Hi Valerie,

I meant to include you on this communication so it could be added to our LU30.030 file. It is my response to

Anne Goslin of HPAC's letter of Dec.17th to BOR. Thank you.

Sue Halpern

------ Original Message ------From: HALPERN <suehrn1@optonline.net> To: Anne Goslin <AGoslin@stamfordct.gov> Cc: Rebecca Shannonhouse <rkahnhnpp@optonline.net>, jbhersh4@aol.com, elena@kalmandesign.com, Virgil de la Cruz <Vdelacruz@Stamfordct.gov>, Bradley Michelson <BMichelson1@stamfordct.gov>, Megan Cottrell <MCottrell@Stamfordct.gov>, charles florio <cflorio@stamfordct.gov>, Anzelmo Graziosi <AGraziosi@stamfordCT.gov>, Benjamin Lee <BLee@stamfordct.gov>, Bob Lion <Blion@stamfordct.gov>, Nina Sherwood <NSherwood@Stamfordct.gov>, todd.levine@ct.gov, mary.dunne@ct.gov, dwoods@marsh-woods.com Date: January 2, 2020 at 3:15 PM Subject: Response to HPAC's Dec. 17, 2019 Letter

Hi Anne,

HPAC's commendation and advisory support in your Dec. 17, 2019 letter is much appreciated, however the "ad hoc" group is very disappointed to hear that HPAC voted to withhold support. Our understanding from the 2015 Master Plan is that HPAC is tasked to support, promote and work in the best interest of all aspects of historic preservation.

As you are aware, the SHPO handbook provides all the information about what is required for a Study Committee. Anything that would pertain to the actual results of the study cannot be fully determined until the study is done. Thus, the group is unclear about what information you are lacking at this time. The study is intended to be inclusive to all South End properties covered in the 1986 National Registry. The study's objective is to canvas and seek feedback from as many owners as possible.

Regarding the Land Use Bureau's efforts to revise zoning regulations and strengthen preservation tools (i.e. Omnibus Text Draft Section 7-

3), the "ad hoc" group is open to further discussion. The concern is that a historic overlay can be easily overturned with special exceptions and does not offer protection as strong as the local historic district would. Further, overlays need clarity as they may not cover unprotected properties.

This study being requested is a continuation of what has been approved in the 1986 National Registry, and the 2015 Master Plan, as well as the vision portrayed in the first 19 pages of the 2018 South End Study. The study's mission is to seek <u>better</u> solutions in the South End to preserve & protect its unique heritage, density & design of its architectural character and to build a community spirit.

There is trepidation as to what is being done today and over the past 5-10 years resulting in a loss of 40% of historic homes in the district; particularly, the impact of recent development and application approvals due to special exceptions which allowed permits and some new regulations since the 2015 Master Plan.

There are inconsistencies in what is written in the 2018 South End Study related to protection of the Historic South End and also contradictions of this study to the 2015 Master Plan (chapters 6 and 9) such as:

(1) In the 2018 South End Study, neighborhood objections are that the narrative in the first 19 pages and page 22 which references the rationale for a local preservation commission contradicts what is stated in pages 20-35 where 15-22 story high rises would replace historic homes and properties, and

(2) "Spot Zoning" techniques is cited for its poor planning usage 3 times (pages 24, 32, 64) and yet was recently approved for the firehouse at the corner of Pacific and Henry Streets.

How do we ensure the vision and recommendation from the 2018 South End Study to keep all the National Register buildings that are still standing? (pages 7 and 16).

SHPO has provided written support to the merits and requirements of the proposed resolution which follows State and municipal regulations – benefits of a Local Historic District can be found in CT's 2010 Handbook of Historic Districts. The study requires no expense to the city's budget with effort done pro bono with SHPO guidance. But again, this initiative is only at the stage of a Study Committee at this point, and we anticipate that with SHPO's guidance, there will be a positive outcome. Thank You,

Sue Halpern

(please also forward to Dee Davis Oberwetter)