 in
the Greenwich Town Clerk's Office particularly bounded and
described as follows:

BOUNDARIES: Northerly 45 feet by land formerly of Anthony,
Easterly 203.50 feet by Lot #8 on said map, Southerly 50
feet by East Elm Street and Westerly 213.35 feet by Lot #6
on said map; and

WHEREAS, it is the intention of the parties hereto to
establish a driveway between the houses erected upon the respective
The premises above described and ingress and egress to and from said respective premises;

Now, Therefore, this Agreement witnesseth: That the parties hereto, in consideration of the sum of One Dollar ($1.00), and other good and valuable considerations, do hereby agree as follows:

1. The parties hereto do hereby create, locate and permanently establish a right of way or driveway as shown on a certain survey entitled, "Property of Mary K. Busch", prepared by S. E. Minor & Co., Inc., Civil Engineers, certified substantially correct by Allan S. Devaul dated June 29, 1961. Said driveway is generally described as follows: Commencing at the intersection of the boundary line between the premises above described with the northerly line of East Elm Street and encompassing the easterly more or less five (5) feet of the premises first above described and the westerly five (5) feet of the premises secondly above described and running to a depth of two hundred (200) feet more or less from the said northerly line of East Elm Street.

2. Said right of way or driveway shall not be built upon and shall be kept open and unobstructed for the benefit of, and may be used in common by, all the respective owners and occupants, present and future, of the respective premises above described and the several buildings erected thereon, for ingress and egress, to and from said lands and buildings; and said driveway shall be maintained in common by all the respective owners, present and future, of the said lands and dwellings; and the easements hereby created shall run with, and become and be appurtenant to, the respective premises above described.

3. Finch and Caldwell do further agree that the covenants
herein contained shall be binding on the parties hereto and their heirs, executors and assigns.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have duly executed this agreement the day and year first above written.

Witness:  
John G. Heagney  
Edna B. Finch  
Marianne LoConto  
Arthur B. Caldwell  
Rose Caldwell  
L.S.  
L.S.  
L.S.  

STATE OF CONNECTICUT)  
COUNTY OF FAIRFIELD)  
ss. Greenwich  

On the 29th day of June, 1962, before me personally came EDNA B. FINCH, ARTHUR B. CALDWELL and ROSE B. CALDWELL, to me known, and known to me to the persons described in and who executed the foregoing instrument, and they duly acknowledged to me that they executed the same.

John G. Heagney  
Commissioner of the Superior Court  

This instrument was received by EDNA B. FINCH at 5:23 p.m., on the 29th day of June, 1962, and recorded by

In my official capacity as

Receptionist
DECLARATION DRAFT FOR RELINQUISHMENT OF ACCESS
DECLARATION OF RESTRICTIVE COVENANTS

THIS DECLARATION OF RESTRICTIVE COVENANT ("Declaration") dated as of _______, 2021 is hereby executed and delivered by 99 E. ELM PROPERTIES, LLC and 97 E. ELM PROPERTIES, LLC (collectively, the "Declarant"), Connecticut limited liability companies with offices in Greenwich, Connecticut.

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, Declarant is the owner of two adjacent properties located at 97 East Elm Street, Greenwich, Connecticut ("97 East Elm") and 99 East Elm Street, Greenwich, Connecticut ("99 East Elm", collectively the "Property") described on the attached Schedule A as shown on a certain map entitled "________________________" prepared by Rocco V. D'Andrea, Inc., last dated ________________ and recorded on the Greenwich Land Records as Map No. ______ (the "Map"), a copy of which is attached hereto as Schedule B;

WHEREAS, Declarant will construct a two-family building on each of 97 East Elm and 99 East Elm, which development is the subject of the following Planning and Zoning Commission applications Final Site Plan and Special Permit PLPZ 2021-00050 (97 East Elm) and Final Site Plan and Special Permit PLPZ 2021-00051 (99 East Elm) (the "Applications");

WHEREAS, the new buildings will be served by a common driveway partially located on both Lots, which driveway is shown on the Map;

WHEREAS, there is also an existing shared driveway shown on the Map traversing the boundary between 97 East Elm and adjacent property to the north known as 93 East Elm Street, Greenwich, Connecticut set forth in a certain deed recorded in Book 671 at Page 450 of the Greenwich Land Records (the "Shared Driveway");

WHEREAS, the Department of Public Works has required that as a condition of the Applications' approval the Declarant prohibit any future owners or residents of the Property from using the Shared Driveway for vehicular access to the dwellings to be constructed on the Property;

NOW, THEREFORE, the Declarant hereby declares on behalf of itself, as the present owner, and all future record title owners from time to time of the Property, the following restrictive covenant:
1. For so long as the Property is developed in accordance with the plans approved by the Applications, no owner or resident shall use the Shared Driveway for vehicular ingress or egress to the dwelling units located on the Property. It is further understood that the site design further includes physical obstructions to such use of the Shared Driveway, preventing such access. Such owners or residents of the Property shall only use the common driveway between 97 East Elm and 99 East Elm. Reference is made to the final site development plans for the Property as approved by the Applications on file in the office of the Town of Greenwich Planning and Zoning Commission.

2. The original agreement governing the Shared Driveway, however, remains in full force and effect and unchanged by the terms and conditions hereof. The foregoing shall be construed as a covenant running with the land binding only on the Declarant and all future owners of the Property.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Declarant has caused this Agreement to be executed this ___ day of ______________, 2021.

Signed, sealed and delivered
In the presence of:

99 E. ELM PROPERTIES, LLC

By: ________________________________

______________________________

97 E. ELM PROPERTIES, LLC

By: ________________________________

______________________________
The foregoing instrument was executed before me this ___ day of _____________, 2021, by _____________, ____________ of 99 E. ELM PROPERTIES, LLC, who acknowledged that the execution hereof was his free act and deed and the free act and deed of said limited liability company.

____________________________
Notary Public /  
Commissioner of Superior Court

The foregoing instrument was executed before me this ___ day of _____________, 2021, by _____________, ____________ of 97 E. ELM PROPERTIES, LLC, who acknowledged that the execution hereof was his free act and deed and the free act and deed of said limited liability company.

____________________________
Notary Public /  
Commissioner of Superior Court
SCHEDULE A

97 East Elm Street

ALL that certain tract, piece or parcel of land with the buildings and improvements thereon, situated in the Town of Greenwich, County of Fairfield and State of Connecticut, known and designated as Lot #7 on map entitled, "Property of J. Frederick Bath at Greenwich, Conn." numbered 295 in the Greenwich Town Clerk’s Office particularly bounded and described as follows:

BOUNDDED Northerly 45 feet by land formerly of Anthony; Easterly 203.50 feet by Lot #8 on said map, Southerly 50 feet by East Elm Street and Westerly 213.35 feet by Lot #6 on said map.

99 East Elm Street

BEGINNING at a point on the northerly line of East Elm Street formed by the intersection of the division line between said Lot No. 9 and Lot No. 7 on said map, running thence along said Lot No. 7 North 15° 42’ East 203.5 feet, and running thence along the southerly line of Elm Place South 76° 11’ East 45.0 feet and running thence along Lots Nos. 13, 12, 11, 10 and 9 on said map South 14° 41’ West 182.95 feet and running thence along the said northerly line of East Elm Street North 88° 32’ West 40.94 feet and North 87° 21’ West 9.06 feet to the point and place of beginning, together with all right, title and interest of William B. Hubbell, Jr. in and to East Elm Street in front of and adjoining said premises to the center line thereof and together with all right, title and interest of William B. Hubbell, Jr. in and to Elm Place.
SCHEDULE B

See attached map
4-15-21 and 4-23-21 Semanuk Email
Good morning,
Please include the following with the materials presented to the P&Z Commission for the 97&99 East Elm Street Application at its April 27, 2021 meeting.
Thank you
Andrea

April 23, 2021

Dear P&Z Commission,

Regarding the current application to develop 97 and 99 East Elm Street, we, the neighbors at 93 East Elm Street who share a driveway with 97 East Elm Street, would like the following:

1. That the word ‘vehicular’ be stricken from the applicant’s proposed Declaration of Restrictive Covenants in order to fully comply with DPW’s requirement that it relinquish all use of the driveway 97 East Elm shares with 93 East Elm. This issue was fully vetted at the last meeting where the Commission specifically agreed that all use (not just vehicular use) would be restricted.
2. That the finished grade between the existing 93/97 driveway and the 97 structure be no more than 6” below the grade of the 93/97 driveway at any point.
3. That the existing 93/97 driveway, including Belgium block curbing, not be altered in any way.
4. That a new 6’ solid cedar two sided fence be installed and exist in perpetuity at the grade of the 97/93 driveway running uninterrupted along the entire length of the 97 structure. Plantings are unlikely to survive in such a narrow (3’), shallow and sunless space.
5. That the carport floors be solid (not gravel).
6. That no HVAC equipment, gas or electric meters be installed on the west side of the 97 structure any such equipment be fully screened from 93 view.
7. That applicant designate a snow stockpile area for 97 East Elm Street.

Respectfully,

Andrea & Chris Semenuk

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.
Good morning, Patrick and Marisa,

I believe that the Declaration of Restrictive Covenants proposed by the applicant does not satisfy the condition required by DPW which was reiterated and confirmed by the P&Z Commission and the applicant at the March 30, 2021 meeting (lines 950 forward on the transcript).

The DPW requirement in sum:

2(a)(i) “No access to the existing driveway on 93 & 97 East Elm Street will be allowed for 97 & 99 East Elm Street.”

2(a)(ii) “…97 East Elm Street must relinquish its right to use the existing shared driveway for access (ingress/egress)….”

Applicant’s proposed language in sum:

“…no owner or resident shall use the Shared driveway for vehicular ingress or egress….”

DPW requires all access to the shared driveway be relinquished. The applicant’s language only relinquishes its rights relating to vehicles while retaining all other forms of use/access. Therefore, it does not satisfy the DPW condition which has been clearly stated and reiterated by the P&Z Commission. At minimum, we request that the word ‘vehicular’ be removed from the proposed document.

Furthermore, is Applicant suggesting that this Declaration be filed with land records relating to 97 East Elm Street and 99 East Elm Street? Presently, 99 East Elm Street has no rights over the 93/97 shared driveway. The proposed language insinuates that it does and could create title concerns at subsequent sales. The clearest path would be to file separate Declarations for 97 and 99 - the former relinquishing all existing rights to use 93/97 driveway and the latter clarifying that is has no rights over that driveway.

Thank you.

Andrea
ENGINEERING PLANS
DATED 2-11-21
FINAL SITE PLAN REVIEW SET
"RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT"

LOCATION

97 EAST ELM STREET
99 EAST ELM STREET
GREENWICH, CONNECTICUT

PREPARED FOR

97 E. ELM PROPERTIES, LLC
99 E. ELM PROPERTIES, LLC

SHEET INDEX

<table>
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<th>TITLE</th>
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</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
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<td>2</td>
<td>DEVELOPMENT PLAN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2-11-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NOTES &amp; DETAILS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2-11-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SEDIMENTATION &amp; EROSION CONTROL PLAN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2-11-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SIGHT DISTANCE PLAN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2-11-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PEDESTRIAN BYPASS PLAN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2-11-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LOW IMPACT DEVELOPMENT PLAN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2-11-21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MOST RECENT PLANS DATED 3-25-21
1. SCOPE OF WORK - NEW DEVELOPMENT AT 97 AND 99 EAST ELM STREET IN GREENWICH, CONNECTICUT.

2. NO DEBRIS SHALL BE ALLOWED TO ACCUMULATE ON THE SITE. DEBRIS SHALL BE REMOVED BY THE CONTRACTOR AS THE JOB PROCEEDS. THE SITE SHALL BE LEFT BROOM CLEAN AT THE COMPLETION OF EACH WORK DAY.

3. THE WORK DESCRIBED IN THESE DOCUMENTS IS EXPECTED TO MEET THE HIGHEST QUALITY STANDARDS IN BOTH MATERIAL AND WORKMANSHIP. ANY SUBSTANDARD WORK OBSERVED BY ARCHITECT WILL BE REJECTED.

4. ALL WORK SHALL CONFORM TO FEDERAL, STATE OF CONNECTICUT, COUNTY OF FAIRFIELD, AND TOWN OF GREENWICH CODES, ORDINANCES, REQUIRED BY JOB CONDITIONS.

5. PLUMBING CONTRACTOR TO EXAMINE PROPOSED LAYOUT WITH RESPECT TO EXISTING FIELD CONDITIONS, AND SHALL NOTIFY ARCHITECT OF ANY REVISIONS TO PLAN WHICH SHALL BE NECESSARY, BASED ON CONDITIONS UNCOVERED IN THE FIELD, IN ORDER TO INSTALL ALL REQUIRED BY ALL REGULATING AUTHORITIES.

6. TERMINATE ANY UTILITIES OR SERVICES ENTERING THE SITE (BY PLUGGING, CAPPING, ETC.) SO THAT THEY CAN BE EASILY LOCATED AND RECONNECTED.

7. MINOR DETAILS NOT USUALLY SHOWN OR SPECIFIED, BUT NECESSARY FOR PROPER CONSTRUCTION OF ANY PART OF THE WORK SHALL BE INCLUDED AS IF THEY WERE INDICATED IN THE DRAWINGS.

8. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL COORDINATE ALL WORK PROCEDURES WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF LOCAL AUTHORITIES AND BUILDING DEPARTMENTS.

9. THE SITE SHALL BE LEFT BROOM CLEAN AT THE COMPLETION OF DEMOLITION.

10. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL LAY OUT HIS OWN WORK, AND SHALL PROVIDE ALL DIMENSIONS REQUIRED FOR OTHER TRADES (PLUMBING, DRAINAGE, ELECTRICAL) AS INDICATED ON THE DRAWINGS AND ALL OTHER WORK THAT MAY BE REQUIRED TO COMPLETE THE JOB.

11. PLUMBING AND ELECTRICAL WORK SHALL BE PERFORMED BY PERSONS LICENSED IN THEIR TRADES, WHO SHALL ARRANGE FOR AND OBTAIN ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND PAY ALL FEES REQUIRED BY THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT, COUNTY OF FAIRFIELD, AND TOWN OF GREENWICH. THE SOLE EXCEPTION TO THIS IS THAT THE OWNER WILL PAY FOR THE PRIMARY BUILDING PERMIT.

12. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL DO ALL CUTTING, PATCHING, AND REPAIRING AS REQUIRED TO PERFORM ALL OF THE WORK AS INDICATED ON THE DRAWINGS AND ALL OTHER WORK THAT MAY BE REQUIRED TO COMPLETE THE JOB.

13. THE CONTRACTOR, UPON COMPLETION OF WORK, SHALL APPLY FOR CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY, AND SHALL ARRANGE FOR DEPARTMENT OF BUILDINGS INSPECTIONS AND SIGN-OFFS REQUIRED TO OBTAIN A CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY.

14. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE ADEQUATE WEATHER PROTECTION FOR THE BUILDING AND ITS CONTENTS DURING THE COURSE OF THE WORK.

15. PLUMBING CONTRACTOR SHALL ARRANGE AND OBTAIN INSPECTIONS AND REQUIRED SIGN-OFFS.

16. TERMINATE ANY UTILITIES OR SERVICES ENTERING THE SITE (BY PLUGGING, CAPPING, ETC.) SO THAT THEY CAN BE EASILY LOCATED AND RECONNECTED.

17. BEFORE COMMENCING WORK, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL FILE ALL REQUIRED CERTIFICATES OF INSURANCE WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF INSURANCE.

18. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL ASSEMBLE IN A BINDER AND PASS ALONG TO THE OWNER ALL EQUIPMENT AND MATERIAL WARRANTIES THAT MAY EXTEND BEYOND THE BASE GUARANTEE PERIOD, AS WELL AS INSTALLATION AND MAINTENANCE INSTRUCTIONS.

EAST ELM DEVELOPMENT
GREENWICH, CONNECTICUT
Dodaro Architects LLC

PERSPECTIVE VIEWS
EAST ELM DEVELOPMENT
GREENWICH, CONNECTICUT
Dodaro Architects LLC

LANDSCAPE PLAN

SPACING

PLANT LIST

COMMON NAME SIZENO.

- FLOWERING DOGWOOD (CORNUS FLORIDA) -1
  30"-36"

- NORTHERN BAYBERRY (MORELLA PENSYLVANICA) 36"-42" HEDGE2
  42"-48"

- EMERALD GREEN ARBORVITAE 48"-72"3
  84"-90"

- LITTLE LEYLAND CYPRESS 60"-72"

- MIXED PERENNIALS AND ANNUALS -
  4

1. ALL PLANTS LISTED ABOVE ARE NATIVE TO THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT
2. LAWN INFO - SEEDED BY LOCAL SEED MIX FROM TEED & BROWN

P&Z ISSUE03.25.21
002
REC ROOM
UP
COMPACTED FILL - SLAB ON GRADE
24" WIDE FOOTING
- 2 #5 CONTINUOUS PLACED 3" CLEAR FROM THE BOTTOM AND SIDES. LAP 2'-0' 1 1/2" X 3 1/2" KEY AT CENTER TOP OF FOOTING
- 4" DIA. PERFORATED PVC. FOOTING DRAIN W/ HOLES ORIENTED DOWN AT PERIMETER

TYPICAL FOUNDATION WALL CONSTRUCTION
- PROTECTION BOARD W/ DRAINAGE MAT
- RUB-R-WALL SPRAY WATERPROOF MEMBRANE FROM BOTTOM OF EDGE OF FOOTING TO 4" BELOW GRADE
- CONCRETE FOUNDATION WALL
- SEE PLAN FOR DIMENSIONS
- 2 #4 BARS TOP AND BOTTOM, CONTINUOUS, TOP BARS PLACED 2" BELOW TOP OF WALL, LAP 2'-0".
- #4 WALL DOWELS AT 4'-0" O.C. EMBED VERTICAL LEG 9" INTO FOOTING WITH 90 DEGREE, 6" HOOK AT END. EMBED VERTICAL LEG 1'-8" INTO WALL.
- 2" AIR SPACE MIN. BETWEEN FOUNDATION WALL AND WOOD FRAMING
- CLOSED CELL SPRAY FOAM IN CAVITY
- 2 X 4 WOOD STUDS - BOTTOM PLATE P.T.
- 5/8" GYPSUM WALLBOARD

CASEMENT WINDOW OPENING INTO WINDOW WELL - PROVIDE DRAINAGE AND TEI INTO PERIMETER DRAIN SYSTEM.

ELEVATOR
HOISTWAY WIDTH - 4'-2 1/2"
HOISTWAY DEPTH - 5'-1"
(4'-11 1/2" IN BASEMENT)

EGRESS

10'-10 1/2"
1X10 BORAL CHANNEL GAP SIDING - BOARDS TO CUT TO ALIGN W/ ADJACENT SIDING COARSING - (2) SHINGLES BOARD WIDTH - TYP.

FINISHED BASEMENT SLAB
EL: 103.8' (-9'-2"

FINISHED FIRST FLOOR
EL: 113' (0'-0"

FINISHED DECK LEVEL
EL: 112.5' (-0'-6"

FINISHED SECOND FLOOR (MAIN)
EL: 123.6' (+10'-7 5/8"

FINISHED ATTIC FLOOR
EL: 133.3' (+20'-3 5/8"

AVERAGE GRADE PLANE
BUILDING 1 EL: 112.55'

BUILDING 2 EL: 112.33'

34'-10 7/8" (BUILDING 2)
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DEVELOPMENT
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EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS
SIDE (WEST) ELEVATION 1
FRONT (NORTH) ELEVATION 2

GENERAL NOTES
1. ELEVATION MARKS COORDINATE WITH BUILDINGS 1 AND 3. BUILDINGS 2 AND 4 FIRST FLOOR ELEVATION IS AT 113.7'
TYPICAL ROOF ASSEMBLY:
- ASPHALT SHINGLE ROOFING
- 1/2" EXT. GRADE APA RATED PLYWOOD W/ 20# BLDG. PAPER
- 2X10 RFTRS @ 16" O.C. W/ MIN. R-49 CLOSED-CELL 2# SPRAY FOAM INSUL. IN CAVITIES

TYPICAL WINDOW CASING W/ GALV. FLASHING AT WINDOW / DOOR HEAD 4" VERT. - SEE 3/A501

TYPICAL CLG. ASSEMBLY:
- 3/4" PLYWD. SUBFLOOR
- 11 7/8" TJI 560 @ 16" O.C.
- 3" ROXUL 'SAFE N SOUND' MINERAL WOOL INSULATION
- 5/8" G.W.B. CEILING W/ LEVEL 4 FINISH

TYPICAL CROWN ASSEMBLY - SEE 1/A501

1A402

GALV. FLASHING UNDER WINDOW - CONT. TO BACK OF WINDOW STOOL - PROVIDE END DAMS

DOUBLE-HUNG WINDOW - SEE WINDOW SCHEDULE

TYPICAL WINDOW NOSE PROFILE - SEE 3/A501

TYPICAL WINDOW SILL - SEE 3/A501

CLOSED CELL 2# SPRAY FOAM INSULATION BEHIND RIM JOIST - MIN. R-20

TYPICAL FLOOR ASSEMBLY:
- 3/4" T&G WOOD FLOOR
- 3/4" PLYWD. SUBFLOOR
- 11 7/8" TJI 560 @ 16" O.C.
- 3" ROXUL 'SAFE N SOUND' MINERAL WOOL INSULATION
- 5/8" G.W.B. CEILING W/ LEVEL 4 FINISH

TYPICAL WALL ASSEMBLY:
- SIDING OPTION 1; MAIBEC CEDAR SHINGLE SIDING, 4" - 4 1/4" EXPOSURE
- SIDING OPTION 2; CEDAR CLAPBOARD W/ 3/8" BUTT END, 4" - 4 1/4" EXPOSURE COARSE TO WINDOW HEAD & SILLS - TYP
- 1/2" EXT. GRADE APA RATED PLYWOOD W/ #15 BLDG. FELT UNDERLAYMENT
- 2X4 STUD FRAMING W/ MIN. R-20 CLOSED-CELL SPRAY FOAM INSULATION IN CAVITIES.
- 5/8" G.W.B. W/ LEVEL 4 FINISH

FINISHED GRADE - TO SLOPE AWAY FROM FOUNDATION - TYP.

EXT. STONE CURB NO CHANGE TO EXISTING ELEVATIONS

CONCRETE FOUNDATION WALL - SEE STRUCTURAL

18" S.S. ANCHOR BOLT AND WASHER AT SILL PLATE - SEE STRUCTURAL

8"

TYPICAL BASE - SEE FINISH SCHEDULE

FINISHED SECOND FLOOR EL: 123.6' (+ 10'-7 5/8")

FIN. FIRST FLOOR EL: 113' (0'-0")
FIN. CARPORT SLAB

EL: 112.5' (-6")

2'-0"
1'-0"

CONC. FTG. W/ (2) - #4 REBAR AT BTM. - SEE STRUCTURAL PROTECTION BOARD W/ DRAINAGE BOARD

ROLL APPLIED WATERPROOFING MEMBRANE

4" CONCRETE SLAB W/ 10X10 WWM. TO SLOPE UP 1/4" PER 1'-0"

2X4 SLATS AT 45° ANGLE. SCREENING TO HAVE A MINIMUM OF 50% OF SURFACE AREA OPEN PER ZONING REGULATIONS.

OPENING CASING TO MATCH WINDOW CASING - SEE 3/A501

TOP OF CARPORT STEM WALL EL: 114' (+12")

1'-0"
1'-1 1/2"

113.6'
113.7'
113.45'

EXTG. DRIVEWAY BETWEEN 97 AND 93 PROPERTIES - NO CHANGE TO EXISTING ELEVATIONS

EXTG. STONE CURB - NO CHANGE TO EXISTING ELEVATIONS

NOTE: SPOT ELEVATIONS BASED ON DRAWING, "1 OF 3 SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN", AND COORDINATION WITH D'ANDREA ENGINEERS

T.O. PLATE

+ 8'-6 5/8" A.F.F.

1/2" EXT. GRADE APA RATED PLYWD. & 3/4" MAHOGANY VENEER MARINE GRADE PLYWD. AT UNDERSIDE OF OUTRIGGER

5/4 X 8 FRIEZE BOARD W/ 3/4" QUARTER ROUND MOULDING - ON EAVE SIDE ONLY - TO STOP 2" BUILDING CORNER

5" DIA. HALF-ROUND GALV. GUTTERS ON ADJUSTABLE GALV. ROOF SHANKS W/ 3" DIA. GALV. LEADERS - TYP.

GALV. FLASHING W/ DRIP - RUN UP EAVE SHEATHING 12" MIN.; APPLY OVER 'GRACE' ICE-AND-WATER SHIELD; LAP W/ BLDG. PAPER 7"

5/4 X 6 FASCIA W/ 1X2 SQ. MOULDING

1 1/2" 4" 1 1/2"

5/4 X 6 FASCIA W/ 1X2 SQ. MOULDING

1/2" PLYWOOD BACKER
FIN. GARAGE SLAB

EL: 112.5' (-6")

2'-0"

1'-0"

CONC. FTG. W/ (2) - #4 REBAR AT BTM. - SEE STRUCTURAL PROTECTION BOARD W/ DRAINAGE BOARD ROLL APPLIED WATERPROOFING MEMBRANE

TYP. WALL ASSEMBLY:
- 1X10 BORAL CHANNEL GAP SIDING - BOARDS TO CUT TO ALIGN W/ ADJACENT SIDING COARSING - (2) SHINGLES BOARD WIDTH - TYP.
- 1/2" EXT. GRADE APA RATED PLYWOOD W/ #15 BLDG. FELT UNDERLAYMENT
- 2X4 STUD FRAMING W/ MIN. R-20 CLOSED-CELL SPRAY FOAM INSULATION IN CAVITIES.
- 5/8" G.W.B. W/ LEVEL 3 FINISH

4" CONCRETE SLAB W/ 10X10 WWM. TO SLOPE UP 1/4" PER 1'-0" TO TOP OF GARAGE STEM WALL EL: 114.83' (+1'-10")

TOP OF STEM WALL TO FOLLOW SLOPE OF GRADE - CONCRETE WASH TO SLOPE AWAY FROM BUILDING

CONTINUOUS FLASHING TO SEAL JOINT BETWEEN STEM WALL AND FRAMING

PROPERTY LINE BETWEEN 97 AND 93 PROPERTIES

NOTICE: SPOT ELEVATIONS BASED ON DRAWING, "1OF3 SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN", AND COORDINATION WITH D'ANDREA ENGINEERS
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GREENWICH, CONNECTICUT
Dodaro Architects LLC
1 PARK AVENUE, OLD GREENWICH
CONNECTICUT 06870.1722
TEL 203.637.75.30
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FILEJOB NO. DRAWN BY APPROVED BY

WALL SECTION
WALL SECTION AT GARAGE (97 PROPERTY)1

1 1/2"=1'-0"
2'-0" 4"

FLOOR ASSEMBLY:
- 4" CONCRETE SLAB W/ 6X6 10/10 WWF
- 2" CLOSED CELL SPRAY FOAM INSUL. UNDER SLAB
- 1" CLOSED CELL SPRAY FOAM INSUL. AT PERIMETER OF SLAB
- FIN. BASEMENT SLAB
- EL: 103.8' (-9'-2"

2X3 STUD WALL W/ 1" SPACE MIN. FROM FOUND. WALL
- 5/8" G.W.B. ON 2X3 STUD WALL W/ 1" SPACE MIN. FROM FOUND. WALL
- R-20 CLOSED CELL SPRAY FOAM IN CAVITIES
- CONC. FTG. W/ (2) - #4 REBAR AT BTM. - SEE STRUCTURAL
- PROTECTION BOARD W/ DRAINAGE BOARD
- ROLL APPLIED WATERPROOFING MEMBRANE
- 1'-0"

2X6 P.T. MUDSILL W/ SILL SEALER
- CONCRETE FOUNDATION WALL - SEE STRUCTURAL
- 18" S.S. ANCHOR BOLT AND WASHER AT SILL PLATE - SEE STRUCTURAL
- (2) - #4 REBAR AT TOP, BTM. & THIRD POINTS OF WALL - TYP.
- TYP. BASE - SEE FINISH SCHEDULE
- 6"

TYP. FLOOR ASSEMBLY:
- 3/4" T&G WOOD FLOOR
- 3/4" PLYWD. SUBFLOOR
- 11 7/8" TJI 560 @ 16" O.C.
- 3" ROXUL 'SAFE N SOUND' MINERAL WOOL INSULATION
- 5/8" G.W.B. CEILING W/ LEVEL 4 FINISH
- FINISHED GRADE - TO SLOPE AWAY FROM FOUNDATION - TYP.
- TOP OF STEM WALL - 6" MIN. ABOVE ADJACENT GRADE
- CONTINUOUS FLASHING TO SEAL JOINT BETWEEN STEM WALL AND FRAMING
- 115.55'
- 115.65'
- 115.4'
- EXTG. DRIVEWAY BETWEEN 97 AND 93 PROPERTIES
- NO CHANGE TO EXISTING ELEVATIONS
- EXTG. STONE CURB
- NO CHANGE TO EXISTING ELEVATIONS

NOTE: SPOT ELEVATIONS BASED ON DRAWING, "1 0F 3 SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN", AND COORDINATION WITH D'ANDREA ENGINEERS

Dodaro Architects LLC
1 PARK AVENUE, OLD GREENWICH
CONNECTICUT 06870
TEL 203.637.75.30
FAX 203.297.61.91
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A404
19176 176A401 JR KD
VARIES
WALL SECTION
WALL SECTION AT REAR UNIT (97 PROPERTY)1
1 1/2"=1'-0"
FIRST FLOOR PLAN - FAR

FAR101

19176 176A101A ML KD

00.00.00

3/8"=1'-0"

F.A.R. CALCULATIONS

FIRST FLOOR AREAS

A1 = 206 SF
A2 = 100 SF
A3 = 773 SF
A4 = 209 SF

A (FIRST FLOOR TOTAL) = 1288 SF

SECOND FLOOR AREAS

B1
B2
B3
B4
B5
B6
B7

B (SECOND FLOOR TOTAL) = 1263 SF

FAR TOTALS

A
B
C (< 40% OF SECOND FLOOR)

PROPOSED FLOOR AREA PER UNIT =

PROPOSED FLOOR AREA PER BUILDING =

ALLOWABLE F.A.R. (97 EAST ELM) =

ALLOWABLE F.A.R. (99 EAST ELM) =

1288 SF
1263 SF
0 SF
2551 SF
5102 SF
5365.8 SF
5104.6 SF

BASEMENT

NOT APPLICABLE 0 SF

ATTIC FLOOR AREAS

C1
C2
C3
C4
C5

D (THIRD FLOOR TOTAL) = 461 SF

UNIT - FIRST FLOOR PLAN - FAR1

P&Z ISSUE 03.25.21
FAR102

SECOND FLOOR PLAN - FAR1

F.A.R. CALCULATIONS

FIRST FLOOR AREAS

A1  206 S.F.
A2  100 S.F.
A3  773 S.F.
A4  209 S.F.
A (FIRST FLOOR TOTAL) = 1288 S.F.

SECOND FLOOR AREAS

B1  676 S.F.
B2  168 S.F.
B3  116 S.F.
B4  54 S.F.
B5  188 S.F.
B6  74 S.F.
B7  -13 S.F.
B (SECOND FLOOR TOTAL) = 1263 S.F.

FAR TOTALS

A  1288 S.F.
B  1263 S.F.
C  0 S.F.
D (THIRD FLOOR TOTAL) = 48 S.F.

PROPOSED FLOOR AREA PER UNIT =

PROPOSED FLOOR AREA PER BUILDING =

ALLOWABLE F.A.R. (97 EAST ELM) = 5102 S.F.
ALLOWABLE F.A.R. (99 EAST ELM) = 5365.8 S.F.

BASEMENT

NOT APPLICABLE 0 S.F.

ATTIC FLOOR AREAS

C1  48 S.F.
C2  295 S.F.
C3  104 S.F.
C4  37 S.F.
C5  -23 S.F.
D (THIRD FLOOR TOTAL) = 461 S.F.

TITLES

UNIT - SECOND FLOOR PLAN - FAR1

P&Z ISSUE - NO CHANGE FROM PREVIOUS ISSUE 03.25.21

Doddaro Architects LLC
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**FAR PLANS**

**ATTIC FLOOR PLAN - FAR PLAN**

---

### FAR103

#### EAST ELM DEVELOPMENT
- **97 AND 99 EAST ELM STREET**
- **GREENWICH, CONNECTICUT**

**EAST ELM DEVELOPMENT**

**GREENWICH, CONNECTICUT**

**Dodaro Architects LLC**

**DATE**

---

**FAR TOTALS**

- **A**
  - PROPOSED FLOOR AREA PER UNIT = 1288 S.F.
  - PROPOSED FLOOR AREA PER BUILDING = 5102 S.F.
  - ALLOWABLE F.A.R. (97 EAST ELM) = 5365.8 S.F.
  - ALLOWABLE F.A.R. (99 EAST ELM) = 5104.6 S.F.

- **B**
  - 1263 S.F.

---

**BASEMENT**

- NOT APPLICABLE 0 S.F.

---

**ATTIC FLOOR AREAS**

- C1 = -23 SF
- C2 = 48 SF
- C3 = 295 SF
- C4 = 104 SF
- C5 = 37 SF

- D (THIRD FLOOR TOTAL) = 461 S.F.
EXISTING PRIVACY FENCE TO REMAIN
EXISTING PRIVACY FENCE TO BE SALVAGED AND RELOCATED PER SITE PLAN

COMMON NAME | SIZE
---|---
FLOWERING DOGWOOD (CORNUS FLORIDA) | 30"-36"
NORTHERN BAYBERRY (MORELLA PENSYLVANICA) | 36"-42" HEDGE
EMERALD GREEN ARBORVITAE | 48" - 72"
EASTERN RED CEDAR (JUNIPERUS VIRGINIANA) | 60"-72"

MIXED PERENNIALS AND ANNUALS

ALL PLANTS LISTED ABOVE ARE NATIVE TO THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT

LAWN INFO - SEEDED BY LOCAL SEED MIX FROM TEED & BROWN