

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 Kindergarten, 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 redesigning 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/artisanal/etc (ACUs) with no off-street parking requirements? This is ridiculous. When do you expect people to park who don't have 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 R7-10 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 removed the 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 & R7-10 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-face 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	lauramartin2@aol.com	Tapscott & 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 transit 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 floor 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	Dylan	dj1984@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 willeries in Pound Ridge and New Canaan because they are more accessible than Stamford's nearest library, Harry Bennett 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 (Bantkville). 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.	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 city construction is lacking homogeneity 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. Please 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 disappear or poorly lit and detract from the feeling of safety in the area.				you have to do something about school quality perception.	Toren Kutrick	torenkutrick@gmail.com		Yes	
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 willeries in Pound Ridge and New Canaan because they are more accessible than Stamford's nearest library, Harry Bennett 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 (Bantkville). 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.	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 curbed walking trails, healthy prepared food with simple parking could go. Lurocco's is a 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 that 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 comes to the city. This highly destructive practice should not be encouraged. In fact we should be seeking to undo 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.						Zachary Oberholzer	zob171@gmail.com	People Friendly Stamford IAC	Yes	
7/17/2025 16:35:43	Yes		p51, 65, 68 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 Scatzi, 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 cutovers 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	ssweeney444@gmail.com	Stamford home owner	Yes	
7/17/2025 18:07:37	Yes									Robyn Stein	stein.robyn.m@gmail.com	AICP, Former Land Use Bureau Chief, now retired	Yes
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. WHO 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.				Very complete, comprehensive, formatted and well done! A very few comments: Page 96, STS 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. STS 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 STS.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.	Yes, will continue on another form, thanks	Katherine Grenier	KGrenier2@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 21:38:14	Yes				57 - The need for socialization and activities for retirees and the older population is critical. The parry 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. <small>Hubbard Heights is already a high density neighborhood, with high property values, and a high quality of life. It is not a place for multi-family housing.</small>							Mathew Allieri	Mattalieri18@gmail.com		Yes	
7/29/2025 16:51:41	Yes		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 botogas, 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 rezoning.  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 convert our neighborhood from R1 to R2, then it would be on me to move away. At least, you have a legitimate process.						Christina			Yes		
7/29/2025 17:25:15	Yes									Joe			Yes	
7/30/2025 0:04:26	Yes									Kim DMondo			Yes	
7/30/2025 10:09:01	No									diana boglee	dianaboglee@gmail.com		Yes	
7/30/2025 10:30:38	Yes				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	mvlask@optonline.net	Hubbard Heights Association	Yes	
7/30/2025 10:45:57	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, whilemaking 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 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 really like all the ideas put forth on pg 78-79 around strategies to add density to currently low-density neighborhoods.	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 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		Expanding the EV charging network would be great (page 106) as well as bike share.		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 than 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 right-of-way is 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 nightclubs 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 Melchiorre	Dmelchiorre@gmail.com	Lifetime resident and taxpayer	Yes
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 rotary sign a document for the EPD and Engineering departments, it's 2025, use Docsign!	Malaka Myers	mimyers1701@gmail.com		Yes	
7/31/2025 23:58:46	Yes							This whole plan sucks	The plan sucks.	JoAnn Fiore	joanne1@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	cornawolf27@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 1895. 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 Kees			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					<p>I live in Hubbard Heights and I strongly oppose rezoning Hubbard Heights as R2.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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!)</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Sincerely, John</p>	John Birbaum	john.tyler.birbaum@gmail.com		Yes
8/1/2025 20:58:02	Yes								<p>Use Stamford 2035 Planning Committee members.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Sincerely, Haley and Mike Zanglabadi Residents, Hubbard Heights Neighborhood</p>	Haley and Mike Zanglabadi	Haley.zanglabadi@oubook.com	Hubbard Heights Resident	Yes
8/3/2025 13:01:06	Yes		<p>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 make Stamford 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.</p>		<p>Bicentennials 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.</p>		<p>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 Stamford has the leverage... They need to exercise it.</p>		<p>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.</p>	Anthony Easton	asmar95@aol.com		Yes
8/3/2025 14:38:15	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		<p>- 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 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, while making sensitive changes to improve quality of life ...then the commission MUST KEEP the neighborhood designation R1 - not change to R2.</p>							Erka Trott	erika.white44@gmail.com		Yes
8/3/2025 16:32:46	Yes		<p>Frederick J. Laist 40 Hillside Avenue Stamford, CT 06902</p> <p>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 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 review the map showing the Future Land Use categories to include Hubbard Heights in the R1 category. Respectfully, Frederick J. Laist</p>						Frederick J. Laist	FLaist99@gmail.com	Hubbard Heights	Yes	
8/4/2025 7:48:48	Yes		<p>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 FILLED WITH GREEDY LANDLORDS RENTING OUR DUPLEXES AND CONDOS FOR THE NEXT TEN YEARS. THE BEST THING ABOUT THIS AREA IS ITS COMMUNITY AND LOVE MY NEIGHBORHOOD 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, RUN 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 TARIQA, BUT IF THE MAYOR TURNS ON HER RESIDENTS AND GOES THROUGH WITH ZONINGS CALAMITY OF A PLAN, THEN SHE SHOULD EXPECT THE RESIDENTS TO TURN ON HER. (PAGES 40, 44, &amp; 54 SPECIFICALLY)</p>							Brian		Hubbard Heights Resident	Yes
8/4/2025 16:24:53	Yes		<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 37? 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Pg 49- this graphic is hard to follow. It looks like some 'grow' and 'enhance' is in flood zones, which is a terrible idea.</p> <p>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.)</p> <p>Pg 52 Same- 2015 plan uses different graphics, so is useless. Plus we need to see the current reality.</p> <p>Pg 54 Is R-1 just the bright yellow?</p>					Yes, see additional forms.	Katherine Grenier	KGrenier2@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		<p>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.</p> <p>The 2035 Stamford plan states that one of its objectives is to "celebrate Stamford's historic sites and neighborhoods." (p. 44)</p> <p>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)</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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)</p> <p>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:</p> <p>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)</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Please review the map showing the Future Land Use categories to include Hubbard Heights in the R1 category.</p>							chris lancaster	chris.lanc27@gmail.com	Stamford Heights resident	Yes		
8/5/2025 7:05:08	Yes								<p>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.</p> <p>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 background is my neighborhood:</p> <p>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 65-66).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>			Anthony DeRosa	tderosa@gmail.com	Hubbard Heights	Yes
8/5/2025 11:33:46	Yes			<p>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.</p> <p>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 rich/poor 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Pg 53: define terms, such as TOD, the first time you use them. That's just common courtesy. A glossary at the end is well, but not if it's a secret.</p> <p>There are multiple vague references to changes at the transportation center, but no specifics. It seems important to clarify what exactly is happening there.</p> <p>Pg 57- enhance connections? What does that mean in civilian language? We can't see it from the map.</p> <p>Pg 58- again, what's a cohesive connection? ...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.</p> <p>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!</p> <p>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?</p>					Yes, will send additional forms, thanks.	Katherine Grenier	Ktgrenier2@gmail.com		Yes		
8/5/2025 14:24:57	Yes			<p>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.</p> <p>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 special.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>					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	jeannefahan@gmail.com	none	Yes		
8/6/2025 7:09:14	Yes			<p>Pg 53- not a good graphic</p>	<p>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. So, 3.1 no, absolutely not. As soon as you add "...reflect Stamford's unique architecture 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.</p> <p>Be careful of design competitions- they lock all participants into premature solutions. You want to compete to pick a team, not a design.</p> <p>Be careful of the historic preservation push-it, too, can inadvertently become a shackles to reasonable development unless it is simple, clear and targeted. It's unclear how historic markers actually address any of the real issues.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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!)</p>	<p>Pg 120- the statistics here are shaky. Cited 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?</p> <p>No one wants theories. Part of the divisiveness of this issue in Stamford is 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.</p> <p>ST 21.4 Yes! Although you do not need to start from scratch. Use a couple of successful existing designs.</p> <p>21.8 Explain special permits.</p> <p>21.10 Co-living and SRDs- Yes! They are essentially free ways of increasing</p>	Yes, will fill out another form.	Katherine Grenier	Ktgrenier2@gmail.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!	Michael Rappaport	mkr3901@aol.com		Yes		
8/6/2025 16:08:34	No									hossein	hharazi@hotmail.com	none	Yes		
8/6/2025 20:21:26	Yes								<p>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.</p> <p>I have no interest in turning glenbrook into a medium density neighborhood as a whole, the infrastructure cannot support this.</p>	Diego Santiago	Diegomsantago92@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?
8/7/2025 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 City cities. This plan totally changes the city and its 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 112 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 gessing 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 multi 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 hack/aide jobs. Market demands and taxpayer wishes should maintain neighborhood designs, not social engineering.				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. We need to keep these covered neighborhoods as single family home city to protect all of the beauty in these 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.	Katie Martinez	katie.dingensen@gmail.com		Yes
8/8/2025 13:35:11	Yes									Regina Woods Gordon	reginawoods@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 Firer Tusk 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									Andrew Sparico	dsparico@gmail.com	Hubbard Heights	Yes
8/10/2025 18:18:46	Yes								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									Shane Reff	shane.refff@hotmail.com	Hubbard Heights Association	Yes
8/12/2025 12:04:31	Yes								August 14, 2025 Dear Members of the Planning Board, Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on Stamford's draft 2035-2035 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 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 Pramberger	apram@optonline.net	none	Yes
8/12/2025 14:47:34	I have reviewed parts of it								no	Evan Dunnell	evandunnell@optonline.net		Yes
8/12/2025 15:59:32	Yes								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.	Lita Croen	wcroen@gmail.com	I am a member of the Stamford Senior Center	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?	
8/13/2025 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 tax 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	davidennis@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 my 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.					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 or even asked for additional growth of our City.	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?	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 resist 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 fitness 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?	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.	The plan envisions a utopian, pedestrian city filled with bike lanes, and future land use is "realized" accordingly. Traffic is worsening as these ideas are being implemented. For instance, the traffic light to make a right turn from the Exit 8 off-ramp 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 Courtland Ave will be dangerous for cars, bicyclists, and pedestrian crossing.	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).	James Taylor Anselmo	taylor11@net.net	Resident of Stamford	Yes	
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 review 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 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. 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.						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 provided this plan.	Patricia Morris	normpatty01@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 SI 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
8/22/2025 7:35:42	Yes		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.	Mataka Myers	mmyers1701@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 Comprehensive 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-judgmentally 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.	Futura 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 (Vaduct 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.114 - I'm curious as to why the transportation department or strategic traffic calming/flow measures (not sure of language) within the CTDOT partnership? Putting that into 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 central location for information—would make searching much easier. p.91, it seems that people in my neighborhood (Springdale) absolutely want less net use, but they are concerned about permits being expedited on projects without resident input—can one of the goals include specific timelines that include public	p.110, 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 maybe 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	p.144, I think there's an opportunity for more 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 considerment "Desire paths" as part of the future sidewalk/crosswalk infrastructure—where are people usually crossing most often because it is inconvenient to walk up or down the street to a labeled crosswalk? ex. Main St, people cross from the Delatogage 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 - can we list examples of	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. 7. 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 Biking." 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 student 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 for 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 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!	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								Great work overall, the extensive community outreach is appreciated, I feel as if the community is really being heard.	Mathew Keenan	matykeenan11@gmail.com		Yes		
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 RT 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 places being able to plow the streets properly. Adding ADUs'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 Antia Finn	Antia Finn	antia.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.							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.						Kenia 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.						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. Respectfully	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: <a href="https://resilientconnecticut.media.uconn.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/3830/2023/05/Conservation-Commission-Fact-Sheet.pdf">https://resilientconnecticut.media.uconn.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/3830/2023/05/Conservation-Commission-Fact-Sheet.pdf</a>	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: <a href="https://resilientconnecticut.media.uconn.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/3830/2023/05/Conservation-Commission-Fact-Sheet.pdf">https://resilientconnecticut.media.uconn.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/3830/2023/05/Conservation-Commission-Fact-Sheet.pdf</a>					Jeanette Bilczynski	bltro96@gmail.com		Yes		
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 as "come and go", not making long term "investment in the well being of Stamford. New comes choose to settle in neighboring towns, because Stamford public schools are still so behind other competitive schools 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 cooperate 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 employees. 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 the luxury retail 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 CN 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	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	melanhollas@gmail.com / M-Hollas@StamfordCT.gov	Resident / Parks & Recreation Commission Chair	Yes			
9/9/2025 11:53:55	Yes		Shift from homeowners to renters: Renters now make up 53% of households (p. 21) Page 50 on: Need to formally state a goal of preserving Historic Districts somewhere in this section by including the language below: With	Rising costs not matching incomes: Median H Flood risks: 75% of city-owned properties are Racial and income disparities: White and Asian Shift from homeowners to renters: Renters now Non-binding plan: It "guides" zoning and invet This draft plan reads less like a roadmap for Stamford's future and more like a glossy brochure designed to pacify developers and co					warrickdirectvelli@gmail.com	warrickdirectvelli@gmail.com	Hubbard Heights resident	Yes			
9/10/2025 13:03:39	Yes			I was pleased to read that many of the "opportunity" priorities included a focus on deliberate housing development strategies and enhanced					Patricia Morris emma@stamfordcouncil.com	Patricia Morris emma@stamfordcouncil.com	Stamford Council	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?
9/11/2025 12:50:27	Yes	I have reviewed parts of it		It seems like most of the land use changes are relatively minimal compared to the city's goals of increasing affordability and reducing traffic. There's a decline in RES2 and only slight uplift in the mixed-use designations (looking at page 65 comparing to 2015 plan). This leaves single family residential as the continued dominant land use. I get that it is hard to introduce mi					Good luck! Stamford rocks, and with a bit more investment in pedestrian and bike infrastructure, distributed retail (see don't talk much about that) I am a Stamford resident and I am reaching out to demand that you oppose the Comprehensive Plan in its current form and hold the City accountable. I am a Stamford resident and I am reaching out to demand that you oppose the Comprehensive Plan in its current form and hold the City accountable. I am a Stamford resident and I am reaching out to demand that you oppose the Comprehensive Plan in its current form and hold the City accountable.	Gabriel Nardi-Huffman	gnardi@stamfordct.gov	N/A	Yes
9/15/2025 20:05:54	Yes									Christine Dzujna	cdzujna@gmail.com		Yes
9/16/2025 3:44:33	Yes	You addressed that there is a significant amount of seniors who currently live in your demographics section. I support the land use suggestions put forth on Page 26. Encouraging denser land uses in Downtown, up towards Bulls Head, and through the city center is a good idea. I support the idea of allowing for more multi-family housing in the city center. I support the idea of allowing for more multi-family housing in the city center.	There needs to be some level of control on building ADUs because they are made for property owners but once the property gets sold the city has no control. Making the school system a priority where students are achieving higher academic success is important. What is being done to make better use of the school system? Artificially creating affordable housing only creates a greater price increase for the rest of the market.						Steven Nikolopoulos	stevnikolopoulos@gmail.com	Unaffiliated	Yes	
9/16/2025 10:23:42	Yes			I support the land use suggestions put forth on Page 26. Encouraging denser land uses in Downtown, up towards Bulls Head, and through the city center is a good idea. I support the idea of allowing for more multi-family housing in the city center. I support the idea of allowing for more multi-family housing in the city center.					Angelo B	angelo1559@gmail.com	People Friendly Stamford	Yes	
9/16/2025 14:05:13	Yes	Cover Sheet - I don't like the coloration of the cover sheet. It makes it look like the City is on fire. I think the natural photo coloration (as shown at the top of this comment page) would be so much better! Red has other bad connotations, such as poor financial management (e.g., "operating in the red").							Stephanie Barrera	stephanie.c.barrera@stamfordct.gov	City of Stamford employee	Yes	
9/16/2025 19:21:24	Yes			Stamford Single family housing should be protected and not converted into multi-family housing like the RES2 implies. While the expected increase in density is a good goal, it should be done in a way that respects the character of the neighborhood. Single family housing should be protected and not converted into multi-family housing like the RES2 implies. While the expected increase in density is a good goal, it should be done in a way that respects the character of the neighborhood.					JoAnne F	joanne1@outlook.com		Yes	
9/16/2025 20:29:59	Yes			Stamford Single family housing should be protected and not converted into multi-family housing like the RES2 implies. While the expected increase in density is a good goal, it should be done in a way that respects the character of the neighborhood. Single family housing should be protected and not converted into multi-family housing like the RES2 implies. While the expected increase in density is a good goal, it should be done in a way that respects the character of the neighborhood.					Alan	ak2014@gmail.com		Yes	
9/17/2025 22:18:59	Yes			Stamford Single family housing should be protected and not converted into multi-family housing like the RES2 implies. While the expected increase in density is a good goal, it should be done in a way that respects the character of the neighborhood. Single family housing should be protected and not converted into multi-family housing like the RES2 implies. While the expected increase in density is a good goal, it should be done in a way that respects the character of the neighborhood.					Anthony DeRosa	terosa@gmail.com	Hubbard heights associat	Yes	
Received via email									Under the new plan will "ADUs" be allowed on all lots over 10,000 sq. foot lot.	Clemmon Williams	clemmonwilliams7426@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									to increased residential density.				
Received via email									Say NO				
Received via email									to multi-family housing in single-family neighborhoods				
Received via email									Say NO				
Received via email									to single-family units being used for small businesses				
Received via email									Say NO				
Received via email									to ADUs				
Received via email									Say NO				
Received via email									to garages being used as commercial units to operate small businesses				
Received via email									Barbara Romans				
Received via email									City of Stamford, members of the Planning and Zoning Board, members of the Board of Representatives and others.				
Received via email									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.				
Received via email									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, Burnwood and side streets. They have had to adjust bus routes due to the congestion on narrow roads. 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.				
Received via email									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.				
Received via email									The revision to the map is an improvement. Thank you for listening to some of our concerns.				
Received via email									Sincerely, Steve Garst 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.				
Received via email									Please DO NOT approve the 2035 master plan as it is now.				
Received via email									I am here to advocate for a Conservation Commission.				
Received via email									If you are asking what a Conservation Commission is and its responsibilities. UConn offers resources that I will forward to board members.				
Received via email									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.				
Received via email									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.				
Received via email									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.				
Received via email									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.				
Received via email									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!				
Received via email									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 Master Plan.				
Received via email									Jerry Silber 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.				
Received via email									Sincerely, Malaka Myers I am 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.				
Received via email									I repeatedly receive letters regarding the water that I am using to live day-to-day.				
Received via email									The traffic on Newfield is so bad it is difficult to pull into traffic. Not to mention that we need some "green" space.				
Received via email									Too many apartment buildings, we do not have to look like New York City.				
Received via email									It is sad that you want to take a great community and destroy everything that makes it desirable to live here.				
Received via email									Ruth Miner Owner/Broker Country Club Properties, LLC 1095 Newfield Avenue Stamford, CT 06905				
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 established 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/revoke/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.				
Received via email									Barbara A. DeGastani 65 Glenbrook Road				

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									<p>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 farmer front lawns, Putnam Lane, Mayflower Avenue, Rock Spring Road are all examples of this. I grew up on Putnam 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?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Please reconsider the Master Plan 2035. Thank you.</p> <p>Ray Downey</p> <p>the plan is a disaster. why build more apartments, why force more people, we can't even support the number of people in town now. no roads, schools, sewer, water, green space, police, fire etc.</p> <p>Another land grab, there are 3X as 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>I heard the developer who is buying buildings 2 and 3 opted for NO affordable apartments to be included in the new build.</p> <p>Why aren't the developers paying their fair share of taxes, why is UCONAN 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.</p> <p>I can't get out of my condo now with the amount of traffic, what next.</p>				
Received via email									<p>I vote against it. Don't do it.</p> <p>Sent from my iPhone</p>				
Received via email									<p>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 Springfield 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.</p> <p>LESS DISTURBED LAND PLANNING COMMITTEE MEMBERS:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The 2035 Stamford plan states that one of its objectives is to "celebrate Stamford's historic sites and neighborhoods." (p 44)</p> <p>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)</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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:</p> <p>"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)</p> <p>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:</p> <p>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)</p> <p>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.</p>				
Received via email									<p>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 as "intended to support a range of single-family and "missing middle" housing types- including ADUs, duplexes, triplexes, and townhomes.</p> <p>Please stop this from happening.</p>				
Received via email									<p>All,</p> <p>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".</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Thank you for making citizens aware of the issues in our neighborhood. I live in the Hubbard area. I appreciate the opportunity to speak to the Land Use/Urban Redevelopment Committee.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>I have just read your master plan and I see many major problems not addressed within it.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 cheap rent or cheaper houses. If you build lots of cheap buildings without a specific plan you will get lots of congestion and cheap chaos. This plan doesn't address this issue it looks away and imagines.</p> <p>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 park 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 your 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 48 people's cars that must park on one side only of my narrow street. This really doesn't take any imagination if you understand physics and</p>				



