

Minutes of November 13, 1962  
Meeting of the 7th Board of Representatives  
Stamford, Connecticut

3515

A regular meeting of the 7th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford was held on Tuesday, November 13, 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 P.M.

INVOCATION was given by Rev. Russell M. McGown, First Congregational 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. However, several members arrived shortly thereafter, changing the roll call to 35 present and 5 absent. The absent members were: Benjamin Kozlowski, William Murphy, Anthony Esposito, William Hearing and Alan Katcham.

ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES - Meeting of October 1, 1962

There being no corrections, the Minutes were accepted.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

THE PRESIDENT read the following report:

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT  
Meeting held Monday, October 29, 1962

A meeting of the Steering Committee was held on Monday, October 29, 1962 in the Mayor's Office, City Hall.

The meeting was called to order at 8:15 P.M. The Chairman, Paul D. Shapero, presided. All members were present with the exception of Messrs. Murphy, Blois, Baker and Russell.

The following matters were discussed and acted upon:

- (1) Additional appropriations previously approved by the Board of Finance on October 16, 1962 - REFERRED TO FISCAL COMMITTEE, with items of \$2,000 and over referred to a secondary committee.
- (2) Ordinance for final adoption of proposed amendment to Building Code relating to plate glass or patio doors - Approved for publication at the Oct. 1, 1962 Board meeting - ORDERED PLACED ON AGENDA under Legislative & Rules Committee.
- (3) Ordinance for final adoption concerning CARNIVALS, CIRCUSES AND WILD WEST SHOWS - Approved for publication at the Oct. 1, 1962 Board meeting - ORDERED PLACED ON AGENDA under Legislative & Rules Committee.
- (4) 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 - ORDERED PLACED ON AGENDA under Legislative & Rules Committee.

- (5) Letter dated 9/26/62 - Curtis, Brinckerhoff & Barrett concerning application for subdivision of JOHN J. DENHAM, et al - ORDERED PLACED ON AGENDA under Legislative & Rules Committee.
- (6) Petition - SALVATION ARMY - Permission for CHRISTMAS KETTLES - Letter dated Oct. 22, 1962 - ORDERED PLACED ON AGENDA under Legislative & Rules Committee.
- (7) Petition - Retail Merchants' Council of the Stamford Chamber of Commerce - Letter dated Oct. 5, 1962 requesting permission to erect and maintain Christmas lighting poles and/or arches across the major streets during the Christmas Season - ORDERED PLACED ON AGENDA under Legislative & Rules Committee.
- (8) Planning Board's Appeal from denial of an application by JAMES B. JENSEN (Letter dated Oct. 17, 1962 from Planning Board) REFERRED to Legislative & Rules Committee and the Planning & Zoning Committee - ORDERED PLACED ON AGENDA.
- (9) Parking Authority - Letter dated 10/24/62 requesting permission to install 21 all-day meters on Beehler Street and 12 meters on South Street from the railroad bridge to the Electric Specialty Company - REFERRED to Health & Protection Committee - ORDERED PLACED ON AGENDA
- (10) Mrs. Joseph Ackerman's request that a portion of EAST LANE which abuts lot #12 owned by her be accepted as addition to REVONAH AVENUE (Deferred 6/4/62; deferred 8/6/62; deferred 9/10/62; deferred 10/1/62) -ORDERED PLACED ON AGENDA under Planning & Zoning Committee.
- (11) Request for Traffic Light at Corner of Old North Stamford Road and Bedford Street (Letter dated Oct. 3, 1962 from Ronald M. Schwartz) Referred to Health & Protection Committee - ORDERED PLACED ON AGENDA.
- (12) Concerning Lights for night use of Tennis Courts (Deferred 10/1/62) ORDERED PLACED ON AGENDA under Parks & Recreation Committee.
- (13) Petitions for acceptance of roads - REFERRED TO PLANNING & ZONING COMMITTEE  

(Note: Concerning petition for change of name of ALMA ROCK ROAD. This road has not been accepted as a City Street. Therefore, no action can be taken on change of name.)
- (14) FUC letter dated 10/24/62 concerning hearing held on Oct. 22, 1962 - Re: Scheduling of trains on the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad - NOTED AND FILED.
- (15) WELFARE DEPARTMENT report for August 1962 - REFERRED TO EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.
- (16) FUC - Letter dated Oct. 16, 1962 concerning hearing held on Oct. 16, 1962 Re: Increase in rate for taxis - NOTED AND FILED.

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

emk

Paul D. Shapero, Chairman  
Steering Committee

\*\*\*\*\*



Mr. Schwartz arrived at this time, changing the roll call to 32 present and 8 absent.

MR. MEYERS Chairman of the Fiscal Committee, yielded the floor to Mr. Baker at this time for the reason that Mr. Baker had to catch a train.

LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE:

MR. BAKER presented the report of his committee at this time, on the following matters:

- (1) 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  
(Mayor's letter 7/24/62) (Deferred on Oct. 1, 1962)

MR. BAKER explained that this matter had been deferred at the October meeting for the reason that there was included in the reference another part which involved the whole transaction which had not yet been passed upon by the Board of Finance.

He said the Bartlett Tree Company owns a stretch of land which runs from High Ridge Road about half way to the campus of the University of Connecticut and intends to deed this property to the University of Connecticut, predicated upon action taken here tonight, so as to provide for a 50 foot roadway giving access to the campus from High Ridge Road. He explained that the City of Stamford holds the remainder of the property, running from a point adjoining the Bartlett Tree Company's land to the campus. He said tonight, he will bring before this Board action authorizing the transfer of a 50 foot strip of that land to the State of Connecticut, which will provide the State of Connecticut with a 50 foot strip of land, running from the campus through to High Ridge Road.

He said the Bartlett Tree Company has requested the City of Stamford to deed to it a small splinter of property which is to be sliced off from the City property, being approximately 6/10ths of an acre, which property is needed by them to square off it's property. The City's contribution will be this 6/10th of an acre.

MR. BAKER MOVED for approval of the following resolution. Seconded by Mr. Kane and CARRIED unanimously:

RESOLUTION NO. 397 \*

CONVEYANCE OF STRIP OF LAND OWNED BY CITY  
OF STAMFORD TO THE F. A. BARTLETT TREE  
EXPERT CO. CONTAINING .067 ACRES

BE AND IT HEREBY IS RESOLVED that the conveyance by the City of Stamford to the F. A. Bartlett Tree Expert Co. of a 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 is hereby approved.

- (2) University of Connecticut request to City to transfer to the State a 50 foot strip of land giving right-of-way through City-owned property (See Mayor's letter of July 30, 1962)

MR. BAKER MOVED for approval of the following resolution. Seconded by Mr. Johnson and CARRIED unanimously:

RESOLUTION NO. 398 \*CONCERNING TRANSFER OF 50 FOOT STRIP OF  
CITY-OWNED LAND TO STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
FOR ROAD PURPOSES

BE AND IT HEREBY IS RESOLVED that the conveyance by the City of Stamford to the State of Connecticut of a 50 foot strip of land, as shown on a map entitled "Proposed Access Road Showing Right of Way through the Property of the City of Stamford, Stamford, Conn.", Certified Substantially Correct, Morton S. Fine, February 5, 1962 is hereby approved.

- (3) Final adoption of amendment to Section 106.5 of Building Code, Concerning Exit Doors Containing Glass (Submitted in letter of 5/28/62 from Ronald M. Schwartz, 16th District Representative - Deferred 9/10/62; approved for publication 10/1/62, published 10/5/62)

MR. BAKER MOVED for final approval of the following Ordinance, being an amendment to the Building Code. Seconded by Mr. Sherman and Mr. Cushing and CARRIED unanimously:

ORDINANCE NO. 80.4 SUPPLEMENTALAMENDING SECTION 106.5 OF THE BUILDING CODE OF THE CITY OF  
STAMFORD, CONCERNING EXIT DOORS CONTAINING GLASS, BEING AN  
ORDINANCE CONCERNING THE BUILDING CODE, APPENDICES AND  
AMENDMENTS.

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.)

- (4) Final adoption of Ordinance Concerning Carnivals, Circuses and Wild West Shows (Rescinding previous Ordinance No. 98 Supplemental) (Adopted for publication 10/1/62; published 10/5/62) (Proposed by Mr. Mead, 1st District)

MR. BAKER MOVED for adoption of the following Ordinance. Seconded by Mr. Mead, and CARRIED unanimously:

ORDINANCE NO. 103 SUPPLEMENTAL

CONCERNING CARNIVALS, CIRCUSES AND WILD WEST SHOWS  
(Rescinding previous Ordinance No. 98 Supplemental)

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.

- (5) Request for variance of 49.50 feet in road width (as specified in Ordinance No. 51 Supplemental) and substitution of frontage on Haviland Road of 44.90 feet in subdivision of John J. Denham, et al, as requested in letter dated 9/26/62 from law firm of Curtis, Brinckerhoff & Barrett.

MR. BAKER said his committee took this matter under advisement, but lacked sufficient information at the time of their meeting and therefore deferred action. He said he was informed today by Mr. Hertz of the law firm of Curtis, Brinckerhoff & Barrett, that there was a deadline for action which must be met prior to December 1st by his client, the failure of which will result in the loss of a pending transaction. He said it was his understanding the Planning and Zoning Committee plans to request suspension of the rules so that this may be brought before this Board for action tonight. However, he said it must be understood that his committee can make no recommendations tonight.

The above matter was referred to the Planning and Zoning Committee for any further action.

- (6) PETITION NO. 292 from Stamford Chamber of Commerce Retail Merchants' Council (dated 10/5/62) for permission to erect Christmas lighting poles and arches across major city streets during Christmas Season.

MR. BAKER MOVED for approval of the above petition, subject to the usual restrictions. Seconded by Mr. Baer and CARRIED unanimously.

- (7) PETITION NO. 293 from Salvation Army (dated 10/22/62) for permission to set up Christmas Kettles in various parts of city and to erect a Hut on Atlantic Street.

MR. BAKER MOVED for approval of the above petition, subject to the usual requirements being met. Seconded by Mr. Kane and CARRIED unanimously.

- (8) Appeal from denial of Planning Board of Application of JAMES B. JENSEN  
(Also referred to Planning & Zoning Committee)

The above matter was deferred until the December 3rd Board meeting, pending receipt of proof that the requisite number of property owners have signed the appeal.

There being no further matters for the Legislative and Rules Committee to report on, the Board returned to the regular order of business, being the report of the Fiscal Committee.

FISCAL COMMITTEE:

MR. MEYERS, Chairman, presented his committee report. He reported a meeting was held on November 8, 1962, with the following members present: Eleanor Austin, Rose Farina, George Connors, George Russell, William Walsh, Richmond Mead, Jr. and Robert Meyers.

- (1) \$75,000.00 - FIRE DEPARTMENT, Code 550.1505, Water for Hydrants (Mayor's letter Oct. 4, 1962)

MR. MEYERS MOVED for approval of the above request. Seconded by Mr. Nolan, and CARRIED unanimously.

- (2) \$18,000.00 - POLICE DEPARTMENT, Narrow Band Radio Communication System - Resolution amending 1962-1963 Capital Projects Budget and appropriation of funds for said project. (Mayor's letter 10/4/62)

MR. MEYERS MOVED for approval of the following resolution. Seconded by Mr. Nolan and CARRIED unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 395 \*

AMENDING 1962-1963 CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET BY  
ADDING ITEM TO BE KNOWN AS "POLICE DEPARTMENT,  
NARROW BAND RADIO COMMUNICATION SYSTEM" AND  
APPROPRIATION OF \$18,000.00 THEREFOR.

BE AND IT HEREBY IS RESOLVED, by the Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford, pursuant to Section 611.5 of the Stamford Charter, to approve an amendment to the Capital Projects Budget for the year 1962-1963 by adding thereto an item to be known as "POLICE DEPARTMENT, NARROW BAND RADIO COMMUNICATION SYSTEM" in the amount of \$18,000.00; and



BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, to approve the appropriation of \$18,000.00 for said project.

- (3) \$333.00 - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - Code 626.0101, Bureau of Engineering, Salaries (Reclassification of Assistant City Engineer, from Grade S25 to Grade S27, effective Oct. 1, 1962 - Approved by Personnel Commission) (Mayor's letter 10/4/62)

MR. MEYERS MOVED for approval of the above request. Seconded by Mr. Kelly and CARRIED unanimously.

- (4) \$2,882.95 - Pension for Patrolman Thomas M. Hogan, effective 9/23/62, based on annual pension of \$3,733.32, or 2/3rds of annual salary of \$5,600.00 (Mayor's letter 10/4/62)

MR. MEYERS MOVED for approval of the above pension. Seconded by Mr. Kane and Mr. Johnson and CARRIED unanimously.

- (5) \$130,000.00 - Resolution to amend 1962-1963 Capital Projects Budget for purchase of the Palmer property for park purposes and appropriation therefor in accordance with terms of contract, as outlined in the Mayor's letter of 6/7/62.

MR. MEYERS reported that the Committee voted to DEFER action on the above item, so as to obtain additional information.

- (6) \$850,000.00 - HELCO BUILDING purchase - Resolution No. 396 amending 1962-1963 Capital Projects Budget to add item to be known as "Purchase of the Helco Building", to be financed by issuance of non-interest bearing bonds, amortized as outlined in Mayor's letters of July 30, 1962 and October 11, 1962.

MR. MEYERS said this is not an appropriation, but is merely the authorization to purchase the building and issue the bonds, which are to be non-interest bearing.

MR. MEYERS MOVED for adoption of the following resolution. Seconded by Dr. Grove.

RESOLUTION NO. 396 \*

AMENDING 1962-1963 CAPITAL PROJECTS  
BUDGET BY ADDING ITEM TO BE KNOWN AS  
"PURCHASE OF THE HELCO BUILDING", TO  
BE FINANCED BY ISSUANCE OF NON-INTEREST  
BEARING BONDS IN AMOUNT OF \$850,000.00

BE AND IT HEREBY IS RESOLVED, by the Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford, pursuant to Section 611.5 of the Stamford Charter, to amend the 1962-1963 Capital Projects Budget by the addition thereto of an item to be known as "PURCHASE OF THE HELCO BUILDING", said purchase to be financed, in the amount of \$850,000.00, by the issuance of non-interest bearing bonds of the City of Stamford, to be amortized as follows:

\$200,000 on September 1, 1963  
\$200,000 on September 1, 1964  
\$200,000 on September 1, 1965  
\$250,000 on September 1, 1966

MR. SCARELLA presented a letter from Mr. Kucso, Representative from the 10th District, who was not present at this time. (Due to another commitment, he arrived later in the meeting) The letter read as follows:

"If I am unable to get to the meeting at the time this matter comes up, I would appreciate it if you would read this letter to the Board on my behalf.

"------(Note: Due to changing record, the first part of letter does not appear.)

"However, I am strongly opposed to the haphazard and unplanned manner that has brought about the matter now being considered. If the Administration felt that the present building, or buildings, were unsatisfactory, there should have been a report showing: (a) In what manner they were unsatisfactory, (b) The defects within the present framework and (c) If not, what were the possible alternatives.

"It is clear that this logical procedure was not followed. If the need were so great, what did the Administration do before they suddenly discovered that they could buy the Helco Building? If the need were so great, was any other building, or buildings, or land considered before the Helco Building was offered for sale to the City? If the need were so great, why didn't the Urban Redevelopment Commission and their sponsors, recommend changes instead of keeping the present setup while changing the whole area that surrounds the present City Hall?

"The answers to these questions are obvious. There was no need until Helco offered this building, and then immediately the need was found.

"As I said before, before we can approve this purchase, we should know what offices are available. We also must consider another factor that I have mentioned before and which I refer to briefly above - we have spent many thousands of dollars and are planning to spend millions more, on an urban renewal plan for this area.

"In all the plans and in all the proposals, it has always been assumed that City Hall would remain in its present location and that the Helco Building would be merely a commercial structure that would remain.

"It does not require an expert's eye to show that this change is a basic and substantial change from the plan that was submitted to Washington and which has been the subject of years of study.

"Now, instead of City Hall being at the Square and the hub of urban renewal, we have City Hall on a mall, many blocks from its original site. This will change the traffic pattern, the use of the area, and many other matters already finalized by URC.

"I believe in change. I believe in expansion and consolidation - BUT, I believe in these when done with proper planning and efficiency and after a full consideration of all factors.

"I feel that if we approve this tonight, we are doing a disservice to the City, to the taxpayers and urban renewal. We are also acting prematurely and committing ourselves to buying these buildings, which will not be the answer to our needs.



"I do not think that this Board should go along with this decision, and I feel that much more study is needed. If I were present, I would move to table this matter. However, being unable to be present, I strongly urge that either this motion be made by someone else or that this purchase be defeated at this time."

Paul J. Kuczo, Jr.

MR. JOHNSON asked permission to ask a question of Mr. Meyers. This was granted. He said it was his impression that if the urban renewal program were to go through that the education building and the welfare building were going to be purchased by the Federal Government. He said his question was: Has this purchase been tied in with the urban renewal? He said it was his understanding that it had, to some degree.

MR. MEYERS said it was also his understanding.

MR. KELLY presented the following statement on this matter:

"Concerning the purchase of the Helco Building for \$850,000 and for which I am about to vote favorably, has left a cloud of misunderstanding of a letter directed to the Mayor, the press, the radio and other Boards, concerning the purchase of the two buildings as a City Hall Annex. It appeared as though the re-editing of the letter from the East Side Democratic Club wanted the public to believe that they were against the purchase, when they were for the principle, but were requesting and recommending that several necessary steps be taken, including the appraisal of the two buildings involved."

MR. KELLY said he wished to make the above statement for the reason that, as a past employee of the company involved in this purchase, they (the company) had mistakenly assumed that the East Side Democratic Club opposed this purchase and he wished to clear up that misunderstanding.

MRS. CLARKE, Chairman of the Education, Welfare and Government Committee, reported that four members of her Committee met with the Fiscal Committee and concurred with that Committee in recommending the purchase of the Helco Building.

MR. SCARELLA said, to his mind, this matter which is placed before the Board this evening is highly irregular, but perhaps it can be clarified - that there is a cloud in his mind.

THE PRESIDENT informed Mr. Scarella that if he has a question as to any irregularity, he would like him to be specific - that just saying there is a cloud in his mind does not answer the question.

MR. SCARELLA said he always thought that any matter coming before the Fiscal Committee would be an appropriation - he said he failed to see any appropriation before this Board.

THE PRESIDENT said this has been explained by the Fiscal Committee Chairman, that this is not an appropriation, but is in the nature of an amendment to the Capital Projects Budget. He said this has been done many times in the past.

MR. SCARELLA said, to his mind, any action taken by this Board is in the nature of a direct appropriation. He said he cannot see why this Board can go ahead and act upon matters to be financed in 1963 and so on.

THE PRESIDENT said this is merely an authorization so that a contract can be entered into. He said if he would read the Mayor's letter of October 11th, it would be self-explanatory.

MR. SCARELLA said, in essence, it was explanatory, but the fact remains a definite appropriation was not made. He said "How can I possibly commit myself to something to be done in 1963?" He said he wished to abstain from voting on this matter.

MR. JOHNSON asked if anyone knows about another offer being made for this property.

MR. MEYERS replied that he has no first hand knowledge of what any offer was. He said as far as the negotiations for this building are concerned, he felt the statements made were rather irresponsible, as the negotiations for this building were conducted over a considerable period of time, having been investigated by the Board of Finance as well as his committee and all city departments concerned and a great deal of responsible leadership went into the discussion of this purchase. He said this allegation of a haphazard activity is baseless and irresponsible.

He said anyone with any knowledge of the way the city offices are cramped for space, would not question the need for expansion.

MR. MEYERS urged the adoption of the resolution.

MR. BAKER was excused at this time, leaving 31 members now present.

After considerable further debate, a VOTE was taken on the motion to approve Resolution No. 396 and CARRIED, with one abstention (Mr. Scarella).

(7) \$42,500.00 - TELLER PROPERTY purchase - Resolution amending 1962-1963 Capital Projects Budget for purchase of Teller property adjoining West Beach and appropriation therefor. (As outlined in Mayor's letter of 9/6/62)

MR. MEYERS presented a resolution on the above matter and MOVED for adoption. Seconded by Mrs. Austin and Mr. Mulreed.

MR. MEYERS spoke in favor of the resolution. MR. SHANEN reported for the Parks and Recreation Committee and said they also approved the purchase of the property.

MR. SHERMAN spoke in opposition and said he thinks this is a form of "legalized blackmail".

~~MR. SCHWARTZ~~ and MR. TRUGLIA arrived at this time, leaving 33 members now present.

MR. SHANEN said he disagreed with Mr. Sherman.

MR. CONNORS spoke in favor of buying this property.

MR. MULREED also spoke in favor of the motion, saying he did not think it would be wise to take this to court (in condemnation proceedings) as this might be a long drawn out procedure.

MR. JOHNSON asked if the Board of Finance had this property appraised.



MR. MEYERS explained that before a property could be appraised the boundaries would have to be defined which would be difficult in this particular case.

MR. NOLAN said he thought this matter was being further confused by all the debate. He said he realized that Teller has "somewhat held us up" but the easiest way out at this time would be to go ahead with the purchase and does not think this will set a precedent for future action as each matter has to be considered on an individual basis.

MR. SCHWARTZ said he thinks this Board does consider this a "hold up" and that condemnation proceedings do not necessarily mean it has to be dragged out for an interminable time - that the City can apply to the courts for immediate possession. He said he felt this was the proper course of action to follow. He urged that this matter be referred back to Committee.

MR. SCARELLA said that when Mr. Teller bought this property, the boundaries must have been listed in the certificate of title. He said he was not qualified to know whether the price asked is the right price or not and is willing to be guided by the experts as to what the price should be for this land. He said any lawyer knows that when the city condemns they have the right to take the property, but the question of price might be thrashed out in the courts.

MR. MEYERS said the question of immediate possession was raised by the Committee and is not quite as simple as it may appear. He said the Corporation Counsel has examined all phases of this matter. He said a Quit Claim deed does not specify exact boundary lines.

MR. SHERMAN spoke in opposition and said he disagrees with the method and does not think the City should bow to pressure - that he believes that the price should be a negotiated price and that the best procedure would be by condemnation.

DR. GROVE said at the outset he had been opposed to this thing, but later it became clear to him that this is the best way to do this. He said it had been pointed out that in order to use condemnation proceedings effectively, the City must prove that this property is very necessary.

MR. SCHWARTZ MOVED for a five minute recess at 9:18 P.M. which was granted.

The recess was over at 9:28 P.M. and the members resumed their seats.

MR. MEYERS MOVED (after consultation with the Majority and Minority Leaders) that this matter (item #7) be referred back to Committee for another month for further consideration. Seconded by Mr. Sherman.

MR. SCARELLA said, after all the discussion that just took place on this matter, he would like to know just what further information this committee would like to have before the Board acts. He opposed the motion.

MR. BAER MOVED to amend the motion that the Corporation Counsel be invited to attend the next meeting of this Board so that he can be present to advise the members, so that it can be fully clarified.

THE PRESIDENT asked Mr. Meyers if he wished to accept the motion.

MR. MEYERS asked that the amendment be withdrawn. He said he would rather not have this in the form of an amendment, but rather that the Corporation Counsel be invited to be present.

MR. BAER said he would not oppose the manner in which this was done.

MR. SCARELLA said he did not think it necessary to have the Corporation Counsel present.

MR. CONNORS said he would like to know what additional information is necessary. He said the committee discussed this matter for 1-1/2 hours at their committee meeting. He asked if anyone knows what further information is needed.

MR. NOLAN said there has been certain matters brought up by certain members which would probably be better to discuss in committee and not on the floor of the Board and he would be glad to discuss it with Mr. Connors and Mr. Scarella. He said the matters brought up are not actually pertinent to this discussion and they would prefer to discuss them in an executive session of the committee.

MR. CONNORS said he does not think the present Board members are aware of the fact that the city could have bought this same piece of property for \$30,000 five years ago and at that time the Board voted against it. He said now we are up to \$42,000 and if the Board keeps this up, it will go up to \$62,000.

MR. SCARELLA said there was one thing he wanted to know before this Board votes on postponing this matter for another month, and that is, is there a possibility of the price being upped? He said he was in favor of acting on this tonight.

MR. NOLAN said it is his understanding that if the Board waits until the next meeting, which is only a little more than two weeks hence, this Board will not in any way be jeopardizing this transaction.

VOTE taken on postponing action on this matter (item No. 7) for another month.  
CARRIED, with one no vote. (Mr. Scarella)

HEALTH & PROTECTION COMMITTEE:

- (1) PARKING AUTHORITY request in letter of 10/24/62 for permission to install 21 all-day meters on Beehler Street and 12 meters on South Street from railroad bridge to the Electric Specialty Co.

MR. TRUGLIA said the above matter was being kept in committee for further study and additional information.

- (2) Request for traffic Light at corner of Old North Stamford Road and Bedford Street (Letter dated 10/3/62 from Ronald M. Schwartz, 16th District Representative)

MR. TRUGLIA read the following letter from the Superintendent of Communication of the Police Department:

October 19, 1962

Dear Mr. Truglia:

Your letter of October 16, 1962 reference to a traffic light at Old North Stamford Road and Bedford Street has been received.



In the Stamford Police Department request for capital funds for 1962-1963 this intersection would have been one to have been signalized. The entire request was deleted.

On October 16, 1962 Chief Joseph W. Kinsella again appeared before the Planning Board. In this request, money will be set aside for the Old North Stamford Signal Light.

If the funds are granted, we will proceed with the immediate installation of the signals at this intersection.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) Hawley C. Oefinger,  
Superintendent Communications

MR. TRUGLIA said he wished to apologize for being late, due to a prior commitment at the school where he teaches. He said he wished to report that his committee was in favor of the two items under Fiscal Committee which were reported on earlier this evening, being items Nos. 1 and 2 on the agenda.

PLANNING & ZONING COMMITTEE:

MR. RUSSELL, Chairman, reported that a meeting of his Committee was held on Thursday, November 8, 1962, with all members of the committee present.

- (1) APPEAL from denial by Planning Board of application of JAMES B. JENSEN  
(Also referred to Legislative and Rules Committee)

MR. RUSSELL reported that no action was taken by the Committee on the above matter and it was DEFERRED until the December Board meeting.

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

MR. RUSSELL said the committee agreed that this request was proper and reasonable. However, from information received from the City Engineering Department as to the accepted length of Revonah Avenue and from maps supplied by Revonah, Inc., dated August 1937, it would seem that this portion has already been accepted and no further action is required.

He said the Committee, meanwhile will try to gather more information to further verify these facts, and unless additional facts are received, no further action will be taken on this matter.

- (3) Acceptance of roads as city streets:

MR. RUSSELL MOVED for acceptance of the following streets as city streets. Seconded by Mr. Cushing and CARRIED. He said they have been certified for acceptance by the City Engineer, inspected and meet with the approval of the Committee. The roads accepted are as follows. All maps referred to are on file in the office of the Town and City Clerk:

- INTERVALE ROAD EAST - Extending westerly from Newfield Avenue, to and including a temporary turnaround. Length, approximately 1,150 feet, width 27 feet, as shown on Map No. 7333.
- WHITE OAK LANE - Extending from Newfield Avenue easterly to and including a permanent turnaround. Length, approximately 1,300 feet, width 27 feet, as shown on Map No. 7272.
- REDMONT ROAD - Extending from the already accepted portion, northerly to Diamondcrest Lane. Length, approximately 850 feet, width 27 feet, as shown on Map No. 7036.
- DIAMONDCREST LANE - Extending from the already accepted portion westerly to and including a permanent turnaround. Length, approximately 265 feet, width 27 feet, as shown on Map No. 7036.
- ALMA ROCK ROAD - Extending westerly and northerly from High Ridge Road to and including a permanent turnaround. Length, approximately 875 feet, width 27 feet, as shown on Map No. 7247.
- COUSINS ROAD - Extending from the already accepted portion easterly and northerly to and including a permanent turnaround. Length, approximately 375 feet, width 27 feet, as shown on Map No. 7332.
- FISHING TRAIL - Extending southerly from West Trail to the southerly line of Short Trail. Length, approximately 1,100 feet, width 27 feet, as shown on Map No. 7334.
- WOODY TRAIL - Extending westerly from Fishing Trail to and including a permanent turnaround. Length, approximately 175 feet, width 27 feet, as shown on Map No. 7334.
- SHORT TRAIL - Extending westerly from Fishing Trail to and including a permanent turnaround. Length, approximately 150 feet, width 27 feet, as shown on Map No. 7334.
- RIVER HILL ROAD - Extending easterly from Stillwater Road to and including a permanent turnaround. Length, approximately 600 feet, width 30 feet, as shown on Map No. 7255.
- NEWFIELD COURT - Extending westerly from Newfield Avenue to and including a permanent turnaround. Length, approximately 550 feet, width 30 feet, as shown on Maps Nos. 6588 and 6820.
- ISLAND HEIGHTS CIRCLE - Extending northerly from Aquila Road and easterly to and including, a permanent turnaround. Length, approximately 775 feet, width 30 feet, as shown on Map No. 7215.
- PINNER LANE - Extending easterly from High Ridge Road to and including a permanent turnaround. Length, approximately 790 feet, width 22 feet, as shown on Map No. 3700 and a construction Map No. 7249.
- WALLACE STREET - Extending westerly from Shippan Avenue to the west side of Lindstrom Road. Length, approximately 700 feet, width, 27 feet, as shown on Map No. 1206, and a construction Map No. 7326.



NORTHWOODS ROAD - Extending southerly from Oak Lawn Avenue to and including a permanent turnaround. Length, approximately 750 feet, width 27 feet, as shown on Maps Nos. 3274 and 4012, and a construction Map No. 7325.

SADDLE HILL ROAD - Extending from the already accepted portion easterly to and including a permanent turnaround. Length, approximately 425 feet, width 22 feet, as shown on Map No. 7494.

MR. KUCZO arrived at this time, changing the roll call to 34 present, (Mr. Baker having left earlier to catch a train).

Re: Intervale Road

MR. SHERMAN asked about the above road. He said there seems to be three sections of this road, not connected, and all of them named "Intervale Road".

MR. RUSSELL said this problem is one that has bothered the committee and is one which will have to be straightened out in the next couple of months. He explained that when a subdivision was considered this should have been thought about at that time and the name changed. He said that unfortunately there are three sections of this road, one section which prefers to remain as a private road. He said we do know now that Intervale Road is going to have an offshoot road which will run from the temporary turnaround and from his observation, that portion of the road from Newfield may possibly be changed to that road's name, perhaps by next month.

(4) Proposed Ordinance, changing name of Kramer's Road to ISLAND HEIGHTS CIRCLE.

MR. RUSSELL MOVED for suspension of the rules to take up the following matter. Seconded and CARRIED.

MR. RUSSELL MOVED for approval, for publication, of the following proposed Ordinance. Seconded by Mr. Sherman and CARRIED unanimously:

PROPOSED ORDINANCE CHANGING THE NAME OF KRAMER'S ROAD (a City street) TO ISLAND HEIGHTS CIRCLE

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF STAMFORD THAT:

The street name of Kramer's Road, which runs 280 feet from Cove Road northerly to the north property line of Aquila Road, be changed to ISLAND HEIGHTS CIRCLE.

This Ordinance shall take effect upon its adoption.

\*\*\*\*\*

(5) Request for variance of 49.50 feet in road width (as specified in Ordinance No. 51 Supplemental) and substitution of frontage on Haviland Road of 44.90 feet in subdivision of John J. Denham, et al, as requested in letter dated 9/26/62 from law firm of Curtis, Brinckerhoff & Barrett

MR. RUSSELL MOVED for approval of the above request. Seconded by Mrs. Clarke, Mr. Johnson and Mr. Morris. (Note: See item #4 under Legislative & Rules Committee)

MR. RUSSELL said he thinks this is a reasonable request. He explained that it is asking for a variance of our Ordinance No. 51, which spells out the minimum width of streets to be 49-1/2 feet. He said there was a background for the passage of this Ordinance, which was an odd situation where an extension of a street was built 30 feet wide, which entered from a road only 15 feet wide. He said there was a wall on one side and a very difficult problem at that time and for this reason in order to prevent any future problems, this Ordinance #51 was adopted.

However, he said, under Chapter 4, Section 40, sub-section 30 of the City Charter, under the corporate powers of the City of Stamford, it is within the rights of the City to regulate the width of a road - therefore this Board can allow a narrow road.

He explained that the present situation is that the only access to Haviland Road is a width of land which happens to be 44.90 feet wide and the topography of the land allows only for the road to come out in that area, but after the entrance, the road automatically becomes 50 feet wide - it is just the shape of the land in that particular area that causes this condition. He said before the sub-divider can get the Planning Board to act, there has to be an affirmative action of this Board to waive the width as requested.

Mr. Russell explained that the road itself will only be some 27 feet in width and that when he speaks about the width of a road he is speaking about the width deeded to the city and not the actual width of the road bed itself. This is to enable the installation of sidewalks, if desired, at a later date. He said many roads in that area - old roads - are less than that width, but nothing can be done about them at this late date.

THE PRESIDENT re-stated the motion to read that a waiver of the requirements of Ordinance No. 51 be granted in this specific instance, to allow an entry point of the road to be a width of less than that required by the Ordinance, with the understanding that within one foot of the point of entry, or intersection with Haviland Road, that the provisions of the Ordinance will apply.

MR. JOHNSON said the letter of request from the law firm states that the State Statutes "provide that a Board of Representatives may, in their discretion, waive this requirement where they deem feasible to do so." He said his question is, that if the Charter says that this Board can set the width of a street, wasn't that done when this Board passed Ordinance No. 51 Supplemental?

Mr. Johnson asked, if this Board can legally waive the requirements of a City ordinance?

MR. RUSSELL said it does seem reasonable to assume that we are in conflict with our own corporate powers as spelled out in the Charter and the way this Ordinance is written. He said perhaps at some time this Board may wish to add a sentence to the Ordinance which would spell out that the Board clearly has the right to change the width of a street, which it has under Chapter 4 of our corporate powers.

After considerable further debate, MR. NOLAN TO TABLE this motion. Seconded by Mr. Meyers and CARRIED.

PARKS & RECREATION COMMITTEE: Concerning lights for night use of tennis courts



MR. SHANEN, Chairman, presented his committee report at this time. He said his committee has been informed by the Park Commission that there was a request in the budget for an amount of \$85,000 for flood-lighting most of the important areas was reduced to \$35,000 by the Planning Board and reduced an additional \$20,000 by the Board of Finance to \$15,000 which amount was then approved by this Board.

Subsequently, the Park Commission decided to have lighting for a soft ball project, so about \$13,895.00 was used, leaving a balance of \$1,105.00. He said he is assuming that this balance is going to be carried over to the next project which is lighting for the Woodside tennis court area, which will be priority #1 in the 1963-1964 Capital Projects Budget and the Park Commission is requesting \$32,000 for this particular project.

URBAN REDEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE:

MR. OPPENHEIMER presented his committee report at this time. He said two meetings of the Committee were held - one on October 17th and the other on November 8th, at which time they discussed various problems within the Southeast Quadrant and how they would be solved.

He said Mrs. Marshall of the URC described various items of the public facilities group that would take place within the Quadrant, such as installation of storm and sanitary sewers, the widening and extending of roads, the construction of parking garages and surface parking lots and she stated that according to the 1962-63 ten year Capital Project Budget, over \$2,000,000 of public improvements will be incorporated into the Project's plan and budget. He said the Federal Government contributes two-thirds of the cost and the State loans one-sixth, with the City financing one-sixth, plus the loan.

He said the flooding problem in the area will be controlled by the use of additional storm sewers and the creation of a raised land dyke or berm.

He said the City Engineer mentioned that the East Meadow project now provides the garbage trucks with a good road (Harbor View Avenue) to the incinerator which the city would otherwise have had to provide at its own expense, and the Commissioner of Public Works re-emphasized the fact that the Plan also saves the city the full cost of many public works improvements.

Mr. Oppenheimer said at the second meeting they explored the opinions and comments of the men responsible for police and fire protection in the Quadrant. He said both the Chief of Police and the Fire Chief enthusiastically support the Plan and that Lt. Harvey was confident they would be able to handle increased traffic volume with the "Inner Loop" which will consist of a widened Broad Street, South Street, Willow Street and Grove Street. He also felt service will be greatly improved with the addition of the proposed parking garages and stressed that the Main Street traffic signals will be 100% re-usable. He said Mr. Oefinger said his only question related to the Broad Street extension, since the signals will have to be changed at Broad and Atlantic Streets, and requested sufficient time to prepare for this change.

\*\*\*\*\*

NEW BUSINESS:

MR. JOHNSON asked that an amendment to Ordinance No. 51 be presented at the next meeting of the Steering Committee, with the following suggested language:

"Provided, however, that the Board of Representatives may, in its discretion, waive the foregoing requirement of 49 1/2 feet and substitute therefor such lesser requirement as seems feasible."

THE PRESIDENT asked Mr. Johnson to submit this suggestion to the Steering Committee at their next meeting on November 19th.

ADJOURNMENT:

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

Velma Farrell

Velma Farrell  
Administrative Assistant  
(Recording Secretary)

VF

APPROVED:

Paul D. Shapiro

Paul D. Shapiro, President  
Board of Representatives

Note: The proceedings of the above meeting were not broadcast.

VF

\* Marginal Note:

Resolutions appearing out of chronological order for the reason that these matters were not taken up in the order in which they appear on the agenda.