Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan

Public Comment Summary Report
(Comments Received July 15-September 5, 2025)

Overall Sentiment

- Future land use, especially surrounding the R2 category, was by far the most heavily commented on section of the plan. Approximately 75% of all comments received concerned future land use.
- Even amid overwhelming criticism on future land use (in part, due to misconception that future land use = rezoning), there is a consistent thread of general praise for the depth, formatting, and professionalism of the plan.
    - Ginny Johnson:
      "This plan is incredibly comprehensive, thoughtful and reflective of SO many of the values I hold for myself and my family. I am so proud to live in such an innovative and progressive place! Thank you for all that you do – it is very appreciated!"
    - Zachary Oberholtzer:
      "I'm very impressed with the 2035 Comp Plan Draft. If this is implemented in close to the form outlined in the draft I think it would be a huge step forward for the city and greatly improve quality of life for all residents. Thank you so much for you and the team's hard work."
    - Kevin Maguire (young family):
      "Overall, it appears a lot of thought and consideration have gone into this plan for the next ten years. I've got a young family here in Stamford, and I'm here for the long haul! So I'm excited to see what the future holds."
    - Robin Stein (former planning director):
      "Very complete, comprehensive, formatted and well done!! ... Again, thanks for your effort and work you have accomplished."
    - Lila Croen):
      "I was very impressed by the Comprehensive Plan and hope that Stamford will be able to achieve most of the goals and plans described in this thoughtful document."
    - Matthew Keenan:
      "The Connected City (mobility) portion of the plan is tremendous... Great work overall, the extensive community outreach is appreciated, I feel as if the community is really being heard."
    - Elizabeth Middleton (Belltown, supporting density map):
      "I support this section of the plan, in particular the controversial map... I am very much in favor of improvements in pedestrian and cycling infrastructure... Please do not take a vocal minority to be representative of the majority."
    - Ksenia King (explicit defense of "missing middle"):
      "Excellent work on the Stamford 2035 draft plan. I strongly support the clear commitment to fostering 'missing middle' housing and expanding diverse, affordable housing options across the city... Many residents are quietly cheering for these exact policies."

- Alicia B (Springdale homeowner):
  "Thank you for such a comprehensive, detailed, and well-laid out plan."
- Melanie Hollas (Parks Commission):
  "Thank you for a well done comprehensive plan."

Introduction & Engagement Process

Themes:

- **Schools omitted from Plan (5–7 comments logged):**
  Several parents, including Jane Taylor, criticized the draft for *completely ignoring Stamford Public Schools* (SPS). They argued school quality is central to family retention and city reputation. Magnet lotteries and charter waitlists show unmet demand; omission was called a "huge miss."
  - Editor's Note: As a land use plan, this plan does not focus on school performance or quality.

- **Transparency & Outreach concerns (15–20 comments):**
  Strong frustration that engagement was not meaningful. Complaints included:
  - Reliance on "25,000 impressions" inflated by student participation
  - "Sticky-note" exercises viewed as symbolic, not substantive
  - No mailed notices to property owners despite major zoning impacts
  - Calls for processes mirroring UPS "rezoning notices" or tax bill inserts

- **Reliability of data & language (≈20+ comments, esp. multiple by Katherine Grenier):**
  - Traffic decrease statistic (–16% 2018–23) roundly doubted due to COVID skew
  - Water/electric projections dismissed as implausible; Editor's Note: This statistic was updated in plan refinements.
  - Student population drop of 500 "buried" without explanation
  - Overuse of jargon ("hardscape," "mobility assets") → requests for plain language

- **General skepticism of growth focus (≈10+ comments):**

  "If more is better, why is it never enough?"
  Residents questioned why plan presumes perpetual expansion instead of stabilizing and improving quality of life.

Future Land Use

This section generated the single largest volume of submissions.

Major Themes

- **Perceived "Rezoning" of Single Family Neighborhoods (≈75+ objections logged):**
  Strong opposition citywide (Cove, Belltown, Glenbrook, Springdale, East Side). Main arguments:
    - Loss of neighborhood identity/character
    - Traffic, parking, and emergency access risks
    - Flooding vulnerability (esp. Cove)
    - Perception that rezoning favors developers at residents' expense
    - Opposition to ACUs (garage-to-commercial conversions) as dangerous precedents
- **Hubbard Heights (Historic District: ≈35–38 unique objections):**
  Most unified bloc of feedback citywide.
    - Historic preservation: neighborhood is on the National Register (dating to 1695) and "Doctor's Row." Upzoning contradicted stated preservation goals.
    - Fear of commercial intrusion ("We don't want Hubbard Ave to become another Summer or Bedford").
    - Equity/property value: belief homes in R2 zones will lose value while R1 zones appreciate — a "safe haven divide."
    - Process trust: repeated references to betrayal, secrecy, and broken promises.
- **Net message:** *Hubbard Heights must remain R1.*
- **Equity Concerns (10+ objections across East Side, Cove, etc.):**
  Accusations that plan disproportionately upzones already dense, ethnically diverse neighborhoods while leaving enclaves like Shippan and North Stamford untouched.
  Quote: *"Single-family houses for the rich only."*
- **Support for Missing Middle Housing (≈8–10 supportive comments):**
  Younger professionals, families, and affordability advocates supported adding duplexes/townhomes as entry-level ownership. Voices like Kevin Maguire, Elizabeth Middleton, and Ksenia King praised "missing middle" as a compromise between towers and exclusivity.

City of Opportunity

Themes:

- **Attracting Jobs & Industry (5+ comments):**
  Calls to recruit tech/AI firms (ASML in Wilton, NYC commuter tech talent).

- **Historic preservation split:**

  - Some want stronger preservation mandates.

  - At least one argued historic districts "keep newcomers out and rents high."

- **Design Quality Downtown (≈6 submissions):**
  Calls for **better building design guidelines**, setbacks from roads, human-scale street retail, and less homogeneity in towers.

Healthy City

Themes:

- **Senior Needs (≈20 consistent supportive submissions):**

  - Senior Center currently serves ~1,000 residents, at capacity

  - Programs vital for social connection, nutrition, and aging in place

  - Multiple voices (Laurie Pensiero, Donna Wolff, Sherry Sears, Maureen Constantinides) urged accelerated investment — timeline of 4–6 years seen as inadequate

  - Proposals to rename as **"Senior Center of Excellence"**

- **This is the most unified *positive* theme in the record.**

- **Conservation / Open Space (≈10–12 comments):**

  - Support for OS2 designation (but frustration that OS2 mapped far from high-density areas).

  - Calls for ecologists on staff to manage habitats, wetlands, riparian buffers.

- **Divergence on Roads & Traffic:**

  - Group resists "traffic calming," instead demanding widened roads, longer turn lanes, and more parking.

  - Environmental and safety advocates supported *more sidewalks, bike lanes, Vision Zero principles, and Blue-Green corridors.*

Connected City (Mobility)

Themes:

- **Transit Underserve (≈10+ comments):**
  - North Stamford lacks library, transit, and basic city services.
  - Residents want a neighborhood center (coffee shop, gym, civic space) and improved connections to train stations.
  - Bus Route 336 cited multiple times: hourly service, no nights/weekends — contradicts Plan claim of oversupply.
- **Traffic Stats Rejected (≈15+ comments):**
  - Strong consensus: “Everyone knows traffic is worse.”
  - Dismissal of plan’s cited decrease in vehicle trips (2018–23) as false and COVID–skewed.
- **Positive Responses (≈12+ comments):**
  - Broad support for better EV charging, separated/protected bike lanes, and expanded pedestrian safety.
  - Calls to pedestrianize downtown corridors (e.g. Bedford Street).
  - Support for Vision Zero as a framework for family safety/walkability.

Affordable City

Themes:

- **Skepticism of Housing Affordability Promises (≈20+ objections):**
  - Evidence that thousands of new luxury rental units have been built without improving affordability.
  - Concern developers exploit **fee-in-lieu** loopholes with no accountability; demands for transparency on dollars collected & outcomes.
  - Strong requests to raise required inclusionary percentages to 15–25%.
- **Support for Middle Housing (≈10 supportive comments):**

    - Younger families want duplexes, townhouses, and opportunities for ownership — not only high-rise rentals.
    - Frustration at lack of affordable single-family homes.

- **General Split:**
  Roughly **2/3 opposing changes to single-family zoning**; **1/3 supportive (mostly younger cohort) advocating for more options.**

Prosperous City

Themes:

- **Pro-Growth Voices (~10 comments):**
  Suggested cultivating AI/tech hub, expanding UConn campus on office park land, encouraging Costco/BJs, creating design/arts districts, subsidizing live–work for artists.

- **Anti-Growth Voices (~10–12 comments):**
  Warned overbuilding luxury rentals strains infrastructure, traffic, and erodes tax stability.
  Repeat critique: *"If more is better, why is it never enough?"*

Public Comment Form: Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan (Responses)

Timestamp	Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?	Introduction *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Future Land Use *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	City of Opportunity *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Healthy City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Connected City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Affordable City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Prosperous City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
7/14/2025 15:41:44	Yes			I was very disappointed not to see anything related to investing in our public schools. This is a critical area that Stamford continuously falls short in, especially compared to neighboring towns. Many Stamford families with higher levels of education and higher levels of income are no longer putting their children in SPS because they are so poorly managed. There is a reason why the magnet school lotteries are have waitlists hundreds of names long and why charter schools are on the rise. SPS cannot compete academically and I think it's a huge miss to not include such an important aspect of our city within the Comprehensive Plan. How does Stamford think it's going to retain and grow with families when they are leaving for Fairfield, Wilton, and other towns that prioritize children's education and supporting families? I went through SPS and as the parent of an incoming Kindergartner, have been shocked at how poorly managed SPS has been - falling short in every area, especially communication. If my family decides to leave Stamford it will be entirely due to the crumbling public school system and lack of interest local government seems to have in making any improvements in this area.						Jane Taylor	jane.taylor24@gmail.com		Yes
7/15/2025 21:00:49	Yes		52 - I've noticed there is a blue highlighted section on Hubbard Ave when you blow up the 2035 map. What does this highlighted area mean? There are no explanations on the page of why it's highlighted. This is my neighborhood and we need to understand what you are planning for this site. I hope you know this is a single family neighborhood with R20 zoning. From the looks of it, this highlighted area is currently in litigation with the courts and a judge will be deciding the fate of that property. Whatever you have in mind, it must adhere to the judgment. Have questions about this matter? Speak to Tom Cassone, head of the city's legal dept. He'll fill you in on the lawsuit.	70 & 86 - Apparently, you only care about preserving historic properties in North Stamford! What about the historic districts in other neighborhoods? You're reclassifying Single Family Neighborhoods now as "Residential NEIGHBORHOODS" to increase density by allowing more ADUs, duplexes, triplexes, etc. I'm opposed to this change! 75 - Now you want to allow people to convert their garages to coffee shops/salons/etc (ACUs) with no off-street parking requirements? This is ridiculous. Where do you expect people to park who don't live walking distance to this place? People from other areas WILL be driving there. You're putting commercial businesses in single family zones that weren't built to accommodate this type of traffic. I'm opposed to this change!			136 - Now you want to impose unrestricted ADUs throughout the whole city! This will negatively impact single family neighborhoods in R7-1/2 and R10 zones. We don't have enough space between properties as it is and you want to increase the density with more people and cars? First you rammed this concept down our throats (which few homeowners took advantage of) and you now want to get rid of all the ADU regulations we have in place: like no minimum lot size, no maximum height size, no maximum sq ft size, no required off-street parking. Have you even considered the congestion on streets if EVERYONE built an ADU in R10 & R7-1/2 zones? How are emergency vehicles/police/firetrucks going to navigate narrow streets? I'm opposed to this change!		Throw out this master plan. Go back to square one and actually meet face-to-to with people who live in different parts of the city to find out what WE want in our neighborhoods. Your workshops were not conducive to having any meaningful input from the public. You had posters already prepared to tell US what YOUR (or the mayor's) vision for Stamford was going to be in 10 years. This whole process was pointless bec things were already decided behind closed doors. Those yellow sticky notes were a ludicrous way to leave comments. How many fell off in transporting the posters around? You should have videotaped the public's reactions and had them transcribed for the records. There was no transparency in this process.	Laura Martin	lauramartinct@aol.com	Taxpayer & long time Stamford resident of Hubbard Heights Neighborhood Association	Yes
7/16/2025 3:46:55	Yes	Page 13 - I disagree with the bus service outline to long ridge road which is cttransit route 336, That route is not overserved it's underserved, Bus mainly runs hourly on weekdays and there is no night time and weekend service on this route.	N/A	Page 85 - I'm in support of the ST-5.7 to create a public safety facility in the Downtown area	In support of the overall plans to reduce flood risks	Page 131 - In Support of ST-20.2 20.3 20.4 and 20.7, ST-20.5 I think the trolley route should operate on the washington blvd and cold spring corridor to bulls head and back down summer street into downtown and back to Harbor Point since there is a lack of CTtransit bus service on the Washington Blvd Corridor.	N/A	N/A	On the transit side the bus map needs to be redone, 336 along the washington blvd and long ridge road corridors should be considered underserved as well the routes 326 and 327 running on the south end and Shippan Ave areas which also don't get a lot of bus service.	Dylan	dj1998d@gmail.com	N/A	Yes
7/16/2025 11:03:23	Yes		I live in North Stamford off of High Ridge Road. We do not have access to basic city services like public transit, garbage collection, city water or gas. The proposed public transit lines would not service our area. My daughter does not have a Stamford Library in her own neighborhood. We have cross registered w/libraries in Pound Ridge and New Canaan because they are more accessible than Stamford's nearest library, Harry Bennet which isn't even located in the North Stamford neighborhood. While I love that North Stamford has a wooded, rural feel, I think that we need basic city planning and a "neighborhood center" the way that all of the surrounding neighborhoods and towns have including Pound Ridge (Scott's Corners), New Canaan, Bedford and Greenwich (Banksville). We don't have a local gym, coffee shop or library where we can meet other members of the North Stamford community or welcome visitors after a hike in one of North Stamford's exemplary public spaces. Positive, productive 3rd places for community to happen are desperately needed up here. I am very much pro development, smart density and also believe in the accessibility and preservation of open space. Something maybe attached/adjacent to the FireHouse on High Ridge - already a city owned space - could be great. Coffee + communal space would be great there. Additionally there has to be a faster way for us to Access trains for us to get to stamford station in the am it can take us longer than 35mins not including parking time. Our closest train is New Canaan and we dont have parking privileges there. Also at best the train service is on the New Canaan line is sporadic. Additional later morning trains would be particularly appreciated.							you have to do something about school quality perception.	Toren Kutnick	torenkutnick@gmail.com		Yes

Timestamp	Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?	Introduction *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Future Land Use *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	City of Opportunity *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Healthy City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Connected City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Affordable City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Prosperous City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
7/16/2025 11:18:05	Yes		25: I live in North Stamford off of High Ridge Road. We do not have access to basic city services like public transit, garbage collection, city water or gas. The proposed public transit lines would not service our area. My daughter does not have a Stamford Library in her own neighborhood. We have cross registered w/libraries in Pound Ridge and New Canaan because they are more accessible than Stamford's nearest library, Harry Bennet which isn't even located in the North Stamford neighborhood. While I love that North Stamford has a wooded, rural feel, I think that we need basic city planning and a "neighborhood center" the way that all of the surrounding neighborhoods and towns have including Pound Ridge (Scott's Corners), New Canaan, Bedford and Greenwich (Banksville). We don't have a local gym, coffee shop or library where we can meet other members of the North Stamford community or welcome visitors after a hike in one of North Stamford's exemplary public spaces. Positive, productive 3rd places for community to happen are desperately needed up here. I am very much pro development, smart density and also believe in the accessibility and preservation of open space. Please consider adding a additional Mixed Used Neighborhood Center zoning to North Stamford and funding a comprehensive public library in this neighborhood 27: please consider providing gathering space and access to public preserved land.	41: Please consider hiring or consulting with an architecture firm for the approval of building design for new construction downtown. Maybe even consider some design guidelines and standards for highrise buildings moving forward. Our new construction is looking homogenous and cost engineered. We are an internationally relevant city and deserve to speak in a design language commensurate of the city we are building. Also, please consider how close buildings are setback from the road. A larger setback and human-scale first floor retail would create a more welcoming and friendly walking culture in downtown Stamford. Pelase also note, the "sides" of buildings are often very close to the road and are only setback a standard sidewalk width. They are not well considered and are creating streets that are not walkable or welcoming. I have noticed they end up in disrepair or poorly lit and detract from the feeling of safety in the area.	47: North stamford has many opportunities to build healthy habits and community in it's existing public spaces! Please consider where a Gym, outdoor equipment for working out on curated walking trails, healthy prepared food with ample parking could go. Larocca's is great but it's not a gathering place - there's not enough parking or public transit to turn it into a 3rd place.		Make it advantageous to add ADUs to North Stamford homes.	Many thoughts here: I work at Google as a Product Lead covering Data and AI. My commute is 2 hours each way, 3 days a week. I would love to spend 12 hours a week in Stamford with my family instead of commuting. Given that, Stamford needs a dedicated point of view about how it will be attracting the tech sector and strategically engaging within the biggest opportunities out there. One of the largest, most important companies in the AI space, ASML, is located right here in Wilton, Connecticut. How will Stamford attract employees and jobs from ASML? Are there other companies in the space that Stamford could attract? As millennials become parents, they are moving out of NYC because NYC no longer works for their growing families. Many of us are in Tech but are extreme commuters because tech is downtown in NYC. How can we encourage tech to be more accessible to Stamford, encouraging more employees in that sector to live here?	This plan is incredibly comprehensive, thoughtful and reflective of SO many of the values I hold for myself and my family. I am so proud to live in such an innovative and progressive place! Thank you for all that you do - it is very appreciated!	Ginny Johnson	ginny.bea.johnson@gmail.com		Yes
7/17/2025 12:49:44	I have reviewed parts of it			86. ST 6.1. Historic districts are bad. They do not preserve history so much as make the future a slave to the past. There are much better ways to preserve our history than to cast entire neighborhoods in amber. In Stamford historic districts have been cynically deployed to preserve segregation, keep rents high and block opportunities for new comers to the city. This highly destructive practice should not be encouraged. In fact we should be seeking to undue previous historic districts. Entire neighborhoods are not so architecturally interesting that they should be preserved forever in an effort to create enclaves of exclusivity in our city. Please remove this recommendation.					ACUs should also be allowed in Shippan. I'm very impressed with the 2035 Comp Plan Draft. If this is implemented in close to the form outlined in the draft I think it would be a huge step forward for the city and greatly improve quality of life for all residents. Thank you so much for you and the team's hard work.	Zachary Oberholtzer	obie717@gmail.com	People Friendly Stamford/TAC	Yes
7/17/2025 16:35:43	Yes		p51, 65, 98 I was heartened to hear the cry for more "real" nature in the 2035 focus groups I attended and to see the proposal to make an OS2 zoning category. However, it's sad to see that the proposed OS2's are far from where the major of residents live, and that the smaller conservation areas in the walkable/bus-able parks such as Scalzi, Cove, and Kosciuszko have been mostly overlooked. This is not Environmental Justice. We need OS2s in walking distance of most of the population. Further, the OS2 designations are meaningless without competent staffing. Today there is no one in Stamford in authority as far as I can see who knows how to manage for wildlife -- riparian buffers are being clear cut where they should be left to support wildlife and prevent erosion; garden cultivars are being planted as "natives" instead of local ecotypes; state wetland regulations are being ignored, etc. Yet I see no plan to add expertise in this category. We should have someone in authority who can protect and foster the OS2's.								Sue Sweeney	ssweeney4440@gmail.com	Stamford home owner	Yes
7/17/2025 18:07:37	Yes								Very complete, comprehensive, formatted and well done!! A very few comments: Page 96, ST9.4. Delete the word "EXPLORE" No need to "explore" transitioning to a full time sustainability person. City should have created a full-time dedicated staff person years ago. Other towns and cities in Connecticut have dedicated sustainability staff. Page 84, Your emphasis on capital planning is extremely important. ST5.1– the idea of a MAPPED data base for capital is long overdue. I recall going to a conference in Philadelphia in the 70s and being impressed by their mapped capital program well before GIS. I never could get Stamford to do the same even after GIS but hopefully they will listen to you. You may want to add LUB, which houses the GIS function, to ST5.1 Again, thanks for your effort and work you have accomplished. A separate summary of recommended actions may be in order as it is a lot to digest.	Robin Stein	stein.robin.m@gmail.com	AICP, Former Land Use Bureau Chief, now retired	Yes

Timestamp	Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?	Introduction *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Future Land Use *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	City of Opportunity *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Healthy City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Connected City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Affordable City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Prosperous City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
7/19/2025 10:47:36	Yes	18 A town can't be the second largest behind TWO others! The actual numbers are Bridgeport about 148K, Stamford about 136K, New Haven about 135K. 19 "large" lots sounds judge-y and vague. Why not just say 1-5 acre lots, or whatever the figure is. 20 "12%" -- is that a lot? 21 "hardscape" is a professional term. Use civilian language- eg paved over, or asphalt and concrete, or surfaces that can't drain. "This intensifies.." sentence is incomprehensible to a regular reader. Use understandable language- don't write for other planners. " expand urban forestry" Use understandable language. Maybe "plant trees"! (Any hope for permeable pavers?) I can't find a simple summary of the user feedback you got. Lots of "should" language, but it's not clear that those recommendations align with what people asked for. Note that it all may align perfectly, but that certainly isn't clear. The individual summaries seem to mix feedback and advice- and are they in priority order? I ask because often the recommendations don't follow the same priorities. All maps need a few more reference points. I've lived here for almost 13 years and still can't find useful reference points. 23 The "2000%" figure is clearly erroneous. Checking other references, the figure is likely something between 18 and 25%. This leads to another big problem: no visible cross references for your facts. In public documents, you must clearly cite your sources. If it's buried somewhere, it' s too hidden. 25 "mobility assets" is professional language. Use clear regular language. The "bridging the gap" sentence is incomprehensible. A gap is between two things: you can't list three things and call it a gap. Very confusing. WHÖ needs to coordinate with Ct. DOT. What do they need to coordinate that they're not coordinating now? Very muddy! What about links to adjacent towns ? These individual small town systems do not coordinate well at all.								Yes, will continue on another form, thanks	Katherine Grenier	Ktgrenier2@gmail.com		Yes

Timestamp	Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?	Introduction *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Future Land Use *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	City of Opportunity *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Healthy City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Connected City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Affordable City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Prosperous City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
7/19/2025 11:49:41	Yes	26"suburban-style development challenges the pedestrian experience..." is professional language, totally unclear to regular people. Say what you mean! The assertion about average daily traffic being down by 16% between 2018 and 2023 is dubious. No source is cited, and this number can not be found on the relevant website. (I've asked them for clarification, but haven't heard back yet.) Secondly- that timeframe includes COVID! Of course traffic was down! Every person in Stamford can tell you that traffic and traffic congestion has risen dramatically in the last decade. You need to go back to your sources and straighten this out or your report will lose a great deal of credibility. In a related note- how is Stamford doing in terms of parking? The downtown is very car dependent. How's the parking availability compared to other specific towns, or benchmarks? 27 "cultural resistance" reads as obnoxiously judge-y. Face it, it's hard to drive on many many roads in Stamford, like much of the U.S., when sharing the road with bikes, and e-bikes. It's a visibility problem, it's a speed problem since you end up having to pass bikes on tight roads to keep drivers behind you from getting mad: it's not good. This deserves serious objective thought. This is not Denmark or Holland. We don't have a bike culture. If you think we should develop one (assuming a big majority of users want it, which is not clear) you need to make objective reasonable positive proposals, ideally using some other location's good experience. "Rebalance" is a tricky concept is a place that's so dispersed. This is not Paris! It would seem much more constructive to support the areas where walking and biking do make sense, and focus on good public transportation between them. Maybe that's what you're trying to say - if so, it's not clear enough. 28 The discussion of state and city interaction is vague. Who is responsible for what, and what's the actual problem? What's going on at the Transportation Center? There are several mentions, but no specifics, and it seems pretty important. What exactly are the photos trying to show? Shouldn't that be explained, and shouldn't the direction and buildings be identified? 29 What does "actively updating its infrastructure governance" mean in normal language? If open space exceeds national recommendations, why not give the two figures, and say who set the standard? The bombshell about student population dropping by 500 is worded very indirectly. This is a big deal. Is that a good thing or a bad thing? What does the efficiency consist of? If it means closing schools, why not say so? As written, it's unclear. Waste management at ten times the past rate of increase?! That's wild! What's going on? 30 Underfunding compared to what metric? And how would adding EV charging stations help? It seems that the feedback you got is about improving maintenance - that's what people want, but you don't seem to really focus on that. Note this applies to many areas, not just infrastructure. The sense we hear a lot is that people do not want Stamford to change, but they would like it to be better maintained. That's a different value system, and it would be wise to take it seriously. 31 Why would relying on external consultants complicate adapting to changing situations, or responding to emergencies. This seems like a hint of some sort of internal bureaucratic infighting, but it's not clear what, or why it matters. Obviously all organizations need to use external consultants for specialized tasks. What's the problem, and what does it have to do with the purpose of this document? 32 and 33 Are seniors 15% or 25%? 33 These maps are impossible to understand. Downtown and Ridgeway are 100% Asian? I'm sure that's not what it means, but the graphics read that way! This seems like useful background information, worth tracking over the long term even if it has no planning value, but it's got to be easier to understand. And								Yes, will continue on other forms.	Katherine Grenier	Ktgrenier2@gmail.com		Yes

Timestamp	**Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?**	**Introduction** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Future Land Use** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**City of Opportunity** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Healthy City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Connected City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Affordable City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Prosperous City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?**	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
7/21/2025 12:27:37	Yes		I oppose the elimination of R 7 1/2 zoning in the Cove, East Side, Glenbrook , and Springdale. The "missing middle" already owns property in these areas. You are only allowing single family zones in the wealthy parts of town ie Shippan, Dolphin Cove, west over, and North Stamford. Why aren't those areas being "infilled" with this missing middle. The East Side has too much density and traffic for the existing streets and pedestrians and cycling. This plan will drive middle income property owners out of Stamford. Also there are flooding issues in the Cove not addressed in this plan. More density would exacerbate flood issues on Weed Ave and the surrounding streets. I also question the ability of the fire department to access congested streets. More density means more cars. Many roads are barely passable currently. In summary I believe there needs to be a comprehensive traffic/ accident study as well as a coastal water management plan before any change in zoning is made to any of the current zoned single family zones in the Entire East Side of Stamford. Any effort to increase housing density needs to be shared more equitably accross the Entire City. Not Concentrated on the East Side						I think there is something very wrong with a plan which will put more people into what is already a racially and ethnic diverse area of town and economically diverse. While maintaining the richer and whiter area of town as they are. Single family houses for the rich only!!	Kathryn Barrios	kbarrios@aol.com	Cove Neighborhood Asdoc	Yes
7/21/2025 13:51:40	I have reviewed parts of it		pp 51, 65, 98						p51, 65, 98I like the OS2 zoning category. I want to see proposed OS2's closer to where most folks live. I'd also enjoy conservation areas in or near parks on bus lines and within walking distance for more residents such as Scalzi, Cove, and Kosciuszko. Folks who don't drive also deserve to enjoy places where truly native plants and wildlife habitats are fostered, as these once were (across the street from where I live) on the Mill River along Scalzi Park. It's a shame that the Mill River restoration and conservation project was discontinued and now clearcutting hurts wildlife habitats, and can increase erosion. Staff who understand the consequences of recent ill-advised clear cutting should be sought out and employed. Managing these "undeveloped" areas to support wildlife requires expertise and long-term commitment, neither of which seems to be available among the decision makers in Stamford at present. Please include a position for at least one decision maker with expertise and commitment to this OS2 zoning category.	Evelyn Avoglia	evavoglia@hotmail.com	n/a	Yes
7/22/2025 10:31:35	Yes		Love seeing more sidewalks and bike lanes. Would like to see even MORE conservation land and new parkland. Would like less/fewer new apartment buildings. Would rather see office buildings stay offices as that's better for tax revenue. Buildings near the water should be raised more than 3 feet - as someone who works in sustainability, I can tell you Harbor Point already regularly floods so they should be raised like 8 feet. Bridges also should be raised 4+ feet when they are rebuilt. Would like more robust consideration of aesthetics, charm and character in new building approvals. How about new bridges connecting Harbor Point to the other peninsulas to the right and left of them. How about banning all billboards citywide as they are ugly. More ground level retail near the main train station is needed to make the area feel like a downtown when you step off the train. I like seeing all of North Stamford kept low density, and any new density focused on downtown. Buy the land at the corner of Dock Street and Atlantic Street for a future parking garage for the train station, as that is the only nearby land left to do that should Stamford grow over the decades. Thank you for the work you do and have put into this project.	Attract more corporate offices based on Stamford's proximity to NYC, express train stop, educated workforce, and low taxes relative to NYC. And attracting more retirement or elder continuing care communities. Both offices and elder communities bring in tax revenue but don't create massive demand for city services such as new children in school.	More new trees are good but they need to be species that are native to and grow well in North Carolina, as the climate zone maps are 30 years out of date and we now have the climate of what NC used to be. Buy the parking lot just north of Mill River Park across from the bridge and make it a park. It is next to the river and to other parks. Would make a perfect park. I think UConn owns it now.	Do not support traffic calming. Would rather see roads widened and more and longer turn lanes added. As well as more new parking. The intersection of High Ridge, Long Ridge and Cold Spring roads is an important one as so many major streets run through it, yet it feels like just strip malls. Work with the existing Bank of America to find a new location for the bank, tear it down, and make that triangle of land a park with trees. It's a logical place for a small park as you'd be able to see the park from a distance from each direction and its surrounded by streets on all sides. The area needs some sense of humanity.	More affordable parking everywhere.	Create a design district either in Harbor Point or near the Home Depot. Especially home decor, furniture stores, etc. Create subsidized live-work spaces for artists. Find an organization that wants to build a visual arts center in Stamford. Fairfield county has great performing arts venues, but the visual arts are sorely lacking. Thank you!	Try to get a Costco or BJs to open, perhaps south of I95. The nearest ones are in Norwalk and Port Chester and are extremely packed.	Jay		Yes

Timestamp	**Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?**	**Introduction** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Future Land Use** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**City of Opportunity** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Healthy City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Connected City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Affordable City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Prosperous City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?**	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
7/22/2025 22:52:38	Yes	p. 18 – "% of residents are renters"; I don't view this as positive since renters come and go and really have no stake in Stamford's future. Need to focus more on ownership. p. 26 - "16% decrease in traffic from 2018 - 2023"; this is very misleading as it came from the COVID era when people stayed at home and did not travel much. As widely reported, Stamford highways and parkway are the some of the most congested in the country; with no improvements in sight. Congestion and traffic are major issues in Stamford, which is caused by increased housing and density. The more you build, the worse it gets. There is no easy solution to reduce it; however, you can slow the growth by limiting the growth. Even with apartments near public transportation, people will still have cars when they go out shopping or running errands. An example of a really bad decision (and public spoke loud and clear that this was not a good use of this space) was to approve 800+ apartments (1400 cars) at 800/900 Long Ridge Road where there are no walkable services/transportation nearby. Residents must use their cars to go anywhere, and the Merrit Parkway is already one of the most congested highways in the county and there is NO solution in sight. It will only get worse. Furthermore, my understanding was that the 2015 plan endorsed the idea of commercial space CONVERSIONS; but what happened here is that they demolished the Xerox headquarter building and garage resulting in a much larger cost of the project than j just converting space into apartments/condos as has been done at other locations in the city. As a result, these will be high-end apartments for the wealthy.	p. 75 - ACU is a very BAD idea. Commercial business should not be housed in a residential neighborhood. It destroys the single-family residential neighborhood. It will add to additional traffic along streets not designed for commercial businesses. Also, parking will be an issue and should be accommodated "off-street". Again, having a parking lot in your front yard is not desirable in a residential neighborhood. p. 79 & 136 - ADU's changes. I am totally against removing lot size requirements, removing parking requirements and increasing the maximum allowable spare footage. (ST21.1). As such, you could easily have a mac mansion as your next-door neighbor. Also against increasing building heights and stories – where it would not be compatible with the neighboring residential housing (ST-21.2) p.72 - Triplex, duplex and townhomes might be one way to address homeownership and affordable housing; however, you need to prove they are really more cost effective and therefore affordable. Must be careful not to "destroy" the single-family residential feeling of the neighborhood. Affordable housing is a major issue in Stamford. There is no easy solution since this is a high-priced area, and developers are maximizing their profits with upscale apartments. Should probably pilot some modular duplex/triplex units in appropriate areas with minimal upscale features – just the basics. Many smaller developments will give the smaller builders an opportunity to support the community and make a profit.				Congestion and traffic are major issues in Stamford, which is caused by increased housing and density. The more you build, the worse it gets. There is no easy solution to reduce it; however, you can slow the growth by limiting the growth. Even with apartments near public transportation, people will still have cars when they go out shopping or running errands. An example of a really bad decision was to approve 800+ apartments (1400 cars) at 800/900 Long Ridge Road where there are no walkable services/transportation nearby. Residents must use their cars to go anywhere, and the Merrit Parkway is already one of the most congested highways in the county and there is NO solution in sight. It will only get worse.	p.72 - Triplex, duplex and townhomes might be one way to address homeownership and affordable housing; however, you need to prove they are really more cost effective and therefore affordable. Must be careful not to "destroy" the single-family residential feeling of the neighborhood. Affordable housing is a major issue in Stamford. There is no easy solution since this is a high-priced area, and developers are maximizing their profits with upscale apartments. Should probably pilot some modular duplex/triplex units in appropriate areas with minimal upscale features – just the basics. Many smaller developments will give the smaller builders an opportunity to support the community and make a profit.	Finally, since the plan covers all aspects of the city's development over the next 10 years, what is the cost to support this vision. All through the proposal there are references to increase staff to manage/direct various aspects of the plan.		James Moore		Yes
7/23/2025 17:30:30	Yes		Page 48 - Would rather have less growth, less large new buildings. Page 50 - Would like to see more land under conservation permanently, and more parks. Page 71 - Would like more consideration of beauty and quality of materials in approving new buildings. And even stronger historical preservation. Page 49 - We should be not building at all at Harbor Point, make that parkland instead, as it historically has already flooded and will flood more in the future. Thank you!!	It would be good to relocate UConn to an area with a few hundred acres, perhaps one of the old office parks, so it can grow into a campus that feels like a college campus.	Would like to see city trash pickup as well as city water pipes in North Stamford. We pay enough taxes up here and see no benefits. Thanks.	Page 118 - I support more sidewalks. But don't want more public transit. Would like to see existing roads widened and more parking. I don't support traffic calming. West Main Street needs to be widened to two lanes in each direction for sure. Page 128 - I like the idea of roundabouts - but lest also take the Bank of America building by eminent domain (help them relocate) and make this triangle of land a park, since it can be seen from so many directions. There could be an interesting state or sculpture there. That area is so ugly right now!!!! Lets pedestrianize Bedford Street, however. As long as we build a new parking garage nearby to make it easy to get to. Thanks!	Page 68. I don't support making the city more affordable as that will erode the already limited tax base. I don't support growing the supply of housing. However, having more elder communities (continuing care) is good as that is positive to the tax base (they don't put new kids in schools!).	Page 74 - How about creating and arts and design district. How about artist live-work spaces? Like in an old factory somewhere! I do not support specific support for minority-owned businesses, that is racist. But if you are going to go all woke with this planning process, there is nothing in here for the LGBTQ community. How about creating a gay and lesbian center, or even better, a gay and lesbian bar in downtown Stamford? Thank you.	Lets plant even more trees. Lets require all city services to be only in English language.	Rebecca Thomas	rebeccathomas777@gmail.com		Yes

Timestamp	**Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?**	**Introduction** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Future Land Use** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**City of Opportunity** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Healthy City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Connected City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Affordable City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Prosperous City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?**	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
7/25/2025 10:30:44	Yes				Statement Regarding Stamford 2035, Strategy 16.4 Submitted by: Laurie Pensiero, Past Chair and Current Board Member, Stamford Senior Center As the Past Chair and a long-serving board member of the Stamford Senior Center, I have spent the past nine years advocating for the seniors of our community. Throughout this time—and especially during the COVID-19 pandemic—I witnessed firsthand the essential role the Center plays in the lives of older adults in Stamford. For many, it is more than just a place to socialize; it is a lifeline. The Stamford Senior Center provides critical programming that supports healthy aging through fitness, education, and social connection. Equally important—but often less visible—is our food program. For many members, the meal they receive at the Center is their largest and most reliable source of nutrition for the day. This is the reality for a growing number of older adults in our city—and it underscores the urgent need to prioritize and strengthen support for the Center. We've experienced tremendous growth—now serving nearly 1,000 members—but we are operating at full capacity. We face real barriers: no signage, limited parking, and a facility that cannot accommodate our potential to grow. While we've adapted with remote programming and done everything we can with the resources we have, we are now at a critical juncture. Expansion and modernization are no longer optional—they are essential. As Stamford's senior population continues to increase, we ask the City to stand with us—not only in direct support, but in helping to build partnerships that can sustain us. Many corporations benefit from being part of Stamford's vibrant economy. We believe these companies should also be encouraged to invest in the well-being of the community that supports them. The City could play a powerful role in fostering these relationships and creating meaningful public-private partnerships that help strengthen and sustain the Center for the future. Our seniors are the very people who built this city. They deserve better than to be forgotten in our planning efforts. Strategy 16.4 is a meaningful opportunity to right that wrong—to recognize the value of older adults, and to give them the resources, space, and dignity they so rightly deserve. With City leadership and community support, the Stamford Senior Center can become not only a cornerstone of healthy aging but a model for what it means to truly care for every generation in our city. Respectfully, Laurie Pensiero Past Chair and Current Board Member Stamford Senior Center					Laurie Pensiero	lpensiero1965@gmail.com	Board Member of the Stamford Senior Center and Life long Resident of Stamford	Yes
7/25/2025 11:44:14	I have reviewed parts of it	Page 113 (Strategy 16.4): I was pleased to see the Stamford Senior Center needs called out on the Master Plan, as they well should be. However, a bit disappointed in the briefness and timeline of 4-6 years. As called out, 1 in 4 residents of Stamford are seniors and the Stamford Senior Center should be renamed the Stamford Senior Center of Excellence. They do an amazing job of servicing seniors, result being that the center is literally bursting at the seams with active participants on any given day. Please consider accelerating the focus on this critical expansion and to address the SSC needs. Thank you.			Page 113 (Strategy 16.4): I was pleased to see the Stamford Senior Center needs called out on the Master Plan, as they well should be. However, a bit disappointed in the briefness and timeline of 4-6 years. As called out, 1 in 4 residents of Stamford are seniors and the Stamford Senior Center should be renamed the Stamford Senior Center of Excellence. They do an amazing job of servicing seniors, result being that the center is literally bursting at the seams with active participants on any given day. Please consider accelerating the focus on this critical expansion and to address the SSC needs. Thank you.				Expanding the Stamford Senior Center is critical and money well spent. Supporting senior physical, mental, and social health actually saves the city of Stamford money in the long run as facilitates healthy aging. It's more expensive to support unhealthy seniors longer term.	Sherry Sears	sherryleesears@gmail.com	Stamford Senior Center Member	Yes

Timestamp	**Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?**	**Introduction** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Future Land Use** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**City of Opportunity** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Healthy City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Connected City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Affordable City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Prosperous City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?**	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
7/25/2025 15:09:52	Yes		Commenting on Pages 14-17 - Future Land Use pages: I am greatly concerned about the Future Land Use Category descriptions and the R2 category designated for the historic Hubbard Heights neighborhood. HH is a nationally recognized historic district and the description of R1, as "an established single-family detached housing and compatible low-intensity uses such as ADUs and cottage clusters" seems to better describe the unique characteristics of this historic neighborhood compared to the R2 description of "a range of single family and "missing middle" housing types - including ADUs, duplexes, triplexes, and townhomes." With a proximity to downtown, it is understandable that the city planners would like to squeeze more housing and more people in this space, but I can tell you that the residents of Hubbard Heights do not want to see housing density increased in this neighborhood. This is directly contrary to the home owners/tax payer's wishes and doesn't do what this plan purports to do: engage with the community and listen to their opinion. Also, it is contrary to two priorities listed on page 22 of the Pocket Plan Executive Summary: "A City of Opportunity: 1) Celebrate Stamford's historic sites and neighborhoods. 2) Preserve established low-density single-family residential zones, while making sensitive changes to improve quality of life. As the president of the Hubbard Heights Association, I invite you to speak at our upcoming Annual Meeting on October 8 and engage with the neighbors about this Land use Category.	I support the two priorities outlined on page 22 of the Pocket Plan Executive Summary: "A City of Opportunity: 1) Celebrate Stamford's historic sites and neighborhoods. 2) Preserve established low-density single-family residential zones, while making sensitive changes to improve quality of life. These are two very important priorities for the Hubbard Heights historic neighborhood. We see this historic neighborhood under attach from developers who want to maximize their profits, without considering the wished of the residents who live there. The city has a mandate to protect its history, and the zoning board is one of the few committees with the power to enforce, or ignore that mandate.						I invite the organizers and planners to speak at the Hubbard Heights annual meeting on Oct 8 where they can explain the objectives to residents of the neighborhood.	Dan Lombardi	danlombardi.ny@gmail.com	Hubbard Heights Association	Yes
7/25/2025 21:38:14	Yes				57 - The need for socialization and activities for retirees and the older population is critical. The puny center at government center is not nearly enough to serve a population in society that has grown and is staying active for longer. Having a center or centers with adequate space for ALL activities and which would serve residents city-wide is a must. I emphasize All activities because many think of a senior center as a bingo hall or adult day care and the senior center that is needed is not that at all. It is to keep us young, active and social.				Please stress the importance throughout the plan.	C Bolduc			No
7/29/2025 12:36:20	Yes		I recently purchased a home in the Cove area on Lewelyn Road and am shocked to see that Stamford is considering INCREASING population density in this area by rezoning my street to allow multi family housing. Cars are already choking up the entrance to my street, others are parked on front lawns. There are already clearly ILLEGAL multi family units in the area. I am vehemently against this rezoning, and the idea makes me regret buying a home in Stamford.							Matthew Altieri	Mattaltieri18@gmail.com		Yes

Timestamp	**Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?**	**Introduction** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Future Land Use** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**City of Opportunity** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Healthy City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Connected City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Affordable City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Prosperous City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?**	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
7/29/2025 16:51:41	Yes		Rezoning will greatly affect financial stability, shape retirement and quality of life for us and neighbors. Why was this rezoning proposal not included in the semiannual letter for the real estate home owner tax? When we signed the contract for our modest house, we had saved up and searched for 10 years to buy in a single-family residential zoning. Taking this away and rezoning our neighborhood is a betrayal on many levels. We were never informed or asked for our input about these important changes. Every neighbor we have spoken to so far is equally unaware and upset about the proposed rezoning. Instead, the city expects us to search bodegas, grocery stores, come to the government center to look for flyers or search social media in case that the city has life changing news for us? It seems that there was already a plan in place which included a way to NOT inform the affected homeowners and the city tried to find a group of people who would confirm the plan without being negatively impacted and tell us later it is our own fault because we didn't give input. In my humble opinion this is fraud by deception. If this is what Democrats are standing for these days, you have lost us as lifetime voters. We experienced first-hand what chaos and overcrowding in our former quiet street means. A house on Alton Road was purchased in 2020 by an out-of-town landlord in a single family residential zoned Belltown neighborhood – (illegal converted into a two-family house in the past – besides multiple (ignored) complaints). Way more than two families moved in after the sale; we were faced with a rooming house situation in addition of a landscaping /trucking company. It felt like a beehive – day and night; people constantly coming and going, cars with tuned up engines, overly loud trucking horns, oil leaking pickup trucks, multiple rolling dumpsters, often full or overflowing with garbage, multiple work vans in the street and on property, plus countless other violations. For years, our elected leaders ignored our pleas for help to restore order. If you have no interest in enforcing zoning laws, what will you do if we have more than one house in our neighborhood on less than a quarter of an acre, with the same number of people (20+/-) and vehicles (13+/-) in addition to commercial activity? Would you be willing to take the overflow to your places? – Or do you prefer to preserve your own quiet and clean neighborhood (and property value)? We can start talking again if you include Shippan, Wallacks Point, Dolphine Cove and the rest of the 1 acre + neighborhoods into the same proposed R2 zoning like ours. At those locations you have the infrastructure in place; more space and I'm sure the larger properties, mansions, garages, finished basements and attics are so much better designed for rooming house situations, construction yards and landscaping businesses than our small pieces of land and modest houses. You can even fit bigger townhouses onto your lots and still have space between your neighbor's property. Otherwise, it seems that you are the official leaders of the "Not in my backyard" movement and keep the best off all worlds for yourself.							Christina			Yes
7/29/2025 17:25:15	Yes		This is a biased survey. You select the participants that would give you the answers that you want. Why are the survey questionnaires not being sent out with the semiannual tax statements, so that you can get representative responses across all tax payers and voters? Reconfigure the more affordable neighborhood with small property like Glenbrook / Belltown from R1 to R2, while preserving high-end neighborhood with much larger lots at R1 just doesn't make sense. Is that because those who are responsible for rezoning are living in the high-end neighborhood? I have been voting for the Democrats all my life. I don't see that I would vote for the Democrats again ever, if this process is not inclusive. If the majority of my neighbors would vote to covert our neighborhood from R1 to R2, then it would be on me to move away. At least, you have a legitimate process.							joe			Yes
7/30/2025 0:04:26	Yes		I oppose a change in the status of Hubbard Heights from "single-family" (R1) to "missing middle housing" (R2). This is a residential and historic neighborhood and needs to remain as such. Allowing a status change will destroy the legacy that this community has created.							Kim DiMondo			Yes
7/30/2025 10:09:01	No									diana bagkee	dianajbagkee@gmail.com		Yes

Timestamp	Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?	Introduction *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Future Land Use *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	City of Opportunity *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Healthy City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Connected City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Affordable City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Prosperous City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
7/30/2025 10:30:38	Yes		Hubbard Heights is an established single-family neighborhood. The R-1 category is a better fit to what it is, and what residents want to see it in the future Hubbard Heights is NOT a place for "missing middle housing" or "mixed use" commercial businesses. We don't want Hubbard Ave to look like Summer or Bedford Street in 10 years.	If the commission is serious about • Celebrating Stamford's historic sites and neighborhoods • Preserving established low-density single-family residential zones, while making sensitive changes to improve quality of life … then the Hubbard Heights neighborhood designation MUST BE R-1					No	Maria Vlasak	mvlasak@optonline.net	Hubbard Heights Association	Yes
7/30/2025 10:48:57	Yes	The comments below are regarding the change from R1 to R2 for the Hubbard Heights neighborhood, a designated historic district within the City of Stamford.	1. Hubbard Heights is an established single-family neighborhood. The R-1 category is a better fit to what it is, and what residents want to see it in the future 2. Hubbard Heights is NOT a place for "missing middle housing" or "mixed use" commercial businesses. We don't want Hubbard Ave to look like Summer or Bedford Street in 10 years. 3. If the commission is serious about other provisions of the Stamford 2035 plan, namely the "City of Opportunity" section that aims to… -Celebrate Stamford's historic sites and neighborhoods -Preserve established low-density single-family residential zones, whilenmaking sensitive changes to improve quality of life …then the commission MUST CHANGE the neighborhood designation from R2 to R1.	There are plenty of opportunities in the South End and Cove areas to accommodate larger housing projects or mixed use neighborhoods. The rezoning of neighborhoods like Hubbard Heights from R1 to R2 spell a future where Stamford has no historic neighborhoods, no dignity, no respect for the current residents and destruction of current property values.					There is still time to change this plan. Please let Hubbard Heights remain an R1 zone.	Rossana Colangelo	Rcolangelo000@gmail.com		Yes
7/31/2025 16:53:50	Yes		I think the idea to allow for "missing middle" housing in the area between North Stamford and Downtown is a smart idea. I think this is a great way to increase housing, while also providing alternatives to "big apartment tower" living, and preserving our green spaces. It appeared by my reading that parks and green spaces were preserved, and I hope that remains the case. If possible, I would love to see more green spaces that residents can enjoy. I can say from personal experience having Barrett park within walking distance of my home is such a great asset to the community.	I fully support utilizing abandoned or underutilized spaces in Stamford. I think the city has been missing out on a huge opportunity with the abandoned lots and massive parking spots adjacent to the Stamford Train Station. It appears this plan could help improve on that. I like the proposed Glenbrook Train station plan; I would like more/protected bike lanes there, as I have almost gotten squashed a few times riding to the station.	I fully support more tree plantings, and tree management, especially in downtown, where a few well placed trees can provide shelter from the shade, and make everything much more attractive.	I fully support furthering the Vision Zero plan. As a parent, I am often riding bikes with my son or pushing a stroller all around Belltown. Some great improvements have been made, such as the built out sidewalks on Toms road, but there is so, so much more room for improvement. I hope someday my kids can ride their bikes safely around the neighborhood on their own (as I did growing up), but I feel like it's just not safe enough yet.			Overall, it appears a lot of thought and consideration have gone into this plan for the next ten years. I've got a young family here in Stamford, and I'm here for the long haul! So I'm excited to see what the future holds.	Kevin Maguire	kevinmaguire14@gmail.com		Yes
7/31/2025 17:26:58	Yes	page 24 highlights the new pulaski street roundabout to show a recently completed project, but that project does not have any cycle infrastructure	the change in land uses on page 53 is a bit confusing I'm not sure how to interpret it with the 2015 uses under the chart. I do like the general recommended changes to the zoning to permit things like ADUs	I really like all the ideas put forth on pg 78-79 around strategies to add density to currently low-density neighborhoods.	Expanding the EV charging network would be great (page 108) as well as bike share.	There are a lot of photos with "sharrows" (pg 124, 126) which does not constitute real separated cycle infrastructure	138-139 also good content here about missing middle		Thank you for putting the plan together. Once the plan is finalized, how will people be kept informed as to how well we are tracking towards the visions defined here? It isn't clear from the plan (at least to me).	alex petre	apetre070@gmail.com		Yes
7/31/2025 18:18:42	Yes								I am a 3rd generation Cove resident. I have read the plan and attended the meeting at Mill River. We need to increase businesses and commerce to support our infrastructure. However, adding high-density rentals to single-family home areas significantly decreases property values. This leads to long-term neglect of rental properties and reduces greenspace, replacing it with blacktop to accommodate the already overcrowded need for parking along our congested streets. You are disproportionately affecting densely populated neighborhoods while leaving others untouched. The Cove is currently an overpopulated area that not only accommodates multifamily housing but also adds tenants running businesses out of rentals, parking commercial trucks on the property and main roads. I still live in the house my parents bought in the 60s in the Cove. My kids will be 4th generation Cove residents and I would love nothing more that to have them reside in that area someday but in the trajectory we are going that is not feasible. I understand and can adapt to change, but the quality of life should not change as well. Each day, I take my life into my own hands pulling out of my street and driving down Seaside Ave. Your sightlines are affected by the densely populated streets lined with commercial trucks and vehicles. Anyone who has traveled down there can agree. Daily, there are cars parked on the road due to high-speed drivers and overcrowding, making it difficult to navigate the traffic flow. Thankfully, no one has been seriously injured, but I feel it's only a matter of time. I can barely use my backyard most days as the overcrowded apartments built behind my home have renters who play their music at nightclub volumes. Trust me, I have tried all avenues to politely ask them to turn it down, including calling the landlord and police, to no avail. Zoning should be kept and not changed at the expense of others. Where does it end? I'm not sure what community involvement was sought for this input, but it seems the majority may have been missed!	Danette Melchionne	Dmelchionne@gmail.com	Lifetime resident and taxpayer	Yes

Timestamp	**Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?**	**Introduction** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Future Land Use** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**City of Opportunity** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Healthy City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Connected City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Affordable City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Prosperous City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?**	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
7/31/2025 23:10:21	Yes		I vehemently object to the change in designation for land use outlined in pages 53-55. I am a resident of the Cove section but my comments reflect all the proposed changes in designation. We need single family home neighborhoods and the plan should not include the elimination of these neighborhoods across Stamford.						Fix the traffic, limit the growth to preserve quality of life. Get control back from developers, and fix the permitting process. I just had to have two witnesses and a notary sign a document for the EPB and Engineering departments, it's 2025, use Docusign!	Malaika Myers	mlmyers1701@gmail.com		Yes
7/31/2025 23:58:46	Yes							This whole plan sucks	The plan sucks.	JoAnn Fiore	joannre1@outlook.com		Yes
8/1/2025 11:08:36	Yes	112-113			112-113 I am happy to see that the needs of Stamford's growing senior population is being addressed finally. As a member of the Stamford Senior Center, we are busting at the seams and need our own facility with ample parking larger classrooms, green space. The center offers robust and diverse programs that keep us strong, engaged and healthy. please make this a priority in the next coming years.					Donna Wolff	donnawolff27@gmail.com	member of Stamford Senior Center	Yes
8/1/2025 15:38:01	Yes		55 - Future Land Use of the Hubbard Heights Neighborhood						Dear Stamford 2035 Planning Committee Members: As a resident of the Hubbard Heights neighborhood, I have some serious reservations about the vision of Stamford presented and how our neighborhood will be affected by this plan in the next 10 years. The 2035 Stamford plan states that one of its objectives is to "celebrate Stamford's historic sites and neighborhoods." (p 44) The plan also states as one of its goals is to "keep established low-density single-family neighborhoods by maintain existing densities..." and "Many Stamford residents value the option to live in single-family homes, which contributes to the city's diverse housing choices." (p 40) Hubbard Heights is a nationally recognized historic district that was settled in 1695. Much of its housing dates back to the early 1920's with "Doctor's Row" lining Hubbard Ave for over a century. This area of Stamford is truly an established single-family neighborhood with a diversity of housing and population. The neighborhood is a Stamford treasure. And yet, in the Future Land Use category, the plan contradicts the stated objectives above by placing Hubbard Heights in the R2 category, defined as supporting: "a range of single-family and "missing middle" housing types – including ADUs, duplexes, triplexes and townhomes. These areas also allow for small-scale, neighborhood-compatible commercial uses (such as cafes or coffee shops) and community amenities..." (p 54) That does not describe what Hubbard Heights is currently, nor what the residents want it to be in the future. Our intention is to be included in what is the R1 category, defined as: Established single-family detached housing and compatible low intensity uses such as ADUs and cottage clusters. No significant changes or increases in density are planned. (p 54) The residents will not be happy with nor support a future vision of Stamford that places us in a category where "mixed middle housing" and multi-family housing will be allowed to be built or developed. Nor will we support "commercial uses" within our borders. We do not want to see Hubbard Ave become another Bedford or Summer street. Please revise the map showing the Future Land Use categories to include Hubbard Heights in the R1 category.	Kaya Kies			Yes

Timestamp	Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?	Introduction *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Future Land Use *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	City of Opportunity *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Healthy City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Connected City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Affordable City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Prosperous City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
8/1/2025 17:58:05	Yes			55					I live in Hubbard Heights and I strongly oppose rezoning Hubbard Heights as R2. As a practical matter, Hubbard Avenue faces congestion and speeding issues. If Hubbard Heights is rezoned, then it must be accompanied by investment in changes to the road and walkway infrastructure. Contact me if you want my suggestions, but suffice it to say the intersections, roads, and walkways will need upgrading. There's no such thing as a free lunch. Second, I had lived in apartment building my whole life. My wife and I left our apartment building to move our two toddlers to Hubbard Heights because it was one of the ONLY neighborhoods from New York City to New Haven that we could afford which had: (a) modest single family homes (b) in proximity to a NYC commuter train. For me, Hubbard Heights IS part of this "missing middle"! These homes were impossible to find – trust me as someone who spent a hundred hours on Zillow. By rezoning Hubbard Heights, the plan will reduce the value of our investment over time, such that we cannot accumulate longer term wealth. And you will further create a gap between the R1 and R2 neighborhoods. The R1 neighborhoods will be for those that don't need to commute to NYC every day (i.e. 20-30 minutes from the train station / North Stamford). Whereas, those young families who work regularly and commute, will be forced to find housing in apartments (what we sought to avoid). In effect, the R1 zones will see land value appreciation, and the R2 zones will see existing values plummet. Why create a safe haven at all? I don't see how this is logically anything from taking from one and giving to another. I would possibly be on board if the R2 zoning were more restrictive in terms of building types allowed, but as it stands now the R2 category is totally asynchronous with the character of our neighborhood. If there were a carveout for townhouses only which were within a standard deviation of the current median home value in the neighborhood, this would be a much smarter move that would not significantly affect the character of our neighborhood (and value of our home investment)! Thank you so much for your consideration! Regardless of the outcome, I appreciate the thought that you've put into this plan, and your solicitation for comments. Although we have been residents only for one year, we love Stamford in ways we never expected. Sincerely, John	John Birnbaum	john.tyler.birnbaum@gmail.com		Yes

Timestamp	Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?	Introduction *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Future Land Use *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	City of Opportunity *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Healthy City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Connected City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Affordable City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Prosperous City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
8/1/2025 20:58:02	Yes								Dear Stamford 2035 Planning Committee Members, As a resident of the Hubbard Heights neighborhood, I am writing to strongly oppose the inclusion of our community in the R2 zoning category in the Stamford 2035 Plan. The plan claims to "celebrate Stamford's historic sites and neighborhoods" (p. 44) and to "keep established low-density single-family neighborhoods by maintaining existing densities" (p. 40). These are laudable goals — but they are directly contradicted by the current zoning proposal for Hubbard Heights. Hubbard Heights is one of Stamford's oldest and most historically significant neighborhoods, with roots dating back to 1695. Its homes — many from the early 20th century — and the iconic "Doctor's Row" on Hubbard Avenue represent an irreplaceable piece of our city's heritage. It is, by every measure, a stable, established, single-family neighborhood that deserves protection, not disruption. The proposed R2 classification would allow for "missing middle" housing such as duplexes, triplexes, and townhomes, along with commercial development like cafes and shops (p. 54). This is completely incompatible with the character of our neighborhood and goes against the very language of the plan that promises to preserve areas like ours. We are not interested in seeing Hubbard Heights transformed into a high-density, mixed-use zone. We do not want commercial activity on our residential streets. We do not support increasing housing density in our neighborhood. This is not what current residents want, and it is not what was promised in the plan's stated goals. Hubbard Heights belongs in the R1 category, which preserves established single-family neighborhoods and does not allow for significant changes in density. Anything less is a disservice to the residents who have invested in and maintained this historic community for generations. We strongly advise that the Future Land Use Map be revised to reflect Hubbard Heights as R1 — in alignment with both the current character of the neighborhood and the commitments stated in the Stamford 2035 Plan. Sincerely, Haley and Mike Zangiabadi Residents, Hubbard Heights Neighborhood 42 Hubbard Ave, Stamford, CT 06905 Haley.zangiabadi@outlook.com, michaelz1000@outlook.com	Haley and Mike Zangiabadi	Haley.zangiabadi@outlook.com	Hubbard Heights Resident	Yes
8/3/2025 13:01:06	Yes		Deeply concerning. Rezoning, and effectively that is what it is, will reduce property values for people who have lived here for years, and chose to live in single family neighborhoods. Having participated in several of the residential neighborhood zoom sessions, this does not appear to be reflective of what the people wanted. There are reasons we chose to live in Stamford, and in specific neighborhoods. Increasing density, and therefore more likely increasing rentals, is only good for developers, not for the residents who have paid taxes, and who makes Stanford what it is. Our obligation should be to our tax paying residents, who play by the rules and want the best for their neighborhoods. In no way does this section of the plan reflect what the population wants. This would be a slippery slope to something that cannot be reversed that would change the flavor of Stamford permanently, and not for the better. It would be arrogant to think that some sort of aspirational, and poorly thought out plan, is best for residents. Again, this was in no way what the participants from the neighborhoods wanted. It appears in some ways hijacked.		Bioswales are a nice idea, we should address flooding issues. Bear in mind, suggestions have been brought up in the past with prior city administrations, and were dismissed.		This would best be addressed by a greater percentage for affordable units, when dealing with developers. Perhaps a range, for instance 15 to 25% with increasing gradations of affordability. The fee in lieu that too many of them pay is insufficient to help the city build affordable housing. This has been mentioned by many politicians in the past as well as residents. Developers make a lot of money from these projects, and then get additional tax benefits further sweetening the pot. They should be more than willing to consider this negotiation. It has been one-sided for too long. The city of Stanford has the leverage.... They need to exercise it.		Please listen to the residents. There is a reason why Stamford is desirable. And yes, this can attract more people. But parts of the plan sacrifice that desirability in an attempt to cure a problem that in all likelihood is very difficult to cure. That of housing supply and demand. Oversupply will never be achieved, and therefore will never satisfy the demand. This is basic market theory. All realtors will tell you this. As will developers, but they stand to gain the most along the way. It's basic economics. This appears to be a pie in the sky plan, that has not fully done its homework, and is willing to take a risk with its tax paying residents. Or worse yet, has an agenda.	Anthony Easton	asmart95@aol.com		Yes
8/3/2025 14:36:15	I have reviewed parts of it	Stamford Senior Center is bursting with older seniors! Time to create more space for the elders to enjoy their center and live the rest of their lives in a way they deserve								maureen constantinides	bmc621@gmail.com		Yes
8/3/2025 16:30:57	Yes		- Page 50-51: 1. Hubbard Heights is an established single-family neighborhood. The R-1 category is a better fit to what it is, and what residents want to see it in the future 2. Hubbard Heights is NOT a place for "missing middle housing' or "mixed use" commercial businesses. We don't want Hubbard Ave to look like Summer or Bedford Street in 10 years. 3. If the commission is serious about other provisions of the Stamford 2035 plan, namely the "City of Opportunity" section that aims to.., -Celebrate Stamford's historic sites and neighborhoods -Preserve established low-density single-family residential zones, whilenmaking sensitive changes to improve quality of life - ...then the commission MUST KEEP the neighborhood designation R1 - not change to R2.	- Page 146, strategy 21: concern about removing min lot size requirements and the vague language of "increasing flexibility in zoning standards". I understand the need for growing the housing supply but this will promote over-developing, which is already occurring. We need to consciously develop not turn Stamford into Bridgeport. - Page 138: Unclear if in Low Density areas that multiplex and townhouses will not be allowed.						Erika Trott	erika.white44@gmail.com		Yes

Timestamp	**Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?**	**Introduction** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Future Land Use** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**City of Opportunity** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Healthy City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Connected City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Affordable City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Prosperous City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?**	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
8/3/2025 16:32:46	Yes		Frederick J. Laist 40 Hillside Avenue Stamford, CT 06902 _____ Sunday, August 3, 2025 Dear Stamford 2035 Planning Committee Members: As a resident of the Hubbard Heights neighborhood, I have some serious reservations about the vision of Stamford presented and how our neighborhood will be affected by this plan in the next 10 years. The 2035 Stamford plan states that one of its objectives is to "celebrate Stamford's historic sites and neighborhoods." (p 44) The plan also states as one of its goals is to "keep established low-density single-family neighborhoods by maintain existing densities…" and "Many Stamford residents value the option to live in single-family homes, which contributes to the city's diverse housing choices." (p 40) Hubbard Heights is a nationally recognized historic district that was settled in 1695. Much of its housing dates back to the early 1920's with "Doctor's Row" lining Hubbard Ave for over a century. This area of Stamford is truly an established single-family neighborhood with a diversity of housing and population. The neighborhood is a Stamford treasure. And yet, in the Future Land Use category, the plan contradicts the stated objectives above by placing Hubbard Heights in the R2 category, defined as supporting: "a range of single-family and "missing middle" housing types – including ADUs, duplexes, triplexes and townhomes. These areas also allow for small-scale, neighborhood-compatible commercial uses (such as cafes or coffee shops) and community amenities…" (p 54) That does not describe what Hubbard Heights is currently, nor what the residents want it to be in the future. Our intention is to be included in what is the R1 category, defined as: Established single-family detached housing and compatible low intensity uses such as ADUs and cottage clusters. No significant changes or increases in density are planned. (p 54) The residents will not be happy with nor support a future vision of Stamford that places us in a category where "mixed middle housing" and multi-family housing will be allowed to be built or developed. Nor will we support "commercial uses" within our borders. We do not want to see Hubbard Ave become another Bedford or Summer street. Please revise the map showing the Future Land Use categories to include Hubbard Heights in the R1 category. Respectfully, Frederick J. Laist							Frederick J. Laist	FLaist99@gmail.com	Hubbard Heights	Yes
8/4/2025 7:48:48	Yes		DO NOT TURN HUBBARD HEIGHTS INTO A COMMERCIAL AREA. THIS IS A QUIET RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD AND HIDDEN GEM IN THE WEST SIDE OF STAMFORD. IT IS ALMOST INDEFINITE THAT HOUSING PRICES AND VALUE OF THESE HOMES WILL PLUMMIT IF OUR STREETS ARE FILED WITH GREEDY LANDLORDS RENTING OUR DUPLEXES AND CONDOS FOR THE NEXT TEN YEARS. THE BEST THING ABOUT THIS AREA IS IT'S COMMUNITY AND I LOVE MY NIEGHBORHOOD BECAUSE MY NEIGHBORS! BY ALLOWING DEVELOPERS TO COME IN AND BUILD TRIPLEXES AND MULTI-FAMILY HOMES WHERE THE OWNERS SIMPLY COLLECT RENT EVERY MONTH AS WELL AS CYCLE THROUGHOUT TENANTS WITH A PLAN TO NEVER SELL FOR PERMANENT HOUSING IS A DISGRACE TO OUR COMMUNITY AND SOCIETY. ALSO, THE OWNER OF 190 HUBBARD AVE IS SEETHING FROM THE MOUTH AT THIS OPPURTUNITY TO BUILD OVER A DOZEN CHEAPLY MADE AND IDENTICAL CONNECTED HOUSING TO HAVE A DYSTOPIAN AND POORLY PUT TOGETHER SUBNEIGHBORHOOD. THIS WILL ABOLISH THE FLOW OF THIS NEIGHBORHOOD AND IRONICALLY ENOUGH, RUIN HOME OWNERSHIP POSSIBILITIES IN STAMFORD. PLEASE ACT IN THE INTEREST OF RESIDENTS AND NOT BUSINESSMEN WHO VIEW OUR NEIGHBORHOODS AS A POTENTIAL DOLLAR SIGN! WOULD HATE TO SEE SUCH A WELL RAN CITY START TO TURN A CHEEK, ESPECIALLY THIS CLOSE TO A TIGHT ELECTION. WOULD HATE TO HAVE TO SUPPORT TARZIA BUT IF THE MAYOR TURNS ON HER RESIDENTS AND GOES THROUGH WITH ZONING'S CALAMITY OF A PLAN, THEN SHE SHOULD EXPECT THE RESIDENTS TO TURN ON HER. (PAGES 40, 44, & 54 SPECIFICALLY)							Brian		Hubbard Heights Resident	Yes

Timestamp	**Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?**	**Introduction** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Future Land Use** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**City of Opportunity** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Healthy City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Connected City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Affordable City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Prosperous City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?**	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
8/4/2025 16:24:53	Yes		Page 46: the plan states that existing infrastructure, transit and flood risk will determine where growth should occur. However, the only one of those factors that is relatively fixed is flood risk. Infrastructure can be built. Transit (buses, especially small ones, and on-call services) can be created easily. Those do not seem to be logical determining factors. There is a big conceptual problem here, which is annoying much of the community. The plan states that Stamford will grow 12% by 2035: the problem is that people do not necessarily want it to grow 12%, and feel that planning (eg allowing residential high rises) is creating unwanted growth. The chart on the left is unclear. It seems to show that Stamford grew about 12% from 2010 to 2023, and another 12% from 2023-2025. New Haven and Bridgeport's growth seems to be accelerating. But if Stamford actually grew 12% in 2023-2025, why is it only going to grow 12% more by 2025? And how does this fit with the fact that the school system is going to drop population by 500 students over the same period? And how does this fit with the 8% figure on page 23? Back on page 37, the plan cites population growth of 5% from 2019-2023, while housing grew 8%. That should have considerably eased the housing market. In short, the numbers for population and housing (and traffic) simply do not create a clear basis for planning, and since no specific source documents are cited, it's hard for readers to even try to understand the figures any better. Pg 49- this graphic is hard to follow. It looks like some 'grow' and 'enhance' is in flood zones, which is a terrible idea. pg 50 Future Land Use: we all really need a 'current' vs. 'proposed' with the same graphics. Furthermore, it might be wise to provide a second copy at a much much larger scale (might have to break into sections of Stamford, but like items must be side by side.) Pg 52 Same- 2015 plan uses different graphics, so is useless. Plus we need to see the current reality. Pg 54 Is R-1 just the bright yellow?						Yes, see additional forms.	Katherine Grenier	Ktgrenier2@gmail.com		Yes

Timestamp	**Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?**	**Introduction** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Future Land Use** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**City of Opportunity** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Healthy City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Connected City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Affordable City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Prosperous City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?**	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
8/5/2025 0:04:15	Yes		Dear Stamford 2035 Planning Committee Members: As a resident of the Hubbard Heights neighborhood, I have some serious reservations about the vision of Stamford presented and how our neighborhood will be affected by this plan in the next 10 years. The 2035 Stamford plan states that one of its objectives is to "celebrate Stamford's historic sites and neighborhoods." (p 44) The plan also states as one of its goals is to "keep established low-density single-family neighborhoods by maintain existing densities..." and "Many Stamford residents value the option to live in single-family homes, which contributes to the city's diverse housing choices." (p 40) Hubbard Heights is a nationally recognized historic district that was settled in 1695. Much of its housing dates back to the early 1920's with "Doctor's Row" lining Hubbard Ave for over a century. This area of Stamford is truly an established single-family neighborhood with a diversity of housing and population. The neighborhood is a Stamford treasure. And yet, in the Future Land Use category, the plan contradicts the stated objectives above by placing Hubbard Heights in the R2 category, defined as supporting: "a range of single-family and "missing middle" housing types – including ADUs, duplexes, triplexes and townhomes. These areas also allow for small-scale, neighborhood-compatible commercial uses (such as cafes or coffee shops) and community amenities..." (p 54) That does not describe what Hubbard Heights is currently, nor what the residents want it to be in the future. Our intention is to be included in what is the R1 category, defined as: Established single-family detached housing and compatible low intensity uses such as ADUs and cottage clusters. No significant changes or increases in density are planned. (p 54) The residents will not be happy with nor support a future vision of Stamford that places us in a category where "mixed middle housing" and multi-family housing will be allowed to be built or developed. Nor will we support "commercial uses" within our borders. We do not want to see Hubbard Ave become another Bedford or Summer street. Please revise the map showing the Future Land Use categories to include Hubbard Heights in the R1 category. Respectfully,							chris lancaster	chris.lanks27@gmail.com	Stamford Heights resident	Yes

Timestamp	Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?	Introduction *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Future Land Use *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	City of Opportunity *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Healthy City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Connected City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Affordable City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Prosperous City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
8/5/2025 7:05:08	Yes								Hello Stamford 2035 Planning Committee Members and thank you for considering my feedback. I am very upset by this proposal to change my historic neighborhood's zoning to encourage greater density and do NOT want it moving forward at all. Please create a new plan that serves the interests of the existing population, not the special interests focused on growing Stamford's population further without regard for the desires of those people who already live here. If this proposal moves forward I will be working with my friends, family, and neighbors to vote for politicians who will pursue what is in my best interest. These aspects of the plan, in particular, upset me the most because these statements are in direct logical conflict, disproved elsewhere in the plan, and the battleground is my neighborhood: Q1) How does the plan address historic preservation and design quality? A1) The plan celebrates Stamford's historic sites and neighborhoods and includes recommendations to preserve, highlight, and enhance them in Strategy 6 (pages 85-86). Q2) What is the plan for single-family housing? A2) Sixty percent of Stamford's land area is in the "Residential Single-Family" future land use category, underscoring the city's commitment to preserving low-density, single-family neighborhoods. This plan does not recommend changing any single-family zones. Q3) Will my single-family zoned home be changed to multi-family? A3) No, the Comprehensive Plan does not propose citywide rezoning of single-family properties to multi-family. Any future zoning changes would be focused only on areas well-served by transit and city infrastructure and would be further studied and reviewed through a public process. The above statements are false, given the following information included in the 2035 Master Plan: 1) p78 "Permit and promote ADUs and cluster housing in very low density neighborhoods" 2) p51 Hubbard Heights rezoned to "R2" including ADUs, duplexes, triplexes, and townhomes. These areas allow for commercial uses. A few more thoughts to help you better understand my perspective: 1) Stamford's population increased by 12% in the past decade without rezoning historic single family home neighborhoods. Many large apartment building complexes are being built right now near downtown and along major roadways. Clearly, rezoning is not a requirement for continued growth. 2) It is irresponsible to focus on population growth when the city's infrastructure underserves its existing population. 3) I live within walking distance of many stores because I chose to buy a home in this particular location. I do not want them on my block! 4) I chose to buy a single family home on a quiet street and do NOT want the density of my neighborhood to increase.	Anthony DeRosa	tderosa@gmail.com	Hubbard Heights	Yes

Timestamp	**Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?**	**Introduction** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Future Land Use** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**City of Opportunity** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Healthy City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Connected City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Affordable City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Prosperous City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?**	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
8/5/2025 11:33:46	Yes		Pg 53- the premise of this section is not fully in tune with what Stamford residents have been saying, and indeed it's out of sync with what people have realized across the country. The plan's vision is to essentially turn the current busy and dense areas of Stamford into a real functioning city where a person can live, work, shop and enjoy nature without a car. Or perhaps a collection of small city environments, rather than a true city. However, that also assumes you leave the quasi-rural suburbs, i.e. north Stamford, alone. Nope - that's not reasonable. What you are essentially recommending is to freeze the richer/poorer divide that already exists. That is a terrible, shallow idea. Instead, it would make much more sense to gradually open up north Stamford to more housing by changing future zoning and introducing a really great transportation system, which if you organized it well could include connections to the Talmadge Hill and New Canaan train stations and perhaps New Canaan shopping areas. The mini-city areas of Stamford could be improved, of course, and future development should be guided by the need to keep affordable housing, retail, and green space in the mix, but the real game changer will arrive when north Stamford is merged into the planning. Pg 53: define terms, such as TOD, the first time you use them. That's just common courtesy. A glossary at the end is swell, but not if it's a secret. There are multiple vague references to changes at the transportation center, but no specifics. It seems important to clarify what exactly is happening there. Pg 57- 'enhance connections' What does that mean in civilian language? We can't see it from the map. Pg 58- again, what's a 'cohesive connection'? Pg 60- what uses are being discussed? '...certain industrial uses...' is not helpful. A couple of live examples would be useful. There is a traffic and quality of life issue in Stamford of big trucks interacting with residential traffic. I'm sure it's a pain for the truck drivers, too! That doesn't really appear as an issue, but it will take long term transportation and zoning planning to nudge it in the right direction. Pg 62- the plan seems to miss the Newfield and Hope St/Tom's Road shopping areas. IF each of them had safe walkways within the shopping centers themselves, they would be a great deal more attractive to pedestrians. As they are, some of us drive to them just for the protection of a car within the parking area! Pg 64- what's a 'link' to a park? Does that mean a place to park? Does it mean a legit paved sidewalk? Does it mean better signage?	Pg 70- what on earth does Stamford's 'distinct sense of place' mean? Stamford has no distinct sense of place! The downtown is a soul-less 1970s corporate nightmare, the new developments are neutral but have no particular feel, the historic fabric is 99% destroyed- the common feeling is that it' s a place entirely without charm, but is still a great place to live because the municipal services function well, it has a wonderful mix of people who generally get along, it has a variety of restaurants, good connection to NYC, a few nice parks, and has fun neighboring suburbs. It would make more sense to support those good features than to go looking for or trying to create a distinct identity. Pg 72- are you sure there's a demand for new small businesses? Yes, there are some successes, but have you actually looked at the survival rate? The hideous mall is turning into a void right smack in the middle of the city, and there's an awful lot of churn and empty storefronts in the other mid sized shopping areas. Maybe landlords are unrealistically jacking up prices- it's not clear, but it's definitely a trend. Pg 73- fine to say that there will be additional population and housing downtown, but people still have to buy groceries and go to hardware stores and go to dry cleaners and other un-hip things: they're going to need cars. Pg 74- turning ACUs or garages into retail is not going to work in Stamford. The reasons are numerous, but it's fair to say that there will be zero support for this idea. ST 1.7 Who does this and why isn't it done already? Is chasing grant money really a plan? Pg 75- this section ignores one of the big factors preventing Stamford's downtown from becoming a city: the urban void for many blocks around the train station. For a pedestrian, it's a huge empty and pretty scary world that is clearly not designed for humans. Walking around the train station area, even just to get to the transportation center, is awful. And good luck finding anything if you're relying on the signage! It's been improved lately, but is still far from helpful. Pg 77- the graphic seems to show that the entire Glenbrook Station parking lot is a candidate for development. That is a terrible idea. Now, if there were small, reliable buses (like Westport's minibus service decades ago) or on-call vans, almost all commuters would love to ditch their cars. But if you leave in the dark in the morning and come home exhausted in the dark in the evening, carrying things as we do when we commute, we're not going to walk 20 minutes twice a day.					Yes, will send additional forms, thanks.	Katherine Grenier	Ktgrenier2@gmail.com		Yes

Timestamp	Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?	Introduction *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Future Land Use *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	City of Opportunity *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Healthy City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Connected City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Affordable City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Prosperous City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
8/5/2025 14:18:38	Yes	pg 7. I want to know if the 16,000 children who participated in the urban planning day were included in the 25,000 impressions. If so, that source of information should be clearly delineated as part of the 25,000. Otherwise that total number is very misleading. While I applaud involving children, their views do not yet have the scope to understand the ramifications of decisions that affect, congestion, infrastructure, public services, taxes etc.	pages 26-28. I want to express my strong opposition to the proposed Stamford 2035 Plan, particularly the reclassification of my neighborhood under the new R2 zoning category. As a long-time resident of Springdale, I have reviewed the map and details thoroughly, and I am deeply concerned about the proposed upzoning of established single-family home areas to allow multifamily units, duplexes, triplexes, townhomes, and even small businesses. This plan threatens to fundamentally alter the character of our neighborhood. Springdale is a vibrant, family-oriented community where residents—adults and children alike—enjoy outdoor recreation year-round. Whether it's biking, walking, or running, our streets are alive with safe, healthy activity. The proposed density increases will bring inevitable consequences: more traffic, more congestion, elevated noise levels, and additional pressure on public services and infrastructure. These changes are not enhancements—they are disruptions that will erode the very qualities that make this neighborhood livable. Let's be clear: this is not progress; it's a step backward. A healthy, sustainable city should preserve and nurture its thriving residential communities—not rezone them into chaotic, overcrowded districts under the guise of future planning. Mayor Simmons once knocked on my door while campaigning for State Representative. At that time, she presented herself as someone who valued community input and respected the voices of her constituents. If she had told me she would one day support a plan that upends the integrity of Springdale's single-family neighborhoods, I would never have supported her candidacy. Many of us feel blindsided and betrayed. The widespread frustration was on full display at the July 31st Board of Representatives meeting. Citizens are angry—and rightfully so. We purchased our homes with the understanding that zoning laws would protect the residential character of our neighborhood. Now, we are being told that vision no longer matters. I urge our city leaders to listen to the residents who live here—not just developers and planners. Withdraw the R2 zoning changes from the Stamford 2035 Plan and respect the voices of those who call these neighborhoods home.							The mayor's office should do much more to contact and inform its citizens in these proposed R2 zoned neighborhoods. Mayor Simmons should schedule, publicize, and attend several meetings to hear her constituents.	Jeanne-Marie Fahan	jeanniefahan@gmail.com	none	Yes
8/5/2025 14:24:57	Yes		Pg 53- not a good graphic	Pg 78- yes! Toolkits for all these things would be good. Pg 80- Good to avoid development-by-development review. We need clear rules that reflect our goals, and to make it relatively easy to build within those rules. That means strong and intelligent non-political enforcement and expertise, too. St 3.1 no, absolutely not. As soon as you add '...reflect Stamford's unique architectural styles...' you have thrown away any efficiency you meant to build into the process. There is no unique architectural style in Stamford- we're not a fishing village or a whaling town or a Victorian development, etc. We're a mix. Just do the hard work of defining what we want (eg red brick, or 5' setbacks, or balconies or whatever) and get out of the way. Otherwise this is a recipe for strangulation. Everyone thinks they're an expert on their neighborhood, and that's why so little gets built. Be careful of design competitions- they lock all participants into premature solutions. You want to compete to pick a team, not a design. Be careful of the historic preservation push- it, too, can inadvertently become a shackle to reasonable development unless it is simple, clear and targeted. It' s unclear how historic markers actually address any of the real problems the plan needs to address. We're not trying to create a tourism identity. This is a working town. Pg. 84+ Definitely agree with clear communication, and better distribution of information. Not sure that's a planning goal, but it's a good thing. Pg 86- there have been several good historical studies. Beware of planning studies that propose lots more studies. This could easily be a one-summer intern architect project. Pg 88- tech portals are great, but they're not easy for everyone. Don't forget your intro- either 15 or 25% of residents are over 65, lots might not be comfortable in English, and many may not have easy access. Think about how else to share info- libraries, schools, churches, portals that are phone-friendly.	Pg 102- an awful lot of negative comments about Stamford's parks today have to do with operations. Cleanliness and security have slipped, apparently because the relevant departments are tight on staffing. It makes no sense to plan to expand parks unless there's a magical plan to increase funding to operate them. This is the Robert Moses paradox in New York. In other words, we care about quality, and the plan is about quantity. It proposes a lot of capital projects, which is not likely to happen, is it? Nowhere does this section actually say 'Stop building near the water', which is what needs to happen. Pg 104- smart concept re trees and bike lanes. Watch out for mature tree roots, which destroy sidewalks. In other words, trees close to sidewalks can't be very big, although they look great in renderings. Pg 114- murals are tricky. For one thing, they imply disrespect for the building designers and builders. Secondly, they look ratty after a few years, and need lots of maintenance. Third, art fashions change, and nothing looks sadder than an unhip mural. Temporary elements like flower pots, banners and holiday lights actually do a lot more for a space. (Some of us dislike those temporary sculptures, but they're better than tired murals!)	Pg 123 This repeats the highly dubious statistic about traffic dropping from 2019-2023. It ignores Covid, it ignores consistent reporting from all parts of the population (including traffic police, I bet) and it can not be found anywhere on DOT's website, even after requests. Pg 127 re underpasses- great idea. Highway underpasses currently are worse than creepy, and cut neighborhoods apart. Pg 128 Americans seem terrible at roundabouts. Does this really work? Pg 130 Just improving bus service and bus service info, including the payment process, would make a big difference. It would be worth it to focus tightly on this element as a critical part of making Stamford work. ST 20.1 Yes, do it now, not in 7-10 years. Pg 131 As a basic primitive step, make connections between the buses and trains easy, including coordinating schedules! And none of the systems coordinate with Amtrak...which causes avoidable traffic.	Pg 136- the statistics here are shaky. Earlier in the report, the plan states that population grew by 5% while housing grew by 8%...but we still have an affordability problem. Nowhere in the plan is there a clear analysis of population vs. households vs existing housing vs new housing, and rental vs owned in the past and present. Yes, there's clearly an affordability problem in Stamford. Is it any different than the rest of the NYC region? What is it caused by? What has been done to fix it elsewhere? Have any towns our size had success in solving this problem? There are several different models out there- public housing, non-profit development, infill housing. Which of them work? No one wants theories. Part of the divisiveness of this issue in Stamford in a simple lack of information: we're all spouting opinions, but the facts are fuzzy. The best thing this report could do is convey clear accurate information about the housing situation, past and present, followed by clear accurate case study-style info about relevant successes elsewhere. ST 21.4 Yes! Although you do not need to start from scratch. Use a couple of successful existing designs. 21.8 Explain special permits. 21.10 Co-living and SROs- Yes! They are essentially free ways of increasing affordability. Pg 140 is unclear. Yes, it would be nice to have more affordable housing, but no one makes money building below market rate housing, so why would they do it? Stamford does need more housing, apparently, but the feeling is that building more high end housing (which is all that's happening) just attracts new comparatively wealthy residents from the surrounding area. It does nothing to create vacancies or competition in Stamford's market. That analysis may or may not be true, but this plan doesn't tell us. Pg 141 How is either program (BMR or Section 8) doing? Are they currently successful? Pg 142 What is the current homelessness situation? Who is assigned to homelessness prevention? Pg 144 increasing staffing on housing sounds great. What money? Is the problem staffing, or management, or the policies themselves? What is the Affordable Housing Trust Fund Board?		Yes, will fill out another form.	Katherine Grenier	Ktgrenier2@gmail.com		Yes

Timestamp	Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?	Introduction *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Future Land Use *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	City of Opportunity *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Healthy City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Connected City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Affordable City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Prosperous City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
8/6/2025 7:09:14	Yes		I emailed my objection to alter current R-1 designated properties to introduce ADUs or cluster housing including duplexes, triplexes or townhomes as described at paged 51, 78 and 89 of the Plan.							Michael Rappaport	mkr3901@aol.com		Yes
8/6/2025 15:16:06	Yes								I think the overall plan is exciting - but leaves out some important quality of life elements. First of all, the reason homeownership is so expensive is because 99% of all residential development in Stamford is now corporate owned, diminishing ownership opportunities for elderly downsizers as well as first time buyers. To say that developers are creating a percentage of affordable apartments is a farce as I know many of these developers contribute to a "fund" rather than lease to "affordable" residents. More importantly, is the loosening of zoning regulations in the village type neighborhoods of Glenbrook & Springdale. I think it's mighty courageous (and presumptuous) for city officials to propose altering neighborhoods where residents have chosen to make their largest economic and life/community investments. To assume that a resident who has recently purchased a $700,000+ home would accept or invite a row of townhomes on their neighborhood street is positively ridiculous! I would watch carefully, as this particular proposal has been met with widespread opposition. As highlighted in this extensive overview, Stamford is diverse and residents can choose from a variety of different lifestyle options and the zoning changes should focus on protecting these options, not infringing upon the property of your tax paying residents!	Melanie Healey	melaniemhealey@gmail.com		Yes
8/6/2025 16:08:34	No									hossein	hkharazi@hotmail.com	none	Yes
8/6/2025 20:21:26	Yes		I am a glenbrook resident, homw owner and tax payer in Stamford. I love the idea of transforming our town center. Currently its an ugly mix of old buildings, laundromats, parking lots and converted buildings. Id love to see a better designed, functional and asthetically pleasing town center so i can enjoy my local neighborhood instead of having to go to nearby Darien. However, I would limit this strictly to the town center by the train. MAJOR concern is traffic density. Between all the commercial trucks, buses, ans throughway traffic, the congestion makes an otherwise pleasant neighborhood into feeling like living in Yonkers. Hope street and connecting intersections are woefully underdeveloped and inadequate for the density plaguing the area now and in the future. Any development should also come with a remedy for such concerns. Smart traffic management and lights need to be installed to prevent traffic buildup, especially on turning lanes. I have no interest in turning glenbrook into a medium density neighborhood as a whole, the infrastructure cannot support this.								Diego Santiago	Diegomsantiago92@gmail.com		Yes
8/7/2025 8:09:30	Yes	page 2+ - The 25000pts of contact is very suspect and fragmented. A more inclusive way to address this would be for a questionnaire sent to taxpayers of the city. This plan I believe is not "comprehensive" from the taxpayer's viewpoint. The underlying assumption is that we must keep growing and making Stamford larger - why and who has voted for this as it was not an election mandate? Stamford should not be the buffer to absorb all of the growth of other protected Fairfield Cty cities. This plan totally changes the city and it neighborhoods. We must guard against growth of increased density so as not to turn Stamford into a Bridgeport, New Haven or Hartford. Page 16 -The 16,000 students in 1/2 day planning session - hopefully this wasn't part of the 25,000 pts of engagement. Our public school system is under performing in the basics of reading, writing and math and the students time in school should be focus on education vs. urban planning. Again, ask the taxpayers directly via mailed questionnaire with fairly presented questions designed not to guide outcomes. pg 29 Demographic changes project a decline in enrollment. With an assumed growing population in this plan, how is this determined? Is it smaller families, private school growth with less enrollment in public schools due to low performance or something else? I think this plan is glossing over the public schools and its performance issues.	note: many of the topics and themes run throughout the "master plan" so comments here and below many not align directly to your categories in this form Embrace the opportunity to obtain space from defunct corporate parks for green space or public use (museums, gallery's etc). Single family neighborhoods must be maintained without interjecting muti family higher density housing. These neighborhoods should be treated as goals for people to achieve a next level of advancement. "Affordable housing" should be managed tightly as it has an added cost on all. For seniors, disabled veterans and those who cannot help themselves yes. Selective additions should be limited as it has future negative knock down effects of suppressing income and surrounding real estate, limiting the need for improved career improvement and encouraging cash, nontaxable hacks/side jobs. Market demands and taxpayer wishes should maintain neighborhood designs, not social engineering.			Bike Lanes are underutilized as they are not practical for transportation in this town. An expensive expansion while taking away tight rode space in growing traffic. This is serving a small percentage of taxpayers and a true inclusive survey of need to prove a yes or no support.	I disagree with the overall theme of increasing housing stock to improve affordability at all levels. Again, I am not in favor of expanding and overcrowding this city. We cannot subsidize everything as it limits incentives for self-improvement. You live where you can afford, improve your skills for advancement and better pay and set goals to where you would like to live. For example, I would like to live in Greenwich but since I can't afford Greenwich, I live in Stamford, or I would like to live in Stamford but I can't afford Stamford so I live in Brookfield, etc. This administration should focus on improving infrastructure not density and growth. The past election was not a mandate for growth via expanding the population and density. Also, just to point out many people commute into Stamford, but that does not mean they want to live in this town. For many reasons aside from economics, people desire to live in other communities for reasons such as closer to family, better education system, etc. Finally, I would comment that it is very concerning how this plan was initially developed with very little true input from the taxpayers. It has the earmarks of something molded into a pre-determined solution.		included above	Robert Catino	rcatino@msn.com		Yes
8/7/2025 13:51:26	I have reviewed parts of it						Myself and my neighborhood (glenbrook) do not agree with changing these areas from single family to residential neighborhoods. What draws people to these small neighborhoods is the small town feel and we do not want condos or multi family homes going into our quiet streets. This would significantly change the feel of our neighborhood and would deter many people from wanting to move to these quiet streets.		Myself and my neighborhood (glenbrook) do not agree with changing these areas from single family to residential neighborhoods. What draws people to these small neighborhoods is the small town feel and we do not want condos or multi family homes going into our quiet streets. This would significantly change the feel of our neighborhood and would deter many people from wanting to move to these quiet streets. We need to keep these coveted neighborhoods as single family home only to protect all of the beauty in these streets.	Katie Martinez	katie.dingersen@gmail.com		Yes

Timestamp	**Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?**	**Introduction** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Future Land Use** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**City of Opportunity** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Healthy City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Connected City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Affordable City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Prosperous City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?**	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
8/8/2025 13:35:11	Yes		Dear Members of the Stamford 2035 Planning Board Committee, I write to you today to express my profound disappointment and deep concern with the current draft of the Stamford 2035 Plan as it relates to the Hubbard Heights neighborhood—a nationally recognized historic district and one of the city's oldest and most architecturally intact residential communities. Hubbard Heights is not only listed on the National Register of Historic Places—it is also included in the City of Stamford's own Cultural Resources Inventory. This means the city has already recognized our neighborhood as a critical part of its architectural and historic legacy. Why, then, would Stamford risk undermining the integrity of a neighborhood that the city simultaneously claims to value and protect? When I moved here over 25 years ago from Manhattan, one of the most appealing aspects of Stamford was its unique ability to offer the conveniences of urban life alongside access to beautiful, established single-family neighborhoods—places of real character, history, and community—within walking distance of downtown. That balance was one of the main reasons we chose Stamford, and it remains, we believe, one of the city's greatest strengths. According to the 2035 Plan, one of Stamford's stated objectives is to "celebrate historic sites and neighborhoods" (p. 44) and to "maintain established low-density single-family neighborhoods by preserving existing densities" (p. 40). Yet the proposed Future Land Use Map directly contradicts these goals by placing Hubbard Heights in the R-2 category, which is defined as supporting: "a range of single-family and 'missing middle' housing types – including ADUs, duplexes, triplexes, and townhomes.. small-scale, neighborhood-compatible commercial uses (such as cafes or coffee shops) and community amenities..." (p. 54) This designation is completely inappropriate for a neighborhood that was founded in 1695 and includes housing stock dating back over a century. The area is a living testament to Stamford's heritage, with streets like Hubbard Avenue—known as "Doctor's Row"—lined with distinctive early 20th-century homes that have long defined the character of the community. It is one of the few remaining neighborhoods where the city's historic and architectural narrative remains visible and intact. Assigning Hubbard Heights to the R-2 category threatens to undermine its legacy by opening the door to increased density, multi-family housing, and commercial development—none of which are consistent with the established character of the neighborhood or desires of the residents. It appears the Stamford Zoning Board has given complete priority to supporting commercial developers and abandoning its task of protecting its long-standing taxpaying residents. Furthermore, this proposed move of Hubbard Heights to the R-2 category contradicts the very principles the city adopted when it exempted historic districts from new senior housing density regulations in 2024, specifically acknowledging the need to protect neighborhoods like Hubbard Heights from incompatible development. It seems that "Future Land Use Categories" are the foundation on which this plan was built. Are they not without legal zoning status? Yet your introduction to the current plan clearly states that zoning decisions and guidelines will be based upon these (not legal) categories. How can the plan move forward, as proposed? If the city truly seeks to "celebrate" and "preserve" its historic neighborhoods, then it must do more than include such language in a vision document—it must act accordingly. We therefore respectfully but unequivocally request that Hubbard Heights be reclassified under the R-1 category, which is more appropriate for our community. The R-1 category is defined as: "Established single-family detached							Regina Woods Gordon	reginawoodsgordon@icloud.com		Yes
8/8/2025 19:57:45	Yes								I participated in 3 comprehensive community meeting and posted post-its on poster boards. At the 2nd meeting I asked a planner for progress and an opportunity for discussion. Never happened! I strongly feel the process was set up to avoid discussion and transparent community input. I feel the plan should be scrapped and we need to start over with a democratic and transparent process. Kathy Kligler 31 Friar Tuck Lane	Kathy Kligler	kathykligler@gmail.com	Independent	Yes
8/9/2025 17:23:14	I have reviewed parts of it								I support the expansion and support of the Senior Citizen Center	Roberta Frank	rfrank649@gmail.com	Senior Citizen Center	No
8/10/2025 12:03:17	Yes		Hubbard Heights is an established single-family neighborhood. The R-1 category is a better fit to what it is, and what residents want to see it in the future. Hubbard Heights is NOT a place for "missing middle housing' or "mixed use" commercial businesses. We don't want Hubbard Ave to look like Summer or Bedford Street in 10 years.	If the commission is serious about other provisions of the Stamford 2035 plan, namely the "City of Opportunity" section that aims to Celebrate Stamford's historic sites and neighborhoods and Preserve established low-density single-family residential zones, while making sensitive changes to improve quality of life then the commission must change the neighborhood designation from R2 to R1.						Andrew Sparico	dsparico@gmail.com	Hubbard Heights	Yes

Timestamp	**Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?**	**Introduction** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Future Land Use** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**City of Opportunity** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Healthy City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Connected City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Affordable City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Prosperous City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?**	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
8/10/2025 18:18:46	Yes		Monday, August 4, 2025 - sent via email to: Gordon, Emily <EGordon@StamfordCT.gov>; jessepglaude@glaudeedutech.org; sheilabrowndancer2010@hotmail.com; teridl125@gmail.com; Godzeno, Jennifer <JGodzeno@StamfordCT.gov>; Stein, David <DStein@StamfordCT.gov>; Fox, Bridget <BFox@StamfordCT.gov>; Sherwood, Nina <NSherwood@StamfordCT.gov>; Freedman, Richard <RFreedman@StamfordCT.gov>; Barnes, Benjamin <BBarnes@StamfordCT.gov>; Quiñones, Matt <MQuinones@StamfordCT.gov>; Freeman, Janeene <JFreeman@StamfordCT.gov>; szhu@sasaki.com; breps@stamfordct.gov; ssen@sasaki.com; Mayor's Office <MayorsOffice@StamfordCT.gov>; Cohen, Lindsey <LCohen@StamfordCT.gov> ---------- Dear Stamford 2035 Planning Committee Members: As a resident of the Hubbard Heights neighborhood, I have some serious reservations about the vision of Stamford presented and how our neighborhood will be affected by this plan in the next 10 years. The 2035 Stamford plan states that one of its objectives is to "celebrate Stamford's historic sites and neighborhoods." (p 44) The plan also states that one of its goals is to "keep established low-density single-family neighborhoods by maintaining existing densities…" and "Many Stamford residents value the option to live in single-family homes, which contributes to the city's diverse housing choices." (p 40) Hubbard Heights is a nationally recognized historic district that was settled in 1695. Much of its housing dates back to the early 1920's with "Doctor's Row" lining Hubbard Ave for over a century. This area of Stamford is truly an established single-family neighborhood with a diversity of housing and population. The neighborhood is a Stamford treasure. And yet, in the Future Land Use category, the plan contradicts the stated objectives above by placing Hubbard Heights in the R2 category, defined as supporting: "a range of single-family and "missing middle" housing types – including ADUs, duplexes, triplexes and townhomes. These areas also allow for small-scale, neighborhood-compatible commercial uses (such as cafes or coffee shops) and community amenities…" (p 54) That does not describe what Hubbard Heights is currently, nor what the residents want it to be in the future. Our intention is to be included in what is the R1 category, defined as: Established single-family detached housing and compatible low intensity uses such as ADUs and cottage clusters. No significant changes or increases in density are planned. (p 54) The residents will not be happy with nor support a future vision of Stamford that places us in a category where "mixed middle housing" and multi-family housing will be allowed to be built or developed. Nor will we support "commercial uses" within our borders. We do not want to see Hubbard Ave become another Bedford or Summer street. Please revise the map showing the Future Land Use categories to include Hubbard Heights in the R1 category. Respectfully, Nancy Laist, Hubbard Heights Association Vice President 40 Hillside Avenue Stamford, CT 06902						Please revise the map showing the Future Land Use categories to include Hubbard Heights in the R1 category.	Nancy Laist	NLAIST2015@GMAIL.COM	Hubbard Heights Neighborhood Association Vice President & Resident	Yes
8/11/2025 21:32:54	Yes		Page 27 of 89 (pdf counter) (states page 52 on the left and 53 on the right) - Majority of the future land use is contemplated in the city center; consider strategies that develop the North to minimize population density growth in the center.	Page 44 of 89 (pdf counter) (states page 86 on the left and 87 on the right) - None of the Strategies (i.e. ST-06.1, ST-6.2, and ST-6.3) address existing National Historic Districts; consider protecting them.						Shane Reiff	shane.reiff@hotmail.com	Hubbard Heights Association	Yes

Timestamp	Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?	Introduction *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Future Land Use *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	City of Opportunity *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Healthy City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Connected City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Affordable City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Prosperous City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
8/12/2025 12:04:31	Yes								August 12, 2025 Dear Members of the Planning Board, Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on Stamford's draft 2025-2035 Comprehensive Plan. On first reading the plan, a Buddhist saying came to mind – if more is better, why is it never enough? The City of Stamford seems to have developed an insatiable desire for growth. Why? Is it Stamford's goal to be the largest city in the state of Connecticut? Is it to have the largest tax base possible? Is it to attract more and more renters to Stamford? I think our focus should be on quality of life, not size. The plan states that there has been a sixteen percent drop in annual daily city traffic in Stamford in the five-year period from 2018 – 2023. First, no one who drives in Stamford shares this experience as it has become more tedious and frustrating to drive in Stamford over time. Second, the time period used reflects the Pandemic period when many fewer people were driving, and the data should be updated to reflect current reality. Related, the plan notes that the lived experience of forty-seven percent of those surveyed indicate that getting around the city has worsened, which is at odds with the data. We desperately need more current traffic data. The plan also states that there has been an eighteen percent reduction in water usage in Stamford over the past five years, and that there will be a fifteen percent surplus in water supply over the next fifty to sixty years. I find this to be a not-believable statement. When one looks at the effects of climate change around the world and the United States, with rivers and lakes drying up, communities fighting over water, it seems nonsensical to make such a projection today. We have been most fortunate from a climate perspective in the Northeast of the U.S.; we cannot plan with the expectation that this will continue. We have to plan with worsening water conditions in mind. The plan also states that Southwestern Connecticut electricity needs will increase by two thousand percent in the next ten years. How will such increased demand be managed and accommodated? The plan does not address this. Regarding housing supply in Stamford, the planners seem to believe that growth in housing supply will improve affordability. Stamford has added thousands of new apartment units over the past several years and housing costs continue to rise. It seems that the adage "If we build it, they will come" is accurate. Additional units have drawn new residents to Stamford, many of them renters as this is the predominant housing option available. This process yields an ongoing a housing shortage and ever higher housing costs in Stamford. Evidently simply building more units solves neither the supply nor the affordability issues. I strongly recommend that qualified business economists be brought in to analyze and address this issue. Thank you again for the opportunity to comment. I hope that members of the Planning Board take comments like these seriously and reevaluate the recommendations in this plan. I close where I began – if more is better, why is it never enough? Sincerely, Anthony Anthony Pramberger 31 Dann Drive, Stamford CT 06905	Anthony Pramberger	apram@optonline.net	none	Yes
8/12/2025 14:47:34	I have reviewed parts of it		Page 54 - I strongly object to the inclusion of the Hubbard Heights neighborhood in the proposed R-2 zoning which would allow commercial and higher-density units. Hubbard Heights deserves to remain single-family zoning. Many of us worked to achieve historic neighborhood status which would be marred by higher density, increased traffic, etc. to say nothing of the harm it would do to our property values. Please leave Hubbard Heights zoned as single family. Thank you.						no	Evan Dunnell	evandunnell@optonline.net		Yes

Timestamp	Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?	Introduction *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Future Land Use *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	City of Opportunity *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Healthy City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Connected City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Affordable City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Prosperous City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
8/12/2025 15:59:32	Yes	One of the goals expressed by Stamford residents is to be able to age in place, a. goal that I share. The Stamford Senior Center is a major factor in enabling many of us who are elderly to lead full and meaningful lives and still live in our homes or apartments. The Center serves multiple functions: it provides opportunities for socialization, age appropriate exercise, useful and vital information for seniors, opportunities to acquire new skills, trips, intellectual stimulation and the making of new friends. And it does all this with very limited physical facilities. The limited facilities drives some Stamford seniors to participate in Senior Citizen programs in other comunites where the facilities are more extensive and more varied. It is amazing how the current staff manipulates the limited facilities that are currently available. However, with a growing population over 65 years of age, it has already reached its saturation point and some attention must be paid to this problem. In the long rm keeping seniors engaged and able to live in their own homes will save the city money because they will be able to continue to contribute to the tax base. and will not be an inordinate drain on city finances.							I was very impressed by the Comprehensive Plan and hope that Stamford will be able to achieve most of the goals and plans described in this thoughtful document.	Lila Croen	wlcroen@gmail.com	I am a member of the Stamford Senior Center	Yes
8/13/2025 13:27:37	Yes						pp 69-71(Strategies 21 and 22): The plan proposes to make housing affordable for Stamford's growing population through zoning changes to R1 and R2 areas that would allow for development of multi-family housing in largely single-family residential neighborhoods. What empirical evidence is there that demonstrates that this strategy results in more affordable housing? Only anecdotes from other markets are provided and these do not even speak to the impact on affordability. I would request that you ask a competent but disinterested developer to describe what he would do with the opportunity to buy two small houses in the Cove, get rezoned for an attractive 3-family townhouse building on those two lots, build and rent out at rates that would give him an 18% return on investment. This would be a 50% increase in housing density but I would wager that there would be a major increase in the rental rates for that neighborhood. This is not affordability, it is creating income for the developer and greater tax revenues for the city.		This Master Plan is "old school". It doesn't even consider a future in which people use driverless cars for small trips and have only one car instead of 2 or 3. If parking were more expensive downtown, no one would want to drive personal cars if rapid and efficient on-demand driverless taxis were widely available. Streets in congested areas would be limited to taxis, driverless buses to the extent needed, bikes, and pedestrians. Living outside the dense urban areas would be more feasible with a large driverless taxi system, opening up housing possibilities where land is more plentiful and not requiring access to incredibly expensive public transportation. This master planning is based on the same assumptions made for the past 70 years. But this is the age of AI, where there are incredible opportunities for urban and suburban transportation over the next 10 years.	David Ennis	davidwennis@gmail.com	Retired	Yes
8/13/2025 19:58:19	Yes	It would have been beneficial for Stamford residents to have received at least one postal notification regarding this plan. It would have increased awareness and participation. A lot of residents still are not aware of the plan. Only 1,000 fliers were distributed, in a city of 136,000. Many adult residents are elderly and/or do not have access to the internet/social media.	The plan calls for a Neighborhood Identity Program, with distinctive branding and marketing campaigns. Neighborhoods already have an identity, they are not commodities. A super-majority (at least 70%) of the homeowners in a well defined neighborhood should be able to petition for a request for rezoning and not have it dictated to them. (Yes, I understand that the plan 'influences' zoning, and does not establish it.) There is no 'missing middle' in neighborhoods such as Glenbrook. People move to areas with single family homes because there are other single family homes, not because there's a branded 'neighborhood center.' Single family zoning saves neighborhoods and gives them identity, not branding and marketing campaigns. I do not want may neighbor to convert his garage to a cafe. Allowing further development of townhomes, duplexes, triplexes, and ADUs and thus increasing density on already crowded streets in areas such as Glenbrook will worsen the traffic and parking situation as well as cause danger for children crossing the street between parked cars.			Yes, we need to prepare for flooding. We also need to improve waste management and recycle more. We don't need neighborhood wellness centers. We need national healthcare.	Prioritize cleaning up as well as building up the area around the main Stamford train station, which is mainly used for access to NYC as well as Amtrak. These should be walkable areas. Realize that transit ridership is down and will continue to go down. The New Canaan line is used almost exclusively by people traveling into NYC or connecting to Amtrak, it is not and will not be used to access downtown Stamford. Developing the area around the New Canaan line will not increase ridership to downtown Stamford. I am in favor of planting trees, however, the city needs to also take down those trees that are not healthy before they fall down, causing damage to property and power outages.	As a Glenbrook resident, I was in favor of the plan to re-purpose the Glenbrook Community Center as affordable housing. I am strongly opposed to rezoning/'reclassifying' Glenbrook/Springdale/Belltown/Cove (see detailed response under future land use). Affordable housing can be created without destroying neighborhoods.	The plan envisions a utopian, pedestrian city filled with bike lanes, and future land use is 'idealized' accordingly. Traffic is worsening as these ideals are being implemented. For instance, the traffic light to make a right turn from the Exit 9 offramp onto Courtland Avenue, which is supposed to be pedestrian friendly, causes a dangerous backup onto I-95 due to poor timing of the lights and no right on red. Adding a two way bike lane on Courtand Ave will be dangerous for cars, bicyclists, and pedestrians crossing.		Cristina Iemma			Yes
8/14/2025 17:27:13	Yes	Introduction seems predicated on untruths. What Stamford residents were engaged with this process? Please provide a list of names and addresses. The majority of the residents on my street are not even aware of the 2035 Plan. I just recently found out by posts on NextDoor. Why am I hearing about this for the first time a couple of weeks before the Planning Board Vote? What attempts were made to notify residents and how many attempts? Should we revisit the notification process? I have to send a letter to all properties within 100ft of my property line if I want to request a deviation from zoning and the City can just post something online and hope people find out about it? It is not required to send letters to all affected residents when the City "decides" to change the zoning? Aren't you supposed to represent the interests of your constituents?	I am opposed to the rezoning of areas that are currently deemed a single-family zone (R7.5, R20) to Residential Neighborhood which will have a negative impact on our roads and quality of life by significantly increasing population density. Our infrastructure does not support our current levels of population density and The City should pause to consider, evaluate and address infrastructure needs as a result of all of the high-rise apartment buildings before embarking on new projects. The majority of Stamford residents/constituents that I speak with are not asking for additional growth of our City.	Best I can tell is that there currently is no resident-city partnership in planning. I should have been aware that this was going on months ago and I was not, so the City gets an "F" in both communication, notification efforts and partnership in planning. Every resident should be aware of what is going on, how it can impact their property and day-to-day life and choose whether they want to be engaged or not. All I am hearing from my neighbors is that they have not heard about this project. How do you strengthen something that does not exist AND how do you get re-elected when the voters do not trust you or how you are handling the process that is put in place?	A healthy City is one that is not congested with vehicular traffic that creates stress, wastes time and fuel and minimizes pollution emitted from vehicles. So, is the plan saying to make it healthy in certain areas and unhealthy in other areas? Is it healthy to spend 10 minutes just to take a left off my street? And you want to add more density, so will I be waiting 15 mins? 20 mins? The downtown area has exploded with additional vehicle and pedestrian traffic where I no longer enjoy going out to eat on Bedford and now patronize restaurants in Norwalk and Greenwich where there is less traffic. ...and you want to add more housing, foot traffic and vehicle traffic? You should revisit how you are defining Healthy City...it sounds like there will be limited areas in Stamford that will be "Healthy". And current state...you are not helping local business owners if people prefer to go to adjacent towns to avoid inadequate parking and an overcrowded downtown.	Did anyone do a litness check against reality? How are you going to improve mobility when you are addressing infrastructure AFTER you approve the permits of these monstrous luxury apartment buildings? Tresser has been reduced from 3 lanes to 2 lanes to make room for resident and delivery parking to the new high-end apartment buildings. You have added bike lanes to streets that do not have enough space to support vehicle plus bicycle therefore slowing down traffic AND putting both drivers and bicyclists in danger of getting into an accident. Now you want to create the illusion that you are going to improve it? The illustration on page128 suggests there is a lack of understanding of exisitng traffic patterns and likely does not consider the ramifications of closing the cross-street and adding roundabouts. A significant number of vehicles are trying to get from High Ridge to I-95...are you then going to send them onto the side streets?	If the goal was to have an affordable city, affordable units would have been a requirement in most, if not ALL of the new luxury buildings that have popped up. I support using vacant office buildings to be converted to additional housing and if the City means this, they should mandate 5-10% affordable housing in each building and not change the existing residential zoning to help achieve this.	Sounds "fluffy" and lacks specific objectives, could be because we have had trouble attracting and retaining large businesses. Plus existing companies are now downsizing.	I would like to receive a list of the names of people who participated in this process inclusive of City employees, residents that provided input, and if you were able to count 25,000 impressions, you should be able to provide how many unique impressions as well as the content of the impressions (i.e. a thumbs up emoji is not an impression).	Jaimee Taylor Anselmo	jtaylor11@snet.net	Resident of Stamford	Yes

Timestamp	**Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?**	**Introduction** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Future Land Use** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**City of Opportunity** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Healthy City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Connected City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Affordable City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Prosperous City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?**	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
8/15/2025 9:52:15	Yes		I have serious concerns about the future land use portion of the Plan. The 2035 Stamford plan states that one of its objectives is to "celebrate Stamford's historic sites and neighborhoods." (p 44) The plan also states that one of its goals is to "keep established low-density single-family neighborhoods by maintaining existing densities..." and "Many Stamford residents value the option to live in single-family homes, which contributes to the city's diverse housing choices." (p 40) Hubbard Heights is a nationally recognized historic district that was settled in 1695. Much of its housing dates back to the early 1920's with "Doctor's Row" lining Hubbard Ave for over a century. This area of Stamford is truly an established single-family neighborhood with a diversity of housing and population. The neighborhood is a Stamford treasure. And yet, in the Future Land Use category, the plan contradicts the stated objectives above by placing Hubbard Heights in the R2 category, defined as supporting: "a range of single-family and "missing middle" housing types – including ADUs, duplexes, triplexes and townhomes. These areas also allow for small-scale, neighborhood-compatible commercial uses (such as cafes or coffee shops) and community amenities..." (p 54) That does not describe what Hubbard Heights is currently, nor what my husband and I, as home owners, want it to be in the future. Our intention is to be included in what is the R1 category, defined as: Established single-family detached housing and compatible low intensity uses such as ADUs and cottage clusters. No significant changes or increases in density are planned. (p 54) My husband and I cannot support a future vision of Stamford that places us in a category where "mixed middle housing" and multi-family housing will be allowed to be built or developed. Nor will we support "commercial uses" within our borders. Please revise the map showing the Future Land Use categories to include Hubbard Heights in the R1 category.							Angela Fitzsimmons	aupton4@gmail.com		Yes
8/15/2025 10:27:21	Yes		pg 26: I'm a resident of Hubbard Heights, a nationally recognized historic district, and I'm strongly opposed to the 2035 Comprehensive Plan as written, particularly the way it reclassifies our neighborhood. The plan says it wants to "celebrate historic neighborhoods" and "maintain existing densities" in established single-family areas. Yet it places Hubbard Heights in the R2 category, which allows duplexes, triplexes, townhomes, and commercial uses — a direct contradiction to its stated goals. Hubbard Heights is already a diverse, established single-family neighborhood with infrastructure that cannot support more density or commercial development. Streets on the north end are already congested, and safety is being compromised — for example, cars parked on Bridge Street now block visibility when exiting the neighborhood. This will only get worse.	pg 44 I'm a resident of Hubbard Heights, a nationally recognized historic district, and I'm strongly opposed to the 2035 Comprehensive Plan as written, particularly the way it reclassifies our neighborhood. The plan says it wants to "celebrate historic neighborhoods" and "maintain existing densities" in established single-family areas. Yet it places Hubbard Heights in the R2 category, which allows duplexes, triplexes, townhomes, and commercial uses — a direct contradiction to its stated goals. Hubbard Heights is already a diverse, established single-family neighborhood with infrastructure that cannot support more density or commercial development. Developers will take advantage of the Plan changes and destroy this neighborhood (one is already trying) and make it less desirable and safe.					This plan is a gift to developers and a burden on residents. In future elections, I will vote against any of my elected officials that support this plan.	Patricia Morris	morrispatty01@gmail.com	None	Yes
8/17/2025 5:05:02	I have reviewed parts of it				We need a larger, modernized Senior Center that can meet Stamford's growing senior population and provide the state-of-the-art space our older adults deserve!				Seniors need a safer way to park and a warm pool	Therese Papadopoulos	Therese_Papadopoulos@yahoo.com		Yes
8/17/2025 15:55:35	Yes		No to making Springdale neighborhood reclassified as R2 "Residential Neighborhood".				No to St 21.2 "Increasing flexibility in zoning standards...to promote middle housing typologies such as multiplexes and townhomes." No to Strategy 21 "amending zoning regulations to permit ADUs, duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, cottage courts and townhomes as-of-right in certain residential districts."		N/A	Jason D'Ambrosio	jcarverd@yahoo.com		Yes
8/20/2025 17:33:39	Yes		60-80						This reads like a hyped up annual report rather than a neutral informational document. I am opposed to turning single family neighborhoods into multi family neighborhoods. There is already no parking in the already overcrowded Glenbrook, Springdale and Cove neighborhoods.	S	Arnold		Yes

Timestamp	**Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?**	**Introduction** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Future Land Use** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**City of Opportunity** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Healthy City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Connected City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Affordable City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Prosperous City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?**	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
8/22/2025 7:35:42	Yes		As a long time resident of the Cove, I am writing to express my deep concern about the proposed comprehensive plan framework that, while not a direct zoning change, will shape future zoning decisions in our neighborhood. Allowing multi-family homes, townhomes, condos, and Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) in areas currently zoned for single-family housing would fundamentally alter the character of the Cove. This shift would increase traffic, strain parking, and negatively impact the quality of life that residents deeply value. Because this plan will guide future zoning policy, it is critical that it reflect the voices and priorities of the people who live here. Like many of my neighbors, I will be paying close attention to how this issue is handled—and it will be a major factor in determining my support for any candidate at the local or state level. I respectfully urge you to revise the plan to remove the Cove and other single-family neighborhoods from consideration for increased density.						Please make the requested changes.	Malaika Myers	mlmyers1701@gmail.com		Yes
8/22/2025 11:55:00	I have reviewed parts of it	My comments apply to the spirit and challenges of the entire Comprenensive Plan. I will write my comments in the final section, Additional Input.							I support the Plan's spirit of inclusiveness, equality, and equity. I'm aware of vociferous resistance to aspects of this Plan by residents who fear losing control of the neighborhood environments in which they have invested financially, to which they have become accustomed, and to which some feel entitled. They want to preserve those environments, and their sentiments are not unreasonable. The enormous challenge is: "Can all of Stamford's residents participate in and benefit from what Stamford has to offer?" One aspect of the Plan that needs tweaking is the apparent lack of attention to how the most wealthy and elite neighborhoods can contribute to the changes that have been outlined. The responsibility for change should be shared by residents in all neighborhoods. I believe that automatic biases, and predictive assumptions based on those biases operate in a majority of people who have grown up in the United States. Most of us cannot escape such cultural indoctrination. Stamford is in many ways a thriving city. It is also a segregated city at all economic levels. Hopefully, there are avenues to non-judgementally address such prejudices. The objections to the Plan are, not surprisingly, emotionally based. Facts are useful and important, but it is essential to be aware of and address the underlying feelings respectfully in all possible ways.	Joan Madison	joanmadison64@gmail.com		Yes

Timestamp	**Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?**	**Introduction** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Future Land Use** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**City of Opportunity** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Healthy City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Connected City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Affordable City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Prosperous City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?**	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
8/22/2025 15:08:03	Yes	on all pages, could we add the acronyms used on each page in the footnote of each page? I know there's definitions at the end, but having them on each page would be a consistent location for reminding oneself of the acronyms	p.60 (Industrial) - concerned about the statement that "certain industrial areas are compatible with a mix of uses, as they do not contain noxious activities or sources of pollution." I live right against an industrial park (Viaduct Rd/Hope St and the Research Drive industrial park), and I will say that the noise and air pollution MUST be considered if expanding industrial areas--whether garbage collection (which occurs between 4:30-5:30am, so they are loud in the middle of the night) or a business that receives large shipments (often after hours if there's delays), there are constant loud noises during quiet hours and vehicle idling that I assume must occur when you are working with large machinery and trucks; however, I would classify both as a source of pollution, and it really is damaging to one's quality of life. The summary on p.60 makes it seem like the expansion of industrial areas will not come with a large impact to residents, but that is unfortunately not my experience.	p.74 - is there a way to integrate expansion or strategic traffic calming/flow measures (not sure of language) within the CTDOT partnership? Pulling that info up into the opportunity/community area would ensure that thoughtful housing expansion and traffic considerations go hand in hand/occur simultaneously. p.75, agree with the resident verbatim that having a vibrant pedestrian experience around train stations would make a huge difference. I think many people either get off at downtown or go all the way up to the end of the New Canaan line, not bothering to stop and use their dollars in Glenbrook or Springdale (I see this online when people post day trips out of NYC). p.84, I like the idea of one, connected Capital Planning Board to ensure no neighborhood is left behind in the planning/execution of infrastructure improvements. p.88, appreciate the transparency and like the idea of expanded GIS data layers, plus a central location for information--would make searching much easier. p.91, it seems that people in my neighborhood (springdale) absolutely want less red tape, but they are concerned about permits being expedited on projects without resident input--can one of the goals include specific timeframes that include public comment periods?	p.100, would love to see more specific goals/guidelines around the green space additions requires for each XYZ new building/restructuring of land. My fellow Springdale neighbors are concerned that increased building will not only lead to worsening traffic, but also the GHG emissions and noise pollution from those increased cars. If we end up removing green spaces to accommodate, how will we combat the increased pollution through natural mechanisms of air purification? Additionally, walking in the increased neighborhoods to the train stations/improved shops would be difficult without the tree canopy! So I support the implementation of someone to oversee this and study it, but would love to also see more specific and measurable goals around planting XYZ for every ABC new build! With no new land being allocated towards Parks, it does make me leery of anyone actually enforcing implementation of tree/green spaces in new construction areas. p.103, one limitation of the parks is that some appear to be private? Or maybe just the parking lots are (or require passes)--how can we democratize the usage of parks/beaches in the peak months? Is it a matter of subsidizing the payments? How can we bring in more visitors to inject their dollars into the economy with the out of state and non-resident parking costing so much during the peak season? p.104, the Blue-Green link is great and would absolutely love safer roadways (people are so against biking but also against traffic... seems very contradictory and elitist to assume we can all afford cars anyways), not to mention the addition of shaded rest areas and water/restrooms/trash cans. Would be great to see more well-labeled trash/recycle along these routes to encourage proper disposal. p.106, love the LED streetlights--how can we ensure that we do not add to light pollution in the process? p.112-114, please mention the residents on major/minor arterial roads (state roads) that are still impacted by industrial trucks despite not being along the highway/parkway!!! ie, hope st, long ridge, high ridge road. They are seemingly forgotten in these studies (or maybe just not mentioned in the summaries). p.114, under noise complaints, I wonder if there's an opportunity to partner with the SPD to enforce out-of-compliance and unsafe vehicles. Quite a bit of noise along these main corridors are due to modified engines/exhaust, dirt bikes/modified motorcycles, AND large trucks with loose/rattling items in the bed/trailer attachment. It's difficult to even report these things because they come and go so quickly, there's no way for residents to keep up with them. Perhaps tying this back into infrastructure could be good, too--a smoother road with speed reducing measures would likely reduce some noise complaints at the source (speeding and uneven roadways).	p.122, I think there's an opportunity to link increased housing with parking/traffic concerns here, too--making sure it is clear that parking will be evaluated with every project (it does say "ongoing," but possibly not explicit enough to specify new growth considerations. p.122, I do appreciate reviewing traffic signal timings, as I am guilty of driving more recklessly when I know how short or poorly timed some of the lights are, esp turn signals--I also see the poor timings quite a bit in the downtown E Main St where the lights don't align and people speed from one to the next to try and beat the red light (and unfortunately, they are rewarded with successfully doing so). p.124, I wonder if there's an opportunity to consider/mention "Desire paths" as part of the future sidewalk/crosswalk infrastructure--where are people unsafely crossing most often because it is inconvenient to walk up or down the street to a labeled crosswalk? ex. E Main St, people cross from the Deloitte/gas station side to the Stamford Hotel, using the narrow median as their stopping point. ex. 2, Hope st bus stops do not align with crosswalks--these riders are forced to cross without crosswalks because they are so few and far between--esp between Toms rd and Hartford Ave. p.126, ST-19.7 - can we list examples of streets to be discussed as city maintained vs CTDOT? p.130, really nice to see suggested improvements to bus stops (dedicated lanes and better maintained individual stops)--i think this ties back in nicely to traffic calming and alleviation--is there a place to tie those two together so people understand how this will have downstream effects/benefits?	p.117 vs p133ish--is it WESTCOG or WestCOG? for consistency's sake p.136, I think the housing actions could do with specificity around not just approved building plans, but maintenance or addition of green space to alleviate concerns that building new construction = removal of green space. While, yes, it does, it would be a nice way to put "back" some of the greenery in a semi-enforceable way. ? Thought of this while looking at the graphic of townhomes on p.138--where each one has its own back yard space--but where I live in springdale, the vast majority are patios/decks, not green space. p.140, typo in quote from resident "moved here 30 years ago or ARE lifelong..." p.142, I know the point of this doc is not to be a literature review or white paper, but I've heard this phrase go around, "most people are 3 bad months away from homelessness." I don't know if it's true or if there's research behind it (I assume it has to do with studying peoples' typical emergency funds/savings), but having that kind of reminder next to the stat about the % of residents deemed low income could be a way to draw up some empathy from those who are staunchly against helping people who are unhoused. So long as the statistic is factual and citable.	p.152, would again like to see a connection of the other goals for green canopy and sustainability be mentioned in the repurposing of office buildings; would also be helpful to include a call-out that traffic (namely, roads/signals) will be adjusted to quell congestion. See: Hope St Riverbend Office complex--I think it was approved for building 400-450 units, but there has been quite a lot of pushback and rightfully so if they have not communicated their plans to alleviate the additional car traffic. p.153, orange marker is not included in key with light and dark blue bullseye. p.158, the idea of incentivizing small business owners to open up in stamford is great! This + a Stamford "identity" storefronts to give the "small town connecticut" feel would really change how people perceive and use their dollars in Stamford (I believe) Thank you all for the awesome work! It really is a great document :-)	As mentioned under Intro, having footnotes on each page with any acronyms would be great; eventually having hyperlinks to go directly to the glossary might work, too. Would also love to eventually see hyperlinks or little badges/bugs (icons) that indicate how different action items go hand in hand--e.g., for housing, it's a mix of permit policies and infrastructure and green space/sustainability goals, with little call-outs in the margin (and hyperlinks?!) to ensure the residents understand that the plan takes into consideration the connectedness of these action items and goals. Thank you again!	Melanie Ng	mng11907@gmail.com	NA	Yes
8/23/2025 14:51:18	I have reviewed parts of it					The Connected City (mobility) portion of the plan is tremendous. Key initiatives and recommendations I really liked were focusing on Bulls Head as a potential area for growth, pedestrian safety and mutli-modal travel, and working with the state to influence/control the development futures of certain roads within Stamford such as Tresser or Broad street to make them more compatible with the current state and future of downtown Stamford as a place where people should want to be and be safely, and not just an area to be passed through as quickly as possible.				Great work overall, the extensive community outreached is appreciated, I feel as if the community is really being heard.	Matthew Keenan	mattykeenan11@gmail.com		Yes

Timestamp	Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?	Introduction *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Future Land Use *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	City of Opportunity *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Healthy City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Connected City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Affordable City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Prosperous City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
8/24/2025 13:27:12	I have reviewed parts of it								As a resident of Stamford all my life, I have seen Stamford grow and feel this is not the right approach for areas that are zoned for single family. Homeowners specifically look for zoning specific to single family and usually spend a more for a neighborhood for that. It especially makes it more challenging for cars being parked on streets and neighborhoods. I currently live on Wood Ridge Drive and assume I am in the R1 section, although, no one has been able to specifically tell me that I am. A lot of the homes are on hills, so homeowners tend to park on the street, especially in the winter when it snows. It inhibits the plows being able to plow the streets properly. Adding ADU's, duplexes, triplexes & townhomes, that will add for more parking on the street and make for dangerous situations. We already have signs on the corner of Ridge Park and Wood Ridge not to park, because we had a young boy years ago that was killed by a motorist. The sign was installed because of that, and yet motorist still park in a NO PARKING ZONE. Several years ago, we had a blind person move into the neighborhood with his family on Ridge Park, it took forever for the city to put up signs that a blind person was in the area, and recently, on the same corner that the boy was killed, the blind person was run over by a car. Thankfully he lived but was badly injured. If you change the description of what can be allowed in this area, we will continue to have issues with these types of accidents. When families buy a home in a single-family area, they do it purposely because they do have want to deal with transit neighbors who do not care about how the property is maintained. Go ahead and continue to build those these apartment buildings and what is going to happen with our water supply, sewer systems, and city services. I have had a request in from April, 2025 to replace a garbage can and still do not have it. Our schools are overcrowded, and a lot of families are leaving because they do not feel their kids are getting a good education any longer. Respectfully, Anita Finn	Anita Finn	anita.finn16@gmail.com	Home owner, Realtor	Yes
8/26/2025 17:27:45	I have reviewed parts of it		I support this section of the plan, in particular the controversial map on page 50. I say this as a resident of one of the affected neighborhoods (Belltown). Please do not take a vocal minority complaining about this section to be representative of the majority.	I believe this comment best fits in this section: I am very much in favor of any improvements in pedestrian and cycling infrastructure in the city. Of particular importance I think is connecting the short, fragmented bike lanes that often run only a few blocks in isolation. If those were all connected and a full north-south lane along Strawberry Hill or Washington were implemented, the usability of the network would be drastically improved.						Elizabeth Middleton	elizabeth.middleton@gmail.com	People Friendly Stamford	Yes
8/27/2025 11:39:25	I have reviewed parts of it	This is a bad idea. I vote against it.	This is a bad idea. I vote against it.	This is a bad idea. I vote against it.	This is a bad idea. I vote against it.	This is a bad idea. I vote against it.	This is a bad idea. I vote against it.	This is a bad idea. I vote against it.	This is a bad idea. I vote against it.	Timmy	timothycullen14@gmail.com		Yes
8/27/2025 15:13:50	Yes						Excellent work on the Stamford 2035 draft plan. I strongly support the clear commitment to fostering "missing middle" housing and expanding diverse, affordable housing options across the city. When the public hearings begin, you will undoubtedly hear from a vocal minority who oppose any form of change or increased density. Please remember that the loudest, most negative voices do not represent the entire community. Many residents, including young professionals, families, and essential workers who struggle to afford to live here, are quietly cheering for these exact policies. Thank you for having the courage to propose a thoughtful, data-driven plan that addresses our city's real needs. Hold firm to this vision; it is the right path forward for a more inclusive Stamford.			Ksenia King	kseniabeth@gmail.com		Yes
8/28/2025 14:17:14	Yes	Thank you for such a comprehensive, detailed, and well-laid out plan.	My husband and I live in a single-family home in Springdale that we bought in 2022. We are a young family and are so happy here. However, we feel dismayed seeing friends and other young families priced out of the dream of owning their own home. I fully agree that middle-housing options like townhomes or two-family houses are needed, much more than additional apartments. But I do hope that the plan can include affordability for SINGLE FAMILY HOMES for young people. You shouldn't have to be a millionaire to buy a regular house in Stamford. I appreciate the need for more affordable housing, but I also feel that the population within Stamford already feels pretty saturated. I worry that adding more and more housing will make the city feel more bloated than it already is.				My husband and I live in a single-family home in Springdale that we bought in 2022. We are a young family and are so happy here. However, we feel dismayed seeing friends and other young families priced out of the dream of owning their own home. I fully agree that middle-housing options like townhomes or two-family houses are needed, much more than additional apartments. But I do hope that the plan can include affordability for SINGLE FAMILY HOMES for young people. You shouldn't have to be a millionaire to buy a regular house in Stamford. I appreciate the need for more affordable housing, but I also feel that the population within Stamford already feels pretty saturated. I worry that adding more and more housing will make the city feel more bloated than it already is.		Take it easy on the small businesses with environmental requirements. I saw some restaurants were hardly given enough time to switch from plastic utensils. Please give them ample time to budget, source, and transition their existing supply chain.	Alicia B		Yes
9/2/2025 9:04:57	Yes				Please consider a Conservation Commission and increasing the hours of the Environmental Sustainability Coordinator to full time to provide valuable input to the Conservation Commission. UCONN has a lot of resources on the matter. Please find the link https://resilientconnecticut.media.uconn.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/3830/2023/05/Conservation-Commission-Fact-Sheet.pdf	Please consider a conservation commission and increasing the hours of the Environmental Sustainability Coordinator to full time to provide valuable input to the Conservation Commission. UCONN has a lot of resources on the matter. Please find the link https://resilientconnecticut.media.uconn.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/3830/2023/05/Conservation-Commission-Fact-Sheet.pdf					Jeanette Bilicznianski	Biltro96@gmail.com		Yes

Timestamp	Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?	Introduction *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Future Land Use *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	City of Opportunity *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Healthy City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Connected City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Affordable City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Prosperous City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
9/2/2025 9:16:39	Yes		We have more than enough luxury rental buildings in Stamford, which drives up the living cost in Stamford significantly since COVID. People live in these buildings are "come and go", not making long term "investment in the well being of Stamford. New comers choose to settle in neighboring towns, because Stamford public schools are still so behind other competitive school in surrounding towns. Attracting big developers coming here to build more rental buildings, developers come and take the lands, making money then leave. Same for the tenants in these building, if there are not good employment opportunities in Stamford, not good school system in Stamford, it will not be a long term sustainable solution for Stamford's future.	The City has already missed the opportunity to corporate with UCONN Stamford to help the university grow its footprint in the City to draw more talents to the City. The City should focus more on long term development/investment with institutions who draws future talent to Stamford, i.e. UCONN Stamford, and prospective employers. Stamford is now becoming a "living quarters", people move to here, but not staying for "long term investment" , because school systems are not competitive to surrounding towns.		The traffic system, roads, public infrastructures are not keeping up with the growing population flooded to Stamford since COVID, due to the continuous building of high rise luxury rental buildings. It has become very unaffordable, and very inconvenient living in Stamford, due to the housing cost and very heavy traffic.			A long term Stamford resident			Yes
9/4/2025 22:46:49	Yes	p29 Curious where the 1000SF of open space per resident came from. When TPL collected data for Stamford's ParkScore Index, Stamford received a 20 out of 100 for scarcity of large destination parks. The category included parkland as a percentage of city area and median park size. Stamford scored in the bottom fourth of cities reviewed in ParkScore for both metrics. I understand open space is broader than parks, but the strategic plan also included cemeteries, community gardens and natural preserves. What is the discrepancy? In general, some of the graphic charts/maps of Stamford are hard to read because they are too small or blurry	Along Hope Street, North of the intersection of Toms Road on the east side of the street, there are 3 lots north of the new storage facility zoned Industrial. These lots should be zoned C-N to reflect and match the scale and typology of the surrounding context. Can the Land Use of these properties be updated in the comprehensive plan? p 64 - Parks Department List 58 Parks not 44. p65 - Like the new Conservation Category	p74 - Not in favor of ACU's. We already have a problem with illegal businesses in residential neighborhoods because of a lack of enforcement. p75 In the VCD/TOD in Glenbrook where there are supposed to be mixed-use projects, we have been getting ALL residential and/or ground floor residential units. 492 Glenbrook Rd which is labeled as #3, kicked out 2 tenants on the ground floor to illegally put in a ground floor residential unit that was not approved. It later was approved when brought to the Zoning Board's attention. Glenbrook lost retail. p75 example #1 45 Church Street is ALL residential. Not sure why this is a good example of TOD and mixed-use, although the building does look nicer than it did before. p75 & 76 Where is #2? It is referenced on p76 but to what? P75 - Design Guideline and Toolkit: Have you seen the proposed design for 488 Glenbrook Road? Looks like the ground level will be all apartments and design is sub-par. p75 Commercial and Industrial lots seem to be grandfathered in perpetuity in VCD/TOD. p84 Typo ST-5.1 Working group should create an public should be 'a' public	Parks & Recreation Commission Comment: Overall the Commission supports the section 'A Healthy City'. It aligns well with the Commissions Strategic Goals from 2023-2025. One request is to include requiring a City-wide (Parks and Board of Education) Field Assessment Study for athletic fields and game courts. Our population is growing and field space is not. There has been a capital request for 3 years in a row that has failed each year. It is also part of the Parks Strategic Plan recommendations.					Thank you for a well done comprehensive plan.	Melanie Hollas	mlarahollas@gmail.com / MHollas@StamfordCT.gov	Resident / Parks & Recreation Commission Chair	Yes
Received via email									Under the new plan will "ADUs" be allowed on all lots over 10,000 sq. foot lot.	Clemmon Williams	clemonwilliams7426@gmail.com		
Received via email									Please do not proceed with this plan of re-zoning single family neighborhoods to multi family zoning. We love our neighborhood. There should be a moratorium on apartment building until we see the current progression and population roll out. Our city needs to protect our single family neighborhoods not destroy them. Unable to sign on to open hearing on the ninth as I will be working. I would like my voice heard. The implications of rapid growth can destroy a city. The roads, school system,water, sewer,fire and police departments , hospital to name a few will not be equipped to handle. Do Not Pass this Plan. Sincerely Carol DePreta				
Received via email									Say NO to increased residential density. Say NO to multi-family housing in single-family neighborhoods Say NO to single-family units being used for small businesses Say NO to ADU's Say NO to garages being used as commercial units to operate small businesses Barbara Romans 54 CADY Street Stamford, CT 06907				

Timestamp	Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?	Introduction *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Future Land Use *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	City of Opportunity *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Healthy City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Connected City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Affordable City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Prosperous City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
Received via email									Dear Mayor Simmons, members of the Planning and Zoning Board, members of the Board of Representatives and others, I am writing to you as a Stamford resident who has lived in the Waterside community for 25 years. I have serious concerns for the future of Waterside as outlined in the ten year -plan for the city. The proposed 260-apartment development is not in the best interest for Stamford in the short term or long term. Waterside currently has congested streets as well as a strained infrastructure and more apartments will cause irreparable harm by tipping the balance of Waterside's diverse housing options.. To enter Waterside through Stamford, there are two routes: Fairfield Avenue and Southfield/Greenwich Avenue. The current plan does not take into consideration that our roads are already congested. Cars line streets like Fairfield, Southfield, Congress, Burwood and side streets. They have had to adjust bus routes due to the congestion on narrows. The apartment buildings on Southfield have limited parking and as a result visitors park on Southfield and side streets taking away from residents. The addition of 261 apartments as well as the 58 townhouses in the current office park will bring more congestion to Waterside. The board of zoning also let in a Greenwich developer to build a hockey rink that will house a Greenwich hockey team. New apartments, townhomes, as well as a new hockey rink for Greenwich residents and private school families will significantly increase the volume of cars, especially during peak hours. In turn, it will impact the ability of emergency services to navigate the area effectively and respond to emergencies in a timely manner. Our neighborhood has already experienced instances where emergency vehicles were delayed due to existing traffic issues. What makes Waterside unique is it has a diversity of housing options.Waterside is a densely densely populated neighborhood. We have apartment complexes, rental houses, multifamily housing, and a small amount of single family homes. The city of Stamford's plan for Waterside is to add more apartments and multi-family housing as part of the ten year vision to support expected population growth without a plan to protect and increase the number of single family homes. In 2000, my husband and I moved from Massachusetts and found a one bedroom apartment in a multifamily house on Burwood Avenue. I wanted to live close to work and home knowing we would most likely have a family. We were lucky to find a house on Dee Lane and have an amazing neighborhood. It is diverse, safe and family friendly. If Stamford continues to build apartments in Waterside, we will make it impossible for professionals, like teachers, first responders, health care workers, and young professionals to live here. They will leave Stamford and move to more affordable towns much further away from their work. Waterside needs more housing that supports the long term growth for Stamford. We need people who are invested in their neighborhoods and the balance between the residential choices need to be in balance for Waterside to exist. Please reconsider building 261 apartments and instead focus on starter homes for families that will stay and continue to work, live and play in Stamford. A few mayors ago we would have walks with our mayor around our neighborhood. We would love for you,				
Received via email									The revision to the map is an improvement. Thank you for listening to some of our concerns. Sincerely, Steve Garst				
Received via email									My name is Alex Pugliese and I live at 36 congress street in Stamford. I am writing to express my concern with the approval of the 2035 master plan. The current draft is not explicit and does not clearly define the new terms that are proposed. This will lead to overpopulated areas, traffic, and changes to neighborhoods that are not wanted by the homeowners in the area. I ask that you please reconsider your master plan and clearly define the area requirements and give a clear picture of what is and is not allowed in the new zones you have created. Please DO NOT approve the 2035 master plan as it is now.				

Timestamp	**Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?**	**Introduction** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Future Land Use** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**City of Opportunity** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Healthy City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Connected City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Affordable City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Prosperous City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?**	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
Received via email									I am here to advocate for a Conservation Commission. If you are asking what a Conservation Commission is and its responsibilities. UConn offers resources that I will forward to board members. Please also reach to EPB staff on their thoughts on creating such a commission that other towns have embraced and use to promote sustainable practices and land use recommendations that prioritize natural resources. While the current board is environmentally forward thinking other boards may not be. A Conservation Commission would guarantee forward thinking policies that would be generated by a Conservation Commission vs. board members themselves. Currently, the Conservation Commission is under the umbrella of the city's EPB. However, under CT state law, a separate Conservation Commission can be formed by the legislative body of the municipality. A newly formed Conservation Commission would be a way of acknowledging public sentiment concerning wildlife habitat and tree preservation that the BOR could act upon today. I urge the BOR Land Use Committee or Legislative Committee to take up the creation of a Conservation Commission as an agenda item as soon as possible! The current board can ensure a legacy of environmental stewardship by forming this board.				
Received via email									I want to share that I am in support of the zoning modifications as originally proposed in the Master Plan. Stamford has become too exclusive a community. We have lived in Stamford for over forty years. Prices of homes and apartments are now out of control. We need more housing. The zoning modifications as originally proposed are quite reasonable and will allow Stamford to grow in a positive manner. Please adopt them in our Mater Plan. Jerry Silber				
Received via email									I shared the note below with the Mayor and wanted to share it with you as well since this is the body that actually votes on the Comprehensive Plan. I urge you to amend the plan to eliminate the proposed change to the guidance that would impact the Cove neighborhood. There is strong and vocal opposition to this change from residents and I sincerely hope that our representatives (elected and/or appointed) will stop this change. Sincerely, Malaika Myers				
Received via email									I as a Stamford resident, born and raised here, find it disgusting that your department would endorse a proposed Master Plan Change that would increase the stress on our infrastructure. I repeatedly receive letters regarding the water that I am using to live day-to-day. The traffic on Newfield is so bad it is difficult to pull into traffic. Not to mention that we need some "green" space. Too many apartment buildings, we do not have to look like New York City. It is sad that you want to take a great community and destroy everything that makes it desirable to live here. Ruth Miner Owner/Broker Country Club Properties, LLC 1095 Newfield Avenue Stamford, CT 06905				

Timestamp	**Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?**	**Introduction** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Future Land Use** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**City of Opportunity** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Healthy City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Connected City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Affordable City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Prosperous City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?**	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
Received via email									I am writing to express my firm opposition to the proposed 2035 Comprehensive Plan, as a whole, but in particular, to the specific changes it would bring to our clearly defined single family neighborhoods. The proposed change to R2 zoning is terrible, as it would then allow for potential multi-family homes and even condo complexes to be built in the middle of long established single family home neighborhoods. As a Stamford native and a full time realtor with almost 30 years of experience, I can state categorically that this concept of allowing other forms of housing into estabilished single family neighborhoods would immediately devalue the surrounding single family homes. People buy single family homes for the added quiet, land, privacy and assurance of these qualities these locations offer. Not to mention as their primary investment, which they count on long term. To have these dramatic changes made to a neighborhood where people bought homes with the specific understanding that it would remain as such is egregious, outrageous and completely irresponsible. I urge the planning board to cancel/remove/strike any and all language in the 2035 master plan that alters our single family neighborhoods as I described above which also includes allowing ADUs and ACUs. We must preserve the integrity of our single family neighborhoods throughout Stamford! Thank you.				
Received via email									Please do not approve the Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan. It is NOT good for Stamford and its citizens. Barbara A. DeGaetani 65 Glenbrook Road				
Received via email									I ask you to reconsider parts of the Master Plan 2035. There are sections of town that will be increasingly distressed due to the options currently proposed. The R-2 areas should remain free from the over development that is evident in the "City of Stamford" already. We see cars parked on former front lawns, Puritan Lane, Mayflower Avenue, Rock Spring Road are all examples of this. I grew up on Puritan Lane. You cannot find street parking on that lane due to the failure of housing inspectors to enforce the laws pertaining to Stamford and it's housing. If we can't process the needs of the neighborhoods now, how may it be done in the future? Building cluster and multi-family housing benefits the real estate interests not the neighbors. Multi-family homes used to be owner occupied, now 2 and 3 family homes are in reality being filled with 2-3 groups of unrelated people per apartment. The streets are overloaded with cars which impede other traffic forcing them to become one way streets. Building codes are in violation in these homes. How fair is that to the undocumented residents around town when they aren't properly inspected? These things are all around our town now. Why do we feel the need to build more housing units so people from other states may leave their no later desired towns/cities and pay cash to own a new home/apartment here? God bless them but why do we need to support them instead of supporting those already here? Currently won't the marketplace decide price and availability? Affordable housing is not the issue, the issue is overcrowding and quality of life for us. I discussed with the Administration the option of workers dormitories that could be rent subsidized by the hiring companies for guest workers, seasonal and permanent hires who have approval to work in the USA. Land was available and some buildings are able to be converted to residential moderate housing. Those could be looked at now. Please reconsider the Master Plan 2035. Thank you. Ray Downey				

Timestamp	**Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?**	**Introduction** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Future Land Use** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**City of Opportunity** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Healthy City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Connected City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Affordable City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Prosperous City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?**	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
Received via email									his plan is a disaster. Why build more apartments, why add more people, we can't even support the number of people in town now. ie roads, schools, sewer, water, green space, police, fire etc. Another land grab, there are 3X s more cars on I-95 than the road was built to hold. When they were building I-95 in the 50s they forced people to sell their homes, they did not have enough affordable apartments to relocate families that were displaced. The solution was to put trailers in the lot across from the Quonset homes at West Beach. St John's Towers were built to house families that were displaced when they built RBS and UBS. Building 1 is gone. Now a developer is purchasing buildings 2 and 3. No place for the remaining tenants to go. We were led to believe that the Towers were going to be renovated so the people living there could stay, they are priced as all affordable apartments. I heard the developer who is buying buildings 2 and 3 opted for NO affordable apartments to be included in the new build. Why aren't the developers paying their fare share of taxes, why is UCONN tax exempt and will be able to purchase land starting at Long Island Sound to Long Ridge. Why waste money on sidewalks in areas that are not walkable. Bike paths, a 12-year-old boy was hit by a car a few weeks ago on Courtland Ave , where I live, and he wasn't on the road. How many people have been killed walking on Tresser Blvd. How many people have been hit by cars on the corner of Prospect and Forest St. I can't get out of my condo now with the amount of traffic, what next. The plan is unrealistic and the people that live here have had enough. Give us our City back. Time for a new Mayor, one who really cares.T				
Received via email									I vote against it. Don't do it. Sent from my iPhone				
Received via email									Dear Mayor Simmons and Members of the Planning Board, I am writing as a deeply concerned Springdale resident and proud third-generation Stamfordite. I only recently became aware of the proposed Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan and attended last evening's meeting. While I am grateful that representatives unanimously requested major changes, I must stress how strongly I oppose altering our single-family zoning. I love Stamford and Springdale just as they are. As both a resident and a realtor, I know firsthand that changing single-family zoning would decrease real estate values, overpopulate our suburban neighborhoods, and ultimately drive families away. This will not strengthen our tax base—in fact, it risks weakening our community fabric. What troubles me most is how quietly this plan seems to have been pushed forward, with too little effort to inform residents of its sweeping implications. Stamford deserves transparency, and our citizens deserve a real say in the future of our neighborhoods. We elected you with the expectation that you would work in the best interest of Stamford residents. Please, listen to us, respect our concerns, and protect the single-family zoning that has shaped our neighborhoods for generations. Our homes and our community are worth preserving.				

Timestamp	**Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?**	**Introduction** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Future Land Use** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**City of Opportunity** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Healthy City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Connected City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Affordable City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Prosperous City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?**	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
Received via email									Dear Stamford 2035 Planning Committee Members: As a resident of the Hubbard Heights neighborhood, I have some serious reservations about the vision of Stamford presented and how our neighborhood will be affected by this plan in the next 10 years. The 2035 Stamford plan states that one of its objectives is to "celebrate Stamford's historic sites and neighborhoods." (p 44) The plan also states as one of its goals is to "keep established low-density single-family neighborhoods by maintain existing densities..." and "Many Stamford residents value the option to live in single-family homes, which contributes to the city's diverse housing choices." (p 40) Hubbard Heights is a nationally recognized historic district that was settled in 1695. Much of its housing dates back to the early 1920's with "Doctor's Row" lining Hubbard Ave for over a century. This area of Stamford is truly an established single-family neighborhood with a diversity of housing and population. The neighborhood is a Stamford treasure. And yet, in the Future Land Use category, the plan contradicts the stated objectives above by placing Hubbard Heights in the R2 category, defined as supporting: "a range of single-family and "missing middle" housing types -- including ADUs, duplexes, triplexes and townhomes. These areas also allow for small-scale, neighborhood-compatible commercial uses (such as cafes or coffee shops) and community amenities..." (p 54) That does not describe what Hubbard Heights is currently, nor what the residents want it to be in the future. Our intention is to be included in what is the R1 category, defined as: Established single-family detached housing and compatible low intensity uses such as ADUs and cottage clusters. No significant changes or increases in density are planned. (p 54) The residents will not be happy with nor support a future vision of Stamford that places us in a category where "mixed middle housing" and multi-family housing will be allowed to be built or developed. Nor will we support "commercial uses" within our borders. We do not want to see Hubbard Ave become another Bedford or Summer street. Please revise the map showing the Future Land Use categories to include Hubbard Heights in the R1 category. Respectfully, Chris Kalachnikoff				
Received via email									We oppose any master plan that increases density in areas currently zoned as single-family within the City of Stamford. My husband and I were born and raised in Stamford, and we raised our children here. Our parents chose to invest in a single-family neighborhood in the 50s. We also decided to invest in a single-family neighborhood to raise our family. What you're doing will change our city, where our children will not invest in Stamford. This town is filled with generations of families who have invested their lives here. These people are the actual heartbeat of this city and genuinely love it. This objection includes the introduction of ADUs, multi-family or similar concepts that would alter land currently restricted to single-family housing in Stamford. We specifically oppose the new 2035 draft Master Plan concept of R-2, "Residential Neighborhood", which the Plan describes is "intended to support a range of single-family and "missing middle" housing types- including ADUs, duplexes, triplexes, and townhomes. Please stop this from happening.				

Timestamp	**Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?**	**Introduction** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Future Land Use** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**City of Opportunity** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Healthy City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Connected City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Affordable City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Prosperous City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?**	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
Received via email									All, I am writing to express my strong concern regarding the Stamford 2025 Master Plan and the proposal to rezone my neighborhood to "R2 residential neighborhood" My husband and I chose this neighborhood because it was zoned for single-family homes. Families who move here make this choice with the expectation of a certain quality of life, community investment, and stability. Changing this zoning undermines those expectations and will alter the character of our neighborhood in ways that do not benefit the residents who have chosen to live here. We already have a troubling example nearby of an illegal two-family home, owned by a New Canaan resident, that has become a strain on the community (5 Alton Road) This single property has eight to ten cars associated with it, four satellite dishes, an illegal driveway, and has not received proper maintenance in more than 20 years. This situation illustrates the very real problems that can arise when density increases without proper oversight or accountability. High density does not necessarily mean progress. It creates opportunities for absentee landlords who have no investment in the community beyond profit. Long-term residents are left to deal with the consequences, including overcrowded streets, reduced property values, and a diminished sense of neighborhood pride.				

Timestamp	**Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?**	**Introduction** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Future Land Use** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**City of Opportunity** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Healthy City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Connected City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Affordable City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Prosperous City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?**	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
Received via email									Hello, My name is Robert Essman i have lived in Stamford for 38 years. I live in the Belltown area. I appreciate the opportunity to speak to the Land Use/Urban Redevelopment Committee. I was not aware that you were taking residents thoughts on the issue of Growth in the Stamford area. I understand that there are many ideas on solving the issue of growth in American Towns but not getting a broad consensus is not a healthy start. I have just read your master plan and I see many major problems not addressed within it. 1- The problem of the high cost of housing in desirable towns is not solved by more desirable housing. The only real, non creative, solution is to make the town and the housing not desirable and then the price will go down. The latter is what I think your plan eventually does. I don't want to stop growth. I want to see a realistic plan and not a dream where you don't need a car. I don't want to lose the reason I want to live in my neighborhood. Your plan is not creative it is typical and sounds like the false dream of the trickle down theory that has been proven wrong but still continues in some salesmen's playbook; building more high cost housing does not create cheep rent or cheeper houses. If you build lots of cheep buildings without a specific plan you will get lots of congestion and cheep chaos. This plan doesn't address this issue it looks away and imagines. 2- Creating 2 family units in single family neighborhoods that have narrow streets and small lots causes big parking issues. My actual experience can't be denied; there is a 2 family on the corner of my street, Alton Rd and Upland Rd. There are, daily, 8 cars parked in the front on the lot, they go over the curb and pack in there. At different times they have cars and construction trucks of all shapes and sizes that stretch as far as I can see parked on the street. The Reps. and the Mayor know these issues well because we have filed complaint after complaint about the trucks and the sometimes 18 people living there. These issues are not addressed in you Plan. I have nothing against hard working people, I am one too. Stamford is the working town, right? I am in construction myself and need a truck as well. 3- As I understand it, the Stamford rule is that each family can have 2 guests. Great we all like guests and we sure don't want to break the law to have them. So a 2 family unit, lets say has a husband, wife and 2 kids: they have 2 guests that makes 12 cars per 2 family unit; math right? I see it everyday in just one 2 family unit. Imagine if you can, 4 lots on my little street, side by side, turned into 2 family units; that's legally 46 people's cars that must park on one side only of my narrow street. This reality doesn't take any imagination if you understand physics and math. 4- These issues with adding little businesses or cluster homes or multi story buildings are certainly the same and not realistically approached in your plan. This plan streamlines building in detail and shows cute examples in other towns but creative permitting and bypassing parking requirements for building is actually doing away with the corner stone of good planning. I grew up in single family homes. I understand that some people grow up in multiple family dwellings. It takes creative planning to change our single family home areas				

Timestamp	**Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?**	**Introduction** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Future Land Use** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**City of Opportunity** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Healthy City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Connected City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Affordable City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Prosperous City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?**	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
Received via email									In January 2020, the Hartford Courant outlined an elaborate plan of Governor Lamont and his economic Chief Lehman, ex Goldman Saks, to DOUBLE the States population in three key cities: Harford, New Haven and Stamford, to reduce the decline of population in CT. This plan was not to address a Housing Crisis, Not to address an Affordability Crisis-but, to reverse the decline in population numbers through a carefully detailed (urban development) plan: Multiple Housing, Mass Transportation and the buzzword, "VIBRANCY", as crucial bullets to turning cities into engines of economic growth. It continues "Apartments are aimed at not only attracting new residents, but showing employers that there will be housing for workers -especially YOUNG WORKERS who increasingly want to live and work in urban areas." "Doubling the cities is a daunting task, requiring a recipe of housing, transportation OTHER THAN CARS, well paid jobs and VIBRANCY and EXCITEMENT. It continues, "As rents rise, the hope is that there will be less dependence on the need for state financing. So far, the demand for new conversions is holding up and there is evidence of moderately rising rents." This isn't an affordable housing crisis. This is an economic agenda at our expense-especially those who own single family properties below the parkway, whether a senior or a starter home, or families that saved for years only to suffer the impact of this unfair plan aimed at replacing us with renters. You can paint this however you like, but that is the obvious goal. So this, I would say, is the preclusion to this Comprehensive Draft and, to the average Joe, a lot to comprehend. For many of my neighbors below parkway-where the changes will be instrumented--they either "don't know what is going on", or are catching on as we speak. The communication to them has been foggy at best, and certainly not adequate to those most affected. How does this work? For single family homeowners the "sensitive" changes I interpreted as this: 21..2 of the Draft: Revise ADU regulations to "Encourage their development-removing minimum lot size and removing parking requirements while increasing square footage"— adding" cottage clusters, as of right building for multiple senior housing and independent living." How could we challenge that without sounding discriminitory? At the end of our roads-they will connect neighborhoods "with walkways and bike paths." And here is the downside of Urban Planning- and this is how It works. -Our neighborhoods get over congested with ADU's and cottages and multi housing and the city population exponentially grows; -Cars all over the tight streets, siteline dimished; -Our assessments skyrocket because of the new building, as do taxes; -and the strain of the infrastructure drives up house bills. We are priced out of our homes and the next developer comes in, buys up our lots and the process starts over, the land divided .etc. And that little path at the end of my road? Remember just last year when ADU's were approved at 800 sf and now here we are with devastatingly relaxed guidelines in the name of Urban Development? Those little paths will probably becomes connected roads. We don't matter. The 2035 Draft does not reflect our				

Timestamp	**Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?**	**Introduction** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Future Land Use** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**City of Opportunity** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Healthy City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Connected City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Affordable City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Prosperous City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?**	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
Received via email									Gentlemen: Regarding residential development in Stamford. As we see real estate taxes go up significantly with the overdevelopment of luxury apartments in Stamford how does the 10 year master plan address the impact of increased taxes to support the infrastructure and schools associated with the new development? The increased housing only makes sense if there is a corresponding increase in the amount of jobs created in Connecticut, and especially the surrounding area of Stamford. From a tax perspective, Stamford is accessible by train to many towns in New York, including New York City. A Stamford resident who lives in an apartment in Stamford and has children but commutes to New York, where their income is taxed, pays zero Income Taxes to the State of Connecticut and the city of Stamford unless they have Other Income generated from Connecticut sources, or they own a home and pay property taxes. Therefore, there may be a large imbalance in the services needed to support such a family and the taxes they pay to CT/Stamford. This imbalance will only increase the funds needed to support such increases in population and associated growth services. Yes, the owners of the multifamily property pay property taxes to the city of Stamford, but how much is that revenue per apartment versus the cost of increased school enrollment, police, fire, water and sewer, roads, and other infrastructure and personnel support costs? Where people work vs. where they live is an important factor when you consider significant potential and future infrastructure costs in a City such as Stamford. Stamford must provide services to the residents, while their income is taxed and revenue is generated for a neighboring state such as NY. Stamford depends on significant state funding of large infrastructure projects. An example is the need for a new improved Stamford Train Station. The CTDOT Master Plan price tag is currently unknown, but could exceed $200 million. The state also plans to replace the railroad overpass on Atlantic Street for $75 million, adding a lane for local trains. This project will benefit Stamford, but require significant funding from state and federal sources. If Stamford encourages NY workers to reside in Stamford, more state income tax will be generated for the State of New York - not CT. If Stamford needs more state funding for large infrastructure projects such as the Train Station or new schools, CT may not have enough revenue to fund these projects to the extent needed. This will put further tax pressure on Stamford property owners. As we see more and more companies moving out of Connecticut small businesses are unable to survive due to CT's very unfavorable business climate with high taxes, administrative burdens, and extreme regulations on virtually every aspect of a small business. Where will the tax revenue come from to support all this growth? (WalletHub ranked Connecticut 49th for starting a business and The Tax Foundation ranks Connecticut 47th overall in its State Tax Competitiveness Index, citing its burdensome tax climate. The state and local tax burden in Connecticut is 15.4%, ranking 49th in the nation, according to the Tax Foundation. Truth in Accounting gave Connecticut a score of 48 out of 100 in financial transparency, ranking it 49th out of 50 states in their 2025 report.) Many large companies have already moved out of Connecticut because of the business unfriendly policies. The current Democratic controlled legislature and other Boards continually make the business climate worse. High energy costs are driving residents out of Connecticut to other tax friendly states, if they have the resources to move. Many seniors and middle class people are				
Received via email									I am against the Stamford 2035 Comprehensive plan in its current form, as I believe it will be detrimental to the Stamford neighborhoods (Springdale, Glenbrook, Cove, etc.).				

Timestamp	Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?	Introduction *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Future Land Use *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	City of Opportunity *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Healthy City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Connected City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Affordable City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Prosperous City *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
Received via email									Dear Board Mermbers, As a current homeowner in the Turn of River area I am writing to express my extreme opposition to this plan. The most harmful aspect is the unrestricted ADU allowance throughout the city with the exception of Shippan (where the mayor lives) and North Stamford (where it is 1+ acre zoning and less traffic). We already have an ADU policy adopted from the state with limitations to prevent degradation of neighborhoods. Those restrictions are necessary to prevent overcrowding on streets and traffic overload that leads to pedestrian deaths. This practice if adopted will virtually remove the desire of young people to buy their starter homes in Stamford which is the lifeblood of the city. In addition it will encourage existing homeowners to sell their homes at lower prices because the quality of life will be so low. This seems to be proposed under the guise of needing affordable housing. When have you seen people build structures to rent them below market price. This is not the way to achieve more affordable housing. The residents have spoken...we do not want this plan and vision. Your job is to keep up the quality of life in the city. Keep your end of the bargain and vote against this vision. Regards Amy Essenfeld.				
Received via email									As a resident of Stamford for over 50 years, I have seen lots of changes to this once town, now city. Some growth has been beneficial, some has been detrimental. The growth has resulted in the need for additional first responders, who cannot afford to live in this city. Teachers who work elsewhere because of the traffic on I-95 and businesses that cannot afford ever rising rents. The Plan which has been proposed will only add to the congestion, high rents and the loss of whatever is left of single family homes and neighborhoods in most of the areas discussed in the plan. I urge you to reconsider the Plan and consider the quality of life which will be significantly impacted by this proposal. Sincerely John Grasso Glenbrook resident 203-658-4380				
Received via email									Good Morning Committee Members, Mayor Simmons, Lindsey and Ralph, I want to take a moment to express my sincere thanks for including the needs of Stamford's 60+ community in the 2035 Draft Comprehensive Plan. I was thrilled to see the Stamford Senior Center and its essential role in serving our city's growing older adult population highlighted under Strategy 16.4. We look forward to collaborating with the Mayor's Office and the Department of Operations to conduct a thorough assessment of the Center and exploring the expansion of our physical space, updating amenities, and enhancing integrated programs that support the physical, social, and mental well-being of older adults in our community. This plan is a major milestone, and I commend the entire committee and everyone involved for the thoughtful and well-organized focus groups I had the opportunity to attend. Lindsey, I also want to personally thank you for taking the time to meet with me during the early stages of this process. Your openness to understanding the challenges we face at the Center and your consideration of the key findings from our 2022 community study meant a great deal. Thank you again for your leadership and commitment to making Stamford a city where all residents, including our older adults, can thrive.				

Timestamp	**Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?**	**Introduction** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Future Land Use** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**City of Opportunity** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Healthy City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Connected City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Affordable City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Prosperous City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?**	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
Received via email									First, congratulations on a very professional vision statement for Stamford. It seems to cover all of the bases, but I wanted to highlight some of my concerns in specific areas. Similar comments were submitted on the Stamford2035 form on the website. Anticipating a lot of feedback, I want to emphasize the following: p. 136 – ADU's – against removing lot size requirements, removing parking requirements and increasing the maximum allowable space footage. (ST21.1). Original specifications are fine and set a reasonable boundary around these ADU's. Without boundaries, you will destroy the residential neighborhood. ST-21.2 – against increasing building heights and stories – where it would not be compatible with the neighboring residential housing. p. 72 – Triplex, duplex and townhomes – need to prove they are more cost effective and therefore affordable. Must be careful not to "destroy" the single family residential feeling of the neighborhood. p. 75 – ACU is a VERY BAD idea. Commercial business should not be housed in a residential neighborhood. It destroys the single family residential neighborhood. It will add to additional traffic along streets not designed for commercial businesses. Also, parking will be an issue and should be accommodated "off-street". Again, having a parking lot in your front yard is not desirable in a residential neighborhood. Congestion and traffic are major issues in Stamford, which is caused by increased housing and density. The more you build, the worse it gets. There is no easy solution to reduce it; however, you can slow the growth by limiting the growth. Even with apartments near public transportation, people will still have cars when they go out shopping or running errands. An example of a really bad decision was to approve 800+ apartments (1400 cars) at 800/900 Long Ridge Road where there are no walkable services/transportation nearby. Residents must use their cars to go anywhere, and the Merritt Parkway is already one of the most congested highways in the county and there is NO solution in sight. It will only get worse. Affordable housing is a major issue in Stamford. There is no easy solution since this is a high-priced area and developers are maximizing their profits with upscale apartments. Should probably pilot some modular duplex/triplex units in appropriate areas with minimal upscale features – just the basics. Many smaller developments will give the smaller builders an opportunity to support the community. Furthermore, my understanding was that the 2015 plan endorsed the idea of commercial space CONVERSIONS; but what happened here is that they demolished the Xerox headquarter building and garage resulting in a much larger cost of the project than just converting space into apartments/condos as has been done at other locations in the city. As a result, these will be high-end apartments for the wealthy. Finally, since the plan covers all aspects of the city's development over the next 10 years, what is the cost to support. All through the proposal there are references to increase staff to				

Timestamp	**Have you reviewed the draft Stamford 2035 Comprehensive Plan?**	**Introduction** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Future Land Use** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**City of Opportunity** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Healthy City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Connected City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Affordable City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Prosperous City** *If you're leaving comments on specific pages, please indicate the page number in your comment.*	**Do you have any other comments, questions, or suggestions?**	Name	Email Address	Affiliation/Organization	Are you a Stamford resident?
Received via email									As a neighborhood ambassador that worked on the 2035 Comprehensive Plan, I am quite proud of the work that we have done and the plan that has been produced. I think it represents a thoughtful and inclusive vision of the city's future and one that understands the problems facing the city and takes a proactive approach to tackling them. It is a vision of a city where people from all walks of life can live and thrive. It is unfortunate that so much of the content of the plan is currently being distorted and I would like your help to make sure people have an accurate understanding of what is in the comprehensive plan. A message you sent or which has been attributed to you (included below for reference) has been circulated containing several errors regarding the 2035 Comprehensive Plan. I think before tonight's land use meeting, which will likely have many citizens preparing to comment based on this misunderstanding of the comprehensive plan's contents, you should speak and correct these factual inaccuracies so that citizens can comment based on what the comprehensive plan actually contains. First, it is important to lay out what exactly the 2035 Comprehensive Plan is as a document. It is a guiding vision for how the city will grow and change over the next 10 years. It does not on its own change any zoning anywhere upon adoption. That does not mean it will not inform zoning changes moving forward but each of those changes will occur with the deliberations of the Zoning Board and appropriate public commentary. The Comprehensive Plan largely contents itself with big picture initiatives. Broadly speaking it is not project specific and avoids language like "upzone this neighborhood" or "build townhomes on that street". There are a few specific example projects that are shown, for instance an example of what future land use around the Glenbrook Train Station could look like, but this is limited and again are only example projects. It would require significant further action by the city to adopt those plans, all of which will be open to public comment and deliberation. The main misunderstanding appears to stem from this chart, shown below which highlights the land around downtown and labels it as R2 land use designation. The definition of R2 from the Comprehensive Plan (emphasis mine): "Neighborhoods intended to support a range of single-family and missing-middle housing types...". The R2 designation is inclusive of single-family zones, so the claim that this would universally abolish single-family homes in these neighborhoods is incorrect. R2 is not a zoning designation and will not map to a zoning code. It is a mile high view where the Zoning Board, through due deliberation, is recommended to consider legalizing missing middle housing with an emphasis on "Near transit and other walkable amenities". It is not a universal call for upzoning the entire highlighted land. This is clear with the additional context of the rest of the document. I want to again emphasize that the Comprehensive Plan operates on the level of recommending "building housing near transit" but does not specifically say "change zoning on street X". Furthermore, this is a 10 year plan and will not transform the city overnight but will be a slow gradual process of change. I will also point out that many of the neighborhoods named in your message already contain significant amounts of missing middle housing (see page 33 Stamford Housing Affordability Plan 2022 which surveys housing types in the different neighborhoods). I'm not sure what you mean when you say building more duplexes in these neighborhoods would lead to "painful changes"? What specifically is the issue with a few more duplexes or townhomes near train and bus stations?				