All,
These newest attachments are directly from the study the Town had prepared that is referred to in my email from earlier this week. It is available as a PDF from the Town website under Greenwich Athletic Fields. I had not read it until today and only knew of it from the article in Greenwich Free Press. Although it is reportedly only a study and not near approval, the mere thought of what it would do to our neighborhood is truly frightening. Noise pollution, increased crowds bringing yet more traffic issues and the need for a fifty car lot to accommodate them.

The loss of the grassy triangle of land with long established trees that divides access and egress to Kinsman Lane will have a negative effect on our home values and destroy the wooded atmosphere of the Park land that surrounds us. The Park is a historic place and it is surely not right to allow it to suffer the destruction that this terrible plan would inflict.

Please, please write letters, send emails, make calls, contact your neighbors, heads of neighborhood associations and District 2 RTM members about what could happen here if we don't speak up. Let's keep this atrocious study from becoming a reality.

Ceci

-----Original Message-----
From: Ceci Morgan <cecinmorgan@aol.com>
Sent: Tue, Feb 16, 2021 9:04 am
Subject: Fwd: Daily Newsletter from Greenwich Free Press for 02/16/2021/YET ANOTHER THREAT TO BRUCE PARK!

All,
Attached is the paragraph regarding Bruce Park from the report of the Engineering Consultants, Weston and Sampson, who were hired by Parks and Rec to do the study described in today's Greenwich Free Press. It seems obvious that they have no
knowledge of the history of Bruce Park. Having just barely finished more than five years of fighting Eversource, finally resolved and over, but not forgotten, I now see that there will always be another threat to our beloved Park lurking around the corner.

The thought of a fifty car parking lot tucked somewhere near the playing field and a magnificent tree removed to make way for this plan makes my blood run cold and my emotions run very hot. Also attached is a photo I took on October 17, 2020 of the tree scheduled for execution, thus supposedly solving the "conflict" this tree presents for implementing their plan.

The whole concept is monstrously misguided. The playing field is in a neighborhood, which surrounds and is an integral part of a significantly historic Park with an original deed that protects it. We must immediately rally the usual troops to object to the proposed plan. Please share your thoughts on how to make our concerns reach the ears of those who represent us in order to put the fire out before the first spark ignites.

Best regards,
Ceci Morgan

From: Greenwich Free Press <editor@GreenwichFreePress.com>
To: Cecilia <cecinorgan@aol.com>
Sent: Tue, Feb 16, 2021 6:00 am
Subject: Daily Newsletter from Greenwich Free Press for 02/16/2021

LETTER: It’s time to put the money in the
[EXTERNAL]

Dear Sirs:

We have recently learned about the “Master Plan Study” for town fields issued February 5, 2021.

We are very concerned in particular about the proposed overdevelopment of Loughlin Park, as it is our local neighborhood park.

We agree with many of our neighbors who met via Zoom last week that some of the recommendations proposed for Loughlin (namely, adding a second ball field, a pavilion/splash pad and 2 parking lots for 70+ cars) would be detrimental.

We appreciate the consulting firm’s ‘leaving no stone unturned’ with regard to exploring the potential for all Greenwich’s parks and playing fields, however, if you lived in our neighborhood, you would recognize the critical role the open, undeveloped fields play for the locals.

For example, the open field at the intersection of Cross Lane and Cedar is used multiple times a year for neighborly block parties: for example, “Cottoberfest” in the fall and an ever-growing “Green Pizza Truck Party” at the end of the school year each June. These parties are permitted by the town and organized by our neighbors. They grow larger each year as more and more neighbors attend, meet each other, network and have their children meet and play with other children. Everyone looks forward to these local events.

So much more than organized sports goes on in Loughlin Park: on a daily basis, dogs are walked, seniors exercise, tennis and paddleball are played, toddlers and pre-schoolers play soccer (some in organized groups, some pick-up), kids organize “Nerf Wars” on the rocks and woods behind the basketball court, pickup games of football and soccer are played.....the list goes on. The open green space suits the neighborhood and encourages conviviality and neighborliness.

Also, don’t forget that our neighborhood endures full-time traffic and noise from I-95 and the train station. To over-develop Loughlin by adding more asphalt and car traffic would really feel like a kick-in-the-teeth and ruin the little bucolic oasis we all enjoy.

Therefore, we’d like to restate our opposition to the proposals A & B (pages 61-63), insist no funding be allocated to this effort, and request a retraction of these proposals from the report.

Kind regards,

Christine Surette & David Ornstein
61 Indian Field Road
Greenwich

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.
Dear all,

In review of the Master Plan Study for the Fields issued February 5, 2021, I am deeply concerned by the proposed overdevelopment to the charming pocket park on Loughlin Avenue. The recommendations and priorities established within this document unequivocally do not address the needs of the Greenwich community and excluded community stakeholders. To act on these recommendations would be catastrophic.

Loughlin Playground currently provides critical outlets for outdoor athletic competition and recreational enjoyment for residents of all ages throughout the community. Per the report outdoor recreation needs relate not just to the sports/athletic programs that make use of them, but also to less formal recreational pursuits by individuals not aligned with a specific organization, like the neighborhood kids who seek a pickup game of football, baseball, or soccer within a particular venue or the parents who would like to stroll in the park with their children. Loughlin is documented as already achieving this important balance.

Therefore, I restate my opposition to the proposals A & B (pages 61-63), insist no funding be allocated to this effort, and request a redaction of these proposals from the report.

Tom Kartanowicz
35 Cross Lane, Cos Cob

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.
To whom it may concern -
In review of the Master Plan Study for the Fields Issued February 5, 2021, I am deeply concerned by the proposed overdevelopment to the charming pocket park on Loughlin Avenue. The recommendations and priorities established within this document unequivocally do not address the needs of the Greenwich community and excluded community stakeholders. To act on these recommendations would be catastrophic.

Loughlin Playground currently provides critical outlets for outdoor athletic competition and recreational enjoyment for residents of all ages throughout the community. Per the report outdoor recreation needs relate not just to the sports/athletic programs that make use of them, but also to less formal recreational pursuits by individuals not aligned with a specific organization, like the neighborhood kids who seek a pickup game of football, baseball, or soccer within a particular venue or the parents who would like to stroll in the park with their children. Loughlin is documented as already achieving this important balance.

Therefore, I restate my opposition to the proposals A & B (pages 61-63), insist no funding be allocated to this effort, and request a redaction of these proposals from the report.

Traci Bosco
3 Loughlin Ave
Cos Cob, Ct
203-550-6561

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.
Siciliano, Joseph

From: Joe Zaffino <park06807@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 21, 2021 3:05 PM
To: Siciliano, Joseph
Subject: Master Plan Feb. 5, 2021

[EXTERNAL]

Dear Mr. Siciliano,

Please be advised that we oppose the above referenced plan regarding the Loughlin Ave. Park.

Would you kindly eliminate all the changes outlined in the proposed plan for the Park.

Many of my neighbors have written a detailed explanation of why the park should remain untouched. I agree with their sentiments.

Respectfully,

Joe and Gail Zaffino
48 Loughlin Ave, Cos Cob, CT 06807

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.
Dear Mr. Siciliano, Mr. Dellabate, and Mr. Johnson:

After reviewing the Master Plan Study for the Fields Issued February 5, 2021, I am extremely concerned by the proposed overdevelopment of the well-used pocket park on Loughlin Avenue. The recommendations and priorities established within this document unequivocally do not address the needs of the Greenwich community and exclude many community stakeholders. To act on these recommendations would be short-sighted, high-handed and thoroughly undemocratic.

Loughlin Playground currently provides critical outlets for outdoor athletic competition and recreational enjoyment for residents of all ages throughout the community. Per the report outdoor recreation needs relate not just to the sports/athletic programs that make use of them, but also to less formal recreational pursuits by individuals not aligned with a specific organization, like local dog owners who enjoy exercising themselves and their pooches, like the neighborhood kids who seek a pickup game of football, baseball, or soccer within a particular venue or the parents who would like to stroll in the park with their children. Loughlin is documented as already achieving this important balance.
Therefore I restate my opposition to the proposals A & B (pages 61-63), insist no funding be allocated to this effort, and request a redaction of these proposals from the report.

Stay well.

Yours truly.

Susan Rattray

smrattray@yahoo.com

203-858-7765

cc: Representative Steve Meskers

Senator Alex Kasser

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.
Dear Mr. Siciliano,

In review of the Master Plan Study for the Fields Issued February 5, 2021, I am deeply concerned by the proposed overdevelopment to the charming pocket park on Loughlin Avenue. The recommendations and priorities established within this document unequivocally do not address the needs of the Greenwich community and excluded community stakeholders. To act on these recommendations would be catastrophic.

Loughlin Playground currently provides critical outlets for outdoor athletic competition and recreational enjoyment for residents of all ages throughout the community. Per the report outdoor recreation needs relate not just to the sports/athletic programs that make use of them, but also to less formal recreational pursuits by individuals not aligned with a specific organization, like the neighborhood kids who seek a pickup game of football, baseball, or soccer within a particular venue or the parents who would like to stroll in the park with their children. Loughlin is documented as already achieving this important balance. If anything was to be done to this area, I would recommend correcting the poor drainage.

Therefore, I restate my opposition to the proposals A & B (pages 61-63), insist no funding be allocated to this effort, and request a redaction of these proposals from the report.

Peter Mingione
18 Cross Lane

**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.
From: Robert Sterling <rob@rlsterling.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2021 9:05 PM
To: Camillo, Fred; Siciliano, Joseph; gary.dellabate@greenwichct.org; Johnson, Scott N.
Subject: Remove Loughlin Park Plans from Field Study

[EXTERNAL]

To:
First Selectman Camillo
Parks and Rec Director Siciliano
Board of Parks Recreation

Feb 23, 2021

15 years ago there was an effort to add an outfield fence and lights to the Baseball Diamond in Loughlin Park in Cos Cob. That effort was overwhelmingly opposed by the neighborhood. It should come as no surprise that the fantastical Baseball Complex envisioned in both Plan A & and Plan B in the recently released Athletic Field Study fail to be either "thoughtful" or "achievable" - to borrow terms from the Study’s stated goal. Such is the universally held opinion of the Loughlin Park neighborhood community.

In the coming days you are going to be hearing from the park's neighbors both individually and collectively, all unanimous in their opposition the Field Study plans for Loughlin Park and in our request that both Plans A&B be permanently removed and excluded from the Field Study as well as any other future plans for similar development of Loughlin Park.

What follows are my specific objections as a homeowner on Cross Lane since 2007 to the Loughlin Park plans A&B.

The status quo is great
Loughlin Park enjoys constant use year round by the neighborhood and the community. The current configuration allows for Cal Ripken League Baseball as well as variety of youth athletic and outdoor programs on the main rectangle and the “L” field. The park is a favorite for dog walkers and people engaged in personal fitness and other outdoor exercise. The fields and the adjacent ledge formation (called “the mountain” by generations of neighborhood kids) provide a space for safe unstructured play - an increasingly rare thing.

Fencing the existing Ball Field
Adding an outfield fence would:

• limit the flexible use of the existing rectangle
• re-direct foot traffic onto Loughlin Avenue and Cross Lane
• create a bottleneck between the restrooms and the proposed outfield fence
• stand as an eyesore, inconsistent with the park aesthetic
• forever change the character and nature of the park, beginning a slippery slope of development leading to lights, larger diamond, artificial turf, second diamond, other athletic infrastructure

Increasing Diamond Size
The current small diamond is a great venue for the Cal Ripken League for youth aged 4-12. Increasing to a
large diamond to accommodate 13-18 year olds or a men’s league would not be appropriate to the space. The risk of foul balls causing injury or damage to the adjacent playground (and the children using it) and to the traffic and parked cars on Loughlin Ave would be unacceptable. As neighbors, we enjoy and support the current level activity and vibrancy of the current mix youth programs. Enlarging the diamond to enable older teens and adults would be an institutional intrusion.

**Adding a Second Diamond**

A second diamond would need to be shoehorned into a space that is not large enough to accommodate it, and would

- create parking and traffic nightmares when concurrent games are occurring
- possibly require additional off-street parking encroaching on green space
- create foul ball problems - exactly the same problems that are cited in the study for other fields as a reason for change

If located on the Cross Lane side (Plan A), the new diamond would:

- create a foul ball nuisance and risk to the adjacent neighbor
- require pruning or removal of many mature trees
- require removal of an unacceptable amount of ledge (aka “the Mountain”), eliminating favorite park feature

If located on the Loughlin side of the park (Plan B), the new diamond would:

- be much closer to Loughlin Avenue than the existing diamond and would
- create a foul ball risk to Loughlin Avenue traffic
- require pruning or removal of some majestic specimen Sycamores that line and define the park

**Artificial Turf**

Loughlin Park is part of the flood plain in a FEMA flood zone. The drainage impact of adding artificial turf to the park is unknowable and mitigation plans cannot be guaranteed. Turf is not it in keeping with the natural green space of the park nor welcomed by residents.

**Off Street Parking Lots**

It almost goes without saying that paving over the green space is a bone-headed idea. Perhaps the regulations require more parking with the addition of a second diamond, so all the more reason not to add a second diamond. The lots would

- be an eyesore and a blight on the green space
- be beneficial only when 2 ball games occur at the same time
- exacerbate the existing floodwater challenge

**Water Retention Pit**

The plans call for a water retention to mitigate the surface water issues caused by the proposed artificial turf and or the parking lots. This would consume the only other green space left in the park after the plan’s other "features" are installed. A pit? In a park? Really?

**Second Restroom**

Why is a second restroom area needed? Do the plans call for the removal of the existing restrooms by the Cross Lane Parking lot?
Concession Stand & Splash Pad
These two features are so far out there it’s hardly worth commenting on. It does raise questions however. None of the other plans consider concession stands or water pads, why was Loughlin Park, of all the fields in the singled out for these?

The Field Study as whole is flawed - School fields are a better choice
Setting aside the validity of the field shortage claimed in the Study, the proposed solutions to that supposed shortage take an approach of maintaining and building a bureaucratic Parks and Rec fiefdom without regard for the residential and non-organized sports stakeholders. The public school fields were not sufficiently factored as a solution nor was any mentions made of the private school fields, which historically were able offer field usage to town-wide programs. As tax payer I would prefer to see the town pay rent for annual usage rather than incur the huge capital costs of field renovations. The schools are best equipped as far as space, parking, and neighborhood tolerance to meet the towns needs.

There are other innovative ways to solve your problem without disrupting and devaluing neighborhoods. Go find them.

Sincerely,

Rob Sterling
Cross Lanc, Cos Cob

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.
[EXTERNAL]

Gentlemen:

We write to voice our strong objection to Proposals A and B (pages 61-63) in the February 5, 2021 Master Plan for the Fields study. We have lived on Loughlin Avenue for more than 8 years. The park was one of the reasons we moved to this neighborhood and is one of primary reasons we have stayed. The park is a true gem—it is both aesthetically beautiful and a wonderful place for children and adults to play, gather, walk dogs and just enjoy a green open space. In addition to baseball, Loughlin Park is used for a number of organized sports, including youth soccer, flag football and youth lacrosse. It is also regularly used for pick-up games, including baseball, basketball, football, spike ball and more. The park also hosts adult outdoor exercise classes and boot camps and innumerable dogs and their walkers. We have three sons and play a variety of sports with them in the park throughout the year. Until the recent snowstorms, we played touch football games in the area where the Master Plan proposes siting a parking lot, which is also the area that hosts the annual neighborhood block party. Transforming the this wonderful multi-use green space to a single sports “complex” would be a travesty.

In addition, the proposals would impose environmental harm and other health and safety risks. It is difficult to imagine at this point in our city history a proposal that contemplates paving over green space except for the most compelling societal need. The proposal would also exacerbate traffic issues. Loughlin Park is nestled in a beautiful quiet neighborhood with fairly narrow streets, some of which are one way. We live towards the train station and regularly see cars speeding to get to the station or I-95, which already poses safety risks due to the number of young children who live at this end of Loughlin and Butler. To add a sports complex that would attract many more people, including people from outside of the area who are not familiar with driving in it would increase this risk immeasurably.

We are sensitive to the need for more high-quality baseball fields and willing to do our part as Town citizens. However, transforming a beautiful neighborhood park into a sports complex is a terrible idea. We urge the Town to look to fields located at schools or other areas that are better suited to accommodate such a complex.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim and Julie McGovern

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.
[EXTERNAL]
Dear Joseph Siciliano,

In review of the Master Plan Study for the Fields Issued February 5, 2021, I am deeply concerned by the proposed overdevelopment to the charming pocket park on Loughlin Avenue. The recommendations and priorities established within this document unequivocally do not address the needs of the Greenwich community and excluded community stakeholders. To act on these recommendations would be catastrophic. Loughlin Playground currently provides critical outlets for outdoor athletic competition and recreational enjoyment for residents of all ages throughout the community. Per the report outdoor recreation needs relate not just to the sports/athletic programs that make use of them, but also to less formal recreational pursuits by individuals not aligned with a specific organization, like the neighborhood kids who seek a pickup game of football, baseball, or soccer within a particular venue or the parents who would like to stroll in the park with their children. Loughlin is documented as already achieving this important balance.

Therefore, I restate my opposition to the proposals A & B (pages 61-63), insist no funding be allocated to this effort, and request a redaction of these proposals from the report.

Olivia Holt
30 Strickland Rd Cos Cob

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.
Siciliano, Joseph

From: Delany, Blake S. <bdelany@HoulihanLawrence.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 24, 2021 11:02 AM
To: Siciliano, Joseph; gary.dellabe@greenwichct.org; Johnson, Scott N.
Subject: Loughlin Park development
Attachments: Blake Delany.vcf

[EXTERNAL]

Gentleman,

Should the Town of Greenwich feel compelled to improve Loughlin Ave Park I would encourage changes that ensure Loughlin Park remains as an undesigned multi-use space – one which invites informal play, gatherings and activities and encourage neighborhood involvement. I would encourage the Town of Greenwich to consider improvements to clean up Loughlin Avenue’s parallel parking, installing better curbing to protect individuals in the park, address drainage and topography within Loughlin Park and improve adjacent sidewalks. Such immediate improvements would both enhance the community’s overall enjoyment and safety of the Park.

I agree with my community’s consensus that the proposed A & B redevelopment plans are highly inconsistent with how the Loughlin Park neighborhood and Cos Cob currently enjoys Loughlin Park. Further, I am confident that the proposed Loughlin Park A & B redevelopment plans would certainly negatively impact the Loughlin neighborhood’s property values.

Kindest regards,

Blake Delany
Houlihan Lawrence
917 697 0728
www.BlakeDelany.com
www.BlakeDelany.HoulihanLawrence.com

The real estate industry continues to be a target for internet hackers and scammers, please keep the following in mind:

- Hackers send emails to home buyers and sellers and attempt to impersonate the attorneys, agents and title closers involved in the closing;
- Hackers will send fraudulent wire instructions to get you to wire funds to an account controlled by the hacker. Never trust an email with wire instructions or asking you to provide sensitive financial information;
- Always call your closer to confirm wire instructions, using a phone number you looked up from an independent source. Never use a phone number from an email, the emails will often provide their phone number in a spoofed email;
- Call me if you receive an email like what I have described here, or any communication you find suspicious. Together we can verify the information and keep you informed.

Remain alert if it is not secure or confidential. Houlihan Lawrence will never request that you send funds or nonpublic personal information, such as credit card or debit card numbers, or bank account and routing numbers, by email. If you receive an email message concerning any transaction involving Houlihan Lawrence, and the message requests that you send funds or provide nonpublic personal information, do not respond to the email and immediately contact Houlihan Lawrence.

To report Houlihan Lawrence of suspected email fraud, contact: fraudalert@houlihanlawrence.com or call 914-273-4357.
Dear Joseph, Gary and Scott,

In review of the Master Plan Study for the Fields Issued February 5, 2021, I am deeply concerned by the proposed overdevelopment to the charming pocket park on Loughlin Avenue. The recommendations and priorities established within this document unequivocally do not address the needs of the Greenwich community and excluded community stakeholders. To act on these recommendations would be catastrophic.

Loughlin Playground currently provides critical outlets for outdoor athletic competition and recreational enjoyment for residents of all ages throughout the community. Per the report outdoor recreation needs relate not just to the sports/athletic programs that make use of them, but also to less formal recreational pursuits by individuals not aligned with a specific organization, like the neighborhood kids who seek a pickup game of football, baseball, or soccer within a particular venue or the parents who would like to stroll in the park with their children. Loughlin is documented as already achieving this important balance.

Therefore, I restate my opposition to the proposals A & B (pages 61-63), insist no funding be allocated to this effort, and request a redaction of these proposals from the report.

Terry Lohmeyer
33 Cross lane
Cos Cob, CT 06807

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.
Dear Misters Siciliano, Dell’Abate and Johnson,

In review of the Master Plan Study for the Fields Issued February 5, 2021, I am deeply concerned by the proposed overdevelopment to the charming pocket park on Loughlin Avenue. The recommendations and priorities established within this document unequivocally do not address the needs of the Greenwich community and excluded community stakeholders. To act on these recommendations would be catastrophic.

Loughlin Playground currently provides critical outlets for outdoor athletic competition and recreational enjoyment for residents of all ages throughout the community. Per the report outdoor recreation needs relate not just to the sports/athletic programs that make use of them, but also to less formal recreational pursuits by individuals not aligned with a specific organization, like the neighborhood kids who seek a pickup game of football, baseball, or soccer within a particular venue or the parents who would like to stroll in the park with their children. Loughlin is documented as already achieving this important balance.

I am also very concerned about the parking lot on the corner of Cross & Cedar. Cross is a one way street and I feel the possibility of people driving the wrong direction is astronomical. The amount of times I see it without the extra traffic is already an issue. I do also believe that additional impermeable surfaces will cause more water issues on this space with such a low water table.

Therefore, I restate my opposition to the proposals A & B (pages 61-63), insist no funding be allocated to this effort, and request a redaction of these proposals from the report.

Thank you
Christin Cody-O’Brien
61 Loughlin Ave
Cos Cob, CT

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.
From: Janice Merrill <janicehmerrill@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 25, 2021 11:30 AM
To: Siciliano, Joseph; Dell'Abate, Gary; Johnson, Scott N.; Camillo, Fred; Oberlander, Jill K.
Subject: Greenwich Athletic Field Study

[EXTERNAL]

Dear Mr. Siciliano,

We listened with interest to the virtual Parks and Recreation Meeting held on February 24, 2021. In particular, we focused on your decision to refine the terminology used in the recently-released Field Study.

As you will no doubt have noticed by now, the title of the pdf report on the Town of Greenwich website (which you scrambled to revise during the meeting) was not the only place where "master plan" is mentioned. In a cursory read of the document, we see it in "Acknowledgements" (which sets forth "Master Plan" as a short-hand version of the title (p iii)) and in the "Introduction" (pps 6, 7, 9), and the study is referred to as a "master planning effort" and "master planning process" in the "General Recommendations" section (p 20).

We do not point out these instances to "call you out," but as reflecting our confusion over the scope and intent of the newly-entitled "Greenwich Athletic Field Study Report Concepts." Although describing the foundation of the study as a "concept," when you set forth the timeline and process for developing individual projects — even potential projects — during the meeting, we were unable to distinguish any functional difference between what you refer to as "Concepts" and what we have seen roll out in Greenwich under the name "Master Plan."

How things are termed is nonetheless revealing. Most startling to us is the inclusion of Loughlin Park in this document under both of its names, since in each iteration the study announces itself to comprise "Greenwich Athletic Fields." Loughlin Park is, as its name indicates, a park. This spot of green in the middle of a dense, residential neighborhood looks like a park, and is enjoyed as a multi-use park every day of the year. There is no way that this area could be confused with an "athletic field," as even an out-of-towner would perceive in a few short minutes.

For someone such as yourself, who is so familiar with Greenwich, to effectively alter the fundamental characterization of Loughlin Park reveals either a lack of understanding of the neighborhood or a lack of consideration to residents.

Although some special-interest groups in Greenwich may desire "concepts" such as single-use athletic fields for them and large groups of out-of-towners, this approach fails to recognize the vast majority of residents who depend on passive recreation (requiring no additional development) that the park currently offers.

Primarily, though, we point out that including Loughlin Park in a survey of Greenwich athletic fields is just appropriation of a functioning neighborhood park through misnaming.

Sincerely,
Janice and George Merrill
54 Loughlin Avenue
Cos Cob

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.
Siciliano, Joseph

From: Loughlin Park Community <loughlinparkcommunity@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 29, 2021 11:22 AM
To: Siciliano, Joseph; Snyder, Susan; Coughlin, Tim; Wetlands; Sesto, Patricia; katiedeluca@greenwichct.org
Subject: A Letter From Over 100 Concerned Loughlin Park Residents

[EXTERNAL]

Good Morning,

As members of the Loughlin Park Community, we request the immediate removal of proposals A & B for the reconfiguration of Loughlin Park from the recently released Athletic Field Study/Capital Improvement Plan. The town paid an external firm $75,000, while failing to consult the local community, Loughlin Park residents, and the majority of regular park users. Town residents and Loughlin Park neighbors alike treasure this vibrant neighborhood green space and to suggest the destruction of this prized park is a travesty of great magnitude.

In our community letter to the editor, published in both the Greenwich Free Press and the Greenwich Sentinel, over 90 residents at the time of publishing outlined their concerns regarding this Master Plan.

The Master Plan states on page 9 it will be used to guide field and park improvement over the next 10 years for our community but failed to consult or address any passive users (the majority of users of this park). On pages 6, 7, and 9 it states that the plan would engage the Greenwich community in open dialogues, which it failed to do. It says it will create conceptual plans to meet the needs of the community and residents, which it does not. It says it will be endorsed by community members, which it is not (please refer again to the attached community letter to the editor). It further states that it held open forums with community members but it did not. The plan clearly states on page 10 that the informational and public comment sessions were held with active field user stakeholders only (the complete list can be found on page 10). Additionally, it says that a current field approval study was used as a factor but the lengthy field approval study found in Appendix D clearly shows that Loughlin Park has an overwhelmingly high approval rating making it abundantly clear that it is not in need of redesign or improvement.

We, as members of the Loughlin Park Community, want it to be clear that this redesign in no way embodies our wishes. We ask that no funding be given to the Parks & Recreation Department until the removal of Plans A & B for Loughlin Park from the Master Plan has taken place. The BET historically allocates unrestricted funding to P&R permitting the committee to do as they wish with no further community approval or hearings. Should the BET give any funding to P&R with the current Master Plan remaining as is, our beloved Loughlin Park remains at risk for destruction at any time with any generalized funding over the life of this Master Plan. This destruction would not only ruin the vibrant and idyllic Cos Cob/Loughlin Park neighborhood but would devalue the neighboring homes and turn one of the most desirable neighborhoods in town to a blighted region of Greenwich. We implore you all to take careful consideration of our desires and fears and remove these catastrophic plans and withhold funding to P&R until this is done.

Signed by the below members of the Loughlin Park Community

Margarita T Alban
Francesca Ambrosoni
Regan Avery
Eric Barrow
John Bosco
Traci Bosco
Roger Bowgen
Roxana Bowgen
Barbara Brigham
Barron Butler
Jennifer Butler
Dave Carrescia
Lawton Carrescia
Deborah Carrier
James Carrier
Matthew Chiavaroli
Veronica Chiavaroli
Eric B. Cornell
Jim Cummings
Keith Damsky
Sarah Damsky
Chris Day
Lorenzo De Ferrar
Leslie Dobryn
Bruce Fogwell
Nancy Fogwell
Sandra Grandinetti
Steven Grandinetti
Karen Griffiths
Janice Harmeier
David M. Hays
Maureen Kennedy Hays
Holly Hill
Porter Hill
Olivia Holt
Catherine T. Horn
William R. Horn
Mercedes Horner
Michele Horner
Kate Howell
Bill Irvine
Jen Jones
John Kamen
Sandy Kamen
Thomas Kartanowicz
Chris Keaveney
Peter Keaveney
Tricia Khan
Christine Kopprasch
Akshit Kumar
Emily Kunschner
John Kunschner
Fred Laffan
Nanette Laffan
Al Paul Lefton III
Denise Lefton
Caroline Lerum
Ed Lerum
Katherine LoBalbo
Gillian Marcott
Brad Markowitz
Mary Ellen Markowitz
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Donald McCormack
Margaret McCormack
James McGovern
Julia McGovern
Anne Merrill
George Merrill
Janice Merrill
Ariel Meyer
Sean Meyer
Marisa Mingione
Peter Mingione
Rosalie C. Monahan
Jean C. O'Brien
Christin Cody-O'Brien
Dennis O'Brien
Shinichi Otsuka
Tara Otsuka
Deborah Penn
Russell Penn, Sr
Eugenio Perito
Michelle Perito
Katherine Pushkar
David Quaranta
Jeanne Quaranta
Bret Rattray
Susan Mulvey Rattray
Hal Rubenstein
F. Clawson Smith
Pragati Soni
Andrei Vaida
Alison Walsh
James Walsh
John Whalen
Susan Whalen
Chris Wilson
Lauren Wilson
Gail Zaffino
Joe Zaffino
Susan Zicarelli
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Dear Town Officials:

I am sending this letter as part of the email and as an attachment. I hope you will give it your attention and consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Susan Mulvey Rattray

March 20, 2021

Dear Select Persons, BOE Members, Town Officials, and residents:

As a concerned resident I strongly object to the proposals for a reconfiguration of Loughlin Park presented in the Athletic Field Study/Capital Improvement Plan that the Department of Parks and Recreation released February 5, 2021. Without consulting local residents who value their vibrant neighborhood green space, the town paid an external consulting firm $75,000 to suggest revamping the area with exclusionary fences, paved parking lots, a splash pad, and a concession stand to serve the possible future needs of organized sports. The “Town of Greenwich Athletic Field Study Capital Plan 2020” reflects a recklessly inappropriate vision for the future of Loughlin Playground and Park since its proposals conflict with the town’s Plan of Conservation and Development and Open Space Plan as well as residential respect for environmental preservation. This “sports only” plan is a mind-boggling travesty and needs to be stricken from all master plans.

Loughlin Park is nestled in a family neighborhood a block from the center of Cos Cob and is the only local recreational area that is sidewalk accessible from Cos Cob’s village commercial center. The open green space attracts walkers, strollers, children, joggers, and dog owners for informal exercise and social interaction. Currently the park boasts two tennis courts, two paddle courts, adapted pickle ball courts, a baseball field, a playground, a basketball practice area, picnic tables and ample open lawn space where various soccer groups conduct practices and games. In addition to the designated ares people use the park for football, softball, yoga, bicycling, sledding, cross country skiing, sprints and casual gatherings. Children, whose homes are not on school bus routes, walk through the park safely on their way to GHS, Central, and Cos Cob. Commuters cut through the park on their way to or
from work. The park's proximity to so many houses lends the neighborhood a safe, cohesive camaraderie which would disappear if blacktop, fencing, and a commercial enterprise invaded.

Before any transformative alteration of the park could be seriously considered, the negative environmental impact must be recognized. Loughlin Avenue branches from Strickland Rd. on a coastal/tidal flood plain across from the Mill Pond Basin. The park sits below the FEMA Flood Plain, and it becomes virtually marshland when there is a prolonged rainy period. Serious, expensive topographical changes and tidal flood water management measures would be necessary before even thinking of adding impermeable parking surfaces above the soil. The elevated ledge on the north side of the park which the children call "The Mountain" would have to be removed further changing the land configuration, removing shade areas and altering wind patterns that affect the field's temperature.

The department of Parks and Recreation's director Joseph Siciliano sponsored this study at the behest of a group of commercial and amateur sports organizations, who are lobbying for more specialized athletic fields. Although Mr. Siciliano's title includes both parks and recreation, he has ignored the parks element of his job by eliminating consultation with neighbors and residents who utilize the park. Our taxes contribute to his salary as well as park maintenance, but apparently consideration of our opinions about park usage are outside of his purview. When a group of irate residents voiced objections, he refused to expunge this outrageously inappropriate and impractical plan from the records. Apparently his budget is largely discretionary, which may deserve review. He endorsed this fatuous study, yet he took more than a year to pay attention to the removal of dangerous hanging limbs and dead trees in the southwest corner of the park where children play and ride bikes daily. The same area supported the growth and expansion of a poison ivy patch from July of 2019 through at least November of 2020. No visible attempts were made to treat or remove the dangerous plants. Loughlin Park is a treasured neighborhood resource and deserves proper, attentive maintenance. Subjecting it to a costly partisan study rather than paying attention to safe upkeep indicates a lapse of responsible judgment on the part of departmental leadership.

Residents of the Loughlin Park area have banded together as a community to reiterate our request for the removal of the ill-conceived and inappropriate concept plans for Loughlin Park as shown in the Athletic Field Study/Capital Improvement Plan 2020. We have garnered over a hundred residents' signatures in support of the excision of this segment of the published document. Obviously the hired consultant was given poor direction with a lack of pragmatic guidelines to come up with a series of drastic alterations that would change the character of a treasured neighborhood. The Department of Parks and Recreation should not be authorized any further funding for this park beyond regular planting, seeding, cutting, repairing, and regular vegetative improvements. Should the Department wish to consider any changes, it should work with the Loughlin Park Community which is dedicated to the protection and appropriate enhancement of Loughlin Park. I urge you to give this matter serious attention as it affects the health and well being of many residents.

Yours sincerely,

Susan Mulvey Rattray

30 Strickland Rd.
Dear Joe and Fred,

Thank you for coming out to meet with adjacent property owners on Loughlin Park. While I will say it is still the sentiment below stands and below should be attached in the appendix for public record. I think it was extremely productive and positive to be live rather than remote.

I look forward to seeing the playground improvements and welcome continued involvement in decisions and discussion in regards to preservation of this quintessential neighborhood park.

Katherine LoBalbo, NCARB, RA
District 2
Park and Recreation RTM, Chair
203-241-1431
katherine.lobelbo@greenwichct.org

[EXTERNAL]

Good Afternoon,

As members of the Loughlin Park Community, we request the immediate removal of proposals A & B for the reconfiguration of Loughlin Park from the recently released Athletic Field Study/Capital Improvement Plan. The town paid an external firm $75,000, while failing to consult the local community, Loughlin Park residents, and the majority of regular park users. Town residents and Loughlin Park neighbors alike treasure this vibrant neighborhood green space and to suggest the destruction of this prized park is a travesty of great magnitude.

In our community letter to the editor, published in both the Greenwich Free Press and the Greenwich Sentinel, over 90 residents at the time of publishing outlined their concerns regarding this Master Plan.

The Master Plan states on page 9 it will be used to guide field and park improvement over the next 10 years for our community but failed to consult or address any passive users (the majority of users of this park). On pages 6, 7, and 9 it states that the plan would engage the Greenwich community in open dialogues, which it failed to do. It says it will create conceptual plans to meet the needs of the community and residents, which it does not. It says it will be endorsed by community members, which it is not (please refer again to the attached community letter to the editor). It further states that it held open forums with community members but it did not.
The plan clearly states on page 10 that the informational and public comment sessions were held with active field user stakeholders only (the complete list can be found on page 10). Additionally, it says that a current field approval study was used as a factor but the lengthy field approval study found in Appendix D clearly shows that Loughlin Park has an overwhelmingly high approval rating making it abundantly clear that it is not in need of redesign or improvement.

We, as members of the Loughlin Park Community, want it to be clear that this redesign in no way embodies our wishes. We ask that no funding be given to the Parks & Recreation Department until the removal of Plans A & B for Loughlin Park from the Master Plan has taken place. The BET historically allocates unrestricted funding to P&R permitting the committee to do as they wish with no further community approval or hearings. Should the BET give any funding to P&R with the current Master Plan remaining as is, our beloved Loughlin Park remains at risk for destruction at any time with any generalized funding over the life of this Master Plan. This destruction would not only ruin the vibrant and idyllic Cos Cob/Loughlin Park neighborhood but would devalue the neighboring homes and turn one of the most desirable neighborhoods in town to a blighted region of Greenwich. We implore you all to take careful consideration of our desires and fears and remove these catastrophic plans and withhold funding to P&R until this is done.

Signed by the below members of the Loughlin Park Community

Margarita T Alban
Francesca Ambrosoni

Regan Avery

Eric Barrow
John Bosco
Traci Bosco
Roger Bowgen
Roxana Bowgen
Barbara Brigham
Barron Butler
Jennifer Butler
Dave Carrescia
Lawton Carrescia
Deborah Carrier
James Carrier
Matthew Chiavaroli
Veronica Chiavaroli
Eric B. Cornell
Jim Cummings
Keith Damsky
Sarah Damsky
Chris Day
Lorenzo De Ferrari
Leslie Dobryn
Bruce Fogwell
Nancy Fogwell
Sandra Grandinetti
Steven Grandinetti
Karen Griffiths
Janice Harmeier
David M. Hays
Maureen Kennedy Hays
Holly Hill
Porter Hill
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