

Minutes of October 1, 1962
Meeting of the 7th Board of Representatives
Stamford, Connecticut

3498

A regular meeting of the 7th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford, was held on Monday, October 1, 1962 in the Cafeteria of the Dolan Junior High School, Toms Road, Stamford, Connecticut.

The meeting was called to order by the President, Paul D. Shapero, at 8:05 P.M.

INVOCATION was given by Rev. Laurence Brett, St. Cecilia's Church.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO FLAG: The President led the members in the pledge of allegiance to the flag.

ROLL CALL was taken by the Clerk. There were 31 present and 9 absent at the calling of the roll. Mr. Scarella and Mr. Kuczo arrived shortly afterward, changing the roll call to 33 present and 7 absent. The absent members were: Samuel Cushing, Fred Blois, John Kane, William Murphy, Edward Dombroski, Stanley Kulowiec and George Russell.

A MOMENT OF SILENCE was observed in tribute to the memory of JOHN A. SCALZI, deceased member of the Park Commission.

ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES - Meeting of September 7, 1962 (Special Meeting)
Meeting of September 10, 1962 (Regular Meeting)

The Minutes of the above meetings were accepted, with the following correction to the Minutes of September 7, 1962:

Last paragraph on Page 3477, first sentence, changed to read: "MR. SCHWARTZ said he would like to make a suggestion that the Steering Committee appoint a Sub-Committee to work out a specific set of Charter revision procedures - a time-table schedule, so that the Board does not run into the "snafu" that we ran into this time."

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

THE PRESIDENT read the following report:

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT
Meeting held Thursday, September 20, 1962

A meeting of the Steering Committee was held on Thursday, September 20, 1962 in the Mayor's Office, City Hall.

The meeting was called to order at 8:10 P.M. The Chairman, Paul D. Shapero, presided. All members were present with the exception of Messrs. Murphy and Shanen. Mr. Russell and Mr. Blois arrived shortly after the meeting started.

The President appointed Alan H. Ketcham (Republican) as a member of the Committee, replacing Jack McLaughlin, resigned.

The following matters were discussed and acted upon:

- (1) Concerning request by Stamford Advocate to have a newspaper reporter present:

THE CHAIRMAN informed the members that a request had been received from the Stamford Advocate to have a member of the press present at the meeting. A reporter, who was present, was asked to leave the meeting, while the Committee discussed the merits of the request.

Inasmuch as this request was a departure from the usual proceedings, the Chairman called for a vote on the question.

Mr. Russell arrived at this time.

After considerable debate, a vote was taken on the question, with the understanding that the reporter could stay only during discussion on the matter of a ruling from the Attorney General. CARRIED by a vote of 10 in favor and 3 opposed.

The reporter was invited to come in to the meeting. The Chairman informed him he could stay for that part of the meeting that concerned the Charter Revisions.

- (2) Concerning the request of an opinion from the Attorney General as to the validity of action of the 5th Charter Revision Commission and of the Board in creating same, and notification to Town Clerk to place questions on ballot

THE CHAIRMAN read the following correspondence on the above matter:

September 12, 1962

Honorable Albert Coles
Attorney General
State of Connecticut
Hartford, Connecticut

Dear Mr. Coles:

The Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford has recently authorized, by resolution, certain proposals and charter revisions to be submitted to the electorate by way of referendum at the November 6, 1962 election.

Some questions have been raised by members of the Board concerning the procedural steps taken, particularly as to the compliance with state statutes in regard to timing of such actions. Would you please inform me as to what factual material you will require in order to render an opinion as to the legality of the action taken by the Board of Representatives.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) Paul D. Shapero, President
Board of Representatives

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
Attorney General's Office
Hartford, Connecticut

September 18, 1962

Mr. Paul D. Shapero, President
Board of Representatives
City of Stamford
86 Prospect Street
Stamford, Connecticut

Dear Mr. Shapero:

This will acknowledge your letter of September 12, 1962.

You inquire concerning the facts and material required by me to give a formal opinion as to the legality of action taken by the Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford in connection with certain proposed charter revisions.

I regret that I cannot be of assistance to you. The Office of Attorney General is authorized by statute to advise and counsel with state officers, boards and commissions, and it is not privileged to advise the various municipalities upon their legal problems.

This is a matter for consideration by your corporation counsel, who is the proper legal authority to advise your board of representatives.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) Albert L. Coles,
Attorney General

Mr. Blois arrived at this time.

Mr. Russell said he thinks we must accept the opinion of the Corporation Counsel as binding. Mr. Baker said he felt that the committee should be guided by the Corporation Counsel's opinion that action taken by the Board is valid.

THE CHAIRMAN said it would seem that, in the light of what the Attorney General says in his letter, he would immediately notify the Town Clerk as to action taken by the Board at their September 7, 1962 special meeting in approving four proposals to go on the ballot at the November election.

The business in regard to Charter amendments now being closed, the Committee went into executive session and the Advocate reporter left the meeting.

(3) Committee assignments:

MR. SHAPERO named the following appointments to fill committee vacancies, Mr. Ketcham having already been named as replacement for Mr. McLaughlin on the Steering Committee:

LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE - John V. Kane, Jr. (Democrat) replacing
Raymond Mazza

FISCAL COMMITTEE - William Walsh (Republican) replacing Jack McLaughlin

- (4) Additional appropriations approved by Board of Finance 9/13/62; concerning \$53,018.00 for Holbrook Estates and \$20,285.00 for Mitchell Street (Mayor's letters of 9/4/62) REFERRED TO FISCAL COMMITTEE and PLANNING & ZONING COMMITTEE
- (5) Mayor's letter of 9/4/62 concerning renewal of lease between City and the HALLOWEEN YACHT CLUB, for a 3 yr. period, beginning 1/1/63, at annual rental of \$2,000.00 (Approved by Board of Finance 9/13/62)
REFERRED TO LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE
- (6) Mayor's letter 8/29/62 concerning exchange of property (located at West Beach) between City of Stamford and CLARENCE W. MUZZIO, in order to settle a boundary line dispute (Approved by Board of Finance 9/13/62)
REFERRED TO LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE
- (7) Mayor's letter 7/30/62 concerning conveyance by City to F. A. BARTLETT TREE EXPERT CO. of strip of land containing .067 acres, as shown on map entitled "Sketch Prepared For The F. A. Bartlett Tree Expert Co., Stamford, Conn.", dated July 26, 1962 (Approved by Board of Finance 9/13/62) REFERRED TO LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE
- (8) Rescinding and amending Ordinance No. 98 to prohibit Carnivals, Circuses and Wild West Shows (Proposed by Mr. Mead at 9/10/62 meeting under "New Business") REFERRED TO LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE
- (9) Letter dated 9/10/62 concerning ragweed control, addressed to Thomas Morris, 16th District Representative, from Andrew and Agnes Mitchell of 28 Edward Place - REFERRED TO HEALTH & PROTECTION COMMITTEE
- (10) Concerning Lights for night use of tennis courts:

MR. NOLAN brought the above matter on the floor and asked that it be referred to a committee to ascertain the reason why these lights were never installed.
REFERRED TO PARKS & RECREATION COMMITTEE
- (11) PUC Notice of Hearing (dated 9/20/62) concerning re-scheduling of trains on the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad - Hearing to be held in Hartford at the State Office Building, Monday, October 22, 1962 at 10:30 A.M. - NOTED AND FILED
- (12) Parking Authority Statement for period 7/1/61 through 6/30/62 and Balance Sheet as of June 30, 1962 - NOTED AND FILED
- (13) Stamford Planning Board (letter dated Sept. 17, 1962) concerning Capital Projects Budget Schedule of departmental hearings - NOTED AND FILED

There being no further matters to come before the committee, the meeting was adjourned.

vf

Paul D. Shapero, Chairman
Steering Committee

Mr. Scarella and Mr. Kuczo arrived at this time, changing the roll call to 33 present and 7 absent.

FISCAL COMMITTEE:

MR. MEYERS said the Fiscal Committee met and considered the following items, which were unanimously approved:

- (1) \$53,018.00 - HOLBROOK ESTATES - Improvements (Under provisions of Chapter 64 of Charter - See Resolution No. 23 adopted 9/10/62) (Streets known as APPLE TREE DRIVE, BOXWOOD DRIVE, HOLBROOK DRIVE and PINE TREE DRIVE) (See Mayor's letter 9/4/62)

MR. MEYERS said the City's share on the cost of improvement of these roads will be \$23,568.00 and the property owners' share will be \$29,450.00 for a total appropriation of \$53,018.00 in the 1962-1963 Budget.

MR. MEYERS MOVED for approval of this request. Seconded by Mrs. Austin.

MRS. AUSTIN said this matter has been in "the works" for three years and she is happy to see this go through at a figure which does not place an unfair burden on the taxpayers and is also fair to the residents on these streets. She said they asked the residents to wait until the heavy equipment for installing the sewers is up in their area as they would then be able to get a better price from the contractor, which is what has been done.

MR. MULREED said this had also been referred to the Planning and Zoning Committee. He reported for that Committee, as Vice-Chairman in the absence of Mr. Russell, the Chairman. He said the Committee concurred in recommending approval of this appropriation.

MR. MORRIS asked if this was not supposed to go out for bids.

MRS. AUSTIN informed the speaker that a better price was obtained by waiting until the heavy equipment was in the area - that bids were obtained in the usual way.

MR. SCARELLA asked if the Chairman of the Fiscal Committee has a breakdown on this price - how it was arrived at. He said he was familiar with this project, and as he recalls, about 5 or 6 years ago, the figures were lower.

THE PRESIDENT asked him if he meant the breakdown of figures as contained in the Mayor's letter.

MR. SCARELLA said that was not what he means - he was referring to the breakdown of the job itself - such as the cost of widening the road, storm drains, and black-topping. He said at the time this was first considered the price was somewhere around \$21,000.00 for oiling and sanding and now the figure is \$53,000.00.

MRS. AUSTIN said she is sure Mr. Scarella is aware that just oiling and sanding these roads would not be enough and that there is also a terrific drainage problem.

MR. SCARELLA said he understands that, but the difference in price seems so large, he merely wanted to know how they arrived at these figures and if the Engineering Department has a breakdown of them.

THE PRESIDENT asked Mr. Meyers if he had this breakdown of figures.

MR. MEYERS said he did not have it with him this evening.

VOTE taken on Mr. Meyers' motion to approve the sum of \$53,018.00 for HOLBROOK ESTATES. CARRIED with one dissenting vote (Mr. Scarella).

- (2) \$20,285.00 - MITCHELL STREET - Improvements (Under provisions of Chapter 64 of Charter - See Resolution No. 393 adopted 9/10/62 - Also see Mayor's letter 9/4/62)

MR. MEYERS MOVED for approval of the above request. Seconded by Mr. Mead.

MR. MEYERS explained that the City's share of the cost of improvement will be \$5,968.00 with the property owner's share being \$14,317.00, making a total cost of \$20,285.00.

MR. MULREED said the Planning and Zoning Committee approved the appropriation.

MR. JOHNSON asked a question. He said the Holbrook Estates appropriation was just about two and one-half times the size of the one for Mitchell Street and was the amount of work to be done on the Holbrook Estates in the same proportion.

The answer was "no".

MR. KETCHAM asked if the figure for Mitchell Street was arrived at by competitive bidding.

MR. MEYERS said he thought this was arrived at in the same manner that all projects of this type are done, and that is that the City Engineer's office make up an estimate of what the cost will be and the job is then submitted for bid. He said this actually was not the final figure as a result of bidding.

VOTE taken on the above motion as made by Mr. Meyers. CARRIED unanimously.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE:

MR. BAKER presented his committee report. He said the committee met the evening of September 26th in the office of the Mayor, at which time the Corporation Counsel was present and Mr. Connell from the Park Commission.

- (1) Renewal of lease between City of Stamford and the HALLOWEEN YACHT CLUB, for a three year period, beginning January 1, 1963, at annual rental of \$2,000.00
(Requested in Mayor's letter of 9/4/62) (Approved by Board of Finance 9/13/62)

MR. BAKER said this lease has been approved by the Board of Finance, the Park Commission and the Mayor. He explained the Club has as members small boat owners; that the membership is open to all local residents of Stamford; that it is a non-profit Club; that the premises consist of a building, with surrounding land and docking area. He said the renewal is on the same terms as the prior lease and that the Committee recommends approval of this lease as being in the interests of the City and particularly those residents who are small boat owners.

MR. BAKER MOVED for approval of the above lease. Seconded by numerous members and CARRIED unanimously.

- (2) Exchange of property (located at West Beach) between City of Stamford and CLARENCE W. MUZZIO, in order to settle a dispute over boundary line (Mayor's letter 8/29/62) (Approved by Board of Finance 9/13/62)

MR. BAKER said for many years there has been a dispute over the boundary line between city property and that owned by Muzzio in the area in which the proposed exchange of land is located. He said after three surveys, each of which differed as to the location of the disputed line, they finally accepted the median line as the true line. However, this line created an irregularity in the line between city property and that of the Muzzio property and the proposed change eliminates the irregularity. He said all of the land in the disputed zone is away from the water front and is undeveloped land with excellent park and recreational potentials; in the exchange the city comes off advantageously by acquiring a larger parcel of land than that given up. He urged approval of this exchange of land and SO MOVED.

Seconded by several members and CARRIED unanimously.

- (3) Conveyance by City of Stamford to F. A. BARTLETT TREE EXPERT CO. of strip of land containing .067 acres, as shown on map entitled: "Sketch Prepared For The F. A. Bartlett Tree Expert Co., Stamford, Conn.", dated July 26, 1962 (See Mayor's letter 7/30/62) (Approved by Board of Finance 9/13/62)

(Note: The Board of Finance deferred, pending a ruling from the Corporation Counsel on the change of location of road to connect the Bartlett property with the UConn property. See Mayor's letter of 7/24/62)

MR. BAKER said at the time the committee met the Board of Finance had not yet acted upon a proposed transfer by the city to the same company of a strip of land which has to do with giving the University of Connecticut access to Scofield Town Road. For this reason, they decided this matter should be held in committee.

- (4) Final adoption of Ordinance pertaining to the restriction of parking vehicles on public streets (Adopted for publication Sept. 10, 1962; published 9/13/62) (Requested in Mayor's letter 7/23/62 - See page 3440, item #2, Minutes of 8/6/62)

MR. BAKER MOVED for enactment of the following Ordinance. Seconded by Mr. Sherman and Mr. Meyers and CARRIED unanimously:

ORDINANCE NO. 102 SUPPLEMENTAL

PERTAINING TO THE RESTRICTION OF PARKING VEHICLES ON PUBLIC STREETS

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF STAMFORD THAT:

SECTION 1. Stopping, standing, or parking prohibited. No signs required.

- (a) No person shall stop, stand, or park a vehicle, except when necessary to avoid conflict with other traffic or in compliance with law or the directions of a police officer or traffic-control device, in any of the following places:

1. On a sidewalk;
2. In front of a public or private driveway;
3. Within an intersection;
4. Within 15 feet of a fire hydrant;

5. On a cross walk;
6. Within 10 feet of a cross walk at an intersection;
7. Within 30 feet upon the approach to any flashing beacon, stop sign, or traffic-control signal located at the side of a roadway;
8. Between a safety zone and the adjacent curb or within 30 feet of points on the curb immediately opposite the ends of a safety zone, unless the city traffic authority has indicated a different length by signs or markings;
9. Within 50 feet of the nearest rail of a railroad crossing;
10. Within 20 feet of the driveway entrance to any fire station and on the side of a street opposite the entrance to any fire station within 75 feet of said entrance (when properly signposted);
11. Alongside or opposite any street excavation or obstruction when stopping, standing, or parking would obstruct traffic;
12. On a roadway side of any vehicle stopped or parked at the edge or curb of a street;
13. Upon any bridge or other elevated structure upon a highway or within a highway tunnel;
14. At any place where official signs prohibit stopping.

- (b) No person shall move a vehicle not lawfully under his control into any such prohibited area or away from a curb such distance as is unlawful.

SECTION 2. Parking not to obstruct traffic.

No person shall park any vehicle upon a street, other than an alley, in such a manner or under such conditions as to leave available less than 10 feet of the width of the roadway for free movement of vehicular traffic.

SECTION 3. Parking in alleys.

No person shall park a vehicle within an alley in such a manner or under such conditions as to leave available less than 10 feet of the width of the roadway for the free movement of vehicular traffic, and no person shall stop, stand, or park a vehicle within an alley, in such position as to block the driveway entrance to any abutting property.

SECTION 4. Parking for certain purposes prohibited.

No person shall park a vehicle upon any roadway for the principal purpose of:

- (a) Displaying such vehicle for sale;
- (b) Washing, greasing, or repairing such vehicle, except repairs necessitated by an emergency.

SECTION 5. No stopping, standing, or parking near hazardous or congested places.

- (a) The city traffic authority is hereby authorized to determine and designate by proper signs places in which the stopping, standing, or parking of vehicles would create an especially hazardous condition or would cause unusual delay to traffic.
- (b) When official signs are erected at hazardous or congested places as authorized herein, no person shall stop, stand, or park a vehicle in any such designated place.

SECTION 6. Application of article.

The provisions of this article prohibiting the standing or parking of a vehicle shall apply at all times or at those times herein specified or as indicated on official signs except when it is necessary to stop a vehicle to avoid conflict with other traffic or in compliance with the directions of a police officer or official traffic-control device.

SECTION 7. Penalty - Fine.

Any person, firm or corporation violating any of the provisions of this ordinance shall be fined for each such violation a sum not exceeding \$25.00.

SECTION 8. Removal of vehicles by police.

Upon discovering any such vehicle so parked in violation of this ordinance or when any vehicle upon a highway is so disabled as to constitute an obstruction to traffic and the person or persons in charge of the vehicle are by reason of physical injury incapacitated to such an extent as to be unable to provide for its custody or removal or when any vehicle is left unattended upon a street and is parked so as to constitute a hazard or obstruction to the normal movement of traffic, any police officer may remove or cause said vehicle to be removed to a garage or other parking area, either public or private.

SECTION 9. Notice of removal.

Whenever such a police officer removes or causes the removal of a vehicle from a public street as authorized by this ordinance, and he knows, or is able to ascertain from the registration records in the vehicle, the name and address of the owner thereof, he shall give or cause to be given, notice in writing to such owner, of the fact of such removal and the reasons therefor and of the place to which such vehicle has been removed. A copy of said notice shall also be given to any person who is in charge of the place to which such vehicle has been removed. If the name and address of the owner is not ascertainable as above, and the vehicle is not claimed within a period of three (3) days, the police department shall request such information from the Department of Motor Vehicles of the State where such vehicle is registered.

SECTION 10. Procedure for release of vehicle.

Before the owner or person in charge of any vehicle taken into custody, as above provided, shall be allowed to remove the same from the place where it has been impounded, he shall furnish to a member of the police department, evidence of his identity and ownership, shall sign a receipt for such vehicle, and shall pay at police headquarters, the cost of removal, not to exceed the sum of Five (\$5.00) Dollars, plus the cost of storage, not to exceed Fifty (.50) Cents for each day, or portion of a day, that such vehicle is so stored in excess of the first twenty-four (24) hours.

The police department is authorized to enter into an arrangement with companies offering towing service and provide such service as is required in the enforcement of this ordinance.

SECTION 11. Police Department to keep records.

It shall be the duty of the police department to keep a record of the names of the owners of all vehicles taken into custody under these provisions, the numbers of their state license plates, the place where each vehicle is being stored, and the nature, circumstances and disposition of each case.

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

- (5) Final adoption of proposed amendments to Building Code, Concerning Shut-Off Valves (Sec. 613 of Plumbing Code - See page 161 and page 144 of Code)
(Deferred 5/7/62, page 3360, item #4; approved for publication on 7/2/62; published 7/7/62; Tabled at 8/6/62 meeting - See pages 3449-50)

MR. BAKER read a letter from the Assistant Corporation Counsel as follows:

"On August 27, 1962, you requested an opinion as to whether the City may properly amend the Building Code to require shutoffs for gas and other utility services on buildings other than those enumerated in Section 6.02 b (2) of Docket No. 8950 of the Public Utilities Commission.

"Pursuant to its general corporate powers, the Stamford Charter provides the power 'to license, regulate or prohibit the keeping, storing, manufacturing, selling or use of any explosive or inflammable substances or materials within the municipality.....', Section 40 (17), 'to regulate the construction, re-construction, demolition, removal, altering or repairing, materials, location, height, maintenance, use and occupancy of buildings and generally to regulate all building operations,' Section 40 (22).

"Similar to Section 40 (22) of the Charter is Section 7---194 (41), C.G.S.

"Thus, having the power to enter the area of building regulation, it is our opinion that your Board may properly require such shutoffs for gas and other utility services, provided such amendment is not unreasonable, arbitrary or inconsistent with state law.

"The P.U.C. is concerned solely with the regulation of gas and other utilities by utility companies, while the City is left to exercise police powers for health, safety, welfare, etc., within its confines and so long as we do not change the P.U.C. requirements as applied to utility companies, there is no conflict between our proposed building code amendment and the P.U.C. regulations.

"We feel that an amendment such as is contemplated does not limit the State P.U.C. regulations."

Very truly yours,

ISADORE M. MACKLER
Corporation Counsel

By: Gerald Kolinsky
Assistant Corporation Counsel

MR. BAKER said the committee therefore recommends the final adoption of this amendment to the Building Code, and MOVED for approval of the following amendment to the Building Code of the City of Stamford. Seconded by several members and CARRIED unanimously:

ORDINANCE NO. 80.3 SUPPLEMENTAL

AMENDING SECTION 613 OF THE BUILDING CODE OF THE CITY OF STAMFORD
IN REGARD TO SHUT-OFF VALVES - AN ORDINANCE CONCERNING THE BUILDING
CODE, APPENDICES AND AMENDMENTS

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF STAMFORD THAT:

The Building Code of the City of Stamford shall be amended as follows:

613. SHUT OFF VALVES

1. Every building hereafter erected and in every existing building other than dwellings, which may be supplied from some outside source with gas, vapor or fluid, except potable waters, shall have a conveniently accessible stopcock or other suitable device fixed to the supply pipes at a place outside of the building, arranged to allow the supply to be shut off. Such stopcock or other device shall be marked to indicate the contents and purpose of the supply pipe to which it is attached.

Former language under paragraph 1. (a) on page 161 under PLUMBING has been eliminated. Substitute for such exclusion the following:

- (a) All water shut-off valves controlling water supplies to such building shall be placed so they will be easily accessible for operation and shall be installed and maintained, so as not to create a nuisance.
- (b) In multiple family buildings supplied through a master meter, or where meters are not readily accessible from the appliance location, an individual shut-off valve for each apartment or for each separate house line shall be provided at a convenient point of general accessibility.
- (c) "Building" as provided for in this section shall include theaters, churches, schools, factories, multi-family dwellings, as well as other buildings where large number of persons assemble.
- (d) It shall be unlawful to tamper with, cover, obscure, or in any way impede ready accessibility.

Add another paragraph on page 144 under PLUMBING, 15. SHUT-OFF VALVES, which will now read as follows:

15. SHUT OFF VALVES

Separate stop cocks or valves, always accessible, shall be placed at the foot of each riser line and, in multiple dwellings or commercial buildings, for each individual fixture or group of fixtures controlled by each tenant.

- (a) It shall be unlawful to tamper with, cover, obscure or in any way impede ready accessibility of such stop cocks or valves; and same shall be installed and maintained so as not to create a nuisance.

This Ordinance shall become effective upon its adoption.

- (6) Easement to Stamford Water Company for sum of \$1.00, covering 20 ft. strip of land, from Vine Road to Little Hill Drive, shown on Map #7314, entitled: "Map Showing Right-of-Way Conveyed to Stamford Water Co. by City of Stamford." (Mayor's letter 7/5/62) (Deferred 9/10/62)

MR. BAKER said this easement is requested by the Water Company for the purpose of bringing a water supply into the Vine Road area Jr. High School now under construction and this proposed easement would cross City property from Vine Road to Little Hill Drive. He said it is along an access road and will in no way interfere with the use of the land by the School; it has been approved by the Board of Education, the Board of Finance and by the Mayor. He said the committee recommends that the easement be granted and SO MOVED. Seconded by Mr. Johnson, Mr. Kelly and Mr. Scarella. CARRIED, with one abstention - Mr. Ketcham not voting.

- (7) Concerning proposed amendment to Building Code relating to plate glass or patio doors. (Submitted in letter of 5/28/62 from Ronald M. Schwartz, 16th District Representative - See item #3 under L & R, Minutes 9/10/62 - Deferred 9/10/62)

MR. BAKER said the delay in final action on this matter was because the committee deemed it advisable to be fully informed as to the alternative methods by which the objective could be attained before making a recommendation.

MR. BAKER said the committee recommends the following proposed amendment to the Building Code, for publication, and SO MOVED. Seconded by Mr. Schwartz and CARRIED unanimously:

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 106.5 OF THE BUILDING CODE OF THE CITY OF STAMFORD, CONCERNING EXIT DOORS CONTAINING GLASS

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF STAMFORD THAT:

Section 106.5 of the City of Stamford Building Code, 1959, be amended to read as follows:

5. EXIT, PLATE GLASS AND PATIO DOORS

(a) All doors serving as exits shall open on a platform and the width of such doors shall not be less than 3 feet nominal width; except that interior doors which provide access to or egress from a dwelling unit and do not open directly on a stair enclosure shall not be construed as exit doors. No door shall be hung so as to project when fully opened, beyond the face of the building. .

(b) No plate glass or patio door serving either as an exit or interior door shall be hereafter installed in any new or remodelled

buildings or dwellings unless the glass in such doors is, or has a sufficient design plainly and distinctly displayed thereon to warn users of its existence, or is one of the following:

Approved laminated safety glass;
Approved one-quarter (1/4) inch, or heavier, wired glass;
Approved one-quarter (1/4) inch, or heavier, tempered glass; or
Approved five-eighths (5/8) inch, or heavier, insulated glass.

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

(Note: Underlined portions are new. This can be found on page 33 of Building Code under Section 106. EXIT REQUIREMENTS.)

(8) Proposed Ordinance Prohibiting Carnivals, Circuses and Wild West Shows
(Rescinding previous Ordinance No. 98 Supplemental)

MR. NOLAN MOVED for suspension of the rules in order to take up the above matter. Seconded and CARRIED unanimously.

MR. BAKER said the committee is fully aware of the consensus of the Board members regarding the abolition of this type of entertainment in Stamford, and opinion which is unanimously shared by the Committee. He MOVED for approval for publication of the following proposed Ordinance. Seconded by Mr. Mead and Mr. Johnson:

PROPOSED ORDINANCE CONCERNING CARNIVALS,
CIRCUSES AND WILD WEST SHOWS

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF STAMFORD THAT:

Articles II and III of Chapter 30 of the Code of General Ordinances and which deals with Carnivals, Circuses and Wild West Shows are hereby repealed, and

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that no Carnivals, Circuses or Wild West Shows shall be conducted, operated or performed within the City of Stamford, and

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that this Ordinance is not intended to apply to any fair or amusement or entertainment similar thereto, conducted by a local bona fide fraternal, charitable or religious organization under the provisions of the State Statutes pertaining thereto.

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

MR. MEAD spoke in favor of the adoption of the Ordinance. He said those in the first District certainly approve of it.

MR. RYBNICK said it seemed very foolish that this Board would adopt an Ordinance such as the one adopted on February 5, 1962 (Ordinance No. 98) permitting these shows to come to Stamford and then eight months later decide that they had made

Minutes of October 1, 1962

a mistake and rescind it and go back to the original Ordinance (Ordinance No. 61, enacted March 18, 1957), putting it back on the books. He said if this Board does not approve of this type of show coming to Stamford, then "we should have the courage to refuse these requests" and not change our minds and let ourselves be pressured into doing something we know we will later regret.

VOTE taken on Mr. Baker's motion to approve the Ordinance for publication.
CARRIED by a vote of 26 in favor, 6 opposed, the Chairman not voting.

MR. BAER was excused at this time, changing the roll call to 32 now present.

HEALTH & PROTECTION COMMITTEE:

Concerning RAGWEED CONTROL - Letter dated 9/10/62 from Andrew and Agnes Mitchell, 28 Edward Place

MR. TRUGLIA reported that the Committee had consulted with the Health Department on the above matter and had received the following reply:

September 26, 1962

Dear Mr. Truglia:

This Department investigated a "rag weed" complaint in the rear of Edward Place. Said area comprises several acres of overgrown weeds, etc. The area is privately owned and therefore, this department has no state or local "Weed Ordinance" to order the property owner to cut down the irritating weeds and grasses. If this was City property, we could request the Department of Public Works to cut down this property.

A local "Weed Ordinance" would not be effective unless area communities within twenty-five miles had a similar Ordinance and enforced it. Furthermore, a "pollen study" a few years back indicated that large quantities of pollen found in Stamford atmosphere was emanating from the North shore of Long Island.

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) JAMES J. COSTANZO, M. D.
HEALTH COMMISSIONER

MR. SCHWARTZ said it was his understanding that Greenwich has an Ordinance on ragweed control.

MR. TRUGLIA said he did not know - that he had heard there was such a thing. But, apparently the Health Commissioner felt that unless all communities enforce ragweed control, it will have no affect to adopt such an ordinance.

PLANNING & ZONING COMMITTEE:

In the absence of Mr. Russell, the Chairman, Mr. Mulreed gave the Committee report.

- (1) Mrs. Joseph Ackerman's request that a portion of EAST LANE which abuts lot #12 owned by her be accepted as an addition to REVONAH AVENUE (Deferred 6/4/62; deferred 7/2/62; deferred 8/6/62; deferred 9/10/62)

MR. MULREED said the committee took no action on the above matter. Deferred.

Items Nos. 2 and 3, concerning Holbrook Estates and Mitchell Street were reported under Fiscal Committee.

(4) Acceptance of Roads as Public Streets

MR. MULREED said the committee agreed to present the following road for acceptance; that it was certified by the City Engineer, inspected and met with committee approval. He MOVED for acceptance. Seconded and CARRIED unanimously:

ISLAND HEIGHTS DRIVE - Extending southerly from Neponsit Street to the North property line of Island Heights Circle.
Length, approximately 600 feet; width 30 feet,
as shown on Map No. 7215 on file in the Town and
City Clerk's Office.

PARKS & RECREATION COMMITTEE:

Concerning Lights for Night Use of Tennis Courts

MR. SHANEN said this was an item that should have been before two committees, and for the reason that it had been impossible to have a joint meeting, and to set up a meeting with Mr. Connell, asked to have this deferred.

EDUCATION, WELFARE & GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE:

MRS. CLARKE, Chairman, reported that a meeting of this committee was held Monday, September 17th in the Mayor's office, with the following people present: Hilda Clarke, Chairman, William Walsh, Jack Baer, Anthony Truglia, George Russell and David Johnson.

She said a recent report, given to the Steering Committee, concerning the Welfare Department, was discussed and agreed upon as to contents. She said the members also agreed that the administration of the Welfare Department by Mr. Laturney and his aides is not in question.

She said it was also agreed that more time should be given to trace information or rumors about abuse of welfare checks by individual recipients and that all of this had been reported to the Steering Committee at their meeting held in the Mayor's office on Thursday, September 20, 1962.

URBAN REDEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE:

MR. OPPENHEIMER, Chairman, presented the following report:

At 8 P.M., Tuesday, September 18th, the Urban Redevelopment Committee met at the Commission's offices to hear Mr. Joseph Johnson, Manager of the Hartford Electric Light Company discuss his firm's plans to supply the Quadrant's anticipated requirements for heat, air conditioning, light and power. He

said that the scope and high quality of the plan has induced HELCO to hire the finest available engineers to study the plan and make recommendations. It is possible that a large central steam generating plant may be the answer. Other aspects were discussed. A question and answer period followed. The meeting adjourned before 10 P.M.

Those present were:

From Board of Representatives: Messrs. William Walsh, Michael Sherman, Carmine Longo, James Mulreed, David Oppenheimer and David Johnson.

From Board of Finance: Samuel Wise, and Peter Sileo.

From Urban Redevelopment Commission: Mrs. Dwight Marshall; Messrs. Louis Greenbaum, Paul Plotkin, Salem Shapiro, John Toth and Miss Susan Pinchot.

MR. OPPENHEIMER said the next meeting, to which all Board members are cordially invited, will be held on Tuesday, October 23rd at 8 P.M. at 308 Atlantic Street, and the subject of that meeting will be "Public Improvements".

MR. SCARELLA requested permission to ask a question. He said he would like to know to what extent the Urban Redevelopment Commission has progressed as far as location, land, etc. and has the 108 acres been established and the buying of the HELCO building - is that all within the plans of URC?

MR. OPPENHEIMER said "No".

MR. SCARELLA asked a few more questions of Mr. Oppenheimer and he informed him that if he wanted more detailed information, he was cordially invited down to the office of the Urban Redevelopment Commission.

MR. SCARELLA said he was sorry - that he was too busy.

THE PRESIDENT said he was sure that all information could be easily furnished to Mr. Scarella and it was not appropriate at this time to go into a great deal of detail. He said if he had a certain matter that he wished to have answered, to kindly present it to the Steering Committee so that Mr. Oppenheimer could make a proper report on it.

MR. SCARELLA said he did not think it mandatory that he attend every meeting held by the Urban Redevelopment Commission.

THE PRESIDENT said he did not suggest that, but if he had detailed questions, to submit them to Mr. Oppenheimer, or if he wished them discussed on the floor of a Board meeting, to submit them to the Steering Committee for proper referral so that they could be discussed generally.

NEW BUSINESS:

Concerning request for Traffic Light at Corner of Old North Stamford Road and Bedford Street

MR. SCHWARTZ requested that the above matter be referred to the Steering Committee.

THE PRESIDENT said this would be done.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business to come before the Board, upon motion, duly seconded and CARRIED the meeting was adjourned.

vf

APPROVED:

Paul D. Shapero
Paul D. Shapero, President
Board of Representatives

Velma Farrell
Velma Farrell
Administrative Assistant
(Recording Secretary)

Note: The proceedings of the above
meeting were broadcast over
Radio Station WSTC.

V.F.


