

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COUNCIL MEETING
STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Wednesday, October 7, 2020 @ 9:30 am**

MINUTES

This meeting was conducted in two parts, each on a separate online platform. The first part took place remotely via Microsoft Teams. All the agenda items except Item IX.a. were heard during this portion. Attendees of the meeting then switched over to the Zoom platform for Part 2 of the meeting where the 130 Henry Street, 79 Garden Street, 650 Atlantic Avenue project in Stamford (Agenda item IX.a) was heard.

Part 1 – Microsoft Teams

Council: Ms. Marguerite Carnell, Mr. Tom Elmore, Dr. Margaret Faber, Ms. Karyn Gilvarg (9:48 a.m.), Dr. Leah Glaser, Ms. Kathy Maher, Ms. Christine Nelson, Chairwoman Sara Nelson, Dr. Sarah Sportman, and Dr. Walter Woodward

Staff: Ms. Julie Carmelich, Ms. Mary Dunne, Ms. Erin Fink, Ms. Deborah Gaston, Mr. Jonathan Kinney, Ms. Liz Shapiro

Guest: Ms. Jane Montanaro, Preservation Connecticut
Avery Giorgio, Trinity College Student
Ms. Judy Norinsky, Stamford Historic Neighborhood Preservation
Lucien Lafreniere
Mr. Eric Ott

I. Call to Order for Part 1 of meeting

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

II. Review of Public Comment Procedures

Chairwoman Nelson read aloud the Public Comments Procedures.

III. Code of Conduct/Conflict of Interest

Chairwoman Nelson read aloud the Code of Conduct/Conflict of Interest procedures.

IV. Review and Approval of Minutes

The September 2, 2020 minutes were approved with corrections.

*On a motion by Ms. Maher, Second, Dr. Faber
(Y-8, N-0, Abstaining – 1) (Roll call vote)*

V. State Historic Preservation Grants – Action Items

a. Stewardship Relief Grant, Multiple applicants

On a motion by Ms. Maher, Second by Dr. Faber, the Historic Preservation Council voted to award a Stewardship Relief Grant, funded by the Community Investment Act of the State of Connecticut, to the below-listed applicants in the amounts shown below. All grant guidelines and state requirements shall be met by the below-listed applicants upon receipt of a grant as administered by the Department of Economic and Community Development.

(Y-8, N-0, Abstaining –1) (Roll call vote)

Applicant:	Amount requested
Ward-Heitmann House Museum Foundation, Inc.	\$1,000.00
Friends of Valley Farm	\$1,000.00
TOTAL FUNDING:	\$2,000.00

Ms. Dunne presented this set of two applications. Staff recommends the applications for funding. All applications have been reviewed and include all required attachments. In addition, all invoices and proofs of payment have been reviewed and reconciled with the Certificate of Eligible Actual Costs. The purpose of the funding is to support the continued safeguarding of historic resources at a time when many organizations are experiencing economic distress because of the Covid-19 pandemic. These are reimbursable grants and only 501(c)3 non-profits are eligible. Eligible reimbursable expenses are those related to the basic utilities and regular maintenance costs associated with the upkeep of a designated historic resource.

Ms. Maher asked how much funding was left. Ms. Dunne replied that a cap was set at \$200,000, expecting 200 applications. There is approximately \$160,000 available.

Ms. Maher asked if there was going to be a second round of funding. Ms. Dunne replied that decision was up to the Council on how the funding should be dispersed. Ms. Maher added this issue can be addressed after the first of next year.

VI. State Register of Historic Places Nominations

VII. Local Historic District/Property Study Report/s

- a. Historic Property Study Report, 50 West District Road, Farmington

On a motion by Ms. Maher, Second by Dr. Faber, Pursuant to CGS §7-147 q (c), the Historic Preservation Council voted to recommend approval of the proposed ordinance and boundary as presented in the historic property study report for 50 West District Road, Farmington, CT, as presented by the Farmington Historic District Commission and dated August 15, 2020.

(Y-8, N-0, Abstaining –2) (Roll call vote)

Ms. Dunne presented this application. The study report was received on August 15, 2020 and is technically complete. Staff recommended a positive recommendation from the Historic Preservation Council.

This was a single-property and boundary designation that the Council has the authority under state statute to speak on. If there were any recommendations from the Council, Ms. Dunne ensured that they would be passed on to the applicant and would be made part of the public hearing.

Ms. Maher mentioned that she could not believe this property was not already on the register.

- b. Historic Property Study Report, 93 Coppermine Road, Farmington

On a motion by Ms. Maher, Second by Ms. Nelson, Pursuant to CGS §7-147 q (c), the Historic Preservation Council voted to recommend approval of the proposed ordinance and boundary as presented in the historic property study report for 93 Coppermine Road, Farmington, CT, as presented by the Farmington Historic District Commission and dated August 15, 2020.

(Y-9, N-0, Abstaining –1) (Roll call vote)

Ms. Dunne presented this application. The study report was received on August 15, 2020 and is technically complete. Staff recommended a positive recommendation from the Historic Preservation Council.

This was the second of three properties submitted by the Town of Farmington. Any recommendations from the council, would be passed to the applicant.

- c. Historic Property Study Report, 33 Waterville Road, Farmington

On a motion by Ms. Gilvarg, Second by Ms. Maher, Pursuant to CGS §7-147 q (c), the Historic Preservation Council voted to recommend approval of the proposed ordinance and boundary as presented in the historic property study report for 33 Waterville Road, Farmington, CT, as presented by the Farmington Historic District Commission and dated August 15, 2020.

(Y-9, N-0, Abstaining –1) (Roll call vote)

Ms. Dunne presented this application. The study report was received on August 15, 2020 and is technically complete. Staff recommended a positive recommendation from the Historic Preservation Council.

Ms. Dunne was pleased Farmington is applying for these designations and recommendations from the Council would be passed on to the applicant.

- d. Historic District Study Report, Expansion of Farmington Historic District

On a motion by Ms. Maher, Second by Dr. Faber, Pursuant to CGS §7-147 b (c), the Historic Preservation Council voted to recommend approval of the proposed ordinance and boundary as presented in the study report for the expansion of the Farmington Historic District, Farmington, CT as presented by the Farmington Historic District Commission and dated August 15, 2020.

(Y-, N-0, Abstaining –1) (Roll call vote)

Ms. Dunne presented this application. The study report was received on August 15, 2020 and is technically complete. Staff recommends a positive recommendation from the Historic Preservation Council.

The expansion of the current historic district was originally presented as two separate properties. She asked the applicant to resubmit as an expansion rather than two separate properties because they coincide with one another. Any comments, questions or concerns the Council may have will be shared with the applicant.

Ms. Maher mentioned it would be nice if the houses were referred to as the “Man and Lady of the House” rather than just a John Treadwell North House. It would give the property some diverse history.

VIII. Archaeological Preserves

XI. Report on State Historic Preservation Office – Jonathan Kinney

The SHPO staff continued their exemplary work in each of their program areas, Environmental Review, reviewing Tax Credits, managing the National and State Registers, and coordinating our various grant programs. In addition to these program responsibilities, each member of the staff worked on a variety of special projects, attended site visits, routinely provided support and collaborated with their fellow staff members, and provide technical assistance to applicants, government agencies, non-profits, the public, etc. Mr. Kinney took the opportunity to thank SHPO staff for all that they do.

SHPO had an exciting meeting on September 9th with their consultant Dewberry where the full staff got a first look at what the web-based GIS system could potentially look like. Dewberry and SHPO staff will be working out what type of functionality they would like to see in the system and what levels of information will be available to different types of users. Thanks to Jenny Scofield of the SHPO staff for taking the lead and the additional SHPO staff that have been working on this initiative.

Finally, SHPO is also in preliminary discussions with Preservation Connecticut regarding the potential transfer of administration of the historic preservation easement program to them. It is SHPO's hope that this move will result in a strengthened program with more frequent and robust outreach, education for the property owners of these historic sites as well as more frequent site visits and monitoring to ensure conformance with the restrictions.

XII. Report on Museum Properties – Liz Shapiro

The restoration project at the Prudence Crandall Museum has not been without its complications. In the past three weeks, there have been issues resulting from a misplaced summer beam on the architectural drawings, issues with a walkway to the museum which was drawn and placed without archaeological consultation, and additional related issues. Resolving these problems has taken a lot of time and effort by SHPO staff, particularly Ms. Marena Wisniewski, Ms. Cathy Labadia, and Mr. Jonathan Kinney, who is serving as the point person for the project. Ms. Shapiro thanked them for their work above and beyond.

Old New-Gate Prison reopened the second weekend in September, by advance reservation, allowing groups of 10 people per hour, with a half hour guided tour followed by a half hour of time to explore the site. Feedback has been good. The visitor's center and the gift shop remain closed. Staff is happy to have some return to normalcy.

Staff at the Henry Whitfield Museum will have a visit by Ms. Donia Conn and Mr. Eric Gradoia, their CAP assessors this Friday and Saturday.

The CAP, or Conservation Assessment Program, is funded by a grant through the Institute for Museum and Library Services in partnership with the Foundation for Advancement in Conservation and is administered by the American Institute for Conservation. The staff is looking forward to receiving the recommendations from the report as we embark on restoration projects at the museum.

Ms. Maher commented it was great about the CAP.

Dr. Glaser asked if the museums were doing any virtual programming. Ms. Shapiro replied yes. New Gate has been engaging in virtual field trips. Sloane is prepping for virtuals, Henry Whitfield has reached out to area schools. Joanie after finishing cataloging Prudence Crandall, will be working with teachers and should have some results in the second quarter.

XIII. Old Business – Ms. Karyn Gilvarg

Mr. Levine and Ms. Gilvarg attended the William Lansing statute unveiling in New Haven. The William Lansing House is a site on the Connecticut Freedom Trail. The City of New Haven, Freedom Trail Committee, SHPO, and the Amistad Committee have been working on this project for the past ten years.

XIV. New Business

a. Grants – Extension of No Match Requirement – Mary Dunne

On a motion by Ms. Maher, Second by Ms. Carnell, the Historic Preservation Council voted to table this item until the November 2020 meeting to allow for additional discussion.

(Y-9, N-0, Abstaining –1) (Roll call vote)

Ms. Dunne proposed a motion to extend the deadline on waiving the policy of requiring a match for Survey and Planning and Partners In Preservation Grants from December 2, 2020 to March 3, 2021.

Ms. Gilvarg stated that considering our current world events, this is a reasonable request.

Mr. Maher added that would be a wholehearted yes from her.

It was not clear to the Council whether they had originally voted on a motion to waive the match requirement or if SHPO staff had handled it. Ms. Dunne stated that she could look on the records to find the original language and that the motion could be tabled until the November meeting for additional discussion.

XV. Liaison with Public & Private Agencies – Ms. Jane Montanaro – Preservation CT

Ms. Montanaro thanked Mr. Levine for being a juror at their gallery opening of the Historic Barns and Photography show at the Art League of New Britain. Over 50 people attended a social distancing event with an outdoor reception. Small groups were able to tour the gallery and view the restorations made possible through SHPO grants. The head of the Art League Board was in attendance and thanked SHPO for its contribution to a successful project. There were over 100 submissions of pictures of barns from all over the state. Over \$7,000 was raised for Preservation Connecticut programming. The show will be in New Britain until October 18th, then will travel on display throughout the state.

XVI. Public Forum

XVII. Adjournment of Part 1

On a motion by Ms. Maher, Second by Ms. Carnell, the Council votes to adjourn Part 1 of this meeting.

(Y-9, N-0, Abstaining –1) (Roll call vote)

Part 1 of the meeting was adjourned at 10:16am.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

IN THE MATTER OF:
STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COUNCIL MEETING
October 7, 2020

FALZARANO COURT REPORTERS, LLC
4 Somerset Lane
Simsbury, CT 06070
860.651.0258
www.falzaranocourtreporters.com

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COUNCIL MEETING

Council meeting held remotely via Zoom
platform on Wednesday, October 7, 2020, beginning at
10:38 a.m.

Held before:

SARA O. NELSON, Chair

1 APPEARANCES:

2

3

Historic Preservation Council Members:

4

Sara O. Nelson, Chair

5

Karyn M. Gilvarg, Vice Chair

6

Marguerite Carnell

7

Thomas Elmore

8

Dr. Margaret M. Faber

9

Dr. Leah Glaser

10

Kathleen Maher

11

Christine Nelson

12

Dr. Sarah Sportman

13

Dr. Walter Woodward

14

15

State Historic Preservation Council Staff:

16

Elizabeth Shapiro

17

Jonathan Kinney

18

Todd Levine

19

Marena Wisniewski

20

Mary Dunne

21

Deborah Gaston

22

23

(continued on the following page)

24

25

1 APPEARANCES (continued):

2
3 Presenters:

4 Brad Schide, Preservation Connecticut

5 David Goslin, Crosskey Architects

6 W. Phillips Barlow, todesign

7 James Robertson, Carmody Torrance Sandak &
8 Hennessey

9 Lisa Feinberg, Carmody Torrance Sandak &
10 Hennessey

11 Public Comment:

12 David Michele, Connecticut House of
13 Representatives, 146th District

14 Ralph Blessing, City of Stamford

15 Judy Norinsky, Historic Neighborhood
16 Preservation

17 Robert Danielson, Fuss & O'Neill

18 Anne Moore, Acting Chair, Stamford Historic
19 Preservation Advisory Commission

20 Lisa Feinberg, Carmody Torrance Sandak &
21 Hennessey

22 Terry Adams, President, [group]

23 Ted Ferrarone, BLT

24 Wes Haynes, Merritt Parkway Conservancy

25 Victor Mirontschuk, EDI International

(continued on the following page)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

APPEARANCE (continued):

Public Comment (continued):

Mark Diamond

Bill Buckley, BLT

Elizabeth McCauley

Lee Riccetti, Heritage Consulting

David Dietrich

Susan Halpern

Peter James Quigley

1 CHAIR NELSON: Good morning, everyone.
2 I'm Sara Nelson. I'm chairman of the
3 Historic Preservation Council. I'm calling Part 2 of
4 the October 7th Historic Preservation Council meeting
5 to order for the purpose of considering our agenda
6 item 9, which is 130 Henry Street, 79 Garden Street,
7 650 Atlantic Avenue in Stamford. Part 2 of our
8 meeting will run from 10:30 to 1 p.m. this afternoon.

9 And to speak to the agenda item, all
10 parties will have been required to have preregistered
11 by the end of the day on Monday the 5th. And at this
12 point there are 22 people who have preregistered to
13 speak.

14 Seated this morning for the council
15 are: Karyn Gilvarg, the Vice Chair; Marguerite
16 Carnell; Tom Elmore; Margaret Faber; Kathleen Maher;
17 Christine Nelson; Sarah Sportman; and Walter Woodward.
18 So a quorum is present.

19 Couple of things just for procedures
20 and background.

21 Preservation Connecticut has
22 previously identified themselves as an interested
23 party to these proceedings. They will be given the
24 same amount of time that the property owner/developer
25 will be, and I will go into the timeline in a minute.

1 Our standard policy for a matter such
2 as this, in order to allow sufficient time for all
3 parties, is to sequence the presentations as follows.
4 There will be an introduction of the matter by Todd
5 Levine, our staff coordinator.

6 There will be presentation and answers
7 to the forwarded questions by, in this case, the
8 developer's representative. The presentation is up to
9 and no more than 20 minutes. At the conclusion of
10 that presentation, council will have 20 minutes for
11 questioning. At the conclusion of that,
12 representatives from Preservation Connecticut will
13 have up to and no more than 20 minutes. And then
14 again, at the conclusion of that, council has 20
15 minutes for questions. So that's about 80 minutes of
16 meeting.

17 At that point, we will ask members who
18 have preregistered to speak. There are 22 members of
19 the public who have registered. They will be called
20 in an alternating fashion, those in favor of referral
21 and those against referral. We will give as many of
22 them an opportunity to speak as we can. We need to
23 limit their time to 3 minutes because we don't have
24 the ability to run the meeting longer than 1 p.m. this
25 afternoon.

1 At 12:40, we will close the public
2 testimony to allow council 20 minutes to consider the
3 motion.

4 And I'd like to just ask the council
5 members for a show of hands to signal that you have
6 read the agenda packet in entirety, 1,013 pages.
7 Okay.

8 So for members of the BLT, you can
9 rely upon a fairly comprehensive understanding of the
10 issues that you submitted to us for review.

11 When we have people speaking, in order
12 to keep the meeting moving along, the 20-minute
13 presentations, we will give you a 5-minute warning
14 when you're getting close to the end of 20 minutes,
15 and then a one-minute warning. Then the presentation
16 will be cut off at the end of the 20 minutes.

17 Parties with the 3-minute presentation
18 will be given a one-minute warning.

19 And I can't stress enough, the council
20 is interested in new information, and in the interest
21 of time and out of fairness to all, we ask that if you
22 are in agreement with the point that has previously
23 been made, to please simply signal your agreement with
24 the points made.

25 We ask that anybody who speaks does so

1 by identifying their name and affiliation. And all
2 council members, when speaking, all staff, that we
3 also identify ourselves by name for the benefit of the
4 transcriptionist who's recording this meeting.

5 There are a couple of other items that
6 are in our general procedures with regard to public
7 comment. Some of them I have covered already. The
8 two that I haven't is that if there are written
9 statements that people would like to submit into the
10 record, that they be emailed to *Todd.Levine@ct.gov*.
11 Those written submissions will be made exhibits and
12 available for all to read.

13 Council members and staff do not
14 respond to questions made by or during the
15 presentation of public comments, but the chair may
16 invite clarification from an attendee. The chair will
17 decide when to close the public comment portion of the
18 meeting. Members of the HPC will then address the
19 matter at issue. You may address questions concerning
20 the matter to members of the public who have made
21 public comment.

22 Lastly, the chair of the Historic
23 Preservation Council reserves the right to alter the
24 above proceeding at any meeting in order to ensure
25 that the business of the meeting will be addressed

1 adequately and completely in a timely manner.

2 So two other brief points of
3 background before I read the motion.

4 On June 5, 2020, SHPO sent a letter,
5 an invitation, on council's behalf to John Freeman,
6 the general counsel of Harbor Point Development, and
7 BLT, inviting representatives to attend the August 5th
8 council meeting. It was mutually agreed that the
9 matter would be postponed and discussed at the
10 council's October meeting, today.

11 For those members who were seated in
12 2016, the council -- seated on the council in 2016,
13 this is the same group of buildings that came before
14 the council in November of 2016. The material that
15 was submitted by any party prior to the meeting was
16 made available to all parties, in a transparent flow
17 of information.

18 Lastly, for anybody who wishes to
19 speak, I want to remind all parties that the historic
20 merit of the structures is not subject to debate. The
21 buildings are included in the National Register
22 listing for the South End Historic District. The
23 significance of the buildings with contributing
24 resources has been reaffirmed by the State Historic
25 Preservation Board.

1 Okay. That's the general background.

2 The motion reads: The Historic
3 Preservation Council votes to request the assistance
4 of the Office of the Attorney General to prevent the
5 unreasonable destruction of the historic properties at
6 130 Henry Street, 79 Garden Street, and 650 Atlantic
7 Avenue, Stamford, Connecticut, pursuant to the
8 provisions of Section 22a and 19a of the Connecticut
9 General Statutes.

10 Is there a motion to move this?

11 Everybody is on mute.

12 CHRISTINE NELSON: So moved.

13 CHAIR NELSON: Christine Nelson, okay.

14 Is there a second?

15 DR. FABER: Second.

16 CHAIR NELSON: Todd, do you want to
17 provide some background?

18 MR. LEVINE: Certainly.

19 Good morning. For the record, my name
20 is Todd Levine, and I'm SHPO staff assigned to
21 potential Connecticut Environmental Protection Acts.
22 This is the executive summary of the SHPO
23 investigation.

24 130 Henry Street, 79 Garden Street,
25 and 650 Atlantic Street are located within the South

1 End National Register of Historic Places district
2 listed in March 19, 1986.

3 The threat to these structures first
4 came to the attention of SHPO in April 2016, which is
5 when we were alerted that the local preservation
6 organization in Stamford, Historic Neighborhood
7 Preservation, filed for a demolition delay for these
8 three buildings and two others, which are 122 and 126
9 Henry Street. Those are not under consideration
10 today.

11 At the October 2016 Historic
12 Preservation Council meeting, the owners, Harbor Point
13 Development, BLT, signed a document -- by the way,
14 I'll just refer to the ownership as BLT going forward
15 for this summary -- signed a document that they would
16 do no demolition at least until January 27, 2017, and
17 protect the buildings from the weather to allow time
18 to look at all three for demolition.

19 In November 2016 the demolition
20 applications were withdrawn and the city stated that
21 new permits would be required if demolitions were
22 planned in the future. BLT's legal counsel told SHPO
23 that they would be working towards preserving the
24 historic buildings. In July 2017 was the last we
25 heard from BLT on the matter.

1 In 2018 BLT contacted the city to
2 reinstate the demolition permits. The city informed
3 them that they would have to restart the clock.
4 Deputy Commissioner, at the time, David Kooris, and I
5 met with BLT in 2018 to work on a compromise.
6 Commissioner David Lehman met with BLT late 2019 to
7 work on a compromise. In both cases we were unable to
8 find a solution that satisfied both SHPO and BLT.

9 In February 2020, BLT submitted
10 demolition applications for the subject properties.
11 And in March SHPO was notified of the threatened
12 properties when the Neighborhood Revitalization Zone
13 submitted a letter to the city of Stamford to enact a
14 demolition delay of 180 days.

15 In June 2020, and on the HPC's behalf,
16 SHPO sent a letter to BLT, care of their legal
17 counsel, John Freeman, inviting them to the council's
18 August 5, 2020, meeting to understand their intentions
19 with regard to the properties and to determine if
20 reasonable and prudent alternatives to demolition
21 existed.

22 In July 2020 BLT alerted us that James
23 Robertson of Carmody, Torrance, Sandak & Hennessey is
24 representing them in the matter.

25 Shortly thereafter James Robertson,

1 Junior, requested a later meeting date to complete
2 their questionnaire due to a contamination report on
3 650 Atlantic that had not been completed at the time.

4 Demolition delay ran out early
5 September 2020, so to ensure that the buildings remain
6 standing until the rescheduled meeting of October 7th
7 of 2020, John Freeman, legal counsel of BLT, signed a
8 document stating that their client would not engage in
9 any demolition efforts until at least October 21st of
10 2020, which would give the Attorney General's Office
11 an opportunity to review all submitted information if
12 HPC referred to the matter to that office.

13 On September 17, 2020, the developer
14 that Preservation Connecticut had been working with,
15 Connecticut Housing Partners, opted not to participate
16 any longer in this effort.

17 On September 18, 2020, the State
18 Historic Preservation Review Board voted that 130
19 Henry Street, 79 Garden Street, and 650 Atlantic
20 Street continue to contribute to the historic
21 significance of the National Register of Historic
22 Places, South End District.

23 Thank you.

24 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you, Todd.

25 So I would like to invite Mr. Freeman

1 to provide your presentation.

2 MR. LEVINE: That will be Jim
3 Robertson.

4 MR. ROBERTSON: All right. Good
5 morning, Madam Chairman, Dr. Levine, members of the
6 council.

7 My name is Jim Robertson. It's not
8 Lisa Feinberg as posted up there, as she is going to
9 be sharing this 20 minutes with me.

10 I'm going to put up on the screen the
11 presentation that I'm going to be making, and
12 basically I am going to try, as best as I can, to make
13 five basic points in less than 10 minutes.

14 MS. WISNIEWSKI: Will you please
15 request your screen.

16 MR. ROBERTSON: I'll try to move
17 quickly through these five basic points.

18 First of all, the responsibilities
19 that you are now facing under the statute and the case
20 law are laid out right here. First you need to decide
21 whether or not the proposed improvements are, quote,
22 consistent with the reasonable requirements of the
23 public health, safety, and welfare, close quote; and
24 secondly, to decide whether, quote, considering all of
25 the relevant surrounding circumstances and factors,

1 there is no feasible and prudent alternative to the
2 proposed improvements.

3 That should not be controversial. I
4 have gone to school on the excellent work your lawyer
5 Alan Polunsky has done, read his cases and pleadings,
6 and I doubt there would be any controversy over those
7 two statements of what your issues are this morning.

8 The second point: Under the
9 Connecticut Environmental Protection Act and the
10 federal EPA, the contamination under and abutting the
11 Blickensderfer Building must be remediated and a
12 portion of the Blickensderfer Building must be
13 demolished. The licensed environmental professional
14 managing that remediation is on line and prepared to
15 answer your questions, and also to speak to you, as is
16 the professional engineer who is also going to be
17 managing it. They are fully prepared to answer your
18 questions on that issue.

19 The third point is: With very
20 careful planning and out of complete respect for the
21 preservation of the building and the stated wishes of
22 this organization, SHPO, the contamination can be
23 remediated while at the same time preserving most of
24 the Blickensderfer Building. We estimate we can save
25 about 70 percent of it. And the client's co-president

1 as well as the engineers are prepared to speak to that
2 issue.

3 Fourth: Improving and widening Garden
4 Street is a very important and necessary public policy
5 objective of both the state and the municipal
6 governments. And to accomplish this important public
7 project, it is necessary to demolish 130 Henry Street,
8 79 Garden Street, and the Schick Annex, and
9 considering all the relevant surrounding
10 circumstances, there is no feasible and prudent
11 alternative.

12 Attorney Feinberg and the engineers
13 and the architect will also be addressing those
14 issues.

15 We have six qualified witnesses who
16 will amplify on those four points and be prepared to
17 answer your questions.

18 My fifth point is an unfortunate one.
19 I did alert Dr. Levine that I would be making these
20 points for the transcript. But there are two
21 procedural irregularities that are afflicting this
22 meeting.

23 First, a necessary predicate for this
24 meeting is the affirmative vote of the State Historic
25 Preservation Review Board informing you that the

1 subject buildings continue to contribute to the South
2 End Historic District. My client did not receive
3 notice of that agency's meeting or vote, even though
4 such notice was required.

5 Furthermore, and more troubling, the
6 co-chair of that agency is a Mr. Christopher Wigren,
7 who in addition to co-chairing that important agency,
8 he is also the deputy director of our opponent in this
9 proceeding, namely, Preservation Connecticut. That is
10 a clear conflict of interest which taints this entire
11 proceeding.

12 And finally, the second procedural
13 issue, and equally distressing, the opponents base the
14 viability of their financial projections on their
15 alternative proposals on a memorandum and a financial
16 analysis and development pro formas from their
17 putative partner, Connecticut Housing Partners, pages
18 583 through 588. In fact, that is not the work of
19 Connecticut Housing Partners. That organization is
20 not opposing these improvements. And its name was
21 Misappropriated for the purposes of this meeting.

22 Now, to boring into the site, I now
23 defer to Attorney Lisa Feinberg.

24 MS. FEINBERG: Thank you, Jim.

25 Good morning. For the record, my name

1 is Lisa Feinberg. I'm an attorney with Carmody,
2 Torrance, Sandak & Hennessey. As you all know, we're
3 here to discuss properties known as 650 Atlantic
4 Street, which of course includes the Blickensderfer
5 factory building, as well as the Schick Annex, 736
6 Atlantic Street, 130 Henry Street, and 79 Garden
7 Street here in Stamford.

8 The subject site is outlined here in
9 yellow. It's generally bound by Atlantic Street on
10 the west, Henry Street on the south, Garden Street on
11 the east, and Dock Street, also known as the Urban
12 Transitway, along the northern boundary. You can see
13 that the Stamford Transportation Center is directly
14 adjacent.

15 CHAIR NELSON: Lisa, the screen --

16 MS. FEINBERG: You're not seeing the
17 screen?

18 CHAIR NELSON: No, we're not.

19 MR. LEVINE: Lisa, can you email me
20 this document if you want it submitted as a part of
21 the record, please.

22 MS. FEINBERG: I will do that as soon
23 as I finish.

24 MR. LEVINE: Thank you.

25 MS. FEINBERG: Can you all see my

1 aerial image now?

2 CHAIR NELSON: Yes. Thank you.

3 MS. FEINBERG: Okay. So let me start
4 over.

5 650 Atlantic Street, which includes
6 the Blickensderfer and the Schick building, 736
7 Atlantic Street, 130 Henry Street, and 79 Garden
8 Street, the subject site, outlined in yellow.
9 Atlantic Street borders it on the west, Henry Street
10 on the south, Garden Street on the east, and Dock
11 Street, which is also known as the Urban Transitway,
12 along the northern boundary line.

13 This building over here, this is the
14 large parking garage of the Stamford Transportation
15 Center. So we are directly adjacent.

16 Since most of you folks are not from
17 Stamford, I would like to take a minute just to better
18 orient you to the site.

19 Can you all see this Google street
20 view? Okay, perfect.

21 So we're standing at the corner of
22 Dock Street and Atlantic Street. The Stamford
23 Transportation Center is on our right. And straight
24 ahead you can see the Blickensderfer factory and the
25 Schick Annex.

1 We're going to proceed south along
2 Atlantic Street, passing the Stamford Transportation
3 Center garage. The site is on our left. You can see
4 it vacant. And as we move south, along the right side
5 here is the Metro Green Mixed Income Housing Project,
6 which is directly behind the Stamford Transportation
7 Center, and some buildings that are in the historic
8 district.

9 Our site wraps those buildings that I
10 just showed you that are in the historic district, so
11 this is part of the site, the southern portion of the
12 site. That brings us to the intersection of Henry
13 Street and Atlantic Street. On our right is a nice
14 plaza for Metro Green. And on our left is 736
15 Atlantic Street, which, for the record, I would like
16 to note, was determined by the advisory review board
17 to be noncontributing to the Historic District.

18 Heading east along Henry Street, on
19 our left, 118 and 120 Henry Street, also owned by our
20 client. 126 -- 122, excuse me, and 126 Henry Street
21 owned by our client. And on the right is the Lathon
22 Wider Community Center.

23 We're approaching the intersection
24 with Garden Street. This building on our left here is
25 130 Henry Street. And now headed back north on Garden

1 Street, you can see Garden Street is very narrow and
2 one way. On our left, this is 79 Garden Street. Some
3 multifamily structures on our right. And of course
4 this is the back side of our site. Garden Street runs
5 parallel with Pacific Street, so this is a parking lot
6 for some buildings that do front on Pacific Street.
7 And directly across Pacific Street is the Yale & Towne
8 development that my client preserved.

9 On our left here is the Schick
10 building, Schick Annex.

11 And then headed back north you can see
12 both sides of Garden Street here are entirely vacant.
13 This is part of the proposed development site.

14 Headed north -- excuse me, headed
15 west, again towards the transportation center along
16 Dock Street, you see the vacant parcel. This is the
17 Stamford Transportation Center here. And then of
18 course downtown Stamford, 95 right here, downtown
19 Stamford directly ahead of us.

20 Do you all see the PowerPoint again or
21 are you still on Google?

22 MS. WISNIEWSKI: Still on Google.

23 MS. FEINBERG: How about now?

24 MS. WISNIEWSKI: Okay, perfect. Thank
25 you.

1 MS. FEINBERG: So as Dr. Levine noted,
2 our client did appear before you back in 2016, albeit
3 with a significantly different proposal, which
4 included the demolition of everything on the site
5 except for 118 and 128 Henry Street. This is an image
6 of that proposal back in 2016. So as you can see,
7 118, 120 Henry Street did remain. However, 736, 122,
8 126, 130 Henry Street, 79 Garden Street, and the
9 entirety of the Blickensderfer factory are absent from
10 this photo. They were proposed for demolition.

11 Significantly, and contrary to what
12 some had incorrectly stated, the current proposal
13 includes the preservation of the majority of the
14 original Blickensderfer factory building, as well as
15 118, 120, 122, and 126 Henry Street. Buildings shown
16 here in red or portions of buildings shown here in red
17 are meant to be preserved. Buildings shown as yellow
18 are meant to be demolished.

19 In fact, our team had been studying
20 ways to maximize the preservation of this structure
21 and can now report that we have increased the
22 preservation area by approximately 25 percent as
23 compared to our original submission. On our left
24 is our original submission which was included in
25 your package, and on your right is the updated

1 revised version which does incorporate approximately
2 25 percent more of the building.

3 Based on our review of historic maps,
4 this is a map from 1951, a Sanborn map. You can see
5 here that this -- I've inserted a yellow line which
6 lines up generally with the rear property boundary of
7 the property to our north. I've done that so that we
8 can better orient ourselves on the next map. You'll
9 recognize this map. It is a map that is attached to
10 this historic designation, the Historic District. And
11 I've inserted that same yellow line to line up with
12 the property boundary.

13 After reviewing these maps and
14 superimposing our structure, you can see that we are
15 in fact preserving, or it appears that we are
16 preserving the majority of the Blickensderfer and the
17 entirety of the area that was designated as
18 contributing. I should have mentioned that this
19 darker portion here does designate contributing. If
20 it is not dark, then it is not considered
21 contributing.

22 Thus the current proposal preserves
23 the majority of the Blickensderfer factory, as well as
24 118 and 120 Henry Street, 122 and 126 Henry Street,
25 those latter four buildings being preserved in

1 perpetuity as affordable housing. And as we'll
2 discuss shortly in detail, it does suggest the
3 demolition of 736 Atlantic Street, 130 Henry Street,
4 79 Garden Street, and the Schick Annex.

5 That completes my presentation.

6 MR. ROBERTSON: So we've completed our
7 opening statement. And if there are questions, we
8 will refer the questions -- we have, as I said, six
9 qualified people standing by to answer any questions
10 that the council may have.

11 CHAIR NELSON: You're at the end of
12 your 20-minute presentation a little bit early, so
13 we're starting council member questions a little bit
14 early. Is that correct?

15 MR. ROBERTSON: Yes. Depending on
16 what the question is, we can refer them to the
17 qualified experts who are standing by ready to answer
18 questions.

19 CHAIR NELSON: Understood. All right.
20 Thank you.

21 All right. For council members, are
22 there specific questions that you have about the
23 material that has been presented thus far?

24 MS. GILVARG: To what extent has the
25 portion of the Blickensderfer Building that you intend

1 to renovate been investigated for environmental and
2 controlled hazards?

3 MS. FEINBERG: Perhaps this would be a
4 good time to turn it over to Rob, our LEP, so he can
5 answer those questions. And if we do have additional
6 time, I wonder if we don't have --

7 MS. GILVARG: Mine was a simple
8 question about the portion of the Blickensderfer
9 Building to remain. I don't need the whole
10 environmental presentation. I did look at the Fuss &
11 O'Neill report.

12 MS. FEINBERG: It's okay.

13 MS. GILVARG: I want to understand the
14 level of investigation for the existing building to
15 remain.

16 MS. FEINBERG: Okay.

17 MR. ROBERTSON: We have a very good
18 diagram that demonstrates that, I think, fairly
19 clearly. We'll put that up for you.

20 MS. FEINBERG: I think Rob Danielson
21 is prepared to respond to that as well.

22 Rob, are you on the line?

23 MR. DANIELSON: Yes. Can you hear me?

24 CHAIR NELSON: Yes, we can.

25 MR. ROBERTSON: Rob, up on the screen,

1 if you can see it, is the diagram showing where the
2 plume is.

3 Orient the council as to the location
4 of the plume and where that impacts the
5 Blickensderfer.

6 MR. DANIELSON: So the most
7 significant area of contamination associated with PCBs
8 is associated with the solid blue line. It extends
9 under a portion of the Blickensderfer Building. But
10 the most extreme extent -- as well as the Schick
11 Annex. And that's about a 120 foot by 65 foot wide
12 area that extends down to a depth of 18 feet. So in
13 order to excavate it out, it will be a substantial
14 size excavation. We're estimating, you know, given
15 the side slopes that are necessary, that it would be
16 extending out to about where the dashed blue line is.
17 So all that area needs to come out in accordance with
18 state and federal regulations.

19 As you move to the west where the part
20 of the Blickensderfer Building is that will be
21 preserved, based on existing spoil data we think we're
22 good. The bedrock is shallower there, and the
23 likelihood of that PCB going up that far is very
24 minimal.

25 MS. GILVARG: Thank you.

1 CHAIR NELSON: Other questions?

2 MS. MAHER: I don't know if we want to
3 discuss this now or at the end during a full
4 discussion. But in the transcripts of the 2016
5 report, Mr. Freeman clearly states on pages, of the
6 materials we received, 918 through 919, that the two
7 properties we're talking about today, the 79 and 650
8 Atlantic Street, were not part of the discussion. He
9 was not prepared at the time to talk about those two
10 parcels. And in good faith it was agreed that counsel
11 would have more time to review all of the material
12 that was presented to us barely hours before the 2016
13 meeting. And he completely agreed to that.

14 It is not reflected in the Carmody
15 report that this was the circumstance under which we
16 did not have a vote, as that was pointed out
17 repeatedly in the Carmody report from September. So I
18 find the report that we were presented by them to be
19 rather disingenuous and misleading.

20 I don't know, because we did not
21 discuss the two parcels that are being discussed
22 today, that this should be tabled and brought up again
23 when those two properties are brought to us and
24 discussed. It seems like that is a reasonable
25 request. That council is under the assumption that we

1 were going to reconvene in November 2016. That did
2 not happen.

3 So I thank everyone for providing such
4 thorough reports, but I think that this is something
5 that we should discuss, as none of these parcels were
6 discussed in any form whatsoever, and this is new to
7 us right now, as far as I'm concerned.

8 And thank you, everybody, for giving
9 us that material that we can actually see this.

10 CHAIR NELSON: Kathy, I think that it
11 is important to proceed with the whole presentation as
12 it is envisioned right now. I think the time to have
13 the conversation going back to the 2016 presentation
14 will be when we're deliberating at the end.

15 MS. MAHER: Thank you.

16 CHAIR NELSON: But thank you for
17 bringing that up.

18 Are there -- we're looking for council
19 member questions about the specific material presented
20 thus far.

21 MS. FABER: I've got some questions.

22 CHAIR NELSON: Yes, Margaret Faber.

23 MS. FABER: It is related -- and let
24 me know if you want me to ask later.

25 So BLT presumably performed the due

1 diligence and bought the properties with the knowledge
2 that they were on the National Register. That's
3 actually a question.

4 Then on October 5, 2016, the developer
5 agreed that the structures would be protected from the
6 elements and all work resulting in the removal of the
7 historic fabric would cease. I'd like to know what
8 has BLT done to stabilize and protect the buildings
9 since it acquired them in 2016, and has any historic
10 material been removed? From the photographs and the
11 screenshots, the tour we just took, I see that windows
12 are open and it appears that they are in fact open to
13 the elements.

14 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you, Margaret.

15 Ms. Feinberg, Mr. Robertson, could you
16 address that.

17 MR. ROBERTSON: Perhaps Ted, the
18 co-president, could address that, if he can be brought
19 in.

20 MR. FERRARONE: Good morning. Ted
21 Ferrarone, BLT.

22 Question is what have we done to
23 stabilize and protect the buildings. As you can see
24 in the photos that Lisa showed you on the walk, they
25 have all been protected with chain link fence and

1 plywood over the doors and the windows.

2 I would love to say that they're
3 protected at all times, but obviously, you know,
4 that's certainly not the case. People do break into
5 the buildings and remove the plywood. We constantly
6 replace it. We've done a ton of work on graffiti
7 removal, trash removal. I think the buildings
8 themselves are perfectly fine and secure today. But
9 it's an ongoing challenge.

10 The two that you see on the corner,
11 which is 130 Henry and 79 Garden, both of those we
12 completed pretty substantial environmental remediation
13 in anticipation of the demolition, so we took out a
14 ton of lead paint and asbestos-containing materials,
15 including siding and interim materials. But they're
16 nothing of historic merit inside. Certainly if
17 somebody wants to go look before anything is done
18 there, we would be perfectly fine with that.

19 MS. FABER: And was the developer
20 aware, or were you aware that the buildings were
21 listed on the National Register of Historic Places
22 when they were purchased?

23 MR. FERRARONE: We own a tremendous
24 amount of property within the South End. So, yes,
25 we're aware of the Historic Registry.

1 MS. FABER: So the removal of the
2 historic material and -- whether or not it was, I
3 don't know if anyone went to check to see if it was
4 historic or not. But it says material was removed
5 between 2016 and 2020. So could you just address what
6 material was removed?

7 MR. FERRARONE: I can't comment on the
8 statement. I'm not sure what are our first -- I don't
9 think anything's been done since the initial 2016 when
10 we stripped off the asbestos and lead paint.
11 Nothing's happened there except for sort of a
12 large-scale trash cleanup around the sides, which we
13 do on an ongoing basis.

14 MS. FABER: Thank you.

15 CHAIR NELSON: Are there other
16 questions?

17 MS. CARNELL: Yes. This is Marguerite
18 Carnell.

19 CHAIR NELSON: Yes, Marguerite.

20 MS. CARNELL: My question follows on
21 with Council Member Faber's in terms of the removal of
22 lead paint.

23 My question is: How was the lead
24 paint removed?

25 MR. ROBERTSON: Ted, if you can follow

1 up on that.

2 MR. FERRARONE: I honestly can't
3 comment in detail. I can see if I can find one of the
4 reports. It's been four years. We hired a lead paint
5 and asbestos remediation company to do that work for
6 us. It goes back to, I would say at least 2016.

7 MS. GILVARG: Can I follow up on this
8 line of questioning?

9 CHAIR NELSON: Yes, Karyn.

10 MS. GILVARG: Thank you, Sara.

11 Both Heritage reports contain this
12 notation that between 2016 and 2020 interior -- the
13 interiors of those two buildings were demolished. It
14 doesn't clearly indicate the extent of the demolition.
15 I'm wondering if any of the demolition was structural.
16 I'm wondering if the demolition was done with the
17 benefit of a demolition permit from the City of
18 Stamford.

19 MR. ROBERTSON: Actually, either Ted
20 or Bill can answer that. I think Lee is also on the
21 line.

22 Ted, why don't we start with you. I
23 don't know if you can answer that question.

24 MR. FERRARONE: I can. I can pick it
25 up.

1 No, there's no structural demolition
2 that's been done. In 2016 when we filed for the
3 permits, the way the demolition -- the permit process
4 worked at the time was you had to complete
5 environmental abatement in buildings before the permit
6 could be issued. So as part of that process we
7 started the lead paint and asbestos remediation. Once
8 we had the hearings in 2016 we stopped work, as
9 everybody on the line knows, so the buildings have
10 sat, you know, basically untouched from that
11 standpoint other than, you know, essentially chain
12 link fence and plywood keeping them secure.

13 MS. GILVARG: Thank you.

14 CHAIR NELSON: Are there other
15 questions?

16 MS. FABER: I'm wondering how
17 completely has moving the buildings been explored?
18 Has there been any analysis about moving any of the
19 buildings?

20 MR. ROBERTSON: You're talking about
21 the factory building?

22 MS. FABER: No, I'm talking about the
23 smaller houses.

24 MR. ROBERTSON: Bill, if you want to
25 move in on this, or Ted.

1 MR. BUCKLEY: I can jump on it, Ted,
2 if you want me to give you my thoughts on that.

3 MR. FERRARONE: Sure, go ahead.

4 MR. BUCKLEY: First of all, for the
5 record, my name is William Buckley. I'm a licensed
6 professional engineer registered in the state of
7 Connecticut. I've been practicing since 1974.

8 So we looked at the possibility of
9 moving those buildings. And the challenge is finding
10 a site to move them to. And then once you find a
11 site, you have all overhead wires all around primary
12 electric, secondary electric, and a multitude of phone
13 and cable companies that are up on those poles. So
14 that is a challenge anywhere in the state of
15 Connecticut when you go to move a building. You have
16 to temporarily relocate utilities, take interruptions
17 of service in the neighborhoods, and it's a tremendous
18 task. So we looked at that.

19 The other item is structurally. If
20 you had to move them any distance, you would certainly
21 run the risk of compromising the structural integrity
22 of any of those -- we can call them smaller buildings,
23 but as you can see, they're more than -- it's not like
24 a single-family house. It's a substantially sized
25 building for that neighborhood, to attempt to move.

1 MR. ROBERTSON: I'd also add -- and
2 Lee is on the call, who can amplify if needed. But as
3 historians you know that if those buildings are moved
4 to any extent, they will -- historic integrity will be
5 diminished as well. So going over that with Todd, I
6 gather that's not a controversial statement. You're
7 all aware of that, but I just add it in response to
8 that question.

9 CHAIR NELSON: Are there follow-up
10 questions?

11 Okay. Margaret?

12 MS. FABER: Another one. Have any
13 efforts been made to sell the buildings?

14 MR. ROBERTSON: I defer to Ted on
15 that.

16 MR. FERRARONE: No, not that I'm aware
17 of.

18 CHAIR NELSON: Are there other
19 questions? If there are, because I can't see
20 everybody on the screen all at the same time, I would
21 just ask you to speak up and give your name. I want
22 to make sure that we capture everyone's questions.

23 Okay. I'm not hearing any others,
24 which would mean that we would go to the next
25 presentation, which would be the one by Preservation

1 Connecticut.

2 And so that's -- I'm going to
3 invite -- is it Brad Schide who will be doing the
4 presenting?

5 MR. SCHIDE: Yes, it is.

6 I'll start off and I'll introduce who
7 else will be with me.

8 Again, for the record, I'm Brad
9 Schide, circuit writer and on behalf of Preservation
10 Connecticut. Myself, my colleagues, BLT, their
11 counsel, the Historic Council, we appreciate the
12 opportunity to present a plan to rehab rather than
13 demolish the three buildings in question.

14 I am sharing my time today with Phil
15 Barlow of todesign; as well as David Goslin, Crosskey
16 Architects; and Jane Montanero is also here for the
17 Preservation Connecticut.

18 Let me just say, I was a little
19 dismayed by counsel's comment. Connecticut Housing
20 Partners is in your package. We did submit that as
21 part of what the Historic Council has. They were
22 actively involved throughout the whole process until
23 two weeks ago. I also have their mission statement.
24 Their mission statement, they're saying -- your
25 counsel wants to have you believe they don't do

1 affordable housing. I happen to know that's all they
2 do. They're Connecticut Housing Partners, charter
3 member, NeighborWorks America, a national affordable
4 housing organization. And their mission is to create
5 and sustain innovative housing and revitalize
6 neighborhoods.

7 So again, counsel is saying that they
8 have no mission doing that. The real issue is that
9 they were very involved. And two weeks ago I did get
10 a call from staff, and the staff knew everything, but
11 apparently there was coordinating that did suggest
12 that they should withdraw from the project. And for
13 the public record, they have withdrawn and they are no
14 longer involved in the project.

15 But I do want the Historic Council to
16 know, it's not about them as a developer. What
17 they're trying to do is deflect from the information
18 that we do have feasible alternatives. There's
19 affordable housing resources out there, whether it's
20 Connecticut Housing Partners or whoever it turns out
21 to be, who can rehab these properties. So I did want
22 to get that out.

23 At the outset here, I do want to be
24 really clear. We are not against the development nor
25 the density. Nor even this developer. I used to live

1 in the South End, and they've done a lot of work, and
2 they're a very credible developer. I've had
3 interactions with Ted and the rest of the staff.
4 They're very capable of doing some major developments
5 in the town. We're not here to try to stop any of
6 that.

7 Jane, I don't know if you want to put
8 up the PowerPoint now so we can . . .

9 So our focus, again, is not against
10 development nor the developer. It is laser focused.
11 Laser focused only on the possibility of rehabbing
12 these three properties. And the key question
13 everybody asks, Why can't rehabilitation reside side
14 by side with new construction? Phil Barlow will go
15 through a little -- a proposed site plan.

16 Jane, if you can move forward, the
17 next slide.

18 I think you already saw the photos. I
19 do want to say, the photo on the left, the annex, yes,
20 counsel was absolutely right, it is considered right
21 now a noncontributing resource because in 1986 it did
22 not have the time period. If we went back and amended
23 the South End National Register District, it would be
24 a contributing resource. I don't want council to get
25 lost, oh, it's not contributing, therefore it should

1 be demolished. I do want to make that statement.

2 If you'd go to the next slide, Jane.

3 As Sara and as everybody has already
4 said, in 2016 they were here with two other buildings,
5 and they really didn't have a plan. Their plan was
6 just to demolish the properties. Counsel, with -- I
7 was reading the presentation and they want the council
8 to believe that the council didn't want -- didn't have
9 enough information to make a decision. There was no
10 vote that day because BLT's attorney worked out a
11 compromise, and part of that compromise was to save
12 the buildings and to work with the community, which
13 did not happen. We actually had a couple of follow-up
14 meetings, Preservation Trust, a couple of follow-up
15 meetings with a couple of developers, but then
16 everybody stopped. So as SHPO said in their
17 introductory, we really have not heard from them, and
18 there's been huge vigilance on the part of the
19 community trying to figure out what was going on until
20 now.

21 As they laid out, the demo plan is
22 really talking about a widening of Garden Street,
23 which, again, counsel will have you believe that
24 everybody approved this and wants this to happen. The
25 reality is, unless I missed the point here, it's being

1 funded, or a part of, by the developer. I'm not aware
2 of the city funding any of this. I could be wrong,
3 and I'd be happy to hear if I am.

4 When we did bring up about the
5 widening, the only thing we brought up was, well,
6 okay, great, if widening is really that important,
7 let's see a study, let's try to figure out is this a
8 reality. I know the community is going to testify on
9 that. And we really basically said -- what the city
10 said, and they will do one, but it's not until after
11 BLT actually submits their final plan for engineering,
12 for site plan approval. Well, folks, that's not going
13 to happen for a while, and they're not submitting
14 anything. So you are making a decision before that
15 happens.

16 Final piece, which was not known until
17 the proposal, was about PCBs. I will come back to
18 that. I did read the report.

19 Before we go into that, I'm surprised
20 there wasn't a whole lot of talk about complete
21 streets. Phil Barlow will follow me and talk, in the
22 next slide, about what the complete streets are, and
23 why -- that we could do it on a one-way street. So I
24 do want everybody to understand that.

25 Dave Goslin will follow, talking about

1 the design. Then I'll come back up talking a little
2 about the financing.

3 Next slide. Go ahead, Phil.

4 MR. BARLOW: Good morning. My name is
5 Phil Barlow. I'm a principal with todesign, landscape
6 architects, in New Britain, Connecticut. We're
7 celebrating our 33rd year in business this year.

8 We frequently are called upon to do
9 mobility planning for towns and municipalities.
10 Recently we've done a pedestrian corridor study,
11 limitations for Pratt Street in Hartford. Also a
12 bicycle master plan for New Britain.

13 So we were asked to review Garden
14 Street for its potential as a complete street using
15 the existing right-of-way, and also to look at the
16 site for its potential of being developed while still
17 maintaining the historic resources.

18 What is a complete street? It's a
19 term we all have heard. One definition is complete
20 streets are designed to enable safe access for all
21 users. Pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, and bus
22 riders of all ages and abilities. So it's a street
23 that provides for different types of mobility and a
24 variety of mobility types.

25 The overriding goals typically are

1 three: Safety; as I mentioned, multimodal use; and
2 incorporation of public spaces.

3 Planners and designers have a lot of
4 tools in their toolbox to make this happen. A road
5 diet is one tool that is also used, narrowing the
6 pavement. Traffic calming, enhanced sidewalk zones,
7 lighting, bike lanes.

8 Next slide.

9 So as Brad said, the question has come
10 up, does a complete street have to be a two-way
11 street? I have found no guideline or code or even
12 suggestion that a complete street has to be a two-way
13 street. As a matter of fact, the project I mentioned
14 that we have worked on in Hartford, Pratt Street --
15 many of you may know Pratt Street -- is an extremely
16 successful project and a complete street that is in
17 fact one way.

18 Next slide.

19 So we did look at some ways to enhance
20 Garden Street as, again, a complete street using the
21 existing right-of-way. I will say it is a challenge.
22 It's a 34-foot right-of-way, which is very small. But
23 our proposal on the left does keep the street as
24 one-way. We have been able to greatly enhance the
25 pedestrian zone with widened sidewalks, street trees,

1 ornamental pavements, and ornamental lighting. And
2 that's both sides of Garden Street.

3 We do have one-way traffic, and we've
4 incorporated that traffic lane as a share road,
5 another mobility term. Share road simply means a
6 shared right-of-way. So that traffic lane would be
7 shared with bicycles, very common treatment. The
8 street would be marked with share road signs
9 signifying to drivers that the street is shared, and
10 bicyclists are as important as motorists.

11 We would also have one or two speed
12 tables in that traffic lane to slow down traffic,
13 which has been expressed as a goal for Garden Street.

14 Next slide.

15 So the second piece of what we were
16 asked to do was to look at the development potential
17 of the site, saving, preserving the existing historic
18 resources. I'll say right off this is certainly not a
19 plan, it's an idea, a quick overview of what may
20 happen. Looking at this plan, it's a little dense,
21 but if you look at the center of the page, that's the
22 block that we're discussing. Garden Street is the
23 street with the street trees towards the bottom of the
24 plan.

25 The buildings in the dark brown

1 shading, those are the historic resources, the three
2 buildings that are under discussion. Those are all
3 preserved. And the lighter buildings are potential
4 buildings that can be put on the site, probably as
5 residential buildings. That's what the city Master
6 Plan and the city discussions have been to date, that
7 those would be preferred residential buildings. Under
8 what's being discussed with the proposed zoning
9 regulations, those could be as much as 20 stories and
10 could house as many as 800 apartments.

11 So again, no, we don't want anyone to
12 zero in on the details. We're simply trying to show
13 that the site can be developed preserving the existing
14 buildings.

15 Dave?

16 MR. GOSLIN: Thanks, Phil.

17 My name is Dave Goslin. I'm a
18 principal of Crosskey Architects. Crosskey Architects
19 is a Hartford-based firm with 36 years of experience
20 in multifamily housing, adaptive reuse, historic
21 preservation, and rehabilitation.

22 We were contacted by the Preservation
23 Connecticut to take a look at these three buildings
24 that are in question and in danger of demolition to
25 see what we can kind of come up with, with a program

1 to fit the buildings out for future use.

2 One of the things we were not able to
3 do, we were not given access into any of the
4 buildings, so we don't have firsthand account of
5 what's on the inside. So what we can do and what
6 we've done in the past, and were pretty successful, we
7 go online with the town records and we can get the
8 footprint of the building based on the property cards.
9 And from that we can draw a scaled footprint of the
10 building layout. With our experience and abilities,
11 we can then carry that forward and do test fits to see
12 what would actually fit in the buildings.

13 Of the three buildings, obviously 650
14 Atlantic Avenue would be the biggest of the
15 challenges, because that would be a reuse, converting
16 a factory to a mixed-use building. This would be what
17 we figure to be 49 units of apartments with a
18 commercial component at the street level, 4,000 square
19 feet. Based on our experience, it's a relatively easy
20 fit and comfortable fit, and would work well as
21 apartments given the building configuration. We would
22 keep the full L-shaped arrangement and not propose to
23 tear anything off the back of the building down.

24 Jane, if you can move on to the next
25 slide, please.

1 130 Henry Street is a little bit more
2 straightforward. That's an existing wood-frame
3 structure, multifamily. We would continue to kind of
4 use it in that same capacity. Based on the footprints
5 we assume we can get three apartments in there. We
6 can get a two-bedroom flat in the first and second
7 floors, and a three-bedroom flat underneath the gable
8 roof up on the third floor.

9 Moving forward, Jane, to the next
10 slide, please.

11 This is the plan showing 79 Garden
12 Street. Again, it's an existing two-family structure,
13 three stories. We would continue the use of this
14 building as a two-family, getting a two-bedroom unit
15 on the first floor and a three-bedroom unit occupying
16 the second and third floor, which would have the main
17 living space on the second floor and some bedrooms up
18 on the third floor underneath the gable.

19 So based on our review of the
20 buildings and the properties, we really see this being
21 that there is potential for feasible and prudent
22 alternatives --

23 MS. WISNIEWSKI: You have 5 minutes
24 left of your allotted time.

25 MR. GOSLIN: Okay. Thank you.

1 So that really kind of completes my
2 portion of this, and I will turn it back over to Brad.

3 MR. SCHIDE: Jane, can you go to the
4 next slide.

5 The next slide -- and since I have
6 limited time, I just want to say, again, they're
7 saying there's no feasible alternative. There is.
8 This is a possible feasible alternative. Whether it's
9 Connecticut Housing Partners or any other developer --
10 in fact, by the way, if they don't want to use
11 historic credits, they don't want to go through the
12 public sector, the developer can develop this
13 themselves. Yes, it's even faster. They just rehab
14 it and they wouldn't need to go through this. But the
15 purpose of this exercise is to let you know that there
16 is public resources out there to do that.

17 Jane, can you go to the next slide.

18 So what I want to end on, and I will
19 submit this for the record, I did review the Fuss &
20 O'Neill report in quite detail, and I just want the
21 Historic Council to read it as well. You know, I've
22 been involved in projects like this. I'll just read
23 parts of it to conclude my testimony.

24 Fuss & O'Neill report does not require
25 demolition of any portion of the Blickensderfer or the

1 annex, but rather it simply documents the
2 concentrations of PCBs which were found partially
3 under the building. In fact, the majority of the PCB
4 contamination was found to be outside the building's
5 footprint. The proposed demolition of the annex
6 appears to be an owner decision.

7 Now, I'm not an environmental
8 consultant, but if you look at the Fuss & O'Neill
9 report on page 13, Section 3.1, it's describing the
10 EPA's Toxic Control Act and its requirements. Goes
11 through extensively, and then it says, in parentheses,
12 except to areas where the concrete floors serve as a
13 cap and render the soil inaccessible.

14 On the same page, Direct Exposure
15 Criteria. There's a whole process of removing PCBs,
16 which, again, are dangerous, I agree. But it
17 outlines -- Fuss & O'Neill report says: Unless the
18 soil is rendered inaccessible and has a land use
19 restriction recorded to assure that PCB-impacted soil
20 is not disturbed.

21 DEEP nor EPA is going to require a
22 demolition of a property to remove environmental
23 contamination below a site. In fact, it even goes
24 further and defines soil located beneath the building
25 more than 2 feet below a concrete surface is

1 considered inaccessible. Counsel just said it's 18
2 feet below.

3 So I guess what I want to just
4 conclude my report on, and I did submit this for the
5 record, the slab of the annex, or basement, I don't
6 know, again, we weren't given access, would, in our
7 opinion, serve as the cap to and would not have to be
8 removed. Now, if that building's removed, they have
9 more money to spend because they do have to follow all
10 the guidelines of soil removal. And keep in mind, if
11 you allow the demolition of the annex, which they
12 claim is not historic, you are still demolishing 130
13 as part of the road widening, which is contributing.

14 So -- anyway, so that's -- I think
15 we've made our case. I mean, just to reiterate the
16 points, I think we have been very consistent with
17 safety and welfare, and --

18 MS. WISNIEWSKI: One minute.

19 MR. SCHIDE: We've also posed a
20 feasible alternative, although the developer could use
21 their own money and go a lot faster for sure.

22 We did challenge the notion that
23 something has to be remediated. I would like to see
24 something from DEEP or EPA that really requires the
25 demolition of these properties, which you don't have.

1 I congratulate them trying to save
2 part of Blickensderfer, but I think we can save all of
3 it. And the widening of Garden, again, we don't know
4 what the requirements are and where this came from.

5 So with that, I'll conclude my
6 presentation.

7 MS. MONTANERO: Brad, I just wanted to
8 add that the role of Preservation Connecticut is to
9 support the local efforts. So we're -- of course we
10 support the development. We'd like to work with the
11 developers. We're not planning to stop --

12 MS. WISNIEWSKI: You're out of time.

13 MS. MONTANERO: -- the development,
14 and we support --

15 CHAIR NELSON: All right. Thank you,
16 Brad and Jane and Dave.

17 I want to next ask council members for
18 questions with any of the material that's been
19 presented in this last presentation from Preservation
20 Connecticut.

21 Margaret Faber? You need to unmute
22 yourself, Margaret.

23 MS. FABER: I'm not sure if anyone
24 from the city is on the line that can answer these
25 questions.

1 So I also had a question about -- the
2 word "must" is used quite often, and "shall." That
3 sort of implies a mandate that they must create a
4 complete street and they must remediate the building.

5 And so I wanted to just follow up to
6 be sure that the complete street could be accomplished
7 if it is required while retaining the buildings. And
8 as I understand from the ordinance, Article 7 says
9 that they're only really required to create a complete
10 street if they're undertaking a greater transportation
11 improvement project, and I don't think that's the
12 focus of this development necessarily.

13 And just the last point is that I'm
14 surprised that Preservation Connecticut wasn't given
15 access because it was part of our agreement with the
16 developer, it's on page 720 of the packet, that they
17 would have access to the buildings.

18 So three sort of unrelated things.

19 CHAIR NELSON: Let's break them down
20 and try to get answers one by one.

21 To the question about the complete
22 street and the mandate for the complete street, can
23 somebody address that first?

24 MR. BLESSING: Yes. Ralph Blessing
25 here. I'm the land use bureau chief for the City of

1 Stamford. We're responsible for all the planning.

2 My knowledge about nuts and bolts of
3 the traffic planning, that's with the Transportation
4 Bureau, but I can try to answer the question.

5 So Garden Street is a substandard
6 street. It is very narrow. And obviously what we're
7 looking to do is, if there is an opportunity to bring
8 streets up to par, we like to take that opportunity.

9 There have been significant
10 transportation improvements in the area. We have the
11 Urban Transitway, which was a multimillion dollar
12 investment by the city. The state has invested
13 several million dollars in widening the Atlantic
14 Street underpass under the railroad and I-95. So
15 obviously we want to make sure that whatever
16 development is happening here will not impact on the
17 improvements we already did.

18 So as was said before, the applicant,
19 when they come to us for development proposal, they
20 will have to do a traffic study, and they have to
21 demonstrate that the widening of Garden Street is
22 indeed necessary. However, based on the projected
23 size of the development, I would think that Garden
24 Street would have to be improved to make access to the
25 building.

1 And the other point, of course, is
2 that Garden Street is a substandard street, and when
3 we have the opportunity we want to bring them up to
4 standard with city requirements. One of the examples
5 that we've just seen, and I acknowledge obviously that
6 you can do a lot with what you have, but one of the
7 issues in the South End is on-street parking. And
8 adding bike lanes, for example, would take away
9 on-street parking. That is a big issue for the
10 residents of the area.

11 So our desire is to bring city streets
12 up to par, to not sabotage what we did with our
13 transportation improvements. If that means that
14 everything -- or that the annex needs to come down or
15 that the buildings have to come down at the
16 intersection of Henry and Garden Street, we haven't
17 made a final determination yet.

18 CHAIR NELSON: I just want to clarify.
19 We're talking about the difference between a two-way
20 street and one-way street, the presentation
21 represented by the trust.

22 Atlantic Street itself, a
23 two-directional street, is that sufficient for the
24 proposed development? Is there -- I understand the
25 needing to improve Garden Street from its substandard

1 condition, but does it have to be improved from one
2 lane to two lanes? Or is Atlantic Street sufficient
3 to handle the traffic?

4 MR. BLESSING: Once again, it requires
5 a thorough study. But obviously if the access, the
6 main access from -- to the proposed building is from
7 Atlantic Street -- Atlantic Street is one of the main
8 connectors between downtown and the South End. So if
9 you would add a lot of like left-turning traffic to
10 get into the development or out of the development,
11 that would certainly impact on traffic on Atlantic
12 Street. There's also city plans to widen Atlantic
13 Street further south of the site. It won't become a
14 four-lane street. We would be adding left --
15 dedicated left-turn lanes south of that. Because we
16 recognize there are issues with Atlantic Street.

17 CHAIR NELSON: Okay.

18 Margaret, we went through one of your
19 questions, but not all of them. Can you go back to --
20 you had three points you were making.

21 MS. FABER: Right. I would just
22 wonder if anyone can answer Brad's suggestion that
23 perhaps the building doesn't need to be fully
24 remediated if there's a cap over the PCBs. That's
25 question 2.

1 MR. ROBERTSON: If Mr. Danielson is
2 available, perhaps he can answer that.

3 MR. DANIELSON: Yes, I can answer that
4 question.

5 As I mentioned, this site has not only
6 PCBs but many other contaminants that in some cases
7 are equally as bad actors. The capping can be done
8 for certain contaminants, such as metals, petroleum,
9 and that kind of thing. PCB regulations are totally
10 different under TSCA. They do not allow you to keep
11 anything greater than 10 parts per million, as
12 enforced by EPA Region 1.

13 So we have remediated multiple sites
14 in the South End for PCBs, and EPA has set a
15 precedence on all of those sites that anything higher
16 than 10 ppm has to come out. This has happened on the
17 main Pitney Bowes manufacturing site, the Gateway
18 site, the Yale & Towne site, as well as the Waterside
19 School site. In every case they required anything
20 greater than 10 to come out. So other contaminants
21 can be capped, they can be rendered inaccessible. But
22 there are separate more strict rules for PCBs.

23 CHAIR NELSON: Margaret, you had a
24 third point?

25 MS. FABER: Third question was why

1 Preservation Connecticut not able to access the
2 buildings, because we specified that they should have
3 access in the agreement that we made with the
4 developer.

5 MR. ROBERTSON: I'd like Ted to answer
6 that question.

7 MR. FERRARONE: Preservation
8 Connecticut has had access to the buildings. We let
9 them have access in 2016. And as I said, nothing has
10 happened in the buildings since 2016. Brad just
11 talked about how he has been through it in the past.
12 So I'm just not sure of the reference.

13 MS. FABER: In the agreement that we
14 signed in 2016 with the developer, access was supposed
15 to be given. It's on page 720. And I don't know if
16 they tried to get access and were denied. But it says
17 access to all five structures will be granted to the
18 NHP and/or the Connecticut Trust for Historic
19 Preservation and Preservation Connecticut.

20 MR. ROBERTSON: I think he answered
21 that. But, Ted, why don't you say it again as to what
22 access was in fact given.

23 MR. FERRARONE: As far as I know,
24 access has been given. There has not been a request
25 in the last 3 or 4 years that I am aware of. I'm not

1 aware of anything. But anything can happen inside
2 those buildings since the previous sidewalks.

3 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you.

4 Are there other council member
5 questions? Kathy Maher?

6 MS. MAHER: Thanks. I want to echo
7 what Margaret said earlier. It seems like we're just
8 reliving this 2016 meeting, as we anticipated some
9 things to happen. I think that it's safe to say that
10 the road is subpar based on the visual plan that's
11 being put out by BLT, okay, that's fine. But we're
12 not taking into consideration that it might be quite
13 par based on a community-supported vision that
14 preserves the buildings.

15 So again, there hasn't been a full
16 study, I believe. Mr. Blessing just said there hasn't
17 been a formal study that actually supports either of
18 these projects. So we really don't have any
19 justifiable evidence that supports either of these
20 things.

21 Again, if you're going to do a major
22 development, you need a bigger road. If this
23 maintains itself the way it's being reflected by
24 Preservation, is that road enough? I think that's a
25 question that needs to be answered before that moves

1 forward.

2 So is there any more information on
3 this? It was supposed to come after 2016 and we still
4 haven't seen it.

5 MR. ROBERTSON: Can I ask Lisa to
6 respond to that.

7 MS. FEINBERG: I'm lucky enough to do
8 a lot of large-scale developments in the City of
9 Stamford. I can tell you unequivocally, and I think
10 Mr. Blessing would back this up, that the Stamford
11 Transportation Bureau dictates what a road is going to
12 look like and what a complete street is going to look
13 like. The complete street that's been given to you,
14 the design that's been provided, came directly from
15 Mr. Travers. You should have also received a letter
16 from Mr. Travers confirming his plan and desires for
17 Garden Street. So I don't think there's any question
18 about what will be required.

19 I also note we don't need a traffic
20 study to know that a site adjacent to the busiest
21 train station in the state of Connecticut requires
22 circulation, strong circulation.

23 We're also -- the plan that was put on
24 by Preservation Connecticut includes two 20-story
25 towers. That is a large-scale development. It would

1 require this type of access.

2 MS. MAHER: I appreciate your comment
3 on that. But we do need a report in this case to
4 validate that. On page 925 of the original meeting,
5 Mr. Freeman, discussing the vision for the plan, says,
6 We won't file a plan until we have a clear vision with
7 the community discussion and what makes sense for the
8 project.

9 So I think that a -- evidence of a
10 plan would have helped support that.

11 MR. ROBERTSON: May I respond to that,
12 Madam Chair, briefly?

13 CHAIR NELSON: Yes, Mr. Robertson.

14 MR. ROBERTSON: I note several council
15 members keep referring to the 2016 hearing and plan.
16 What we have tried to explain to you and present is
17 that an enormous amount of work and effort have gone
18 in during the past four years to come up with a
19 virtually totally different proposal that preserves
20 most of the buildings that had been discussed in 2016.
21 And that it involves other additional facts.

22 So I -- it hurts to be held to what
23 was done in 2016 when this is a really fresh look. In
24 fact, it's our position that the only reasonable
25 prudent and feasible alternatives to what was done in

1 2016 is what we're presenting to you today. That's
2 what we're presenting to you now, is the new
3 substantially changed proposal.

4 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you,
5 Mr. Robertson.

6 Are there other questions?

7 MR. GILVARG: This is Karyn Gilvarg.

8 I'm curious as to whether the proposal
9 to widen Garden Street came originally from the
10 developer or from the city. Because the city asserts
11 there has been no traffic study yet. And logically
12 one might expect a change of the street from one-way
13 to two-way, for instance, would come based on some
14 evidence. So did BLT propose to widen the street
15 first using the city's complete streets standards?

16 MS. FEINBERG: It is my understanding
17 that when BLT began discussions about the potential
18 redevelopment of this site, it was made very clear to
19 BLT by the city that the widening of the road would be
20 required.

21 MS. GILVARG: I just want to follow
22 up.

23 And the city required that it become
24 two-way? I mean, that seems to favor one mode of
25 transportation, automobiles, over bicycles and over

1 pedestrians.

2 MS. FEINBERG: For the record, Lisa
3 Feinberg again.

4 The complete street actually includes
5 the accommodation of all modes of travel, including
6 very wide sidewalks, well lit with landscaping, bike
7 lanes on both sides, ADA-compliant sidewalks, parking,
8 as well as two-way traffic. So it doesn't favor the
9 vehicles, but it does accommodate them for sure.

10 And, yes, the design came directly
11 from the City of Stamford.

12 MS. GILVARG: It allocates more to the
13 automobiles.

14 MS. FEINBERG: I'm happy to bring up
15 the image if that would be helpful.

16 MS. GILVARG: It increases the number
17 of lanes. It increases the width and square footage
18 devoted to cars.

19 MS. FEINBERG: It does increase the
20 width of the square footage devoted to cars. However,
21 it also increases the width and square footage devoted
22 to pedestrians, and the width and square footage
23 dedicated to bicyclists.

24 So the purpose is to accommodate all
25 of these modes of travel, not just vehicles. But,

1 yes, it does accommodate vehicles in the safest
2 possible manner. Again, because it is adjacent to the
3 Stamford Transportation Center.

4 As Mr. Blessing noted, Atlantic Street
5 is a very well traveled street, especially in that
6 intersection with the train station. So it's very
7 important to TTP to insure the safety of all. I can
8 tell you, and I think Mr. Blessing would confirm this
9 to be true, that the Transportation Bureau of the City
10 of Stamford is hyper focused on pedestrian safety.

11 MR. BLESSING: Yes. Ralph Blessing
12 for the City of Stamford.

13 There was a discussion about the
14 widening of Garden Street that happened between the
15 Transportation Bureau and developers. I cannot
16 confirm who asked first for what. Generally speaking,
17 with other projects the city is taking the opportunity
18 to ask developers for improvements to streets. In
19 this case, the widening of the street would happen on
20 BLT property.

21 One point about the two-way versus the
22 one-way -- this is something I heard from
23 Transportation Bureau chief, so put that as a caveat.
24 But it is his strong position, and I believe there's
25 also studies, that two-way streets are safer than

1 one-way streets. We actually do have an argument
2 currently with BLT about some streets in the South End
3 that they would like to become one-way streets, and
4 we, the city, for traffic considerations, actually
5 want them to keep them as two-way streets. So I think
6 the -- we believe, the city believes, inherently that
7 two-way streets are safer than one-way streets.

8 CHAIR NELSON: I'm just going to
9 interject that we have about 3 and a half minutes left
10 for council member questions for the Preservation
11 Connecticut presentation before we move on to taking
12 in public comments from others who have signed up to
13 speak.

14 That said, are there other questions?

15 MS. GILVARG: I just want to clarify
16 with Brad Schide. The developer that was working with
17 you withdrew as a potential developer, but they did
18 not retract any of the information that was provided
19 to Connecticut Trust. Is that correct?

20 MR. SCHIDE: That's correct. We
21 actually did the budgets together. But, no, their
22 call to me was that they had to be -- had to leave the
23 project and withdraw, and they wanted me, for the
24 public record, make a statement, and staff was very
25 agreeable, but I guess this came from their board.

1 That's all I know.

2 MS. GILVARG: Thank you.

3 CHAIR NELSON: Leah Glaser, you're
4 raising your hand?

5 DR. GLASER: A question to, I guess,
6 for Barlow and Brad.

7 The proposal from Preservation
8 Connecticut was -- consisted of additional buildings
9 that could be quite high. I was wondering what the
10 thoughts were on putting in buildings of that height
11 in this Historic District in terms of -- and what,
12 also I guess, the City of Stamford's zoning
13 regulations are for this Historic District and
14 building heights and things like.

15 MR. SCHIDE: Let me start and Phil
16 certainly can jump in.

17 The direction -- the only reason we
18 showed that is that I wanted everyone to understand
19 that the developer was not limited. At the end of the
20 day, I doubt they're going to be able to do 800 units.
21 They're going to have to do huge parking garages.
22 But -- I don't know what their -- I guess the point
23 is, I don't know what their plan is. The only point
24 of that -- Phil was very clear. We're not trying to
25 design the site for them, nor are we trying to comply

1 with zoning. We were just saying under the current
2 zoning if they wanted to they could build towers
3 pretty much as high as they want. Whether it fits in
4 with the neighborhood, that wasn't really our
5 challenge -- that wasn't our task.

6 Phil, I don't know if you want to add
7 to that or not.

8 MR. BARLOW: I'll just add that --
9 actually the proposed zoning for the site that's being
10 proposed by the city, we've been assured by city
11 planners that that's going to happen, that would allow
12 20 stories. Again, as Brad said, we're not
13 necessarily endorsing a 20-story building. We're just
14 trying to show what development potential for that
15 site is, yeah.

16 DR. GLASER: So the city, used as
17 proposed zoning, would allow something like that, even
18 though -- not necessarily recommend, but would allow?

19 MR. BARLOW: Correct.

20 CHAIR NELSON: We just hit 20 minutes.
21 I'm going to close this portion of the council's
22 questions and turn the meeting over now to the public
23 who have signed up to speak.

24 Marena, do you have a copy of that
25 list in front of you?

1 MS. WISNIEWSKI: I do.

2 CHAIR NELSON: Can you read off the
3 names in the order, and just -- this is a reminder.
4 It's a 3-minute presentation. As you speak, we just
5 ask you to state your name and your affiliation for
6 the record.

7 MS. WISNIEWSKI: The first person is
8 Ralph Blessing from the City of Stamford. Then Judy
9 Norinsky from Historic Neighborhood Preservation,
10 Robert Danielson from Fuss & O'Neill --

11 CHAIR NELSON: Why don't you call
12 them --

13 MS. WISNIEWSKI: As we go?

14 CHAIR NELSON: Yes.

15 MS. WISNIEWSKI: Ralph Blessing from
16 the City of Stamford.

17 MR. BLESSING: Hi. Thank you for
18 giving me the opportunity to speak to you today. As I
19 said before, my name is Ralph Blessing. I'm the land
20 use bureau chief for the City of Stamford, so
21 responsible for all things planning and zoning in the
22 City of Stamford.

23 I would like to read a letter from our
24 mayor, David Martin. That should be in your records.
25 It was sent to you by the end of last week.

1 Here's the letter to Mr. Todd Levine,
2 Historian, State Historic Preservation Office. Re:
3 650 Atlantic Street, Blickensderfer Building.

4 (As read) Stamford has been most
5 fortunate as we have prospered greatly over the past
6 decade. This in no small way has been tied to the
7 city's ability to see the many possibilities for our
8 future while also embracing the values of our past.
9 With that said, we recognize how important it is for
10 us to share with you our perspective regarding 650
11 Atlantic Street.

12 In 2018 the City of Stamford conducted
13 a South End Neighborhood Study. The study recognized
14 650 Atlantic Street as being ideally situated as a
15 site where growth should be embraced. Given its
16 proximity to our Transportation Center, it is ideal
17 for transit-oriented development-like model to be
18 considered.

19 The study also identified the original
20 Blickensderfer Building as a structure we should take
21 efforts to preserve. The city recognizes that
22 repurposing existing building stock has many benefits
23 which must be considered in conjunction with costs and
24 benefits of new construction. In the case of 650
25 Atlantic, we believe the Blickensderfer Building

1 should, if possible, remain as a symbol of Stamford's
2 heritage, allowing the city to preserve an important
3 vestige of Stamford's industrial past. If that is not
4 possible, the much needed investments into the city's
5 Historic Trust Fund would serve as a valuable resource
6 in preserving many other important historic assets.

7 MS. WISNIEWSKI: One minute.

8 MR. BLESSING: As we embrace both
9 change and preservation, the city has made appropriate
10 revisions to its zoning regulations and Master Plan to
11 create a community where a vision of these changes can
12 become a reality. As these changes evolve, it will
13 possibly impact on other assets in the community.
14 Most likely be impacted would include the adjacent
15 corridor to the Blickensderfer Building, Garden
16 Street. This street will likely need to be
17 redesigned. The city is supportive of plans to ensure
18 the changes are congruent with pedestrian and
19 vehicular safety.

20 We understand the economic impact and
21 benefits of historic preservation, and know that we
22 must care for the city's history and sense of place.
23 We believe in the general public, community
24 development, and the City of Stamford can successfully
25 ensure that archeological, cultural, and historic

1 resources are recognized and sensitively managed for
2 the benefit of the entire community.

3 Very truly yours, David R. Martin,
4 Mayor of the City of Stamford.

5 Thank you.

6 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you,
7 Mr. Blessing.

8 Marena, the next person?

9 We should say that was in favor of
10 preservation. So in favor of referral?

11 MR. BLESSING: It is in favor of
12 balanced development.

13 CHAIR NELSON: Okay. To be clear, we
14 are taking people in favor of referral and opposed to
15 the referral in alternate measures.

16 Marena?

17 MS. WISNIEWSKI: So in favor of
18 referring the matter to the attorney general, Judy
19 Norinsky.

20 CHAIR NELSON: Is Judy on the line?

21 MS. WISNIEWSKI: Judy is on the line.

22 Judy, can you unmute yourself?

23 MS. NORINSKY: Do you have my
24 PowerPoint presentation?

25 MS. WISNIEWSKI: Yes.

1 MS. NORINSKY: I'm just going to tell
2 you which slides to look at as I narrate.

3 First of all, thank you for hearing my
4 comments. I had already submitted previous testimony
5 to Todd, so you should have that, too.

6 The first slide -- I'm just going to
7 look at it here, too, so I know what I'm talking
8 about --

9 MR. LEVINE: We're trying to put that
10 in the chat right now for your convenience.

11 MS. NORINSKY: Thank you. So I don't
12 have to share on my screen?

13 MR. LEVINE: We're going to share a
14 screen so you can see. It won't fit in the group
15 chat. It's too big.

16 CHAIR NELSON: Is there any part of
17 your presentation you can give?

18 MS. NORINSKY: I can read it.

19 CHAIR NELSON: We see an image now.
20 The Remains of Manufacturing in the South End.

21 MS. NORINSKY: Yes. Okay. So I'm
22 going to be speaking about three of the big companies
23 that manufactured products in the South End. Yale &
24 Towne, Pitney Bowes, and Blickensderfer for Schick.
25 Four companies, I guess.

1 Next slide, please.

2 Okay. Sorry, I was looking at the
3 wrong thing.

4 This and the next couple of slides
5 just give you a general sense of the reduced area of
6 manufacturing over the years.

7 Next slide, please. That's 1934.
8 1965.

9 Next slide, 2007.

10 Next slide, please.

11 This is a map of properties that have
12 been demolished, in red.

13 Next slide.

14 So Yale & Towne, the Yale Lock Company
15 was formed in 1961 in Shelburne, Massachusetts.

16 I'm going to shorten some of my
17 narrative since I have less time.

18 They instituted a modern factory
19 system, and within 25 years the company dominated
20 Stamford's economy, becoming the largest employer with
21 150 workers by its third year, a thousand by 1892, and
22 5,000 by 1916. By 1892 Yale & Towne had 21 acres,
23 eventually constructing more than 50 buildings and
24 topping out at 25 acres and continued to grow until
25 1959.

1 Next slide.

2 Most of the buildings were lost. Some
3 were demolished.

4 Next slide.

5 Some lost to fire.

6 Next slide.

7 Today only three buildings remain.

8 Next slide.

9 MS. WISNIEWSKI: One minute.

10 MS. NORINSKY: Okay. I'm just going
11 to go through this. Please just click through the
12 slides so that you can see what was demolished.

13 This is Blickensderfer Typewriter
14 Factory.

15 Next slide.

16 Next slide.

17 Originally there were more buildings
18 on this site.

19 Next slide.

20 This is the Schick Annex.

21 Next slide.

22 Originally there were attachments to
23 the original Blickensderfer Building. All of this has
24 been --

25 MS. WISNIEWSKI: You're out of time.

1 MS. NORINSKY: Okay. Thank you.

2 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you, Judy.

3 MS. NORINSKY: You should have my text
4 at the end of the PowerPoint.

5 CHAIR NELSON: That will be made part
6 of the record officially, yes.

7 MS. NORINSKY: Thank you.

8 MR. LEVINE: Yes, it will.

9 CHAIR NELSON: Marena, the next
10 person?

11 MS. WISNIEWSKI: In nonfavor of
12 referring the matter, Robert Danielson.

13 CHAIR NELSON: Okay. Mr. Danielson.

14 MR. DANIELSON: Good afternoon. My
15 name is Robert Danielson. I'm a Connecticut licensed
16 environmental professional, a vice president of the
17 engineering firm Fuss & O'Neill. I have more than 34
18 years of experience remediating contaminated sites.

19 My reports have been submitted to SHPO
20 and are contained on pages 38 to 278, with an
21 executive summary on pages 38 and 39.

22 The site is contaminated with a host
23 of toxic chemicals, including PCBs, various volar
24 organic compounds, including TCE metals, as a result
25 of that historical manufacturing that dated back to

1 the late 1800s.

2 The PCB-impacted soil and TCE-impacted
3 groundwater extend under the eastern end of the
4 Blickensderfer Building and the Schick addition along
5 Garden Street.

6 Based on extensive soil sampling there
7 is an area of PCBs, shown in blue on the diagram, the
8 solid blue line, that must be remediated. The
9 excavation will be necessary to at least a depth of 18
10 feet in order to meet state standards. In order to
11 dig out that area, the excavation has to be sloped
12 back and the size of the excavation is anticipated to
13 be as shown in blue, the dashed blue line.

14 In addition, once the soil is dug out
15 there will be confirmatory soil samples that must meet
16 standard. If we don't meet standard, some additional
17 soil may need to be taken out until we do meet
18 standard. This is very common with PCB remediation
19 sites.

20 So under the supervision of both EPA
21 and DEP --

22 MS. WISNIEWSKI: One minute.

23 MR. DANIELSON: -- and pursuant to
24 2020 TSCA PCB work plan that we have prepared, it will
25 be necessary to demolish the eastern portion of the

1 Blickensderfer Building and the Schick addition to
2 properly remediate the site.

3 It is the intention of the owner to
4 damage as little as possible of the Blickensderfer
5 Building, and we estimate 70 percent of the building
6 can be saved and preserved.

7 I am certain that the site must be
8 remediated in accordance with state and federal law,
9 and I'm also certain that the remediation cannot
10 properly be completed without demolishing a minor
11 portion of the Blickensderfer Building and the Schick
12 addition.

13 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you. Thank you,
14 Mr. Danielson.

15 One quick question: Can the building
16 be supported above and the excavation that needs to
17 happen be conducted below?

18 MR. DANIELSON: So the scale of the
19 remediation and the depth of the remediation and the
20 size of the building and the condition of the
21 building, the answer is no. I have done that on other
22 sites with smaller areas of contamination, and they
23 were very, very tricky and dangerous. And in that
24 particular case, the groundwater actually became more
25 contaminated as some of the material was disturbed up

1 and we were not able to get it. So I'm certain this
2 is the right way to go with this situation.

3 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you.

4 Marena, the next person to speak?

5 MS. WISNIEWSKI: In favor of
6 referring, Ann Moore.

7 MS. MOORE: Hello. This is Ann Moore,
8 also known as Ann Goslin. Good afternoon. I am the
9 acting chair of Stamford Historic Preservation
10 Advisory Commission.

11 Thank you for your attention to
12 Stamford's contributing resources to the National
13 Register, South End Historic District.

14 The Stamford preservation community is
15 in favor of incorporating 130, 79 Garden, and 650
16 Atlantic Street in featured development plan. It's
17 disappointed that all three structures have been
18 neglected, as 126 and 128 Henry have not been
19 stabilized. Roofs and windows are open to the
20 elements and litter surrounds the buildings.

21 The Zoning Board certified obligation
22 dated September 7, 2018, requires BLT to rehabilitate
23 126 and 128 Henry Street for low-income housing.
24 These are not the only properties that have been
25 neglected or destroyed by BLT in violation of the

1 city's procedure, agreement, and plans.

2 In 2011 the boat yard was demolished
3 in violation of the Harbor Point Development Plan.
4 And 340 Washington Boulevard that was highlighted in
5 the 2018 South End Neighborhood Study was demolished
6 in April 2020, before the city's demolition process
7 ran its course.

8 The commission wishes to work with all
9 parties adhering to city and state regulations and
10 agreements to save extant industrial resources with
11 integrity and feasible alternatives to demolition.

12 Thank you.

13 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you.

14 Marena, the next speaker?

15 MS. WISNIEWSKI: Not in favor, Lisa
16 Feinberg.

17 MS. FEINBERG: Thank you, Madam
18 Chairwoman.

19 Again, for the record, my name is Lisa
20 Feinberg. For Stamford, as we mentioned, a complete
21 street requires safe accommodation for all modes of
22 travel, including pedestrians, bicyclists, and
23 motorcycles.

24 Again, this is the design that was
25 prepared by the City of Stamford Transportation

1 Bureau. As you can see, the existing right-of-way of
2 Garden Street is very narrow at approximately 34 feet,
3 and will require approximately 22 feet of BLT-owned
4 property to safely accommodate all of these users.

5 As you can see, Garden Street is
6 hardly complete today. It has very narrow, non-ADA
7 compliant sidewalks and alley-type field, no lighting,
8 no trees. This environment is not inviting, at least
9 not for the type of activity that residents want to
10 see outside their doors.

11 This is an article from just last
12 week, which features Garden Street just here in a
13 fatal shooting that took place along Garden Street.

14 As Mr. Travers noted in his letter,
15 which is provided on page 281 of your package, it is
16 well documented by transportation planners that
17 complete streets have repeatedly produced results,
18 enhanced safety, and reduced crime. This is why your
19 package included over a hundred emails and letters of
20 support from the residents and businesses in the area,
21 encouraging the proposed street improvements.

22 So when we talk about a community-
23 supported vision, the voices of those most impacted by
24 the proposal should not be ignored. Stamford's
25 Transportation Bureau has worked hard to enhance the

1 safety of the city, and we have a proven track record.

2 Because of the complete street policy
3 for calendar year 2019, Stamford saw the lowest number
4 of overall crashes in the city in the past 8 years,
5 the lowest bike-related crashes in the past 40 years,
6 and lower pedestrian fatalities than state or national
7 averages.

8 This is a life safety policy that
9 should be supported. Simply put, Preservation
10 Connecticut's complete street is an incomplete
11 amenities version, which does not satisfy the City of
12 Stamford's requirements. Each option squeezes or
13 eliminates a user group. There is no on-street
14 parking, which will never be supported by the adjacent
15 properties, which cannot accommodate parking within
16 their own property line.

17 A single vehicular lane next to the
18 busiest train station in the state and does not
19 contemplate loading for the retail use the city so
20 desires. Option A also has no dedicated bike lanes,
21 which is not an ideal safety position, as Mr. Barlow
22 noted as an underlying goal for any complete street.
23 And Option B has no amenity strip; no trees, no
24 lighting, no pedestrian protection, no snow shelf, and
25 reduced width of sidewalks, which is a problem for ADA

1 compliance perspective. There are more people biking
2 and walking than ever. This is not a time to cut
3 corners on a complete street. Even if we wanted to, I
4 assure you that the Transportation Bureau would not
5 allow it. It has been made very clear by them what
6 will be expected for Garden Street.

7 After hundreds of millions of dollars
8 of infrastructure have been invested --

9 MS. WISNIEWSKI: You're out of time.

10 MS. FEINBERG: Thank you.

11 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you. Can we have
12 the next speaker?

13 MS. WISNIEWSKI: In favor, Terry
14 Adams.

15 CHAIR NELSON: Mr. or Ms. Adams, your
16 speaker may be off.

17 MS. WISNIEWSKI: Mr. Adams?

18 CHAIR NELSON: Marena?

19 MS. WISNIEWSKI: We'll go to the next.

20 In favor, Wes Haynes.

21 MR. HAYNES: Hi. I'm coming on
22 visually right now.

23 I'm Wes Haynes. I'm a resident of
24 Stamford. And I support Preservation Connecticut's
25 position entirely. I think they made some really

1 terrific points today about what can be done with
2 Garden Street.

3 I just -- I didn't prepare anything
4 directly. I thought I would respond to some of the
5 things that have been said.

6 First, this destruction is entirely
7 unreasonable. It is demolition by neglect. BLT has
8 been doing nothing to do anything about protecting
9 these buildings since we last met with you in 2016.

10 Second, on the issue of widening
11 Garden Street, in terms of Commissioner Maher's
12 concern about community input, I participated several
13 years ago in the development of -- in the workshops in
14 the South End about the Stamford Master Plan, which is
15 our POCD. And it was never brought up as an objective
16 or desire to widen Garden Street. And in the recent
17 study that Mr. Blessing referred to that was done on
18 the South End, there was no clamor and there was no
19 recommendation in that study to widen Garden Street.
20 Garden Street is a short street that dumps out on the
21 Urban Transitway, which is a one-way street at that
22 point. It would be a dangerous place to bicycle. I
23 wouldn't want to enter the Urban Transitway that way.

24 Thirdly, regarding the houses, these
25 two houses that are endangered right now were once the

1 model that made the South End work, and they have been
2 reclaimed in many, many cities in New England. Just
3 look at Providence, Worcester, Burlington, Vermont.
4 Even in nearby New York, Newburg, New York, is doing
5 wonderful things with these houses. Waterbury has
6 done some things --

7 MS. WISNIEWSKI: One minute.

8 MR. HAYNES: They're a great model for
9 affordable housing. You should make every effort to
10 preserve them and put them back into service.

11 There's been much loss in the South
12 End. In 1979 I was a volunteer doing blue forms in
13 the neighborhood in preparation for the National
14 Register nomination.

15 Henry Street remains one of the most
16 intact streets in the South End. It's between Canal
17 and Atlantic Street. We must maintain these houses.

18 And it is not the only feasible
19 alternative, according to Attorney Robertson. We
20 could move the buildings. BLT has a large site here.
21 The buildings could be moved, if that is an outcome,
22 on the BLT site without encountering any wires.

23 I just wanted to make those points and
24 thank you very much for the opportunity to speak
25 today.

1 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you, Mr. Haynes.
2 Marena?

3 MS. WISNIEWSKI: Ted Ferrarone.

4 MR. FERRARONE: Hi. This is Ted
5 Ferrarone. Mentioned I'm the co-president of BLT.
6 We're the owners of the site and developer of the
7 Harbor Point project. I've been working down here on
8 the South End on the project for about 15 years. I'm
9 glad to have the opportunity to speak to this group
10 and clear up some of the confusion about the history.
11 And I'll respond to some of the claims in the
12 opposition's presentation.

13 One of the challenges when you put
14 together a site plan for something like the 650
15 Atlantic site is that we have to balance a very
16 complicated and competing set of priorities, including
17 historic preservation, which is why I'm here today.
18 But also environmental remediation, economic
19 development, the city's land use policies, and health
20 and safety of our neighbors. The other thing is that
21 we have to come up with a plan that is practically and
22 economically viable.

23 So as we've discussed earlier, in 2016
24 we did an earlier plan that had more demolition on the
25 site. As discussed already, we pulled that plan back.

1 In response to feedback from our neighbors, the local
2 community, the City of Stamford zoning board staff and
3 the zoning board, we incorporated significantly more
4 historic preservation into the site plan, including
5 Blickensderfer Building and the preservation of four
6 historic buildings on Henry Street, which Wes Haynes
7 just referenced, which we're going to turn into
8 first-class permanently deed-restricted affordable
9 housing.

10 That said, we obviously do have to
11 complete the environmental cleanup that's been going
12 on for more than a decade on this site.

13 We just looked at the street section.
14 That came from a direct response from our neighbors.
15 Lisa just referenced we have more than 100 support
16 letters as part of this process that came in during
17 recent hearings.

18 And none of this really works, as I
19 noted, without a plan that is economically viable. I
20 reviewed what was in the package, and, you know, we
21 built and financed a number of buildings here on the
22 South End. I think something like we built maybe
23 6,000 apartments in the last couple of years, both
24 here in Stamford and elsewhere. We've used tons of
25 historic tax credits. I think we actually completed

1 the largest residential historic tax credit
2 rehabilitation ever in the country.

3 MS. WISNIEWSKI: One minute.

4 MR. FERRARONE: So we're familiar with
5 tax credits. But in going through those projections,
6 the groups should just realize they don't work.
7 They're extremely unrealistic. They cover something
8 like 5 percent of the development costs of the
9 project. So 95 percent of the costs are unaddressed
10 in those projections.

11 And even when you go through them they
12 use 7 sources of public funding to create only 44
13 units of affordable housing. And I would point out
14 that our plan will create almost double that amount of
15 affordable housing without using any historic or any
16 public funding sources.

17 But regardless of the challenges and
18 the unrealistic nature of the financing package you've
19 seen, we pledge to restore the Blickensderfer Building
20 and the four historic buildings. We may not be able
21 to preserve every inch of those buildings and every
22 building on site, but we do think the current plan is
23 prudent and feasible, and can be executed so that
24 those buildings can be rehabbed. You know, frankly,
25 for us, we've taken a lot of community input on this.

1 We're trying to balance all these competing
2 constituents, and we think the plan is a compromise --

3 MS. WISNIEWSKI: You're out of time.

4 MR. FERRARONE: And we hope you'll
5 agree. Thanks for having me.

6 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you,
7 Mr. Ferrarone.

8 Quickly, Marena, we have half an hour
9 for this meeting. How many people do we have still to
10 speak, who haven't spoken yet?

11 MS. WISNIEWSKI: Nine.

12 CHAIR NELSON: Nine people? Okay.

13 There's a choice that can be made. We
14 will not be able to hear nine people before we need to
15 close the public testimony before council deliberates.

16 Mr. Robertson and Ms. Feinberg, in the
17 interest of allowing everybody a chance to speak,
18 would you allow this meeting to be continued to our
19 council's November meeting?

20 MR. ROBERTSON: No. We are all set to
21 go. I think we have two, maybe three other speakers
22 that can fit their testimony into 3 minutes. I think
23 we can proceed on your deadline.

24 CHAIR NELSON: Okay.

25 Marena, the next person.

1 MS. WISNIEWSKI: Representative David
2 Michele in favor of referring.

3 MR. MICHELE: Thank you. Thank you
4 for this, putting together this meeting. I'm David
5 Michele, State Representative for the 146th Housing
6 District. That includes the South End.

7 I did submit a written testimony back
8 in July, and I believe it is on the record. I hope
9 you can hear from my constituents and their concerns.
10 We would like to preserve the historical character of
11 the South End. It is quite clear that over a year ago
12 about two-thirds of the board of reps or elected
13 officials in the City of Stamford voted against some
14 revisions for zoning of BLT development. BLT
15 proceeded to sue the board of reps.

16 BLT and their representatives talk
17 about remediation. When they destroyed the historical
18 boat yard, no remediation was done for years. When
19 they practiced remediation for some of their lots,
20 they left piles of toxic soil uncovered for weeks,
21 potentially affecting the neighborhood's public
22 health.

23 Why do I mention this? Because it
24 reminds us that he's a developer and here for profit.
25 Proper remediation would have shown more respect to

1 the neighbors and the neighborhood.

2 Mr. Ferrarone mentioned they are
3 protecting historical buildings by putting planks of
4 plywood. The Queen Anne style houses on Henry Street
5 were let down for years, which is a practice all too
6 known for all on this call. Mr. Robertson says moving
7 the houses would reduce their historical value. So
8 why not maintain them properly? Especially if
9 concerned with their historical value. There is also
10 the question of blight to the historical district.
11 Also blight increases crime.

12 Brad Schide did stress the fact that
13 there are feasible alternatives. He did mention that
14 the densities was okay. But we cannot get the city to
15 come and clean the dust we get from the developments
16 around the residential street to keep the streets
17 clean. But it does show that adding more rentals
18 above increased density could be a problem for our
19 city, especially now with reduced resources.

20 Phil Barlow's proposal A looks more
21 like the character of the neighborhood. He showed us
22 potential development and find that 20 stories high
23 could be too high.

24 MS. WISNIEWSKI: One minute.

25 MR. MICHELE: David Goslin mentioned

1 they were not given access to the Blickensderfer,
2 which is concerning. 130 Henry Street and 79 Garden
3 Street, both are feasible to be restored.

4 Brad Schide shared with us that
5 partial or full demolition of the buildings were not
6 needed for remediation.

7 Ralph Blessing mentioned that Atlantic
8 Street was widened by the state. The entrance to the
9 development should be on Atlantic.

10 It was also suggested that parking for
11 any new development be handled by those properties
12 concerned.

13 Ms. Lisa Feinberg says we do not need
14 a study to approve the need for widening. However, it
15 wasn't needed to be proved in the past, and there's
16 nothing new about this.

17 I have so many more comments.

18 Some of those testifying against
19 referral to the AG are also remunerated. They either
20 work for BLT, showing personal interest.

21 Ms. Feinberg mentioned crime, but
22 blighted properties again lead to crime.

23 Support letters mentioned by Ted
24 Ferrarone seem to have come through --

25 MS. WISNIEWSKI: Out of time.

1 MR. MICHELE: Thank you.

2 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you, Dave
3 Michele.

4 We have time for one other?

5 MS. WISNIEWSKI: Not in favor of
6 referring, Victor Mirontschuk.

7 MR. MIRONTSCHUK: Can you hear me?

8 CHAIR NELSON: Yes.

9 MR. MIRONTSCHUK: My name is Victor
10 Mirontschuk. I am the president of EDI International.
11 I have 45 years experience in residential and
12 commercial architecture. I'm also a registered
13 planner.

14 In the interest of time I will focus
15 on the proposed submittal by Preservation Connecticut
16 and explain why it does not work.

17 The biggest problem with the
18 Preservation Connecticut plan is insufficient parking,
19 based on the very limited information that they
20 provided. The Preservation Connecticut plan calls for
21 1,066 units in total, of which 1,012 of those units
22 are in the two 20-story towers. Their plan shows 192
23 spaces in tower A and 118 spaces for tower B, which
24 are surface parking. That does not meet the city
25 requirement. To meet the city requirements,

1 Preservation Connecticut would need to provide 1,332
2 parking spaces. The city would not support a building
3 without the necessary parking. Providing parking at
4 ground level and above is not feasible as there is no
5 accommodation for internal ramping into the buildings
6 to provide the required parking. If the parking were
7 to be subterranean, that would need to have four
8 subterranean parking levels for tower A and five
9 subterranean levels for tower B. Building that many
10 subterranean floors would not be doable in light of
11 the groundwater and contaminated soils.

12 Another problem with their plan is,
13 while the group stresses the importance of the
14 Blickensderfer Building, with their plan the building
15 would not be visible from, you know, most areas, you
16 know, driving or walking through the community.

17 Yet another problem is --

18 MS. WISNIEWSKI: One minute.

19 MR. MIRONTSCHUK: -- it does not honor
20 the current setbacks for the city.

21 Thank you.

22 MR. SCHIDE: Can I just jump in? It's
23 kind of addressing -- again, the speaker is diverting
24 our comments. We were not hired to do a site plan.
25 What we were showing in our site plan was only -- we

1 were not endorsing 20 stories, we're not endorsing a
2 thousand units. What we're saying is that the
3 developer can build what he needs to build and
4 still have the historic structures. And in terms of
5 parking --

6 CHAIR NELSON: Understood.

7 MR. SCHIDE: -- we were not able to
8 respond to a site plan because they had not provided
9 one. So -- anyway, I just wanted to add.

10 CHAIR NELSON: Fair enough. Thank
11 you, Brad.

12 It is 12:37. How many speakers do we
13 have left?

14 MS. WISNIEWSKI: Seven.

15 CHAIR NELSON: Seven speakers.

16 Council members, if we were to extend
17 for another 15 minutes, would you be able to stay to
18 1:15 so that we can hear more people?

19 MS. CARNELL: This is Marguerite
20 Carnell. Yes, I could.

21 CHAIR NELSON: Tom?

22 MR. ELMORE: Yes, I could.

23 CHAIR NELSON: Kathy?

24 MS. MAHER: Yes.

25 CHAIR NELSON: Leah?

1 DR. GLASER: Yes.

2 CHAIR NELSON: Walter?

3 DR. WOODWARD: Yes.

4 CHAIR NELSON: Christine?

5 CHRISTINE NELSON: Yes.

6 CHAIR NELSON: We'll go another 15

7 minutes. Let's take the next person in line.

8 Marena?

9 MS. WISNIEWSKI: Mark Diamond.

10 CHAIR NELSON: Mark Diamond sent me a
11 note. He had to leave. I'm going to read it into the
12 record.

13 (As read) Dear Ms. Nelson, hi. I'm
14 Mark Diamond, past president and current board member
15 of the Historic Neighborhood Preservation Program.
16 I've reserved time to speak. I'm very sorry. I have
17 an appointment for which I must leave.

18 I would just like to note that
19 Atlantic Street, which is the street that runs along
20 the west side of the Blickensderfer property and is
21 parallel to Garden Street, is a four-lane, two-way
22 street which can certainly accommodate the traffic for
23 which BLT claims it wants to widen Garden Street.

24 You can certainly add this comment to
25 the record if you think it is relevant. Thank you,

1 Mark Diamond.

2 Next one.

3 MS. WISNIEWSKI: Not in favor of
4 referring, Bill Buckley.

5 MR. BUCKLEY: Hi. Can you hear me?

6 CHAIR NELSON: Yes.

7 MR. BUCKLEY: Okay. Again, my name is
8 Bill Buckley. I'm a licensed professional engineer
9 registered in Connecticut. I have experience as a
10 public works director and city engineer in Danbury
11 dealing with a lot of remediation and historical
12 building restoration. In fact, I live in an 1834
13 house. Moved to the site before they had power.

14 Briefly, I worked with Jim Travers on
15 the road widening so I can tell you what we presented
16 is what Jim is dictating to us that he wants for
17 sidewalks, amenity zones, bike lanes, parking, on that
18 road. Additionally, I've been responsible for
19 excavating impacted soils on all of the sites, and
20 have done so next to buildings. The buildings you saw
21 in the pictures earlier, from Yale & Towne, I was
22 responsible for saving those buildings, and actually
23 surgically removing them structurally from components
24 of the buildings that had to come down in order to
25 complete the remediation.

1 I'm looking at this building. I've
2 been in it. I can surgically remove the portion that
3 needs to come down from the portion that needs to
4 remain so we can salvage that and have a structurally
5 stable building.

6 I relinquish my time to anyone else at
7 this point.

8 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you, Mr. Buckley.

9 MR. BUCKLEY: You're welcome.

10 CHAIR NELSON: Marena, the next
11 person?

12 MS. WISNIEWSKI: In favor of
13 referring, Elizabeth McCauley.

14 CHAIR NELSON: Ms. McCauley, you may
15 be muted.

16 I don't hear her present. She may
17 have had to leave. Continue with the next person.

18 MS. WISNIEWSKI: In favor of
19 referring, David Dietrich.

20 MR. DIETRICH: Good afternoon. Can
21 you hear me?

22 CHAIR NELSON: Yes.

23 MR. DIETRICH: Okay. Very good.

24 My name is David Dietrich, and I'm a
25 retired IBMer for 34 years as well as a mechanical

1 engineer. I just wanted to interject the comments
2 regarding the historical importance of the
3 Blickensderfer and the Schick factories and companies
4 and employees to Stamford as well as to the rest of
5 the country.

6 There's a long tradition going back to
7 1896 of innovation. Quite frankly, I hadn't heard
8 much about Blickensderfer prior to getting into
9 researching and restoring some industrial age
10 products, but that's a fascinating piece of
11 technology. I've had the opportunity to present about
12 the type of technology and the type of innovation that
13 Blickensderfer brought to the products, as well as
14 their work in the munitions area during World War I.

15 Similarly Schick has been a
16 fascinating story. The invention of some early
17 injection razors and the world's first electric razor
18 are really testimonies to some early innovation in the
19 industrial age right here in the South End.

20 So I'm pleased that there's an effort
21 to preserve a portion of the building. I'd love to
22 see the entire Blickensderfer factory be preserved so
23 that it can be a testimony to the innovation of a lot
24 of Stamford's early industrial age inventors, and to
25 the employees that fulfilled their dreams.

1 So thank you for the opportunity to
2 speak today.

3 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you,
4 Mr. Dietrich.

5 Marena, the next person?

6 MS. WISNIEWSKI: Not in favor of
7 referring, Lee Riccetti.

8 MS. RICCETTI: Can you hear me?

9 CHAIR NELSON: Yes.

10 MS. RICCETTI: Hi. Again, not in
11 favor, Lee Riccetti for the record. I'm with Heritage
12 Consulting Group. For some background, Heritage is a
13 national consulting firm that provides guidance to
14 historic buildings, including historic tax credit
15 projects, local design review and a listing on the
16 National Register.

17 I understand you're in receipt of my
18 reports related to the historic significance and
19 integrity of each of the subject buildings. I
20 understand you may not agree with the findings, but
21 let me know if you have any questions.

22 In the interest of time I will not
23 further address my findings or detail the updated
24 plans since it's been discussed at length. But I will
25 say this plan is a dramatic departure from the 2016

1 plan and does seek to preserve 122 and 126 Henry, as
2 well as the contributing section of the Blickensderfer
3 factory. So notably, as has been discussed, the
4 Schick Annex, which was constructed circa 1938 to
5 1951, was not listed as a contributing resource to the
6 South End Historic District. So while we may
7 attribute significance to it today, the fact remains
8 it was listed under the '86 nomination, so that's what
9 needs to be considered.

10 The last point I would like to make is
11 in regard to the cost of the project and the
12 feasibility of taking historic tax credits. While it
13 is possible to take credits, it may or may not be
14 feasible. While we cannot speak to specific financial
15 information, that is not our area of expertise, that
16 said, our firm does have nearly 40 years of experience
17 with HTCs, and we found that taking credits on smaller
18 projects is not always feasible. It is very difficult
19 to take credits on a small scattered site project
20 such as this. Each of these buildings would be
21 considered an individual historic tax credit project
22 with its own --

23 MS. WISNIEWSKI: One minute.

24 MS. RICCETTI: Thank you.

25 There are fees, lengthy design review

1 processes, and the syndication of credits is difficult
2 for a smaller project.

3 For all these reasons it may not be
4 feasible to use the credits. Furthermore, the state
5 credits are a limited resource and it cannot be
6 assumed that such a funding resource would be
7 available.

8 In conclusion, we cannot assume this
9 would be a viable historic tax credit project just
10 because the buildings are listed as historic.

11 Thank you for your time. I have
12 nothing further.

13 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you.

14 MS. WISNIEWSKI: Sara, Elizabeth
15 McCauley is here, in favor of referring the matter.

16 Elizabeth?

17 CHAIR NELSON: Ms. McCauley, you may
18 be on mute.

19 MS. WISNIEWSKI: She is not on mute.

20 CHAIR NELSON: Let's continue.

21 MS. WISNIEWSKI: Elizabeth, if you
22 have anything to say you can submit it in the chat.

23 Susan Halpern.

24 MS. HALPERN: Hi. Can you hear me?

25 CHAIR NELSON: Yes.

1 MS. HALPERN: I'm Sue Halpern. I'm
2 vice president of the South End NRV and a member of
3 the Historic Neighborhood Program. I would just like
4 to address a few issues in the thousand-page
5 presentation that was sent out.

6 People were living in the homes on
7 Henry and Garden Street until March 2016, when the
8 last tenant, who was facing an eviction notice two
9 days before Christmas 2015, moved out.

10 Since BLT bought the property in 2016,
11 the homes and the Blickensderfer have been surrounded
12 with a chain link fence. Windows are open to the
13 elements or haphazardly boarded up. A foundation is
14 smashed in on 122 Henry Street. And garbage had been
15 allowed to accumulate. The fence of 79 Garden Street
16 was breached, allowing homeless to gather. As you saw
17 in the video presentation, there is a community center
18 across the street from these homes, as well as other
19 homes in the area. For five years this has been
20 allowed to happen. Requests to the city to clean up
21 the area -- and to the developer -- to clean up the
22 area have gone unanswered.

23 Nationwide studies clearly indicate
24 blighted areas lead to increased levels of crime,
25 decreased surrounding property values, erode the

1 health of local housing markets, impose safety and
2 health hazards. Cleaning up distressed block doesn't
3 just increase residents' feelings of safety, it
4 impacts their actual safety as well.

5 An analysis done by Columbia
6 University School of Public Health found that crime,
7 including gun, assaults, robbery, burglary, and
8 illegal drug trades, show --

9 MS. WISNIEWSKI: One minute.

10 MS. HALPERN: -- a significant
11 decrease in crime in neighborhoods that experience
12 blight cleanup.

13 Judging by the police records
14 submitted in this presentation, shows many incidents
15 of crime from the time BLT acquired these properties.
16 Vacant and blighted properties make people less safe
17 and less proud of their neighborhoods.

18 Focusing on high-rise development in
19 this area can change local economic conditions, but
20 they also have an unintended consequence of displacing
21 people who do not wish to move, and create further
22 segregation.

23 Please, we need to save these homes on
24 Henry and Garden, renovate and reuse for affordable
25 housing in the South End, and save the Blickensderfer,

1 one of the most significant historic buildings left in
2 Stamford.

3 Thank you very much for your time.

4 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you, Ms. Halpern.
5 Marena, the next person.

6 MS. WISNIEWSKI: The last person, if
7 Elizabeth can't get through, in favor of referring,
8 Peter Quigley.

9 MR. QUIGLEY: I'm on, and for brevity.
10 I'm going to move through this very quickly. I'm a
11 Stamford South End resident. I'm a former vice chair
12 of Greenwich's legislative RTM branch, lead on
13 environment and land use. For brevity -- and I have,
14 and if I can have just another minute I appreciate it.
15 But I will submit for the record a written report to
16 be submitted.

17 I support for preservation as making
18 the recommendation for the State's Attorney General on
19 inspecting, prosecuting legal action if this developer
20 persists in the attempt to demolish any more homes or
21 buildings in the South End, leaving blight to demolish
22 more, to build 25-story skyscrapers, destroying the
23 neighborhood village. The area has lost 35, 40
24 percent of its inventory. There should be no
25 compromises. The expertise of a billion dollar

1 developer's advisors. On South End property, home,
2 business owner, and community, all preservation
3 activists, unpaid volunteers relying on our state's
4 historic preservation experts. The city residents
5 here are fed up. They have voted to follow up,
6 voted -- representatives or not -- they have voted in
7 a public assembly on record to uphold the historic
8 preservation position, provision and regulations found
9 in the city's 2015 Master Plan, Chapters 5, 6, and 7.
10 They have voted to stop further demolition in the
11 South End. They are supporting the preservationists
12 in the South End.

13 Last year, March of 2019, over
14 two-thirds of Stamford's 40 reps voted to stop further
15 development in the South End. They denied, rejected
16 the few on the city Land Use Board and this developer
17 from changing charter amendments.

18 Two-thirds vote represent 80 to 90,
19 maybe 100,000 of the estimate total of a grand 150,000
20 population. You couldn't get them here this morning,
21 but they clearly are behind the vote here for
22 preservation, have popular and political support here.
23 Who would know best than those living here today in
24 Stamford.

25 To the remediation issue, thank

1 experts for their information. What about what has
2 been done in past of the records at many high rises
3 with expectation --

4 MS. WISNIEWSKI: One minute.

5 MR. QUIGLEY: Oh, brother. I have
6 four points. I'm going to move on.

7 There's been a paper submitted, I'm
8 happy to give it to you, the DEP, if they can answer
9 on LEP and soil on testing and transfers and capping
10 issues on properties in remediation.

11 Four quick points. One, state law and
12 court decisions set referral precedent here to go to
13 the Attorney General for inspection for clear
14 violations of state CEPA law and has been successfully
15 prosecuted on similar case, Cornish Development Co. v
16 City of New London.

17 Remediation work -- two, remediation
18 work is questionable in overpopulated South End, too
19 much buildup, too many questions of quality of the
20 remediation programs, the behaviors, and the outcomes.

21 Three, oft-quoted 2018 South End
22 Report is bogus in too many places. Rejected, in
23 essence, by the Board of Reps. Never approved by
24 anyone except by the few who sit on Land Use Boards,
25 not the community.

1 Four, if the few on the city Land Use
2 Board and the mayor do not support South End
3 preservation on this issue, why shouldn't they --

4 MS. WISNIEWSKI: You are out of time.

5 MR. QUIGLEY: Can I make one last
6 statement, Madam Chair?

7 The Board of Reps also heard all the
8 same experts here and made --

9 MS. WISNIEWSKI: Mr. Quigley, you are
10 out of time.

11 CHAIR NELSON: There was one person
12 who wasn't present.

13 A few moments to go, Marena?

14 MS. WISNIEWSKI: Correct.

15 CHAIR NELSON: Is she present now?

16 MS. WISNIEWSKI: She is raising her
17 hand. She is on unmute. But she does not seem to be
18 able to communicate.

19 Elizabeth, if you have something to
20 say you can please write it into the chat.

21 MS. HALPERN: Hi, this is Sue Halpern.
22 I can read her comments if that's allowed.

23 CHAIR NELSON: You have a copy of her
24 comments?

25 MS. HALPERN: Yes. She emailed them

1 to me.

2 CHAIR NELSON: In this case I will
3 allow you to do that.

4 These are comments from?

5 MS. HALPERN: Elizabeth McCauley.

6 (As read) Thank you, Chairlady Nelson,
7 for giving us the opportunity. I have also previously
8 submitted comments to Todd, but I will add that it is
9 time and overdue for the developer to address the
10 cleanup and repair of houses that they own and take
11 the proper steps to preserve and repurpose all parts
12 of the historic Blickensderfer typewriter building.

13 As Sue Halpern mentioned, not doing so
14 has resulted in higher incidents of crime and pileup
15 of trash. In the meeting packet, I took note of the
16 photos of mattresses and debris piled up. But none of
17 this is to blame on three humble structures, but
18 rather of the developer creating and allowing these
19 areas to stand unprotected and open for years, which
20 became dumping grounds.

21 In the name of justice for the South
22 End, I am greatly opposed to the application filed by
23 BLT seeking to abandon their commitment of restoring
24 homes on 79 Garden and 130 Henry Street for affordable
25 housing. Instead, they ask to demolish them along

1 with part of the Blickensderfer typewriter building.

2 Words cannot express the
3 disillusionment that anyone would allow historic
4 landmark buildings to be torn apart for developer gain
5 and for a handful of others seeking profit. This
6 action would be ripping the heart out of the South
7 End, putting us at a huge disadvantage in terms of
8 preservation efforts of significant National Register
9 buildings, and for long-term residents as well.

10 From humble immigrant beginnings, the
11 working class strived to provide a good life for their
12 family, making positive contributions to the society
13 of a growing Stamford.

14 MS. WISNIEWSKI: One minute.

15 MS. HALPERN: It is unconscionable to
16 totally slowly move these residents out of the
17 neighborhood for a deliberate and concentrated effort
18 with this plan. Many others before and those yet to
19 come, and this will not be the end. The very
20 neighborhood which protected their dreams, ideals, and
21 provided financial and economic viability. All under
22 the guise of widening streets for thousands more
23 coming into high-rises with the further flawed selling
24 point that it's for the greater good.

25 To protect these people and the area's

1 history, neighborhood groups have lobbied for putting
2 required measures in place to protect and preserve
3 existing National Register buildings. Now is the time
4 to preserve, rebuild, and revitalize in a way that
5 would ensure the continuation of urban values and give
6 the residents a higher and --

7 MS. WISNIEWSKI: You are out of time.

8 MS. HALPERN: Thank you.

9 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you, everybody,
10 for reading as quickly as you did, so that we could
11 allow everybody to be heard.

12 We had originally said that we would
13 allow for five-minute quick correction of any factual
14 information or clarification of any factual
15 information that may have bearing.

16 So I would like to ask Ms. Feinberg
17 and Mr. Robertson, is there any factual point that
18 needs to be clarified here?

19 MR. ROBERTSON: Yes. I would like to
20 defer to Ted. He's heard a lot of factual
21 allegations. I think he has a response. Ted?

22 MR. FERRARONE: I don't have any
23 particular response. I think the comments about the
24 street and the developmental plan were well addressed
25 by Victor Mirontschuk and Bill Buckley, as well as Rob

1 Danielson.

2 I would like to correct. We've
3 undergone a tremendous amount of community input and
4 support. Lisa cited the hundreds of letters. We just
5 had a Master Plan hearing in the City of Stamford on
6 this. We worked with the City of Stamford Zoning
7 Board to preserve and protect four historic houses on
8 the south side of this site and to comprehensively
9 renovate them into first class affordable housing, not
10 just older derelict product.

11 We are anxious to move forward with
12 the redevelopment of this site. We agree with
13 Ms. Halpern that we are certainly not in favor of the
14 blight on that street. But to blame it on us is just
15 obviously nonsense. You can look on the Google street
16 views and you can see the condition of that street
17 going back for a decade. It's long time been an
18 eyesore.

19 We are anxious to get it turned
20 around. We are the ones who clean up the street. We
21 are the ones who paint over the graffiti and pick up
22 the trash and cut the weeds. And it's a shame that
23 the city street looks that way. I would encourage
24 anyone who's in the City of Stamford to go look at it.
25 I don't think any of you would feel comfortable being

1 there or using it. The sidewalks are totally
2 inadequate. It's just not a great place.

3 And the idea that -- I feel like we're
4 talking past each other with regard to the
5 Blickensderfer. When we spoke with this group last
6 you asked us to preserve that. We heard you loud and
7 clear and we have said we will. We don't need the tax
8 credits. We might use them -- and we've used them a
9 lot so we're very familiar with them. But we don't
10 actually need to use them to preserve them. And we're
11 making our commitment that we will save them there.

12 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you,
13 Mr. Ferrarone.

14 Preservation Connecticut, is there any
15 factual information that needs to be clarified?

16 MR. SCHIDE: Yeah, a couple of points.

17 One, about historic tax credits.
18 Goslin and Crosskey Architects, myself -- in my other
19 hat, I am a real estate development consultant. And
20 historic tax credits, both state and federal, can be
21 used on projects of this size. In this case, 53
22 units. Maybe in Portland that's a small project. But
23 in Connecticut, that is not -- that's a good size.

24 Number 2, I again will raise the
25 question that I do not believe DEEP or EPA or any

1 environmental-related company will require the
2 demolition of the annex to remove the toxic level,
3 particularly if it's 18 feet already below grade. I
4 do believe -- they will have to do an -- would have to
5 do a land-use restriction, however. And would have to
6 make sure the concrete slab is presentable to serve as
7 a cap.

8 That's my only points to raise. Thank
9 you.

10 CHAIR NELSON: Okay. Thank you.

11 I want to just clarify one question,
12 technical question. I'm not sure if it's from
13 Mr. Robertson or Ms. Feinberg or Mr. Ferrarone.

14 The planning and zoning approval that
15 you have in place for the proposed development, is
16 it -- it's predicated on preserving some buildings?
17 Is that part of the approval process?

18 MS. FEINBERG: I'm happy to address
19 that.

20 We do not have a planning and zoning
21 approval related to the redevelopment of 650 Atlantic
22 at this time. The reference to any planning and
23 zoning approval would have been related to the
24 preservation of the structures on Henry Street, and
25 that was an off-site obligation for affordable housing

1 in connection with another development in Harbor
2 Point.

3 Does that address your question?

4 CHAIR NELSON: I was trying to
5 understand for the future of those buildings --

6 MS. FEINBERG: Yes.

7 CHAIR NELSON: -- and whether they
8 were subject to a municipal agreement in the form of
9 an approval process.

10 MS. FEINBERG: That is correct. 118,
11 120, 122, and 126 are to be preserved in perpetuity as
12 affordable housing in accordance with a planning and
13 zoning approval for another project.

14 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you. All right.

15 Council members, one thing that I
16 would like to do, which we did at the beginning of
17 part 1 of the meeting, but before we begin
18 deliberations, I did not specifically go through this
19 again, and I would just like to, to make sure that
20 everybody is very clear.

21 As you know, we always have a
22 discussion about conflicts of interest, and council
23 members are aware -- I'm just going to read the
24 statement, that they: Vote on matters which provide
25 leadership, service, and economic benefits to property

1 owners, consultants, local governments, and
2 not-for-profit organizations. Given this
3 responsibility and to maintain the highest
4 professional standards in the discharge of our duties,
5 it is important to maintain a strong code of ethics
6 for all council members and department employees.

7 In order to avoid possible violations
8 of the Department of Economic and Community
9 Development Ethics Statement, it is necessary for the
10 council to be aware of any situations in which there's
11 real, potential, or apparent conflict of interest
12 involving anyone here. A conflict of interest may
13 occur when the public official's participation in
14 agency matters results in personal financial gain.

15 You have been provided with a copy of
16 the DECD Ethics Statement and governing state statute.
17 Having reviewed them and the agenda items for
18 Stamford, members of the council and staff are now
19 asked to disclose any affiliation with entities or
20 projects that may create a conflict of interest as
21 defined by agency policy and pursuant to Connecticut
22 General Statutes 1-79 through 1-89 entitled Code of
23 Ethics for Public Officials. Once disclosed, the
24 member or staff may recuse themselves from the
25 deliberations for that particular agenda item.

1 So having read this statement, are
2 there any council members who wish to disclose a
3 conflict of interest prior to the deliberation of this
4 agenda item?

5 Okay. None.

6 I wanted to just clarify that again
7 for part 2 of the meeting. Thank you for indulging me
8 in that.

9 Broadly, council, you've had a lot of
10 information that's been presented today. You've had a
11 lot of information that's come in by submission,
12 advanced material.

13 Is there anything that is lacking to
14 allow you to make a deliberation at this particular
15 moment in time?

16 MR. ELMORE: As a landscape architect,
17 and listening and reading here today, I'm really
18 confused about what is required and what is not
19 required on the contaminated soils. And I don't know
20 how to get the information. But Brad argued one side
21 of the coin, the applicant argued a totally another
22 side of the coin. And we're here to make a decision
23 as lay people, not knowing what the real truth is.

24 I'm making more of a statement than a
25 question. But it seems to me that that's a pretty

1 important piece of this puzzle, whether or not the
2 Schick addition can be saved.

3 CHAIR NELSON: Todd Levine?

4 MR. LEVINE: We, just to answer your
5 question, Tom, we submitted all the information to
6 DEEP to see if they could provide us with some
7 guidance. Alternatively, we talked about hiring a
8 third-party environmental specialist to look at the
9 information, and we are waiting for both decisions.
10 So right now we don't have information either from
11 DEEP or whether to go forward with hiring a third
12 party to take a look at the information that's been
13 presented.

14 MR. ELMORE: Okay.

15 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you, Tom, for
16 that question.

17 Other questions that are on people's
18 minds as they're thinking about these buildings?

19 DR. GLASER: There was a lot of
20 discussion about like the reasons for, you know -- the
21 reasons given for the demolition of these buildings,
22 the street widening and the environmental issue that
23 Tom brought up. And I guess I also don't have clarity
24 on the necessity for widening the street except that
25 the city is requiring it. And -- there's that.

1 And then I was wanting to ask two
2 clarification questions.

3 If, Todd, you could just hint at some
4 of the compromises that people -- you said that you
5 were unable to work things out and make some
6 compromises? I was wondering what some of those
7 sticking points was.

8 Probably the easier question that I
9 have is, they contracted with a consulting group,
10 Heritage Consulting, that claimed that these were not
11 necessary to the district and our State Review Board
12 said they were. So I assume that we go with our state
13 review board's opinion on that.

14 Those are my questions.

15 MR. LEVINE: So the discussions we had
16 were -- the compromise that I was looking for was for
17 the entirety of the Blickensderfer to be retained, and
18 that was something that, in both cases, 2018 and 2019,
19 BLT could not agree to, or would not agree to.

20 And then, you know, just to answer
21 your question, SRB is our professional board that
22 advises this office on National Register
23 eligibilities. So we take our SRB's word over a paid
24 consultant.

25 CHAIR NELSON: Other questions?

1 MS. CARNELL: Just a question
2 following up on what Leah asked.

3 So the State Review Board confirmed
4 that all buildings under question here contribute to
5 the district, including the Schick building?

6 MR. LEVINE: The Schick building, the
7 annex, was not -- was listed as noncontributing. So
8 they were asked if the contributing buildings continue
9 to contribute. Brad has stated -- and they voted in
10 the affirmative.

11 Brad has stated that had that been a
12 later nomination, where that annex was 50 years,
13 potentially it would have been contributing. But
14 because it wasn't within 50 years of it being built
15 when the nomination was submitted to the National
16 Parks Service.

17 MS. CARNELL: So 130 Henry, 79 Garden,
18 and also 736 Atlantic, did they rule on that one?

19 MR. LEVINE: They did. They did rule
20 that -- that's not under consideration today, but they
21 did rule that that is no longer contributing because
22 of the loss of integrity.

23 MS. CARNELL: All right. Thank you
24 for the clarification.

25 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you.

1 Walter?

2 DR. WOODWARD: This question is
3 probably for Jim Robertson or for Mr. Ferrarone. And
4 I share Tom's confusion about the ground field
5 situation, the contamination. I wonder if it would be
6 the developer's position that whether -- whether the
7 building could remain in its entirety through some
8 other form of remediation, they would still want to
9 demolish the section that they have on the plans,
10 since that was in the 2016 plan, remains 2020. Would
11 they -- if the ground field question and the
12 remediation question were off the table, would they
13 preserve the Blickensderfer Building?

14 MR. ROBERTSON: I'll try to respond to
15 that.

16 As I understand what's happened today
17 and what your submissions are, you have one
18 professional environmentalist who has presented
19 information. That is an engineering firm, an
20 individual who's been working on this site for years,
21 who has over 30 years of professionalism, has
22 presented an oral and written statement saying that
23 because of that contamination that portion has to come
24 down, period. The opponents started off by saying
25 they're not environmental professionals, they don't

1 know the answer to that.

2 From my perspective, it's a binary
3 decision. That's what the federal and state
4 governments have said, the professional has said. The
5 opponents have presented no expert opinion contrary to
6 it.

7 CHAIR NELSON: Margaret Faber.

8 MS. FABER: Have any of the buildings
9 or part of the Schick Annex been condemned by the
10 city?

11 MR. BLESSING: City of Stamford Land
12 Use Bureau Chief.

13 To my knowledge there were blight
14 proceedings with regard to the buildings on Henry
15 Street. I'm not in charge of anti blight actions in
16 the City of Stamford. But I believe after the
17 buildings were secured, that the city did not pursue
18 that any further.

19 MS. FABER: Thank you.

20 CHAIR NELSON: Walter, did you raise
21 your hand again?

22 DR. WOODWARD: If I might, I would
23 just like to come back with Jim Robertson.

24 Jim, I appreciate -- what you're
25 saying is that your expert is right and therefore it's

1 a moot point. But that didn't actually answer the
2 hypothetical, which is if the remediation -- if there
3 was a work-around on that remediation question that
4 would save the building, would your client keep the
5 building intact or would they still want to demolish
6 part of it?

7 MR. ROBERTSON: So I believe the
8 development plan is as set forth. I mean, to save and
9 preserve that portion of the building and to have it
10 accessible from an educational, historical point of
11 view. Are there other development plans? I'm not
12 aware of it. If Ted or our architect, Victor, wants
13 to provide any additional information. I'm not
14 comfortable with a hypothetical because I just don't
15 know what their other plans would be.

16 MR. FERRARONE: I'm happy to take
17 Mr. Woodward's question.

18 The amount that's being proposed for
19 demolition, which is just that southwest corner of the
20 building, that is based on where we think the plume is
21 that runs under the building. So you can see, we
22 submitted actually an earlier plan, which was probably
23 in your earlier packet, that showed potentially more
24 demolition.

25 We are trying to be very responsive to

1 what we know are the desires of this group and the
2 Stamford community, which is to save the building.
3 Believe me, every building that they showed earlier,
4 historic building that we have preserved in the South
5 End, we are very much preservationists, and we are
6 very much in favor of saving those buildings.

7 Just the reality, as both Bill Buckley
8 and Rob Danielson spoke to you, we are very much in
9 favor of saving those buildings, it's a very deep
10 excavation to get at something that's very toxic.

11 I don't want to Uber promise that we
12 can do something. It's not that simple to do. We've
13 done a lot of remediation around these buildings in
14 the past. We are committed to cleaning this site up.
15 We're not going to knock the building down just
16 because it's the expeditious thing to do. We had a
17 plan in the past that showed much more demolition, and
18 that would have been much, much easier to execute.
19 But we're not going to do that.

20 But to your question, Mr. Woodward,
21 we're going to pace the remediation as far as we need
22 to, but no further.

23 CHAIR NELSON: Other council member
24 questions?

25 MS. MAHER: When do you expect the

1 report from DEEP?

2 MR. LEVINE: I don't have a time. So,
3 as you know, we only got this information about three
4 weeks ago, so we have not been able to get -- you
5 know, we submitted it to DEEP a couple weeks ago.
6 They have not gotten back to us. We were waiting to
7 get word back from DEEP on it before we went and spent
8 state money to take a look at it. So that's where we
9 stand.

10 MR. SCHIDE: We would have had an
11 environmental consultant on the team early on if we
12 knew that this was going to come up. We were not
13 aware that this was coming up.

14 And by the way, we're not questioning
15 Fuss & O'Neill's credentials nor their report, just
16 for the record.

17 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you, Brad.

18 Council members, one thing that I want
19 to make sure that you are considering is that
20 separating out and having debate about one building
21 versus another building is not what's on the table at
22 the moment. What is charged before us is all of the
23 properties together. I just want you to kind of keep
24 that in mind.

25 You've heard from Mr. Robertson that

1 they are unwilling to extend the timeline for further
2 deliberations. Presumably this would include getting
3 additional engineering studies in that timeline.

4 Is that correct, Mr. Robertson? Am I
5 understanding correctly that you want the decision
6 today?

7 MR. ROBERTSON: Yes. We've gone back
8 and forth with Todd for some time on this schedule,
9 and I believe all the information was submitted some
10 time ago, a thousand pages of it. We've got all of
11 our witnesses and experts here, and we would like a
12 decision.

13 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you.

14 Other questions?

15 Let me just go back to reading the
16 motion again, just to remember what it is that we're
17 considering here.

18 The Connecticut Historic Preservation
19 Council votes to request the assistance of the Office
20 of the Attorney General to prevent the unreasonable
21 destruction of the historic properties at 130 Henry
22 Street, 79 Garden Street, and 650 Atlantic Street,
23 Stamford, Connecticut, pursuant to the provisions of
24 Section 22A-19a of the Connecticut General Statute.

25 That is the motion that's on the

1 table. We've gotten a couple of questions that have
2 been asked for which there are not immediate answers.

3 Is there any other information that
4 council feels they need or do they feel that they can
5 vote on the matter?

6 I'm just going to go through and read
7 people's names and ask you to confirm if you feel that
8 you have sufficient information to render a decision.

9 Margaret Carnell?

10 MS. CARNELL: Yes, I think I do.

11 CHAIR NELSON: Tom Elmore?

12 MR. ELMORE: Yes, I do.

13 CHAIR NELSON: Margaret Faber?

14 MS. FABER: Absolutely, yes.

15 CHAIR NELSON: Karyn Gilvarg?

16 MS. GILVARG: Yes.

17 CHAIR NELSON: Leah Glaser?

18 DR. GLASER: Not as confident as
19 everybody else, but I can make a decision.

20 CHAIR NELSON: Kathy Maher?

21 MS. MAHER: Yes.

22 CHAIR NELSON: Christine Nelson?

23 CHRISTINE NELSON: Yes, thank you.

24 CHAIR NELSON: I need to abstain.

25 Sarah Sportman?

1 MS. SPORTMAN: Yes.

2 CHAIR NELSON: And Walter Woodward?

3 DR. WOODWARD: I would like more
4 information, but I'm prepared to vote on the
5 information I have.

6 CHAIR NELSON: So I have reread the
7 motion.

8 Is there any other comments that
9 people want to make?

10 DR. GLASER: I guess just to clarify.
11 It's kind of we're voting on all three and it would be
12 up to sort of the next step for them to sort of parcel
13 through these?

14 CHAIR NELSON: We're voting on
15 everything together, that is correct, yes.

16 I'm not hearing any further
17 conversation, so now I'm going to call a vote.

18 We have a motion to refer by Christine
19 Nelson. We have a second by Margaret Faber.

20 I will do a roll call vote for vote to
21 refer or not.

22 Marguerite Carnell?

23 MS. CARNELL: Aye.

24 CHAIR NELSON: Is your vote to refer?

25 MS. CARNELL: Yes.

1 CHAIR NELSON: Tom Elmore?

2 MR. ELMORE: A vote to refer, aye.

3 CHAIR NELSON: Margaret Faber?

4 DR. FABER: Aye, vote to refer, to
5 refer.

6 CHAIR NELSON: Karyn Gilvarg?

7 MS. GILVARG: Aye, refer.

8 CHAIR NELSON: Leah Glaser?

9 DR. GLASER: Aye, refer.

10 CHAIR NELSON: Kathleen Maher?

11 MS. MAHER: Vote to refer.

12 CHAIR NELSON: Christine Nelson?

13 CHRISTINE NELSON: Aye on the motion
14 to refer.

15 CHAIR NELSON: Sara Nelson abstains.

16 Sarah Sportman?

17 MS. SPORTMAN: Aye to refer.

18 CHAIR NELSON: Walter Woodward?

19 DR. WOODWARD: Aye.

20 CHAIR NELSON: Motion carries.

21 Todd, so council has made a decision
22 on this motion and has voted to refer this matter to
23 the Office of the Attorney General.

24 What would be the next step that you
25 would communicate to Mr. Robertson and Ms. Feinberg,

1 Mr. Ferrarone, at this point?

2 MR. LEVINE: Myself and the assistant
3 attorney general will be reaching out to you.

4 CHAIR NELSON: I want to thank
5 everybody for the presentations, the graphics, for
6 their thoughtful conversation.

7 I want to thank all the members of the
8 public who stayed on this call so that you could share
9 your positions. We very much appreciate it. And
10 thank you.

11 I'll need a motion to call this part 2
12 of the October 7th meeting to adjourn. May I have a
13 motion?

14 MS. CARNELL: So moved.

15 CHAIR NELSON: And a second?

16 MS. GILVARG: Second.

17 CHAIR NELSON: On the vote to adjourn.
18 Marguerite?

19 MS. CARNELL: Aye.

20 CHAIR NELSON: Tom Elmore?

21 MR. ELMORE? Aye.

22 CHAIR NELSON: Margaret Faber?

23 MS. FABER: Aye.

24 CHAIR NELSON: Karyn Gilvarg?

25 MS. GILVARG: Aye.

1 CHAIR NELSON: Leah Glaser?

2 DR. GLASER: Aye.

3 CHAIR NELSON: Kathy Maher?

4 MS. MAHER: Aye

5 CHAIR NELSON: Christine Nelson?

6 Christine Nelson is on mute.

7 CHRISTINE NELSON: Aye.

8 Sara Nelson abstains.

9 Sara Sportman?

10 MS. SPORTMAN: Aye.

11 CHAIR NELSON: Okay. And Walter

12 Woodward?

13 DR. WOODWARD: Oh, yes.

14 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you all. I wish
15 you a good afternoon.

16

17 (Meeting adjourned: 1:25 p.m.)

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that, to the best of my ability, the foregoing 129 pages are a complete and accurate computer-aided transcription of my original stenotype notes taken of the HISTORIC PRESERVATION COUNCIL MEETING in re: STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, which was held remotely, through the Zoom platform, before SARA O. NELSON, CHAIR, on October 7, 2020.

Lynne Stein

Lynne C. Stein, CSR 110
Falzarano Court Reporters, LLC

AGENDA

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

	<u>PAGE</u>
I. Call to Order for Part 2 of Meeting	6
II. Review of Public Comment Procedures	7
III. Code of Conduct/Conflict of Interest	113
IX. Threatened Properties	11
a. Stamford - 130 Henry Street, 79 Garden Street, 650 Atlantic Street - Todd Levine	
XVII. Adjournment of Part 2 of meeting	128