

October 6, 1958

2019

A regular meeting of the Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford, Connecticut was held in the Cafeteria of the Dolan Jr. High School, Glenbrook, on Monday, October 6, 1958.

The meeting was called to order at 8:06 P.M. by the President, Mr. Norton Rhoades.

INVOCATION was given by Rev. Edward J. Scull, St. John's Roman Catholic Church

ROLL CALL was taken by the Temporary Clerk, Mrs. Virginia D. Horner. At the calling of the roll there were 32 present and 8 absent. Mr. Truglia and Mr. Milano arrived shortly thereafter, changing the roll call to 34 present and 6 absent.

The absent members were: George Georgoulis, John Maffucci, Mrs. Zuckert (on vacation), William Murphy, John DeForest and Jack McLaughlin.

ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES - Meeting of September 8, 1958

The Minutes were approved, with one correction. Mr. Wilensky called attention to his remarks at the time the Planning & Zoning report was given, in which he protested the non-inclusion of Dann Drive in the list of accepted streets.

#### COMMITTEE REPORTS

##### STEERING COMMITTEE:

Mr. Rhoades, Chairman, presented the following report:

##### Meeting held Sept. 22, 1958

The Steering Committee met in the Mayor's Office, City Hall, at 8 P.M. on Monday, September 22, 1958.

Present were: Norton Rhoades, Chairman; William Murphy, Alanson Fredericks, Thomas Topping, Ellis Baker, Clement Raiteri, Jr., Rutherford Huizinga, John Macrides, John Nolan and Mrs. Virginia Horner (as Temporary Clerk).

Also present, but not as a member of the Committee, was George Russell.

Absent were Robert Lewis, Doris Zuckert, Rocco Colatrella, George Connors, Vincent Vitti and Bernard Geronimo.

The following matters were discussed:

##### (1) Referred to FISCAL COMMITTEE:

All appropriation requests approved by Board of Finance at Sept. 5th meeting. Request for 6 extra policemen for the Police Department also referred to Health & Protection Committee.

##### (2) Resignation from Mayor's Advisory Committee:

Mr. Rhoades read a letter to the Mayor in which he signified his intention of resigning from the above Committee; and also the Mayor's reply, accepting the resignation with regret.

##### (3) Charter Revision Commission - Request for expense appropriation:

October 6, 1958

A letter from the above Commission was read, requesting \$100 to take care of expenses. Referred to Mayor to initiate appropriation.

(4) Suggested Ordinance regarding persons eligible for relief:

Mr. Baker suggested an Ordinance to regulate eligibility for relief, limiting eligibility, contingent upon one years residence after recipient becomes a qualified voter of the City. Referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE & GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

(5) Request for abandonment of Nash Court:

Letter from William Ivler, dated Sept. 18th. Referred to LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE.

(6) Riverside Avenue and Berges Avenue - Bad road conditions:

Complaint from Mr. Raiteri, 6th District Representative. Referred to PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE.

(7) Eight Street and Weil Street - Dangerous walking conditions:

Petition dated Sept. 16th from residents. Referred to HEALTH & PROTECTION and PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE.

(8) Northwoods Road - Request to bring road up to acceptable condition under Section 640 of Charter:

Petition from residents, presented by Mr. Wilensky, 16th District Representative. Referred to PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE.

(9) Petition - Re Veterans' Day Celebration:

Request for permission to hold annual Veterans Day parade, November 11th. Referred to PARKS & RECREATION COMMITTEE.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 8:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Norton Rhoades, Chairman  
Steering Committee

vf

FISCAL COMMITTEE:

Mr. Huizinga, Chairman, read the Committee report. He said a meeting was held on September 29, 1958, those present being: Messrs. Topping, Robertucci, Cummings, Kolich, Fortunato and Huizinga. Those absent were: Mrs. Zuckert and Mr. Wynn.

Mr. Huizinga said the matters on the Agenda were approved by the Committee and the rest of the meeting was taken up with a general discussion of the pension problem. The following persons were invited and attended the meeting:

Mr. John Cameron - President of The Guardian Life Insurance Co.  
Mr. Isadore Mackler - Chairman of the Board of Finance  
Mr. William Keleman - Commissioner of Finance

October 6, 1958

2021

Mr. Huizinga said the Committee agreed on preliminary steps to be taken in the study of the pension plans of the City of Stamford.

- (1) \$350.00 - Zoning Board of Appeals, Code 550.4. Advertising (See Mayor's letter August 8, 1958)  
(Incurred during 1957-1958 fiscal year)

MR. HUIZINGA: "I MOVE for approval of this appropriation - for Code 551.4. I might clarify that by stating that the Board of Finance made the error, I believe, because I note it is referred to as Code 550.4 on our Agenda. Last year the Zoning Board and the Zoning Board of Appeals were consolidated in one group and had one Code for both in one budget. Now they have separated it and the Zoning Board of Appeals now uses the Code number of 551.4 and the Zoning Board takes 550.4." Seconded by Mr. Topping.

MR. RHOADES called attention to the original letter from the Mayor, requesting the appropriation, saying the Code number was listed as 550.4, but if it was incorrect, it could easily be corrected.

MR. FORTUNATO said the Code number should remain the same as it was in the Mayor's letter, because it was for expenses incurred during the last fiscal year. Therefore, it was an outstanding debt on the old Code number. He said "You are applying this charge to a brand new number."

MR. HUIZINGA: "I know that, and it bothered me even after our meeting when I was having my report typed up, so I checked with the Commissioner of Finance and if we put this on Code number 550.4 which is the way it originally started, it would then go to the Zoning Board, because it happens to now be their Code number, but it happens to have been an expense incurred by the Zoning Board of Appeals. Therefore, according to the Commissioner of Finance, he said that it should be Code number 551.4 because you can't make it retroactive, although that happens to be the reason for the request. It was overlooked, but you can't bring it back to the old budget."

MR. RHOADES said he was sure of the intent of the Board and called for a vote on the request.

VOTE taken on the above request and CARRIED unanimously.

- (2) \$24,000 - Police Department (See Mayor's letter July 2, 1958)  
(Also referred to Health & Protection Committee who approved the request)

(a) Code 430.1 Salaries -----\$21,890 (Reduced by Board of Finance)

(b) Code 430.25 Clothing & Equipment ----- 2,110  
\$24,000

MR. HUIZINGA MOVED for approval of item (a) above - Code 430.1, Salaries. Seconded by Mr. Hearing and CARRIED unanimously.

MR. HUIZINGA MOVED for approval of item (b) above - Code 430.25, Clothing & Equipment. Seconded by Mr. Lewis and CARRIED unanimously.

MR. RUSSELL commented on the item called (a) above in regard to the appropriation for salaries. He explained that this is to take care of the 6 policemen so long sought to take care of the additional need for them which the housing Committee said was needed at Southfield Village. He said that although the Board cannot stipulate where the extra police will go, at least it will help to alleviate the need for additional police at the housing project.

2022

October 6, 1958

LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE:

MR. RAITERI read his committee report. He said meetings were held on September 18, and 25 and October 2.

MR. RAITERI: "The meeting of September 18 was devoted to a final review of the proposed Electrical Code with ten representatives of the trade and of the Electrical Union. This Code is now being finally prepared for public hearing.

"The meetings of September 25 and October 2 were given over to consideration of agenda items for tonight's Board meeting "

(1) Proposed Ordinance regarding "anti-begging" and license fees for vendors and solicitors

MR. RAITERI: "As reported at the September Board meeting, consideration of a petition for increased license fees for frozen dessert vendors and of a request for an ordinance to regulate begging on City Streets, led the Committee to make a complete review of Chapter 23 of the Code of General Ordinances, to strengthen and bring up-to-date the existing ordinance governing (1) hawking and vending, and (2) soliciting for future delivery and to add to the ordinance, provisions concerning solicitation of funds.

"The proposed amended Ordinance has been reviewed by the Corporation Counsel and approved as to form and legality.

"A copy of the amended Ordinance, as originally prepared has been furnished to each Board member. The Committee will propose two amendments to the text furnished each member, but to avoid reading the six pages of the original text, the Committee will move its publication as distributed and then present the suggested amendments."

MR. RAITERI MOVED for approval for publication of the proposed Ordinance as follows:  
Seconded by Mr. Colatrella.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. ----- SUPPLEMENTAL

REGARDING "ANTI-BEGGING" AND LICENSE FEES FOR VENDORS AND SOLICITORS

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF STAMFORD

And it is hereby ordained that:

Chapter 23 of The Code of General Ordinances of the City of Stamford, Connecticut, 1956 be amended to read as follows:

Article I. In General

Sec. 1. License required.

No person shall sell, offer to sell, or exhibit for immediate sale, any goods, wares or merchandise or conduct any business from a vehicle, basket, stand, container or similar equipment or device, situated, contained, located, operated or placed on any of the streets or sidewalks in the city without first having obtained a license therefor and paid the license fee provided for in section 2 of this chapter.

Sec. 2. License fee.



The license fee to be paid under the provisions of this article shall be in the sum of seventy-five dollars per year or part of a year for each vehicle, truck, basket, cart, stand, container or similar equipment or device, used, operated and located as aforesaid; provided, however, that any person, who has paid a personal property tax to the city on any personal property, other than motor vehicles, owned by him or it and located within the limits of the city, on the Grand List of September first, last preceding, shall be entitled to an exemption to an amount equal to such personal property tax thus paid. A minimum license fee of twenty-five dollars per year for each vehicle, truck, basket, cart, stand, container or similar equipment or device used, operated and located as aforesaid, shall be required irrespective of such exemption.

No person shall be entitled to the exemption provided for in this section, by reason of his being temporarily associated with any such person who has paid his personal property tax, or who uses the name of such taxpayer for the purpose of obtaining the benefits of such exemption.

The fee provisions of this section may be waived by a two-thirds vote of the Board of Representatives upon the written request of a local religious, charitable or veterans organization.

**Sec. 3. Issuance; transferability and duration of license; pro rata payment of license fee.**

Upon tender of payment of the license fee, as required by section 2 of this chapter, the controller shall issue a peddler's license to the applicant. Such licenses shall not be transferable and shall in each case, expire on the thirty-first day of December of the year for which such license shall have been issued. No license shall be issued for a fractional period of a year nor shall any pro rata payment be permitted. All licenses issued under this Article to expire on the thirty-first day of October 1958 are automatically extended without additional fee to expire on the thirty-first day of December 1958.

**Sec. 4. Vehicle, etc., sign, tag or badge.**

Each vehicle, stand, basket, container or similar equipment or device used, operated and located as aforesaid, when used for the purpose for which same is licensed, shall have plainly displayed thereon, a sign, tag or badge, designed and furnished by the controller, at the expense of the city bearing the number of the license and the year in which such license is in force.

**Sec. 5. Restrictions on location of vehicles, etc.**

No such vehicle, basket, stand, container or similar equipment or device, shall be so located or placed as to impede traffic or be detrimental or injurious to public safety, or obstruct or interfere with the use of the street or sidewalk by the public at large. The failure to obey this provision of this section shall be grounds for revocation of such license without the return of the license fee, in addition to any other penalty which may be provided for, by the statutes of this state or of any other local ordinance now in force.

**Sec. 6. Operation of business in public parks prohibited.**

No license so issued under the provisions of this article shall be construed so as to permit the conduct of any business in any of the

public parks of the City.

**Sec. 7. Exemptions.**

The provisions of this Article shall not apply to

- a. Sales by farmers and gardeners of the produce of their farms and gardens
- b. The sale, distribution and delivery of milk and cream (except ice cream) teas, coffees, spices, groceries, meats and bakery goods
- c. Sales made to retail or wholesale stores or to professional or industrial establishments
- d. The sale of newspapers.

The provisions of this article shall not be construed to exempt any person from securing any other license, or paying any other license tax which may be authorized and imposed by the General Statutes of the state, or any provision of this Code.

**Article II. Future Delivery**

**Sec. 8. Permit required.**

It shall be unlawful for any person over sixteen years of age to solicit orders of purchase for future delivery of any goods, wares or merchandise, including magazines and other printed matter, from door to door, by telephone, or on any street or highway within the city without first obtaining from the controller of the city a permit to be known as a "solicitor's permit."

**Sec. 9. Application for permit.**

Every person requiring a solicitor's permit shall make application at least seven days in advance of the first date for which such permit is required to the controller of the city in writing on the form provided by the controller and containing the following information:

- (a) The name, home address and local address, if any, of the applicant.
- (b) A physical description of the applicant, setting forth the applicant's age, height, weight, color of hair and eyes.
- (c) The name and address of the person, firm or corporation for whom or through whom orders are to be solicited or cleared.
- (d) The nature of the goods, wares or merchandise for which orders are to be solicited.
- (e) A statement as to whether the applicant has been convicted of any crime or misdemeanor, and if so, what.
- (f) A statement as to the period during which the applicant intends to solicit orders.

The applicant at the time of executing such application shall also submit:

- (a) Identification satisfactory to the controller and containing a specimen of the applicant's signature.

(b) A photograph of the applicant.

(c) References or letters of recommendation by at least three reputable businessmen or property owners of the city such as will establish to the satisfaction of the controller the good character and business responsibility of the applicant.

The Controller shall collect ten dollars (\$10.00) for each such application for use of the city to defray the cost of the administration of this Article.

The fee provisions of this section may be waived by a two-thirds vote of the Board of Representatives upon the written request of a local religious, charitable or veterans organization.

#### Sec. 10. Form and contents of permit.

The "solicitor's permit" shall be in a form provided by the controller of the city and shall contain the following information:

(a) The name, home address and local address, if any, of the applicant.

(b) A physical description of the applicant, setting forth the applicant's age, height, weight, color of hair and eyes.

(c) The name and address of the person, firm or corporation for whom or through whom orders are to be solicited or cleared.

(d) The nature of the goods, wares or merchandise for which orders are to be solicited.

(e) The expiration date of the permit.

#### Sec. 11. Issuance and duration of permit.

The controller of the city shall upon application, as set forth in section 9 of this chapter, issue a "solicitor's permit"; provided, however, the controller shall not be required to issue a "solicitor's permit" to any person who shall have been convicted of any crime or misdemeanor without first obtaining from the Chief of police of the city his endorsed approval.

Each such permit shall expire on the thirty-first day of December of the calendar year for which such permit shall have been issued. No such permit shall be transferable.

#### Sec. 12. Permit and Badge.

The "solicitor's permit" provided for in the preceding section shall be in the possession, at all times, of the person so soliciting and shall be exhibited by him upon the request of any police officer of the city or any purchaser or prospective purchaser.

Each person so soliciting shall plainly display on his person a tag or badge designed and furnished by the controller at the expense of the city and bearing the number of the permit and the year for which such permit is in force.

#### Sec. 13. Permit does not constitute permission to enter privately policed areas.

A "solicitor's permit" issued under this article shall not constitute a permit to enter privately policed areas

**Sec. 14. Suspension or revocation of permit.**

The controller may suspend, pending trial, a "solicitor's permit" issued to a person charged with violation of any provision of this article and the controller shall immediately revoke any solicitor's permit" issued to a person found guilty of violation of any provision of this article.

**Sec. 15. Conduct of solicitor; receipts.**

Any person soliciting an order of purchase for future delivery of goods, wares and merchandise within the city shall conduct himself, at all times, in an orderly and lawful manner and shall give a written receipt, signed by the solicitor, of all orders so taken. Such receipt shall set forth a brief description of the goods, wares and merchandise ordered, the total purchase price thereof, the amount of down payment received by the solicitor from the purchaser and the approximate date of delivery.

**Sec. 16. Exemptions.**

The provisions of this Article shall not apply to:

- a. Sales by farmers and gardeners of the produce of their farms and gardens.
- b. The sale, distribution and delivery of milk and cream (except ice cream) teas, coffees, spices, groceries, meats and bakery goods.
- c. Sales made to retail or wholesale stores or to professional or industrial establishments.
- d. The sales of newspapers.

The provisions of this article shall not be construed to exempt any person from securing any other license, or paying any other license tax which may be authorized and imposed by the General Statutes of the state, or any provision of this Code.

**Sec. 17. Violations and penalties.**

Each order solicited in violation of the provisions of this article and each false statement or misrepresentation of fact for the purpose of obtaining a "solicitor's permit" shall be deemed a separate offense and shall be subject to a fine of not more than twenty-five dollars.

**Article III. Solicitation of Funds****Sec. 18. Entering upon private property.**

No. person over sixteen years of age shall enter upon any private residential property in the city for the purpose of soliciting alms or donations of money or property or financial assistance of any kind; nor for the purpose of distributing any handbill, pamphlet, tract, notice or advertising matter; nor for the purpose of selling or distributing any ticket or chance whatsoever without the consent of the occupant of said premises previously given.

**Sec. 19. Soliciting contributions in public.**



It shall be unlawful for any person, organization, society, association or corporation or their agents or representatives to solicit donations of money or property or financial assistance of any kind upon the streets, in office or business buildings, by house to house canvass or in public places in the city except upon a license issued by the controller of the city and an identification card issued by the chairman or district chairman of any charitable drive and any such regulations as hereinafter provided.

Sec. 20. Application required.

Application to solicit funds for any cause whatever as provided for in this Article shall be made in writing to the controller of the city and shall contain the following information:

- (a) Name and purpose of the cause for which permission is sought.
- (b) Names and addresses of the officers and directors of the organization.
- (c) Time for which permission is sought and localities and places of solicitation.
- (d) Whether or not any commissions, fees, wages or emoluments are to be expended in connection with such solicitation.
- (e) Such other information as the controller may require.

Sec. 21. Exceptions.

The provisions of Sections 19 and 20 of this Article shall not apply to any corporations organized as religious corporations; nor to solicitation at the regular exercises or services of any lodge, benevolent order or fraternity or any branch thereof whenever such solicitation is made at the regularly appointed meetings and regular places of worship or exercises of such lodge, order or fraternity.

Sec. 22. Violations.

Any person, organization, society, association or corporation or their agents or representatives violating any of the provisions of this Article or making any false statement or misrepresentation of facts for the purpose of obtaining permission to solicit funds shall upon conviction thereof and in addition to other penalties provided by law be subject to a fine not to exceed twenty-five dollars (\$25.00), each solicitation being deemed a separate offense.

Article IV. Separability

Sec. 23. Separability.

In the event that any Article or Section of this Chapter shall be declared unconstitutional by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining Articles or Sections thereof.

This Ordinance shall take effect on the date of its enactment.

MR. MACRIDES: "I don't wish to go into the merits of the Ordinance at this time. I will reserve that to a month from now. However, I do have four points that I would like to bring up for consideration by the Board during the intervening period. Number one is directed entirely toward the part regarding solicitor's

permits.

"No. 1 is the requirement that application be made seven days in advance. This I believe, is a little too hard on people who are out of work and wish to begin work immediately. It would mean a delay for them of one week.

"No. 2 is the requirement for three letters of reference from local business men. The theory here is that whatever Stamford does might act as a model for other cities in the state. There have been ordinances which have served for such a model. There is a possibility that we might have local vendors or local solicitors, who wish to go into New Canaan, Darien, Greenwich, and there might be faced with the requirements that they get three local references, which may be very difficult for them to get.

"Point No. 3 is the \$10 which is necessary to accompany the application. This could be a prohibitive sum for a person who is out of work and is looking for immediate work.

"The 4th point is the requirement that each solicitor exhibit on his person a badge of some sort. This, to some extent, derogates from the dignity of the person who is involved. There is something not very satisfactory when a person has to exhibit such a badge. I think those of us who were in the service, who had to carry 'dog tags' did not particularly appreciate the idea and I think this is only a step or two removed from that."

MR. FREDERICKS: "I am a little disturbed by Mr. Raiteri's statement that he is moving this for publication at this time, and then there would be a subsequent amendment recommended by the Committee." He went on to say that if the ordinance was going to be amended this, the amended Ordinance should be the one that is published, for the reason that the purpose of publishing the Ordinance was to alert the public as to the proposed language of the Ordinance which is coming up for final approval at the next meeting.

MR. BAKER: "It is the intention of the Committee to propose the two amendments prior to the vote on publication. The only reason it was done this was to prevent the reading of the six page amended ordinance. Mr. Raiteri has the two amendments and is just waiting to get the floor in order to introduce them. These will be to amend the motion to publish, so that it can all be done at the same time."

MR. LEWIS said he wanted to hear the amendments to the Ordinance before voting on the publication of the Ordinance.

It was decided that Mr. Raiteri would read the amendments without taking action on them, then move on publication of the Ordinance, and then move for adoption of the amended Ordinance for publication.

MR. RAITERI read the two proposed amendments at this time as follows:

MR. RAITERI: "The Committee recommends the amendment of the first paragraph of Article 1, Section 2, by the insertion of the words 'and boats' after the words 'motor vehicles' so that the paragraph would then read:

'The license fee to be paid under the provisions of this article shall be in the sum of seventy-five dollars per year or part of a year for each vehicle, truck, basket, cart, stand, container, or similar equipment or device, used, operated and located as aforesaid; provided, however, that any person who has paid a personal property tax to the city on any personal property, other than motor vehicles and boats, owned by him or it and located within the limits of the city, on the Grand List of September first, last preceding, shall be entitled to an exemption to an amount equal to such personal property tax thus paid. A minimum

October 6, 1958

2031

Representatives of the City of Stamford that said Board of Representatives respectfully requests the Mayor of said City of Stamford to cause a report to be made concerning such work as may be necessary to put WOODRIDGE DRIVE SOUTH, THREE LAKES DRIVE and BRIDLE PATH in condition to be accepted as City streets. The cost of such work is to be assessed in full against the owners of property on said streets.

(5) Pepper Ridge Place - Corporation Counsel's opinion as to acceptance as a public Highway

MR. RAITERI presented the following opinion from the Corporation Counsel, requested at the September Board meeting because of misunderstanding as to the question the Board wished to have answered:

CITY OF STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT

October 6, 1958

Board of Representatives  
City Hall  
Stamford, Connecticut

Gentlemen:

This is in response to your request for an opinion as to whether an expenditure of \$500.00 by the Town of Stamford for the repair of Pepper Ridge Place in 1912 was such an act to constitute said Pepper Ridge Place an accepted public highway.

Whether or not any act or acts on the part of a municipality are sufficient in law to constitute an acceptance of a highway as public is a question of fact which can only be finally determined as the result of a court proceeding.

In my opinion, the repair of Pepper Ridge Place on one isolated occasion by the City, without any express or declared intention to make the highway a public one, is insufficient to constitute Pepper Ridge Place as a public highway.

Very truly yours,

Raymond G. Cushing,  
Corporation Counsel

By: Arthur L. DiSesa,  
Assistant Corporation Counsel

(6) Proposed Ordinance for publication - Concerning the Establishment of Safety Standards for Vendors' Vehicles

MR. RAITERI MOVED for suspension of the rules in order to present a proposed Ordinance on the above matter. Seconded by Mr. Connors.

Mr. Raiteri was questioned as to the subject matter of the proposed Ordinance.



October 6, 1958

MR. RAITERI: "It deals with safety standards for vendors' vehicles. We are interested in cases where people go to a vehicle to purchase an item and there are no precautionary measures taken to safeguard them from crossing streets, especially concerning small children and ice cream vendors' trucks."

VOTE taken on suspension of the rules. A two-thirds vote needed (22 votes) CARRIED by 22 in favor, 12 opposed.

MR. RAITERI introduced the following proposed Ordinance and MOVED for publication. Seconded by Mr. Baker:

The Operator of any vehicle operated in the City of Stamford by a vendor selling, offering to sell or exhibiting for immediate sale any goods, wares or merchandise, to which vehicle the prospective purchaser is invited to come for the purpose of inspecting, examining, or purchasing the goods, wares or merchandise offered for sale, shall be accompanied and assisted by a helper or assistant whose function it shall be to assist the driver in providing for the maximum safety of all persons approaching such vehicle.

A great deal of discussion took place, several members speaking in opposition to the proposed Ordinance. Those who spoke in opposition were Mr. Lewis, Mr. Kelly, Mr. Vitti, Mr. Cummings, Mr. Fredericks, Mr. Ketcham, and Mr. Huizinga. Several people said they thought the Ordinance was too impractical.

VOTE taken on Mr. Raiteri's motion for publication. Result: 16 in favor and 16 opposed. This being a tie vote, the President cast a vote, resulting in a vote of 16 in favor and 17 opposed. LOST.

MR. KOLICH MOVED that the Ordinance be referred back to Committee for further study. Seconded by Mr. Geronimo.

MR. FREDERICKS opposed Mr. Kolich's motion. He said: "You can move that the question be considered by L & R, but you can't move for recommitment."

After further debate, it was decided that Mr. Kolich could bring this up again later in the meeting, in order to give him time to present his motion with the proper wording. (See "New Business")

#### PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE:

MR. TOPPING, Chairman, presented his committee report of meeting held Sept. 26th. He said the members present at said meeting were Messrs. Marciano, Nilan, Geronimo, Topping and Maffucci.

- (1) Complaint re bad road conditions on Riverside Avenue and Berges Avenue  
(Submitted in letter of Sept. 17, 1958 from Mr. Raiteri, 6th District Representative)

MR. TOPPING read Mr. Raiteri's letter and said: "This matter was taken up with Mr. Maguire, Commissioner of Public Works. The condition on Riverside Avenue has been remedied and Mr. Maguire assures us that the condition at the end of Berges Avenue will be taken care of as soon as possible."

- (2) Complaint dated Sept. 16, 1958. signed by 21 residents, requesting curbing along EIGHT STREET and WEIL STREET



Mr. Topping read the petition and said he had consulted with Mr. Maguire, Commissioner of Public Works, who informed him this should be a Capital Project.

MR. TOPPING: "Therefore, this Committee recommends that this portion of the petition be referred to the Public Works Department for inclusion in next years Capital Projects Budget, and I so MOVE." Seconded by Mr. Hearing.

MR. FREDERICKS objected to this Board acting in favor of expenditures prior to action taken by the Board of Finance. He said "This Board has repeatedly said we would not act before the Board of Finance."

Mr. Marciano spoke in favor of the petition and stressed the need for the work being done.

VOTE taken on Mr. Topping's motion (stated above) and CARRIED.

- (3) Request re NORTHWOODS ROAD, dated Sept. 22, 1958, asking under Sec. 640 to have road brought up to condition for acceptance by city (Presented by Mr. Wilensky, 16th District Representative, enclosing petition signed by 11 property owners on street)

MR. TOPPING read the petition. He said: "In processing this petition, I found that the residents only have perpetual right-of-way and do not own the road in fee title. The developer has promised to Quit Claim his rights to the road, to a responsible organization of the property owners. When this is done, the Committee will proceed with the processing of this petition. This Committee recommends to the Board that a letter be sent to Mr. Albert DeLuca, Northwoods Road, advising him to this effect and I so MOVE." Seconded and CARRIED unanimously.

- (4) GREENWICH AVENUE - Complaint from Mr. Colatrella, 2nd District Representative, regarding retaining wall

MR. TOPPING read a letter addressed to the Mayor from Mr. Colatrella, complaining of a long standing condition on the East side of Greenwich Avenue, which has been a very hazardous situation for many years.

MR. TOPPING: "This Committee recommends that this complaint be referred to the Public Works Department for possible inclusion in next years Capital Projects Budget. I have talked with Mr. Chase, who tells me this would have to be a Capital Budget expenditure, and I so MOVE." Seconded by Mr. Longo and CARRIED unanimously.

- (5) Re Pepper Ridge Place

MR. TOPPING: "Mr. Raiteri has already read the letter from the Corporation Counsel, so I do not think it will be necessary for me to read it again."

- (6) TURN-OF-RIVER area - Petition from residents re overflow of streams (Original petition presented by Mr. Ketcham, 18th District Representative)

Mr. Topping MOVED for suspension of the rules in order to take this matter up.

MR. RHOADES: "We had that matter once before, did we not?"

MR. TOPPING: "Yes, we did, but I now have to refer it somewhere else."

Mr. Topping's motion was seconded and CARRIED. He then proceeded to read a letter from the Flood and Erosion Control Board, to whom this matter had previously been referred, in which they say it is not within the scope of their Board but is a

problem of drainage and recommend that it be referred to the Public Works Department.

MR. TOPPING MOVED that the Board recommend this petition be referred to the Public Works Department for study and possible inclusion in next years Capital Projects Budget. Seconded by Mr. Hearing.

MR. KETCHAM spoke in favor of the petition and urged that it not be "kicked around until it gets lost".

VOTE taken on Mr. Topping's motion and CARRIED unanimously.

(7) RIVERSIDE AVENUE, BRIDGE STREET, LOWER HUBBARD AVENUE - Complaint dated Sept. 11, 1958 from Mr. Raymond Stabile. 96 Woodmere Road, addressed to Mr. Marciano, 13th District Representative, re lack of sidewalks and dangerous walking conditions.

MR. TOPPING MOVED for suspension of the rules in order to bring this on the floor. Seconded by Mr. Colatrella and CARRIED unanimously.

Mr. Topping read the letter in question and MOVED that it be referred to the Public Works and Health & Protection Committees for joint action. Seconded by Mr. Colatrella and CARRIED unanimously.

(8) Welcome Signs at Various Entrances to City

MR. TOPPING: "This is in regards to signs put up by the Chamber of Commerce. In January, the Chamber of Commerce, through the Mayor, wrote to this Board asking permission to erect certain signs. This was referred to the Public Works Committee and also to the Parks & Recreation Committee. At that time we contacted the Chamber of Commerce and were told that the wording of the signs had not yet been decided upon and at a later time they would tell us just what they wanted to put on the signs.

"A couple of months ago a sign, much like the ones they are now using, was circulated around this Board. We all looked at it. We had no comments to make on it, and now these signs have been erected.

"There was some question among the members of my Committee as to whether or not they had the authority to put up these signs without the approval of the Board of Representatives.

"In looking over the Charter I find there are several places where we do have the power to authorize the erection of signs such as these. But, we did not exercise that power when we had the opportunity. In other words, when those signs were circulated and we had the chance to make comments about them, we did not do that. I assume that silence gives consent in this particular case."

Mr. topping said he and the committee were concerned as to whether a precedent had been set.

MR. RHOADES explained that no precedent could be set which is in contradiction to the language of the Charter.

MR. LEWIS asked to be heard at this time and the President ruled that the Board was still operating under suspension of the rules, so therefore he could speak.

MR. LEWIS: "Mr. President, we have been writing letters and suggesting that things be included in our Budget, spending millions of untold dollars. I would recommend that we write a letter to the Chamber of Commerce, thanking them for their interest in placing these signs."

MR. RHOADES: "Is that a motion?"

MR. LEWIS: "Yes." Mr. Baker seconded the motion.

MR. NOLAN called attention to page 1782 of the Minutes of January 13, 1958, on this subject, in which the Steering Committee authorized the sending of a letter to the Mayor, suggesting that he pursue the matter further (regarding welcome signs being placed at city entrances).

MR. NOLAN: "I was the one who brought this matter up, and I had thought that possibly these signs would be of such great size that we might not want them. It would seem that the land of the green is becoming bulletin board conscious - we are getting too many of them. However, I have seen the signs and they are of very good quality, insofar as signs are concerned. But, I don't want it said that we failed in doing our duty."

VOTE taken on Mr. Lewis' motion to write a letter to the Chamber of Commerce. CARRIED with one dissenting vote.

Re: Complaint from property owner addressed to Mr. Marciano and introduced by Mr. Topping under Public Works Committee (See #7 under "Public Works Committee")

MR. FREDERICKS: "I am just wondering why it is necessary to take it up under the procedure of having to take a vote for the suspension of the rules by the Chairman of the Public Works Committee. Then, having us vote on suspending the rules and then having it referred by this Board, still under suspension of the rules, to the Public Works Committee.

"The proper procedure, if I recall, in a situation of this sort, would be for the President to make the assignment without taking up the time of the Board on this sort of thing. Or, it could be brought up under "New Business". But, this double voting proposition just in order to introduce these things seems to be a great waste of our time.

"The other motion which Mr. Topping raised, that one regarding the welcoming signs, was definitely a proposition that was out of our hands."

MR. RHOADES: "The President agrees with the Minority Leader."

Re: School Busses

The President reported on Mr. Lewis' request at the September meeting that a letter be written to the PUC regarding signs on busses which carry school children being designated as such.

MR. RHOADES: "We got very rapid action. The PUC sent a Mr. Willard down here, who spent some time in the office of the Board of Representatives. He also consulted the Connecticut Company at its office. He was most cooperative. The conclusion which he reached, after talking with several people was that the Connecticut Company can, and apparently is willing to indicate by signs which busses carry school children exclusively in the morning. Of course, it is not quite as simple as that, but it is the last word we have on this subject."

MR. LEWIS called attention to safety precautions used by one school bus driver, in which he escorts children across the street when they leave the bus and said he hoped everything possible would be done in making the city safer.

MR. RHOADES mentioned the fact that the Board of Education has contracted for school busses to take care of the double sessions at the high school. He said the busses were plainly designated and painted as school busses.

MR. RHOADES: "The matter of using public busses to transport school children has been further reduced by this action. However, some busses still do carry, almost exclusively, school children. It therefore might be well for this Board to follow up the letter to the PUC by another to the Connecticut Company, furthering the same idea. If there is no objection, the President will see that this is done."

Stamford Day on the Radio:

The President announced that on Wednesday morning, October 8th, in New York, the City of Stamford is to receive recognition for the fact that it has been for many years one of the outstanding cities in the east and planning for its future. He said that Mr. Russell had been designated as the representative of the Board at that meeting.  
(Applause)

PLANNING & ZONING COMMITTEE:

MR. RUSSELL, Chairman, presented the report of this Committee. He said they met on October 2, 1958, the following members being present: Messrs. Geronimo, Marciano, Wilensky and Russell.

- (1) Request from UNICO NATIONAL, Stamford Chapter, to re-name City Park known as "West Park" to "CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS PARK" and area surrounding said part to be known as "COLUMBUS SQUARE"

MR. RUSSELL MOVED for suspension of the rules in order to introduce a proposed Ordinance to change the name of the above park. Seconded by Mr. Longo.

MR. RHOADES: "Mr. Russell is moving for suspension so that we may take up an item which is not on the Agenda, which will require a two-thirds vote to suspend."

MR. RAITERI: "Mr. Chairman, I would like to refresh your memory a bit, if I may. At the Steering Committee meeting we had a carbon copy of a letter, addressed to the Mayor from UNICO. The discussion was along the lines that perhaps it had not actually been referred to our Board for the reason that the letter was sent to the Mayor. Upon my request at that time, it was ordered placed on the Agenda under "Parks & Recreation Committee"."

MR. RHOADES: "The President recalls that we were in receipt of a carbon copy only of this letter. Perhaps the communication should have been addressed to this Board directly as a matter of normal procedure. In any case I do not feel that this item can be considered to be on our agenda, and I am sure there will be no objection to Mr. Russell's request to move for suspension of the rules in order to bring this on the floor."

VOTE taken on suspension of the rules. CARRIED unanimously.

MR. RUSSELL: "A request from the local organization of UNICO, a national organization of Italian business men, to have West Park re-named Christopher Columbus Park, and the adjoining area to be known as Columbus Square was considered. If granted, UNICO will spend a considerable sum of money for a statue to commemorate the name of Columbus and the re-landscaping of the ground area. The Committee agreed unanimously to recommend the granting of this request."



October 6, 1958

2037

MR. RUSSELL then offered a proposed Ordinance to change the name of this park, and MOVED for its approval. Seconded by Mr. Marciano.

It was decided to hear from Mr. Kelly, Chairman of the Parks and Recreation Committee, who had a resolution he wished to present on this matter.

MR. KELLY: "Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any need for an Ordinance on this matter. I have a Resolution which I have prepared and am ready to offer for the approval of this Board. They are not asking to change the name of any street, merely to change the name of a park and to call the area surrounding the park Columbus Square. In New York City they do this and there is never any confusion as to the names of streets in the vicinity."

MR. KELLY read from his Committee report on this request: "In addition to having the name of the park and the area around the park changed from West Park to Christopher Columbus Park and to Columbus Square, the Stamford chapter of UNICO National is requesting permission to have appropriate services at the park on Sunday afternoon, October 12th, at 2 P.M. to commemorate the occasion. They have assured your Committee that they will abide by all police requirements and other legal requirements of the City for the occasion.

"The Park Commission has also approved a resolution, signifying their approval of this request."

MR. KELLY offered the following resolution and MOVED for its approval. Seconded by Mr. Raiteri:

RESOLUTION NO. 286

CHANGE OF NAME OF CITY PARK

WHEREAS, the Park Commission has recommended that the park known as "West Park" bounded by Main Street, West Park Place and River Street, be designated as "CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS PARK" and the area surrounding said park be known as "COLUMBUS SQUARE"; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the park known as "West Park" be designated as "CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS PARK" and the area surrounding the park be known as "COLUMBUS SQUARE".

MR. RHOADES: "This is a very unusual situation. The President does not remember anything like this ever having occurred previously. However, it does not appear to make a particle of difference whether this is done by Ordinance or by Resolution."

MR. RAITERI: "The reason I had suggested to Mr. Russell that an Ordinance be written was only in connection with the area change, but not as far as the change in name of the park is concerned. I thought that could be done by resolution because the Park Commission had already taken action by resolution. It seemed to me to be easier to do this by resolution rather than by Ordinance, which would require adoption for publication first and then final adoption at a later meeting, incur the expense of publication of an ordinance and all the red tape that goes along with it. I gave Mr. Kelly a resolution and provided copies for every other member of the Board."

It was decided that since the change of street names was not involved, that it would not be necessary to adopt an Ordinance.

VOTE taken on adoption of Resolution No. 286 and CARRIED unanimously.

(2) Petitions for Road Acceptance:

MR. RUSSELL: "The Committee agreed to present those roads for acceptance which were both certified in writing by the City Engineer and were inspected and met with the Committee's approval. The following roads were certified by the City Engineer to be constructed in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Board and the Engineering Department. They have been inspected by the Committee and are approved. All maps are filed in the office of the Town and City Clerk."

MR. RUSSELL MOVED for approval of the following roads as city streets. Seconded by several voices and CARRIED unanimously:

CASCADE COURT - Extending southerly from Cascade Road to and including permanent turnaround. 970 feet long, 22 feet wide. Map #6134

EDWARD PLACE - Extending northerly from Todd Lane - 796 feet, including temporary turnaround, width 30 feet. Map #5724

FOX HILL ROAD - Extending easterly from Foxwood Road, including permanent turnaround. Length 1,000 feet, width 22 feet - Map #5530, #6151

FOX RIDGE ROAD - Extending northerly and westerly from Fox Hill Road to Foxwood Road. Length 1685.96 feet, width 22 feet - Map #6151

FOXWOOD ROAD - Extending northerly from Fox Ridge Road, including permanent turnaround. Length 399.46 feet, width 22 feet - Map #6151

GARY ROAD - Extending westerly from Scofieldtown Road to Lolly Lane. Length 900 feet, width 26 feet - Map #5786

LOLLY LANE - Extending southerly and easterly from Gary Road, including temporary turnaround. Length 900 feet, width 26 feet - Map #5786

MARCY ROAD - Extending westerly from Foxwood Road to extension of Marcy Road. Length 431.77 feet, width 22 feet - Map #6151

MILLSTONE CIRCLE - Extending northeasterly from Saw Mill Road. Length 210 feet, width 22 feet - Map not filed, but approved by City Engineer and Planning Board.

OLD COLONY ROAD - Extending northerly from accepted portion to dead end. Length 555 feet, width 30 feet - Map #5031 (No petition filed on this road, as bond was called and City finished the road)

SADDLE HILL ROAD - Extending westerly and southerly from accepted portion. Length 1850 feet, width 22 feet - Map #6091 (Turnaround waived by Planning Board)

TWIN HILLS ROAD - Extending northeasterly from Big Oak Road to permanent turnaround. Length 225 feet, width 22 feet (No map filed)

---

RE: DANN DRIVE - Extending northerly from Oaklawn Avenue to Loveland Road. Length 1524 feet, width 30 feet on Maps #5777, #6208, #5644

MR. NILAN: "I understand that there is some legal action about this particular street. We have a gentleman who is affected by this who lives in my district. The non-acceptance of this street presents a problem to the owner and also represents a considerable amount of money tied up in this road. I would like to hear comments on this regarding whatever legal involvement is concerned if we do accept this road."

MR. WILENSKY: "I have a lot of information on this road. As you know, I live right around the corner and I drive by it every day and am familiar with that road since it was first rough graded. That particular lot on the corner, when the house was built, was low grade when the road was laid out and before the house was ever built. The contractor's son was the first occupant. It was below grade when the house was built. It was below grade when the road was roughed out and it was below grade when he sold it to the gentleman who owns the house in between Mr. Grasso and the present owner and it's still below grade. I can cite scores of houses in Stamford which are below grade. The whole East side of Barrett Avenue where I live is below grade. This is not grounds for suit just the fact that it is below grade. I feel that the present owner knew that it was below grade when he bought it - certainly he could see it without the need of a surveying instrument. You speak of an investment, which I'll grant you is substantial on the part of a person who lives there."

"But, let's consider 35 other people who happen to live there too. They have invested, likewise. And, as things stand now, unless that road is accepted, they will not be entitled to snow removal, for instance. You have ample evidence, as our able colleague from the 8th District has cited the 'rape of Holbrook' to us. This is the same thing which is going to happen all over again if that road is not maintained. The road as it stands right now is in perfect condition. There are no less than 8 catch basins on this road - I don't know why he put in so many. An extremely fine job has been done as far as drainage is concerned."

"There is curbing built up to protect the drainage from going on to this low property. Any water you see standing on there runs off from the fact that it's below grade. He's got a drainage problem that has got to be licked."

"There is no litigation going on at the present time. You can't stop any resident anywheres from suing the city once the road is accepted, and I don't think that should constitute grounds for refusal to accept this road - just the fact that somebody might sue some day because he's below it."

MR. FREDERICKS asked Mr. Wilensky what was the cause of action on the presently contemplated suit.

MR. WILENSKY: "The attorney for the resident is threatening to sue the contractor in order to force him to re-grade the land so that it will be above the road."

MR. FREDERICKS: "Then there is no litigation involving the road itself?"

MR. WILENSKY: "None whatsoever - there is nothing wrong with the road. His objection is that he is below the road. He thought that when the road was built, it should have been built with a dip in it, which of course would be impractical because it's got to run down grade. The contractor did all he could have done."

MR. FREDERICKS: "Then the suit is just threatened?"

MR. WILENSKY: "That's right. They have been trying to come to some settlement. The last attempt was made by Mr. D'Andrea who is the attorney for Mr. Grasso. He offered two loads of fill and this was turned down as being insufficient."



October 6, 1958

MR. RUSSELL pointed out that the Committee had a considerable amount of correspondence on Dann Drive when they considered this road for acceptance. He said they also had a certificate from the City Engineer that this road was constructed to his satisfaction and specifications. He also pointed out that the developer built a much better road than he needed to build under the specifications.

MR. RUSSELL: "Unfortunately, the developer had to meet the grade of Oaklawn Avenue, which abuts this man's property also. This road was probably in rough graded condition for many months, but certainly everyone knew where the road was going to be and the grade it would have to be. All the Committee can go on is that we did get certification, we looked at the road, found it to be in ideal condition, graded properly on each side, so all we can say is, that to us it has met the specifications the city requires. Under those terms the committee has no legal right to turn this road down."

MR. NILAN: "Just because the City Engineer certifies it, does not necessarily mean that the Board of Representatives has to accept this street. This thing might turn out to be a nuisance. The Corporation Counsel is busy enough right now without giving him more city suits to handle. He could probably use his time in a more productive direction rather than for us to go out and bring in new business for him to take on. I still want to go on record that until this Mr. Grasso can come to some satisfactory deal with this gentleman, I think we should not accept the road."

Considerable more debate took place. Mr. Topping said when the house was originally built, Dann Road was at a lower elevation than it is today by 8 to 10 inches. He said when they paved the road they raised it up so that it was above the property in question.

Mr. Fredericks talked at some length about the legal implications of acceptance, and MOVED that this be recommitted to Committee. Seconded by Mr. Rybnick.

It was decided to ask Mr. DiSesa, the Assistant Corporation Counsel, if by accepting this street, the Board would be implicating the city in a suit which is now threatened between the builder and one of the owners of a house on said street.

MR. DISESA: "Just in answer to the simple question brought up here tonight as to whether the city would in any way involve itself in a law suit by accepting this road. I think I could say, on the basis of the fact that have been brought out here this evening, that it would not. I can see no way in which the city itself could become involved in this particular law suit. Of course something else might arise. That is something we don't know at this time, but as to the present dispute between the property owner and the developer, I can see no way in which the city could become liable."

Mr. Fredericks withdrew his motion in view of the remarks by the Assistant Corporation Counsel.

MR. RUSSELL MOVED for acceptance of DANN DRIVE. Seconded by Mr. Kolich and CARRIED with one negative vote. (Mr. Nilan)

RE: LOCUST LANE (On Map #6348)

MR. RUSSELL: "The Committee recommends that the bond be released on the above road, but REJECTS it for acceptance as a city street, since it is an extension of a private road. This is just a turnaround area and is built to city specifications. It is only about 10 or 11 feet wide where it comes in from Bedford Street, but we do recommend that the bond be released and I so MOVE." Seconded by Mr. Lewis and CARRIED unanimously.

MR. KELLY waived the right for his committee report at this time so that Mr. Cummings could present the report of his committee. The reason for this was that Mr. Cummings was leaving very early in the morning on a business trip and would have to leave the



See item #4 under report of Steering Committee)

MR. MACRIDES: "Our Committee did not hold a meeting this month because there was no business before it, outside of the following, upon which authority was delegated to its Chairman:

"Mr. Ellis Baker suggested an Ordinance, specifying some minimum period be set up before which people could not be eligible for relief in Stamford.

"The Statutes would not permit such an Ordinance. Section 461 of the Stamford Charter charges the Department of Public Welfare with the duties imposed by law upon the Selectmen. Section 1427d of the 1955 Supplement to the General Statutes says: 'When a person not a resident of the town in which he resides becomes poor and unable to support himself, the Selectmen of such Town shall furnish him with necessary support as soon as his condition shall come to their knowledge, and each Selectman neglecting such duty shall be fine Seven (\$7.00) Dollars.'

"There is, however, another Section, 1424d, which permits the Department to notify the Welfare Commissioner when any person belonging to another State comes to this City and applies for aid. The Commissioner may then apply for an order to have such person transported back to his former residence. This is sometimes used at the discretion of the Welfare Commission, which discretion is based upon the degree of absorption into the community of the involved individuals."

MR. BAKER: "The reason I brought this in was because a number of people in the community expressed the opinion that too many people were coming in and applying for relief almost before they get here. I appreciated the fact that there were State regulations on this matter and thought it might be well to have it brought out to enlighten the people in the community so they'd know what is being done is required by law."

Mr. Connors asked if any thought had been given to enacting state legislation to prevent people from going from one town to another and immediately going on relief.

MR. MACRIDES: "That I do not know. I do know that the Statute that is on the books presently indicates that their feeling is contrary to that.

"There are a number of reciprocal statutes that have been enacted, among the various states, which call for the immediate taking care of any welfare case."

Mr. Kelly said he personally knew of two Stamford families in Massachusetts, who went there to procure work. He said after a short time they were laid off from their jobs and were stranded. He said: "Then, the Massachusetts authorities moved those people back to Stamford and on to the Stamford welfare rolls."

MR. MACRIDES: "I might say that under the last statute that I mentioned that this would be possible in Connecticut. However, I spoke to Mr. Laturney and he said that in this type of case they would extend welfare, because they have a feeling that there is a great contribution made to our state from migrant workers who come up here to work in our tobacco fields, picking apples, etc. They feel that this type of an individual has been properly absorbed into the community, because he had already gotten work in Stamford and they therefore extend the welfare benefits."

Mr. Vitti said he thought that anyone applying for relief should be put under oath so if he should not be telling the truth, would be subject to charges of perjury.

PICNIC COMMITTEE:

MR. RHOADES asked for a report from the Picnic Committee.

Mr. Marciano reported receipts of \$433.00; the disbursements of \$400.34, leaving a balance of \$33.66. He said: "I had a very pleasant surprise when Mr. Longo brought me in \$15.00 returned by one of the merchants from whom he had bought something. This gave us a total of \$47.66 in the treasury, with all the old bills outstanding now being paid for."

Mr. Marciano thanked the Committee for doing a splendid job and for the way in which everything was handled. He then read a letter from Mayor Givens, thanking the Board of Representatives and the Picnic Committee for sending flowers and a picture.

MR. MARCIANO: "Now, tell me what do I do with this money?"

MR. RHOADES suggested that the members could think about this before the next meeting, when they could make some suggestions.

MR. BAKER MOVED for a rising vote of thanks to the Committee for having done a fine job. Seconded by Mr. Milano and CARRIED unanimously. (applause)

A suggestion was made that the balance left over from the picnic money be used to defray the costs of money needed at various times for social purposes, such as buying flowers or cards, or postage needed for matters outside of the normal business of the Board.

MR. RHOADES suggested that this matter be placed on the Agenda of the next meet and discussed at that time.

SPECIAL HOUSING COMMITTEE:

MR. FREDERICKS: "I would like to rise to a point of parliamentary privilege. I would like to ask that we temporarily go off the air and that the press make no notes of a point that I would like to raise. It's in connection with the preamble to the Housing Committee's report."

A recess of five minutes was declared at 10:38 P.M.

The meeting was reconvened at 10:45 P.M.

MR. RHOADES: "The President is not going to request that the report be not broadcast or that the press disregard it."

MR. RUSSELL presented a report of the Committee in two parts. He read the first part of the report and Mr. Colatrella read the second part of the report.

The following is the report as presented by Mr. Russell and Mr. Colatrella:

PART I OF SPECIAL HOUSING INVESTIGATION COMMITTEE  
MONTHLY REPORT - OCTOBER 1958

Outside of several monthly routine inspection tours of Southfield Village made by groups of the Committee, the following meetings were held:

2807 A meeting was held by the Mayor in his Office on Thursday, September 4th, with several members of the Committee, Mr. Dams and Mr. O'Shannassy of the C. R. A., Mr. Walter McGuire and Police Chief Kinsella.

October 6, 1958

2045

A general discussion of the conditions at Southfield was held. After the meeting, the committee, the Mayor and the Public Works Commissioner made a short inspection tour of Southfield Village.

A meeting was held with Congressman Morano and several members of the Committee at his home on Monday September 8th. The purpose was to have Mr. Morano arrange a meeting with one of the top officials in the Public Housing Administration, so that the committee might ask questions and understand better the position of P. H. A. as that agency affects our local C. H. A.

A meeting was held in the Mayor's office on Thursday, September 11 with Mr. Irving Baker, P. H. A. manager assistant to Mr. Hillman, who is regional director over the Public Housing Units in this Eastern area, and his assistant Mr. Schwartz. A short, but most enlightening discussion was held.

The Committee made several efforts to meet with the City Housing Authority during the month, but due to sickness of some of their members, the meeting was not held.

The Committee's regular monthly meeting was held in the Public Works Commissioner's Office at 9 P.M., Friday, October 3rd.

The monthly progress report was drawn up at this meeting and it was voted by those attending that this month's progress report be read by Mr. Colatrella.

## PART II

### SPECIAL INVESTIGATING HOUSING COMMITTEE MONTHLY PROGRESS REPORT TO THE BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES OCTOBER 1958

All members of this Board and the people of the City of Stamford are aware of the intemperate article concerning the Housing Committee of the Board of Representatives.

Continuing the policy of this Investigating Housing Committee we are reporting to the Board of Representatives rather than to the press.

This committee has at no time since its inception made any press releases.

Statements of the nature, as made in the article of September 11 in the Stamford Advocate, attributed to the City Housing Authority impinge on the integrity of the Board of Representatives. Let it suffice to say that these regrettable and intemperate statements are not based on fact. We are quite sure that this closes the issue.

## HEALTH

The Health Department, as requested, has made monthly reports. These reports indicate that unsanitary conditions still exist. As to vermin control this committee has been assured by the C. H. A. (verbally) that remedial action has been started to obtain better results.

## FIRE & SAFETY

The Fire Department is to be congratulated on their excellent reports and

October 6, 1958

the thoroughness of their inspections. These periodic inspections have contributed greatly to improve safety and general outdoor housekeeping.

This committee stills feels that lighting the public areas of the buildings, can be greatly improved, and still recommends Vandal-Resistant lighting fixtures.

#### GROUNDS & STREET LIGHTING

This committee has been informed by the C. H. A. that a study of street and off street lighting is being made to determine the most satisfactory lighting. Evidence of these tests have been noted by this committee.

The C. H. A. has requested the installation of Mercury lights on City Streets in the area such as:

1. Pressprich Street
2. Irving Avenue
3. Wilson Street
4. Victory Street
5. Corner of Fairfield & Pressprich Streets

#### PARKS & RECREATION

The Park Commission is taking action to prepare near-by Laddin Rock Park with minimum facilities for actual use.

#### MAINTENANCE & INSPECTIONS

Since this committee made its original report to this Board, the maintenance crew has been increased from nine (9) to fourteen (14) men, and has recently received funds to employ a qualified maintenance director to supervise the overall maintenance of structures, equipment and grounds.

In addition to the aforementioned, C. H. A. is seeking approval from the P. H. A. for a permanent painting crew for routine preventative maintenance.

A painting contract for the exterior doors is being processed and should be completed in the near future.

This additional personnel will relieve management for more thorough and more frequent inspections of the apartments and adjoining areas.

#### POLICE

This committee requested as an urgent need, Foot Patrol in this area. We sincerely hope that with the increased manpower, that at long last, adequate policing of this area will become fact.

Our committee and all the citizens of Stamford are striving for the same objectives at Southfield Village.

The continued co-operation of all groups contributing to the welfare and recreation of this area is the best answers to problems at Southfield Village

Respectfully Submitted,

SPECIAL INVESTIGATING HOUSING COMMITTEE



October 6, 1958

2047

F. Longo - G. Russell  
Co-Chairmen

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE:

MR. MACRIDES, Chairman, reported that a letter had been received from Mr. Iacovo, former Board member, requesting that the tax on automobiles and boats be changed, and asked that this be referred to above committee.

MR. RHOADES: "This will be done."

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE MAYOR

Appointment, Mrs. Gertrude N. Marshall to Urban Redevelopment Commission for term expiring in 1963 (Replacing Alfons Bach). REFERRED TO APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE.

MR. RHOADES: "This appointment was received the day after the Steering Committee meeting."

RESOLUTIONS

MR. VITTI presented the following resolution and MOVED for its adoption. Seconded by Mr. Colatrella. (This is a substitute for the one appearing on the Agenda under "Old Business")

RESOLUTION NO. 287

BE AND IT HEREBY RESOLVED by the Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford that the bridge located on Richmond Hill Avenue between South Street and Greenwich Avenue, be hereafter known as the J. Flemming Rutledge Bridge.

Mr. Vitti, being questioned, said that this bridge is a city-owned bridge.

Several people spoke in favor of the naming of this bridge as a memorial to the late J. Flemming Rutledge. Among these speakers were Mr. Lewis, Mr. Connors, Mr. Nilan, Mr. Kelly, Mr. Geronimo, Mr. Colatrella and Mr. Truglia.

VOTE taken on adoption of the above resolution and CARRIED unanimously.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER BOARDS AND INDIVIDUALS

- (1) Letter from Stamford Planning Board dated Oct. 1, 1958 - Re: Annual Review of Capital Budget needs for fiscal year 1959-60 and ensuing five year program for 1960-65

Mr. Rhoades read the above letter.

- (2) Public Utilities Commission - Notice of public hearing on Oct. 14, 1958 re extension of route (dated Sept. 30, 1958)

Mr. Rhoades read the above letter.

- (3) Letter from Clement L. Raiteri, Jr., 6th District Representative, dated Oct. 3, 1958 - Resignation

2810 Mr. Rhoades read the following letter:

October 6, 1958

Dear Fellow Board Members:

As the Democratic candidate for State Senator, I feel that it will be impossible for me to be an active member of the Board of Representatives and still devote the time which will be necessary to fulfill my obligation to the Senatorial position.

Therefore, please consider this as a letter of resignation, effective January 1, 1959, only if I am elected in November. Otherwise, it will be my pleasure to continue to serve our community in my present capacity as a member of the Board of Representatives.

(signed) Clement L. Raiteri, Jr.

MR. RAITERI: "The reason this letter was written is because in the past we are all aware of the unfavorable publicity which has been given to the subject of dual job holding. It's been kicked around to the point of being ridiculous. Rather than to have anything come up on it in the future, I felt that I would make my position known at this time."

OLD BUSINESS (See Resolutions)

NEW BUSINESS

Re: Ice Cream Trucks - (See Item #6 under Legislative & Rules Committee - Concerning the Establishment of Safety Standards for Vendors' Vehicles)

MR. RHOADES: "Under 'New Business' the Chair agreed to recognize Mr. Kolich."

MR. KOLICH MOVED to refer the above matter to the Legislative & Rules Committee. Seconded by Mr. Connors.

MR. FORTUNATO said he thought this should also be referred to the Health and Protection Committee for the reason that it involved a safety factor.

Mr. Fortunato was questioned as to whether he meant this should be referred to both the Legislative and Rules and the Health and Protection Committees. He said he meant only one committee - the Health & Protection Committee.

MR. KOLICH refused to accept this amendment.

MR. RAITERI: "It is my feeling that the Legislative & Rules Committee has done everything possible along these lines and I don't feel that anything would be gained by again referring it back to this Committee."

VOTE taken on Mr. Kolich' motion and LOST.

Re: Next Board meeting and next Steering Committee meeting

MR. NOLAN MOVED that the next Board meeting be scheduled for the second Monday in November, namely November 10th, because of conflict of dates with election day. Seconded and CARRIED unanimously.

MR. RHOADES called attention to the fact that moving up the date of the Board meeting to a later date would now bring the next meeting of the Steering Committee on Monday, October 27th.

October 6, 1958

2049

Small maps of City

MR. RHOADES: "We owe thanks to Mr. Weed of the Citizens Savings Bank, who presented the members of the Board with copies of a booklet and small maps of the city, which were mailed out to all the Board members."

ADJOURNMENT

On MOTION of Mr. Baker, duly seconded, the meeting adjourned at 11:10 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

*Norton Rhoades*

Norton Rhoades, President  
Board of Representatives

vf

2812