



CITY OF STAMFORD
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION
888 WASHINGTON BOULEVARD
P.O. BOX 10152
STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT 06904-2152

ADDENDUM NO. 1
(April 6, 2021)
Request for Proposals No. 828
Redevelop 35 Crescent Street for Affordable Housing

Addendum No. 1 is being issued to all potential bidders to provide the items and attachments set forth herein which shall act to qualify, clarify, or otherwise modify the Contract Documents previously issued regarding the above referenced project. These items, whether of omission, addition, substitution, or clarification, shall be incorporated into the proposals submitted by all bidders, and receipt of this document and its attachments must be acknowledged, either in the space provided on the Bid Form or on the Contractor's Form of Proposal. Failure to do so may subject the Bidder to disqualification.

The items and references:

Addendum No. 1 is issued to provide responses to a number of questions and to consolidate all previously issued General Bid Notifications.

- The presentation from Feb. 18, 2021 is posted, as is a facility assessment.
- Note to all proposers - The correct V-C Village Commercial District is Section 4.B.7. Village Commercial District, specifically subsection 4.B.7.b.(1) "In the V-C Districts in Glenbrook and Springdale, on land within 100 feet of Arterial Streets as defined in Subsection 4.B.7.c(7) below... which Glenbrook Community Center is located allows for an additional story – that is, the existing structure is 3 stories, which means the maximum is 4 stories.
- Please note - the third floor will be accessible during the tour scheduled for Friday, Feb. 26th.
- Stamford RFP No. 828 Glenbrook Community Center Dwg Set has been posted.
- Clarification #2 re the max. building height with the 7.3 bonus for the Glenbrook Community Center that is zoned Village Commercial (V-C) and designated an arterial road.

Per the new Zoning Regulations: Proposers are allowed one story additional than what is permitted as of right. That is, for V-C on an arterial road, Zoning allows 4 1/2 stories as of right within 100 feet of an Arterial Street, and 3 stories beyond 100 feet ; however, with the historic bonus (Section 7.3) developers can propose a full 5 stories within 100 feet of the arterial road and 4 stories beyond.

- The "As Built" drawings were provided to serve as reference material only. State prevailing wage requirements or federal Davis Bacon wage rates would be required if a developer will use state, local or federal funds in the project.

1) With regards to the requirement stated in the RFP of the preserving the historical significance of the existing building, could you confirm if the additional building at the rear of the main building (where the bathrooms are located) can be demolished? It appears to be an add on building post original construction of the main building. We would look to preserve and enhance the main building but would want this building removed so we could tie the “new to the old”.

A) Per Dr. Woods, “Yes you can demolish – it was an add-on, reminder as I said in the briefing the goal here is preserve the historic character of the building especially the façade.”

2) Could you confirm which local, state, federal historical registers 35 Crescent St is currently listed on?

A) Proposers should review the current listings maintained by federal, state and local entities such as:

https://portal.ct.gov/DECD/Content/Historic-Preservation/03_Technical_Assistance_Research/Research/Historic-Property-Database

https://portal.ct.gov/DECD/Content/Historic-Preservation/01_Programs_Services/Historic-Designations/National-Register-of-Historic-Places

Local Historic Resource information can be obtained from the Stamford Historical Society, Ferguson Library and City of Stamford Community Development Office.

3) If the proposed development proposal incorporates the day care use into its submission, Is an outside play area required by code?

Proposers are responsible for determining and satisfying requirements as they pertain to their specific proposals.

4) Regarding your evaluation criteria of each submission on its own merits, are you able to confirm the cash remuneration v the affordable equivalency valuation matrix, are they both considered 1:1 weighting? I.e. \$1m of cash is equal to \$1m of affordable equivalency is considered the same value in the scoring?

This information is not currently available.

All other terms and conditions of **RFP No. 828** remain the same.

Erik J. Larson
Purchasing Agent

Cc: David W. Woods, PhD, FAICP, PP, Deputy Director of Planning
Purchasing Department File