

From: Patrick Kazley <patrickkazley@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, February 23, 2024 3:55 PM

To: Stamford Land Use <StamfordLandUse@StamfordCT.gov>; Board of Representatives <bdreps@StamfordCT.gov>; tdell@stanfordct.gov <tdell@stanfordct.gov>; Tepper, Jay <JTepper@StamfordCT.gov>; Godzeno, Jennifer <JGodzeno@StamfordCT.gov>; Levin, William <WLevin@StamfordCT.gov>; Weinberg, Carl <CWeinberg@StamfordCT.gov>; RBlessing@stamforsct.gov <RBlessing@stamforsct.gov>; Bosak Jr., Gerald <GBosak@StamfordCT.gov>; McManus, Rosanne <RMcManus@StamfordCT.gov>; Boeger, Sean <SBoeger@StamfordCT.gov>; Pierre-Louis, Fred <FPierreLouis@StamfordCT.gov>; BOR_AllReps <BOR_AllReps@StamfordCT.gov>; Buccino, Michael <MBuccino@StamfordCT.gov>; Totilo, Michael <MTotilo@StamfordCT.gov>; Perry, Stephen <SPerry@StamfordCT.gov>; Stein, David <DStein@StamfordCT.gov>; Morris, William <WMorris@StamfordCT.gov>; Smith-Anderson, Racquel <RSmithAnderson@StamfordCT.gov>

Cc: Adele Langie <langie4468@hotmail.com>; Michael Kellick <kellickm@optonline.net>; lhoza@optonline.net <lhoza@optonline.net>; Joanna R. Savino <joannar.savino@gmail.com>; Shirley_Grimmett@greenwich.k12.ct.us <Shirley_Grimmett@greenwich.k12.ct.us>; mkilcoynetweety@aol.com <mkilcoynetweety@aol.com>; pberns@stamford.gov <pberns@stamford.gov>; katinap@hotmail.com <katinap@hotmail.com>; glenn_lu@yahoo.com <glenn_lu@yahoo.com>; bohbbann@gmail.com <bohbbann@gmail.com>; blazrwmn@aol.com <blazrwmn@aol.com>; jsullivan@thepropertygroup.net <jsullivan@thepropertygroup.net>; steve.delloio@gmail.com <steve.delloio@gmail.com>; info@northstamfordassoc.org <info@northstamfordassoc.org>; lhumphrey@optonline.net <lhumphrey@optonline.net>; lbalaw@gmail.com <lbalaw@gmail.com>; thimio2001@gmail.com <thimio2001@gmail.com>; btrem@optonline.net <btrem@optonline.net>; afishkow@optonline.net <afishkow@optonline.net>; a.carella@ctexaminer.com <a.carella@ctexaminer.com>; tips@ctnews.com <tips@ctnews.com>; turchio@hotmail.com <turchio@hotmail.com>; amguglielmo@icloud.com <amguglielmo@icloud.com>; inara612@yahoo.com <inara612@yahoo.com>; richard@paragoncoffee.com <richard@paragoncoffee.com>; cnanos@optonline.net <cnanos@optonline.net>; pjoner@gmail.com <pjoner@gmail.com>; Paul Arvoy <ifyouseekstamford@gmail.com>; tanthonyhowell@mac.com <tanthonyhowell@mac.com>; drmchase@yahoo.com <drmchase@yahoo.com>; Nancy Carbone <nancy_carbone@att.net>; theolssons.ab@gmail.com <theolssons.ab@gmail.com>; Gleiciane Kazley <ackazley@gmail.com>

Subject: Fwd: 800 Long Ridge - Letter of Opposition and Resident Notification

Dear Planning Board, Zoning Board, Board of Reps, etc,

This email is to formally note opposition to the 800 LRR proposal, notify concerned residents about this proposal, and encourage the same residents to also voice their dissent and share this note far and wide.

For Planning Board, who must first consider this application, this email is an appeal to please stop entertaining requests for spot zoning for the purposes of assisting developers maximize their economic yields, and to consider the impact on existing residents who are explicitly protected through a number of provisions in the Master Plan (1.3, 1.3B, 6A.1, 8.2 Subsections 1,2, and 8 just off the top of my head).

We are not just curmudgeons grumbling in the corner – we understand full well that there is an explicit mandate from on high to repurpose underutilized corporate office parks in Stamford. Same as we noted for 900 LRR, this simply doesn't need to be a monstrous mid-rise apartment complex with massive commercial space. We believe townhome-style development is far more compatible and responsible use of this land, and that such development of this land would both address commercial needs of the landowner without unduly disturbing the existing single family zones that run adjacent to these corporate parks. Think River Oaks, Havemeyer, etc.

I am here again just a few short months after we mutually agreed that the proposed monstrosity at 900 LRR was highly incompatible with the adjacent zones and single-family neighborhoods, and after you unanimously rejected that proposal, imagine my surprise when I learn about an outstanding application (223-38) for the lot next door, this time owned by BLT (the same folks who construct apartments that [sink and collapse](#)), are now onto their latest mission to displace single-family homes and urbanize Stamford up to the Merrit and beyond.

The project is more or less the same exact proposal as the one attempted next door – 354 apartments, almost 10k sq. ft. of multi-purpose commercial space. Our concerns with this proposed development will therefore be largely consistent with our objections to the 900 LRR (zoning incompatibility, traffic burden, school and resource burden, lack of creativity for land use, no need for another luxury apartment, the list goes on). I encourage you to read through the Zoning Board rejection for that project as you consider the general scope of this project. It is unfathomable to me that this proposal gains any traction beyond its initial planning phases.

I was shocked to learn that this inept developer (BLT) who has been on a steady mission to swallow Stamford whole was able to maneuver a direct audience with the Planning Board for a special site walkthrough on March 4th (see attached), before posting their application on any publicly available website. I have been able to request the application and have thus far found the materials to fully replicate the mistakes that Monday properties and Redniss and Mead made with their application.

I urge you to nip this in the bud – send the developer back to planning stages, ask them to work with the community to develop a subdivision or townhome community that is more compatible with the surrounding single-family zones.

Thank you for the consideration and please do not waste too many public resources entertaining this insane proposal,

Patrick

From: Anne Marie Guglielmo <amguglielmo@icloud.com>

Sent: Friday, March 1, 2024 10:46 AM

To: Stamford Land Use <StamfordLandUse@StamfordCT.gov>

Cc: Board of Representatives <bdreps@StamfordCT.gov>; tdell@stamfordct.gov <tdell@stamfordct.gov>; Tepper, Jay <JTepper@StamfordCT.gov>; Godzeno, Jennifer <JGodzeno@StamfordCT.gov>; Levin, William <WLevin@StamfordCT.gov>; Weinberg, Carl <CWeinberg@StamfordCT.gov>; RBlessing@stamforsct.gov <RBlessing@stamforsct.gov>; Bosak Jr., Gerald <GBosak@StamfordCT.gov>; Pierre-Louis, Fred <FPierreLouis@StamfordCT.gov>; BOR_AllReps <BOR_AllReps@StamfordCT.gov>; Buccino, Michael <MBuccino@StamfordCT.gov>; Totilo, Michael <MTotilo@StamfordCT.gov>; Perry, Stephen <SPerry@StamfordCT.gov>; Smith-Anderson, Racquel <RSmithAnderson@StamfordCT.gov>; pberns@stamford.gov <pberns@stamford.gov>

Subject: Re: 800 and 900 Long Ridge - opposition to zoning and development proposals

Dear Planning Board, Zoning Board, Board of Reps, et al.:

This email is to formally note opposition to the 800 and 900 LRR rezoning and development proposals, as these both appear to be “spot zoning” changes that should be strictly scrutinized and should not be done for the sole purpose of satisfying the needs and economic benefit of the developer at the expense of surrounding landowners and existing land uses.

I have previously voiced my strong opposition to similar developments along Long Ridge Road for reasons that include (1) lack of conformity with current single residential homes in the area, (2) dangerous congestion and traffic conditions in an already highly travelled route along Long Ridge/Merritt Parkway entrance as well as the “cut-through” roads in the mid-Ridges like Wire Mill and Cedar Heights and onto High Ridge Roads, and (3) overburdening our resources including fire and police departments, infrastructure like water, energy, waste, schools, etc.

I agree with some of my fellow residents that a townhome-style development is far more compatible and responsible use of this land, and that such development of this land would both address commercial needs of the landowner without unduly disturbing the existing single family zones that run adjacent to these corporate parks (similar to the existing developments like River Oaks).

Thank you in advance for your attention to my concerns and that of my fellow residents. I implore you to deny these behemoth development proposals that are inconsistent with the current land use and surrounding environment and that you, instead, work with the community to develop a subdivision or townhome community that is more compatible with the surrounding single-family zones.

Sincerely,

Anne Marie Guglielmo, 142 Clay Hill Road, Stamford, CT 06905

From: Patrick Kazley <patrickkazley@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, February 29, 2024 2:22 PM

To: Stamford Land Use <StamfordLandUse@StamfordCT.gov>; Board of Representatives <bdreps@StamfordCT.gov>; Tepper, Jay <JTepper@StamfordCT.gov>; Godzeno, Jennifer <JGodzeno@StamfordCT.gov>; Levin, William <WLevin@StamfordCT.gov>; Weinberg, Carl <CWeinberg@StamfordCT.gov>; RBlessing@stamforsct.gov <RBlessing@stamforsct.gov>; Bosak Jr., Gerald <GBosak@StamfordCT.gov>; McManus, Rosanne <RMcManus@StamfordCT.gov>; Boeger, Sean <SBoeger@StamfordCT.gov>; Gleiciane Kazley <ackazley@gmail.com>; Pierre-Louis, Fred <FPierreLouis@StamfordCT.gov>; BOR_AllReps <BOR_AllReps@StamfordCT.gov>; Buccino, Michael <MBuccino@StamfordCT.gov>; Totilo, Michael <MTotilo@StamfordCT.gov>; Perry, Stephen <SPerry@StamfordCT.gov>; Stein, David <DStein@StamfordCT.gov>; Morris, William <WMorris@StamfordCT.gov>; Smith-Anderson, Racquel <RSmithAnderson@StamfordCT.gov>

Cc: Adele Langie <langie4468@hotmail.com>; Michael Kellick <kellickm@optonline.net>; lhoza@optonline.net <lhoza@optonline.net>; Joanna R. Savino <joannar.savino@gmail.com>; Shirley Grimmert@greenwich.k12.ct.us <Shirley_Grimmett@greenwich.k12.ct.us>; mkilcoynetweety@aol.com <mkilcoynetweety@aol.com>; pberns@stamford.gov <pberns@stamford.gov>; katinap@hotmail.com <katinap@hotmail.com>; glenn_lu@yahoo.com <glenn_lu@yahoo.com>; bohnbann@gmail.com <bohnbann@gmail.com>; blazrwmn@aol.com <blazrwmn@aol.com>; jsullivan@thepropertygroup.net <jsullivan@thepropertygroup.net>; steve.dellolio@gmail.com <steve.dellolio@gmail.com>; info@northstamfordassoc.org <info@northstamfordassoc.org>; lhumphrey@optonline.net <lhumphrey@optonline.net>; Lois Anderson <lbawlaw@gmail.com>; thimio2001@gmail.com <thimio2001@gmail.com>; btrem@optonline.net <btrem@optonline.net>; afishkow@optonline.net <afishkow@optonline.net>; a.carella@ctexaminer.com <a.carella@ctexaminer.com>; tips@ctnews.com <tips@ctnews.com>; turchio@hotmail.com <turchio@hotmail.com>; amuglielmo@icloud.com <amuglielmo@icloud.com>; inara612@yahoo.com <inara612@yahoo.com>; richard@paragoncoffee.com <richard@paragoncoffee.com>; cnanos@optonline.net <cnanos@optonline.net>; pjoner@gmail.com <pjoner@gmail.com>; Paul Arvoy <ifyouseekstamford@gmail.com>; tanthonyhowell@mac.com <tanthonyhowell@mac.com>; drmchase@yahoo.com <drmchase@yahoo.com>; Nancy Carbone <nancy_carbone@att.net>; theolssons.ab@gmail.com <theolssons.ab@gmail.com>; bremondinoesl@gmail.com <bremondinoesl@gmail.com>; jo001di@yahoo.com <jo001di@yahoo.com>; bilinday@gmail.com <bilinday@gmail.com>

Subject: Fwd: Ralph Blessing was Dishonest (Again)

Dear Planning Board, Zoning Board, **[Please file this under letters of opposition for both the 800 Long Ridge Road application, and the Text Change Application #224-05]**

I request your undivided attention on the below - this is a perfect example of the backhanded attempts from Ralph and related non-voting members of the Zoning Board to subvert to public's will and force the priorities of developers on Stamford residents at any cost. Unfortunately, these desperate attempts are public record and while they hope no one like me notices and calls them out, here I am...

When Theresa Dell asked Ralph on the last Planning Board Meeting in reference to the latest set of text changes, "So, this is basically a cleanup?", Ralph - the honest answer should have been "No, this is a substantial edit to the existing provisions for the purpose of encouraging the development of residential uses for the corporate office parks along Long Ridge Road and other related housing initiatives that the developers and I have been openly pushing for."

Instead, Ralph replied, "it is a cleanup..." and he continued "it is important, because it sets the tone for what zoning is supposed to do and can help with the interpretation of some of the regulations."

That is a gross misrepresentation, and an intentional glossing over of very substantial edits to these general provisions. If you read the changes, he is clearly setting the table for his crony developers to have open season on the corporate office park lands along Long Ridge.

I'm sorry to tell this to the Planning Board - but you were tricked and lied to by Ralph. Nothing new, but this time it was particularly egregious. Two days ago, Ralph presented these changes PB recently filed text changes related to Section 1 - General Provisions of the Stamford Zoning Regulations. Within it are a host of additions and removals of text. Here are some of the changes Ralph characterized as a "clean up". You be the judge...

A quick count yield 14 brand new provisions and many more partial additions, including:

Limiting the Zoning Board's evaluation criteria for proposals within Section 1A to strictly height, structure versus lot size, open space sizes, density, and utilization of space for advertising, and notably not other factors like compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods (as the Master Plan painstakingly provisions for).

And

Adding 2.b. to explicitly prioritize new developments, specifically multifamily dwellings.

Very convenient amendments given the frustrating setback Ralph had on 900 Long Ridge, isn't it? This is a manipulation of language to achieve his ends, and skirt around the protections of the Master Plan.

But it gets worse:

Further along with a suggestion to limit the scope of Zoning's authority, he also removed language that gave consideration to preserving the values of residential homes. The residents of Stamford purportedly aren't permitted to care about the value of their property.

He also removed language in Section 2 mentioning the restriction of the location for new residential structures, he removed the language noting regulation and limitation of population density, and he removed language that lent support to the existence and enforcement of "distinct zoning districts" (which, without, would support intensive development outside of downtown, for instance, and is directly at odds with the Master Plan Section 1.3).

These are very clearly not just a "clean up", and shame on you, Ralph, for representing them as such. Shame on you.

It is not a coincidence that these changes are coming through shortly after the 900 Long Ridge Road rejection and just before 800 Long Ridge Road proposal by the Stamford's favorite developer, BLT. I can promise you in a few weeks when voting members are called upon to evaluate that 800 LRR application, that you will be directed to this language in the general provisions as justification for why these are "clearly in accordance with the broad objectives of Zoning".

There was no public hearing on this, no extensive consideration – a few minutes passed by and it was briefly approved. This is the way that the developers and Ralph Blessing (in coordination with developers) chip away at the rights of residents and displace all single-family zones south of the Merritt one regulation and provision at a time.

Luckily, these text changes are not laws or regulations that must be adhered to, but clearly these changes will be used and twisted in their interpretation (as Ralph directly suggested on the PB call, quote above) to lend more support to the insanely incompatible developments planned along Long Ridge Road.

Thank you for your attention on this, and nice try Ralph.

Patrick

From: Paul Arvoy <ifyouseekstamford@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, March 4, 2024 8:37 AM

To: Cohen, Lindsey <LCohen@StamfordCT.gov>; Mathur, Vineeta <VMathur@StamfordCT.gov>

Subject: Paul Arvoy. Deny 900 Long Ridge Rd.

This letter is in regards to 800 Long Ridge Rd. I oppose this development for the plethora of reasons that I have laid out during the denial of 900 Long Ridge Rd. As residents we have proposed credible and effective alternatives that align with the master plan and fall under the protections we have as landowners in Stamford. This intrusion of spot zoning, text changes and map changes, that benefit developers and not our community must end. The planning board and zoning board are making decisions with members sitting on the boards with expired terms. This application must follow suit and must be immediately denied without the prospect of even getting to the zoning board. You cannot deny 900 Long Ridge Rd. and then even consider 800 Long Ridge Rd. This would show total hypocrisy and the favorability the expired members are giving to developers for profit. Apartment buildings do not belong here, and it should be a unanimous decision for this application to be set aside for future recommendations. Affordable housing is not being created by the BMR/Fee in Lieu program and has failed Stamford. We have produced over and above the 10% of housing required by the state and it's time to listen to new ideas. Deny any attempt for this proposed application to move forward. Thank you.

Paul Arvoy
Stamford, Ct
203 274 3012