

MEETING OF THE 9TH BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES

Minutes of July 11, 1966

Stamford, Connecticut

The regular monthly meeting of the 9th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford was held on Monday, July 11, 1966 in the Board's meeting room, Municipal Office Building, Stamford, Connecticut.

The meeting was called to order by the President, George E. Russell, at 8:20 P.M.

INVOCATION - Given by Rev. Rocco D. A. Nadile, Sacred Heart Church

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

ROLL CALL:

The roll call was taken by the Clerk. There were 35 present and 5 absent at the calling of the roll. However, several members arrived shortly thereafter, changing the roll call to 38 present and 2 absent. The absent members were: Leon Zebroski (R), 13th District, and Joseph S. Bitetto (R), 14th District.

MAYOR THOMAS C. MAYERS - MAYOR'S ANNUAL MESSAGE - 1965-1966 fiscal year

MAYOR THOMAS C. MAYERS presented his annual message for the 1965-1966 fiscal year to the Board of Representatives, as required by Sec. 303.1 of the Charter.

Copies of the Mayor's message were presented to all members of the Board at this time.

THE PRESIDENT called for the next order of business.

ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES - Meeting of May 9, 1966  
Meeting of June 6, 1966

The Minutes of the above meetings were accepted, with one correction to the Minutes of June 6, 1966, on the 4th paragraph from the bottom, page 4735, which was changed to read:

MR. KUCZO spoke in favor of the intent of the proposed Ordinance.....

Mr. Kuczo also called attention to the dated of the meeting at the top of pages 4734 and 4735, which was changed from June 4, 1966 to that of June 6, 1966.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

The Steering Committee report was read and entered in the Minutes, as follows:

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT

Meeting held Thursday, June 30, 1966

A meeting of the Steering Committee was held on Thursday, June 30, 1966, in the Board of Representatives' meeting rooms, Municipal Office Building, 429 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Connecticut.

4764  
2662

Minutes of July 11, 1966

MR. MORRIS, Majority Leader, Chaired the meeting. The meeting was called to order at 7:15 P.M. All members were present, with the exception of Edwin Lindstrom, William Murphy and Robert Durso.

The following matters were discussed and acted upon:

- (1) Mayor's letter of 6/27/66, re-submitting the name of Mr. Eugene Gordon (R) to the Urban Redevelopment Commission, term ending August 7, 1969, replacing Mr. Lewis Upham, who is moving out of the City.

REFERRED TO APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE and ORDERED ON AGENDA

- (2) Additional Appropriations (5) approved by the Board of Finance on 6/9/66 and one tabled at the last Board meeting, were ORDERED PLACED ON THE AGENDA UNDER FISCAL COMMITTEE, with items in excess of \$2,000 (except pensions) referred to a secondary Committee, in accordance with Rule #10 on page 5 of the Rules of Order.
- (3) Final adoption of proposed Ordinance of RENT RECEIVORSHIP UNDER TERMS OF PUBLIC ACT NO. 554 (1965) "AN ACT CONCERNING THE ABATEMENT OF NUISANCES IN TENEMENT AND LODGING HOUSES" (See Minutes of 6/6/66, page 4734 - Adopted for publication at that time, and published on 6/11/66)

ORDERED ON AGENDA under LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE

- (4) Final adoption of AMENDMENT TO BUILDING CODE, REQUIRING THE SILL OF A WINDOW IN PRIVATE DWELLINGS TO BE A MAXIMUM OF 3-1/2 FT. ABOVE THE FINISHED FLOOR AND TO HAVE A FINISHED UNOBSTRUCTED OPENING OF NOT LESS THAN 2 FT. X 2-1/2 FT. (See Minutes of 6/6/66, page 4733; and published on 6/10/66)

ORDERED ON AGENDA under LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE

- (5) Final adoption of proposed amendments to Article II of SEWER CODE, by adding Section 57 thereto - "CONCERNING ISSUANCE OF BUILDING PERMITS IN CASES WHERE IT WILL OVERTAX AVAILABLE SEWER FACILITIES"  
(Reactivated in letter from Thomas Morris, 15th District Representative, dated 3/21/66. Originally brought before 8th Board and adopted for publication; published 1/11/65; open hearing held 1/27/65; deferred 2/1/65; 3/1/65 and 4/5/65 -- See Minutes of 5/3/65, pages 4318-19 --- Adopted for publication in revised form 5/2/66; published 5/7/66)

ORDERED ON AGENDA under LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE -  
Also referred to PLANNING & ZONING COMMITTEE

- (6) Mayor's letter of 6/1/66 CONCERNING EXCHANGE OF EASEMENTS BETWEEN CITY OF STAMFORD AND DALENE & RUSSACK, INC., covering land situated partly in the City of Stamford and partly in the Town of New Canaan, (to correct an ambiguity in an easement which was given to the City of Stamford by the sub-divider.) - (See Mayor's letter of 6/1/66) (Will have to be an Ordinance)

ORDERED ON AGENDA under LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE

Minutes of July 11, 1966

- (7) Request for WAIVER OF BUILDING PERMIT FEE FOR construction of proposed Senior Citizen building on Washington Court (letter dated 5/27/66 from Mayor) under terms of Article 100, Sec. 6, paragraph 14 of Building Code (Ordinance No. 80.7)

ORDERED ON AGENDA under LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE

- (8) Concerning FIRE TRUCK (65 foot Maxim aerial replacement) damaged, and finally replaced by a new one, but not with the same specifications as original truck - (Letter dated 4/13/66 from Thomas Morris and William Caporizzo, 15th District Representatives - See Minutes of 4/6/66, page 3955, item #14 and Minutes of 5/2/66, pages 4664, 4676-77-78 -- Deferred 6/6/66)

ORDERED ON AGENDA under HEALTH & PROTECTION COMMITTEE and FISCAL COMMITTEE

- (9) Petitions for acceptance of roads as City Streets

REFERRED TO PLANNING & ZONING COMMITTEE

- (10) Proposed Resolution Concerning the feasibility of converting the OLD CLOONAN JR. HIGH SCHOOL PROPERTY into a NEIGHBORHOOD RECREATIONAL COMMUNITY SERVICE CENTER - (Presented by Joseph Bitetto, 14th District Representative at the 6/30/66 Steering Committee meeting)

ORDERED ON AGENDA under PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

- (11) Concerning LINDSTROM ROAD - (Processing under Chapter 64 and Sec. 641 of Charter) - (Requested in letter of 6/6/66 from J. W. Herman)

ORDERED ON AGENDA under PLANNING & ZONING COMMITTEE

- (12) Proposed Resolution Concerning CLOONAN JR. HIGH SCHOOL DETERIORATION (Letter of 6/6/66 from Paul Kuczo, 8th District Representative)

ORDERED ON AGENDA under LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE

- (13) Letter (dated 6/23/66) From William Murphy, 6th District Representative, requesting a report from the Commissioner of Public Works re Caldor Building trouble with facing

REFERRED TO PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE - Not on Agenda

- (14) Letter from William Murphy (dated 6/23/66), 6th District Representative, requesting the Board look into the conditions of the beaches and adjoining water

REFERRED TO HEALTH & PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Not on Agenda

- (15) Letter (dated 6/30/66) from Paul J. Kuczo and George V. Connors, 8th District Representatives, concerning drainage problem on the EAST SIDE OF LINCOLN AVENUE IN THE AREA OF #61 LINCOLN AVENUE (This was brought up previously)

REFERRED TO PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE - Not on Agenda

4766  
2555

Minutes of July 11, 1966

- (16) Letter (dated 6/16/66) from George V. Connors, 8th District Representative, concerning EVICTION OF THE PALMER FAMILY FROM PALMER'S ISLAND, by the Federal Government and City officials

REFERRED TO PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE - Not on Agenda

- (17) APPEAL from decision of Planning Board's denial of application of LEON N. LAPINE to change Master Plan - (Letter dated 6/21/66 from James Bingham, Chairman, Planning Board)

REFERRED TO LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE and PLANNING & ZONING COMMITTEE (Copies mailed to all Board members 7/6/66) ----  
Not ordered on Agenda

- (18) Mayor's letter (dated 6/14/66) requesting appointing of ADMINISTRATOR under terms of Sec. 5 of Public Act No. 551 (1965 Session of General Assembly) - (Copies sent to all Board members on 6/15/66, with copies of P. A. 551 enclosed)

REFERRED TO APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE and LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE --- Not ordered on Agenda

There being no further business to come before the Committee, on motion, duly seconded and CARRIED, the meeting adjourned at 8:00 P.M.

George E. Russell, Chairman  
Steering Committee

ad

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE:

MR. NATHANSON said the Committee only has one appointment, which was referred to the Committee for the second time and which the Committee has again approved.

The Tellers distributed the ballots. The vote is listed below:

URBAN REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Term Ending:

EUGENE GORDON (R)  
1124 Long Ridge Road  
(Replacing Lewis Upham, resigned 6/15/66)

August 7, 1969

VOTE: 24 yes  
14 no

FISCAL COMMITTEE:

MR. HEMINGWAY, Chairman, presented his Committee report, and said they approved all items referred to them.

- (1) \$36,500.00 - DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE, covering following: (REDUCED from (\$30,000 by Board of Finance 6/9/66) - (Mayor's letter of 6/3/66)

Code 410.5502 Cash Relief-----	\$16,500.00
Code 422.0000 General Hospitals-----	20,000.00 (REDUCED from
	\$36,500.00 \$30,000)

429



MR. HEMINGWAY MOVED for approval of the above request. Seconded by Mr. Morris.

MR. MURPHY said the Education, Welfare & Government Committee concurred in approval. CARRIED.

- (2) \$1,494.14 - REGISTRAR OF VOTERS, Code 102.5104, General Election  
(Mayor's letter of 6/8/66)

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

- (3) \$14,593.37 - REGISTRAR OF VOTERS, Code 102.5105 - Primaries (Mayor's letter of 6/8/66)

MR. HEMINGWAY MOVED for approval of the above request. Seconded by Mr. Murphy, who said the Education, Welfare & Government Committee also concurred in approval. CARRIED.

- (4) \$391.64 - BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES, covering following: (Mayor's letter of 4/12/66) (Approved by Board of Finance 6/9/66)

(\*Water Committee Expenses)

*Code 106.0803 - Special Water Committee (Xerox charges for making 7,519 pages at 4¢ each)-----	\$300.76
*Code 106.0803 - Special Water Committee (Stenographic Services)-----	30.00
*Code 106.0301 - Office Supplies for above-----	30.88
Code 106.0701 - Custodial Services-----	30.00
	<u>\$391.64</u>

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

- (5) \$22,000.00 - DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS - Code 651.0000 - Gas, Oil & Repairs  
(Mayor's letter of 5/6/66)

MR. HEMINGWAY MOVED for approval of the above request. Seconded by Mr. Grant.

MR. KUCZO asked if there are any repairs listed under the above request.

MR. HEMINGWAY said that is the title under which these charges are incurred. He said his Committee requested that in the future they break it down, so that it will be known just how much was spent under each category.

VOTE taken on above. CARRIED.

- (6) \$29,652.74 - DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS - Code 606.0609, Snow Removal and Flood Emergency - (Mayor's letter of 5/6/66) (Tabled 6/6/66)

MR. HEMINGWAY MOVED for approval of the above request. Mr. Mosca said the Public Works Committee concurs in approval and seconded the motion.

MR. HEMINGWAY explained that there is still an area here which is a conflict of interest, morally if not legally. He called attention to Sec. 708 of the Charter which refers to contract limitations. He said his Committee proposes that the President of the Board appoint a special committee to go over this whole area of public citizens who are serving on various City Boards, without pay, but in their daily lives and businesses are connected in one way or another, with City business. He said this has been going on for a very long time and they think it should be looked into very carefully by this proposed Committee, and eventually this Committee should make recommendations to the next Charter Revision Commission, based upon their findings.

THE PRESIDENT requested that a vote first be taken on Mr. Hemingway's motion to approve the appropriation request.

MR. NATHANSON asked if the Corporation Counsel had been asked if it is legal for this appropriation to be approved.

MR. HEMINGWAY said, in talking with the Controller and with the Commissioner of Finance, who have talked with the Corporation Counsel, that they do not feel that this conflicts with the Charter. However, he said his Committee does not see it that way, so that is why they are recommending that a Special Committee be appointed to look into the whole area of Section 708 of the Charter.

MR. NATHANSON said his question is whether or not the Corporation Counsel thinks this is the correct way to proceed.

MR. HEMINGWAY replied that this is what he has been told, although he did not personally talk with the Corporation Counsel.

MR. KUCZO said he is requesting that this matter be TABLED because the Chairman of the Fiscal Committee has acknowledged the fact that there is a conflict of interest, possibly one or more and there is considerable doubt as to whether the expenditure of this appropriation is morally right, or whatever the case may be. He urged that this be tabled until everything has been cleared.

MR. HEMINGWAY said there is absolutely no doubt as to where the money was spent, because it is all listed in the Mayor's letter and covers just how the expenditures were made.

THE PRESIDENT said that after this item is acted upon, then the Board can go ahead and consider the Committee's recommendations as to whether or not a Special Committee should be formed.

MR. KUCZO objected. He said he does not feel action should be taken on the appropriation if there is some doubt existing as to conflict of interest here.

MR. NATHANSON spoke in favor of the motion to approve the appropriation.

MR. FUSARO said this has been approved for payment by the Corporation Counsel, who feels it is perfectly all right to go ahead with the appropriation.

MR. NATHANSON said the work has been done and it is only fair to pay for it.

MR. FUSARO asked Mr. Hemingway for clarification. He asked if the Corporation Counsel has o.k'd this for payment as not being in conflict with the Charter.

MR. HEMINGWAY explained that this has been approved by the Finance Commissioner, who has talked with the Corporation Counsel, or so he has been told, and the Committee feels the appropriation should be approved tonight, but that to them it appears that there is a conflict. However, these bills have been approved and they should be paid.

MR. FUSARO said, then is he to understand that the Corporation Counsel has said these expenditures are not in violation of Sec. 708 of the Charter.

MR. HEMINGWAY said that is the opinion of the Corporation Counsel.

MR. KUCZO asked what happened to his motion to TABLE this.

THE PRESIDENT called for a seconder. There being none, the motion to table was not in order.

THE PRESIDENT called for a VOTE on Mr. Hemingway's motion to approve item #6 on the Agenda. CARRIED.

CONCERNING APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO LOOK INTO SEC. 708 OF CHARTER

MR. HEMINGWAY MOVED that a Special Committee be appointed to look into this whole area of Sec. 708 of the Charter concerning contract limitations. Seconded by Mr. Morris.

Two amendments were offered by MR. NATHANSON, as follows; seconded by Mr. Morris:

- (1) That a six month's time limit be placed on the Committee to bring back their report to this Board.
- (2) That this Committee be charged with the responsibility of looking into the enforcement provisions of Sec. 708 of the Charter.

Both of the above amendments were voted upon separately and CARRIED.

Motion, as amended; and CARRIED:

That a Special Committee be formed to look into the enforcement provisions of Sec. 708 of the Charter and to bring back a report to this Board within six months's time.

(Note: This would then be the January 1967 Board meeting)

LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE:

MR. RICH, Chairman, presented his Committee report. He said a meeting was held on Tuesday, June 28th in the Board meeting room, with the following members present: Messrs. Bromley, Farman, Kaplan, Murphy and Rich.

He said this meeting was held in two parts. The first portion was an open session, at which time members of the public discussed with the Committee the pending Sewer Code amendment and Rent Receivorship Ordinance and the second portion consisted of an Executive Session with members of the Committee only.

4770  
4676

Minutes of July 11, 1966

- (1) Final adoption of proposed Ordinance No. 128. Concerning RENT RECEIPTORSHIP UNDER TERMS OF PUBLIC ACT NO. 554 (1965) "AN ACT CONCERNING THE ABATEMENT OF NUISANCES IN TENEMENT AND LODGING HOUSES." (Approved for publication at 6/6/66 Board meeting; published 6/11/66) (See Minutes of 6/6/66 Pages 4734,35,36)

MR. RICH said the proposed Ordinance was published on June 11th and was the subject of considerable debate at the open meeting of the Committee held June 28th.

MR. RICH said the Ordinance, with one amendment (addition of Sec. 18-39) is now submitted for final approval by the Board and the Committee strongly recommends adoption of the Ordinance. He said he would read the amended portion of the Ordinance.

MR. FUSARO requested a recess at 9:15 P.M. and suggested that Mr. Rich read the amendment after the recess. Approval was given for a recess, with several "no" votes.

THE RECESS was declared over at 9:40 P.M.

There was some objection to the length of time taken by the recess.

MR. CHIRIMBES said he would like to go on record that these lengthy recesses do not respect the Chair, or the audience who attends the Board meetings. He said when these recesses go to 25 or 30 minutes it is ridiculous. (applause)

MR. FUSARO said he believes that if the recess is in the interest of good government, the length has nothing to do with it.

MR. RICH said the Ordinance for final adoption tonight is the same as the one voted for publication a month ago, and as published in the Stamford Advocate, with one amendment and the Ordinance as offered tonight is reported out including the amendment. He read the following amendment to the Ordinance, which adds another Section thereto:

Sec. 18-39. Compilation of Records.

The Mayor, or his delegate, shall compile, and at least semi-annually, make public, a list of all parties contracting with said rent receivers to perform work hereunder. Said list shall state the names and addresses of said parties, the addresses where work was performed, the general nature of said work, such as plumbing, electrical, etc., the consideration paid for said work, the dates of said work. For each contracting party shall be stated the names and addresses of all proprietors, partners, officers, and directors; in the case of corporations, the names and addresses of all parties owning in excess of ten (10) per cent of the capital stock thereof shall be stated.

MR. RYBNICK asked if it is not true that when an Ordinance is amended, that each member shall receive a copy of it, in advance.

THE PRESIDENT said this is not necessary when an amendment is proposed from the floor as Mr. Rich has done.

There was considerable discussion of the amendment and of the Ordinance.



Minutes of July 11, 1966

477

MR. RICH said he will be glad to answer any questions that may be raised regarding the Ordinance. He said at the time his Committee held their open meeting, he compiled a list of those who were in favor of its adoption. These were as follows: Social Action Committee of the Unitarian Universalist Society; the Latin-American Central Committee; Integrated Housing Committee; the Church and Society Committee of the First Presbyterian Church; the Stamford Commission on Human Rights; the Civic Improvement Association; Operation Achievement Association; the Bishop's Commission on Human Rights; the Catholic Inter-racial Council; the Stamford Darien Council of Churches; Yerwood Women's Civic Club; Faith Tabernacle Baptist Church; League of Women Voters; NAACP; Union Baptist Church; Stamford Community Council and Our Lady of Mt. Montserrat (Spanish speaking Chapel).

He said one woman appeared on her own behalf; she admitted she was not in favor of the Ordinance and was the only voice that was raised then or since, in opposition to the Ordinance, to his knowledge.

MR. BENNETT spoke in favor of the Ordinance.

MR. FUSARO spoke in favor of the Ordinance, and said this was the position of his party. (Democratic Party)

MR. BROMLEY also spoke in favor of the Ordinance.

MR. MURPHY said perhaps we won't have to tear down the slums if we adopt this Ordinance - maybe we can fix them up and make them habitable.

MR. KUCZO said being a Democrat and a Minority of the Minority party, he is opposed to this Ordinance because it will make the City a landlord, and put the City in the position of condoning these high rents.

He said he has several questions: Who will pay for the collectors of this rent, and are we going to create a staff of employees and are we talking about more than \$100,000 and how many people will be on this staff to collect these rents, or is it a voluntary type of thing? He said he would also like to know how much, or what is anticipated in professional services that will have to be rendered by the City in any litigation that might come up because of this particular Ordinance; who will take care of the fines and who will take care of the bidding and what rights do the landlords have in this case in selecting a bidder. He said if he were a landlord and found that the City was taking bids for contemplated work to be done on his property and were taking the lowest bid, that he might have someone in mind who could do the work cheaper.

THE PRESIDENT asked Mr. Kuczo if he would like to have some of his questions answered first before continuing.

MR. KUCZO said he would like to continue speaking. He said he would also like to know why the City has not given Ordinance #65 a heavier set of teeth - not \$100 fines but \$500 and \$1,000 fines and make these landlords pay. Also, from the standpoint of the landlord, who will pay for the damages caused by the tenant? He said, also, are we talking about 15 landlords, or 20? He said he believes we are talking about a minority of landlords and does not feel that the City should subsidize \$100,000 which, in essence is what we are doing. He urged that the Board vote against the Ordinance for the reason that we already have Ordinance #65 and to just enforce the one we have, as it appears to be just a duplication of effort. (applause)

THE PRESIDENT asked Mr. Rich if he would care to try and answer some of the questions just asked by Mr. Kuczo.

4772  
4672

Minutes of July 11, 1966

MR. RICH said he would - that the first question pertained to high rents. He said just to clarify things, this Ordinance does nothing about the level of rents - that it cannot and does not. He said the question as to who will pay the collectors. That all of the expenses of this operation is to come from the rents. And, as to how many people who are going to be involved in this operation, it is difficult to say, but it is not the intent of the City that this will add one person to the payroll. He said in the event that a great deal of time is taken up by an employee in handling the enforcement of this operation, the City will have to estimate what that time is costing and get that money from the rent. As to professional services - legal and otherwise, are to come out of the rents received. How much the cost of these services will be is difficult to tell until you know how much opposition a landlord may put up to having his rents paid to a receiver. As to fines, he said there is no provision for fines. He said the possibility of having the rents paid to a receiver is enough action required. As to the landlord's right to select bidders, would be, in his opinion, that the landlord has in a sense, foregone that right when he has allowed his building to get below the minimum building standards. He said when it has reached this point and the City has to bring it up to minimum standards, it is not important as to whether Mr. Smith or Mr. Jones does the required work.

He said as to why not try and enforce Ordinance #65, it is now presently being enforced by a very hard working "Task Force" who are working on this, but unfortunately, the enforcement provisions of this Ordinance are such that there are many legal ways to delay and defer and evade for a time, anyway, the ultimate improvement of the building. On the other hand, he said the Ordinance under discussion goes to the heart of the problem, without a lot of wasted motions, by immediately getting the building up to minimum standards and it remains the property of the landlord.

As to the question of who is going to pay for damage done by tenants, he said, this is not the issue - the issue is who is going to bring the building up to minimum housing standards, and the landlord is given every opportunity to do this and gets plenty of warning that the rents may be paid to a receiver; if he chooses to do what the law requires, then everyone is much happier.

The question as to a minority of landlords being subsidized by the City, he said it is estimated that somewhere in the neighborhood of 1,000 or 1,200 dwelling units may fall within the definition of constituting a serious threat to health and safety, and these are the only ones that are involved in this. He said there may be others that one might consider to be in a run down condition, but the dwelling must be a serious threat to health and safety, or be a fire hazard to be considered as falling into the category in question. He said this amounts to about 25% of substandard housing in the City, which is a significant number of dwellings.

MR. GRANT asked if the City is not capable of enforcing the present Ordinance, how can they take on this additional work without adding new personnel. He said it is the feeling of the voters in his District that the present Ordinance should be enforced, or this Ordinance should not be passed.

MR. LOCKHART urged passage of the Ordinance and said the present "Slum Lords" are hiding behind a weak Ordinance such as the present Ordinance #65. He said these landlords should be told that if they wish to receive luxury rents, that they will have to provide luxury apartments.

Minutes of July 11, 1966

MR. NATHANSON spoke in favor of the Ordinance.

There was considerable further discussion of the Ordinance, after which Mr. Chirimbos MOVED THE QUESTION. Seconded.

MR. NATHANSON called for a ROLL CALL VOTE, which was approved.

VOTE TAKEN on Mr. Chirimbos' motion to move the question. CARRIED.

A ROLL CALL VOTE was taken on the adoption of the following Ordinance and CARRIED by a vote of 33 in favor, 4 opposed, the President not voting, as is customary. The vote appears after the Ordinance:

ORDINANCE NO. 128 SUPPLEMENTAL

CONCERNING THE SETTING UP OF A RENT RECEIVORSHIP UNDER TERMS OF PUBLIC ACT NO. 554 (1965) "AN ACT CONCERNING THE ABATEMENT OF NUISANCES IN TENEMENT AND LODGING HOUSES" AMENDING CHAPTER 18, "MINIMUM HOUSING STANDARDS" OF THE STAMFORD CITY CODE

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF STAMFORD THAT:

Chapter 18 of the Code of General Ordinances of the City of Stamford is hereby amended by the addition thereto, following the end of Sec. 18-36 thereof, of the following:

ARTICLE IV. THE ABATEMENT OF NUISANCES IN TENEMENT HOUSES.

Sec. 18-37. State Statute Adopted: Authority Appointed.

The provisions of Public Act No. 554 (1965), hereinafter referred to as the "Act", are hereby adopted, and the following five-member committee is hereby appointed the authority for the enforcement of the Act, in accordance with the provisions of Section I thereof: The Director of Health, the Building Inspector, the Chief of the Fire Department, the Executive Secretary of the Commission on Human Rights, and a citizen, appointed by the Mayor.

The Authority shall have all of the powers and responsibilities as set forth in Sec. 2 of the Act.

Sec. 18-38. Tenement House Operating Fund Created: Custody, Records.

A fund, to be known as the "tenement house operating fund", is hereby created and established. Into such fund, which shall be maintained in a separate account, shall be deposited such monies as shall be appropriated by the Board of Representatives, with the approval of the Board of Finance, or be realized from the sale of bonds issued pursuant to Chapter 109 of the General Statutes of the State of Connecticut, as amended, for that purpose. From such fund shall be withdrawn all amounts expended by the receiver to meet any costs of removing or remedying nuisances pursuant to the provisions of the Act which cannot be met from the rents, issues and profits of the property in which a nuisance exists. Such fund shall be in the custody of the Commissioner of Finance of the City of Stamford, and the books and accounts of such fund shall be kept by the Controller of the City of Stamford.



4774  
~~4674~~

Minutes of July 11, 1966

The receiver shall repay the amounts so expended to such fund from the proceeds of any amounts recovered pursuant to the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 18-39. Compilation of Records.

The mayor, or his delegate, shall compile, and at least semi-annually, make public, a list of all parties contracting with said rent receivers to perform work hereunder. Said list shall state the names and addresses of said parties, the addresses where work was performed, the general nature of said work, such as plumbing, electrical, etc., the consideration paid for said work, the dates of said work. For each contracting party shall be stated the names and addresses of all proprietors, partners, officers, and directors; in the case of corporations, the names and addresses of all parties owning in excess of ten (10) per cent of the capital stock thereof shall be stated.

This Ordinance shall take effect the date of its enactment.

The following ROLL CALL VOTE was taken on Ordinance No. 128 Supplemental:

THOSE VOTING IN FAVOR:

ARRUZZA, Patsy (D)  
BENNETT, Jonathan (R)  
BOCCUZZI, John (D)  
BOCCUZZI, Theodore (D)  
BROMLEY, Robert (R)  
BUCHANAN, William (R)  
CAPORIZZO, Vincent (D)  
CAPORIZZO, William (R)  
CHIRIMBES, Peter (R)  
CLARKE, Hilda (R)  
DURSO, Robert (D)  
FARMEN, Lynn (R)  
FUSARO, John (D)  
GRANT, Alan (R)  
HEARING, William (R)  
HEMINGWAY, Booth (R)  
IACOVO, Edwin (R)  
KAPLAN, Howard (D)  
KARL, Frederick (R)  
KEGGI, Janis (R)  
KELLY, Stephen (D)  
LE BEAU, Alton (R)  
LILLIENDAHL, Frances (R)  
LINDSTROM, Edwin (R)  
LOCKHART, Ralph (D)  
LONGO, Carmine (D)  
MORRIS, Thomas (R)  
MOSCA, Dominick (R)  
MURPHY, William (D)  
NATHANSON, Benjamin (R)  
RICH, John (R)  
RYBNICK, Gerald (D)  
WALDEN, Jerry (D)

THOSE OPPOSED:

CASALE, Louis (R)  
CONNORS, George (D)  
DOMBROSKI, Edward (D)  
KUCZO, Paul (D)

\*President not voting, except in case of a tie.



- (2) Final adoption of AMENDMENT TO BUILDING CODE (ORDINANCE NO. 80.11) REQUIRING THE SILL OF A WINDOW IN PRIVATE DWELLINGS TO BE A MAXIMUM OF 3-1/2 FEET ABOVE THE FINISHED FLOOR AND TO HAVE A FINISHED UNOBSTRUCTED OPENING OF NOT LESS THAN 2 FT. X 2-1/2 FT. (See letter from Thomas Morris, 15th District Representative, dated 3/14/66 - Deferred 4/1/66 and 5/2/66 - See Minutes of 5/2/66, page 4671) (Approved for publication at 6/6/66 Board meeting; published 5/10/66) (See Minutes of 6/6/66, page 4733)

MR. RICH said this amendment to the Building Code was duly published on June 10th in the Stamford Advocate and is now in form for final adoption by the Board and his Committee recommends approval, and he so MOVED. Seconded by Mr. Morris.

MR. MORRIS spoke in favor of the Ordinance.

MR. LE BEAU also spoke in favor of the Ordinance.

VOTE taken on the following amendment to the BUILDING CODE as previously moved and seconded. CARRIED:

ORDINANCE NO. 80.11

AMENDING ARTICLE 106 (EXIT REQUIREMENTS) STAMFORD BUILDING CODE. TO BE KNOWN AS Sec. 1 (a) "REQUIRING THE SILL OF A WINDOW IN PRIVATE DWELLINGS TO BE MAXIMUM OF 3-1/2 FT. ABOVE FINISHED FLOOR, WITH FINISHED UNOBSTRUCTED OPENING OF NOT LESS THAN 2 FT. X 2-1/2 FT."

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF STAMFORD THAT:

Article 106., EXIT REQUIREMENTS, Section 1, entitled "EXITS" of the Stamford Building Code is hereby amended by adding Section 1 (a) thereto, to read as follows:

Every sleeping room in a one-family dwelling, unless it has two (2) doors providing separate ways of escape, or has a door leading directly to the outside of the building, shall have at least one outside window which can be opened from the inside without the use of tools and of such design that it may serve as an emergency exit, if the normal avenues of escape are blocked. The sill of such windows shall not be more than three and one-half feet (3½) above the floor, and when fully open, the aggregate open space at the bottom of said window shall not be less than two feet (2) vertical, by two and one-half feet (2½) horizontal.

\*\*\*\*\*

- (3) Concerning Final Adoption of Proposed Amendments to Article 11 of SEWER CODE, by adding Section 57 thereto - CONCERNING ISSUANCE OF BUILDING PERMITS IN CASES WHERE IT WILL OVERTAX AVAILABLE SEWER FACILITIES - (Reactivated by letter from Thomas Morris, 15th District Representative, dated 3/21/66 - Originally brought before 8th Board and adopted for publication; published first time on 1/11/65; open hearing held 1/27/65; deferred 2/1/65; 3/1/65 and 4/5/65 - See Minutes of 5/3/66, pages 4318-19) (Adopted for publication in revised form 5/2/66; published second time 5/7/66 - Deferred 6/6/66)



4774  
4676

Minutes of July 11, 1966

MR. RICH said his Committee spent considerable time in the past month reviewing some further revisions to the proposed Sewer Code amendment. And, as a result, they now have a proposed amendment substantially different from the one which was published as a result of Board action on May 7, 1966. He said the Committee recommends the present form of the proposed amendment to the Sewer Code (and hopefully) final version for approval tonight, and MOVED for approval. Seconded by Mr. Farman.

MR. FUSARO asked if this is for publication (not final adoption) of the revised form.

MR. RICH said this is for publication of a version of the amendment, which is so different from the one that was published that it probably ought to be republished..

THE PRESIDENT asked Mr. Rich to clarify his motion.

MR. RICH said he is asking the Board to approve it for publication.

THE PRESIDENT explained that Mr. Fusaro asked if this was for new publication and Mr. Rich replied that it had been published previously, but due to the many changes, he felt that it ought to be re-published.

MR. MORRIS said this gets into the same old hassel if you can strictly talk on publication. He said he was the one who presented the original version of the amendment to our Sewer Code and was written up by our then Corporation Counsel, Mr. Kveskin, approved by the Public Works Department, by the Sewer Commission, and now he understands that Mr. Gochberg practically re-wrote it. He said he thinks the new version is very tricky and would therefore NOT want the proposed Ordinance published and believes there definitely should be further study -there are a lot of problems, one of them being that if we do go by this it will be practically taking away the authority of the Sewer Code, which is defined by State Statute and the Board of Representatives would then, by Mr. Gochberg's word, be allowing certain things to happen to which he (Mr. Morris) is very definitely opposed and he is against publication of the amendment as it now is.

THE PRESIDENT asked if Mr. Morris meant without a copy first being handed to the members for study.

MR. MORRIS said the whole text of Mr. Gochberg's thinking on this Sewer Code amendment, he is very much against the publication of any part of it and thinks it should be reviewed again, even though it is asking quite a bit of the Legislative and Rules Committee, because he knows that they have gone through a long hassel. But, he said he now believes that the entire concept of the original amendment to the Sewer Code is entirely changed. He said this man has changed it so much that it now enables different private interests will be controlling Stamford's Sewer system and he feels this is wrong, because it is a definite violation of the State Statutes, because our Sewer Commission is guided by the State Statutes. He recommended that this be given a great deal of thought, and he is definitely opposed to its publication at this time.

MR. FUSARO said in view of the fact that this has been before this Board on numerous occasions and is an Ordinance very close to Mr. Morris and many other members of this Board and he recommends this be REFERRED BACK TO COMMITTEE for study and to make the necessary revisions that the Committees of this Board feel are necessary, rather than publishing it in its present form, which none of the members are familiar with. HE MOVED this be REFERRED BACK TO COMMITTEE, for further study. Seconded by Mr. Durso.

MR. BROMLEY said as a member of the Legislative and Rules Committee, he feels compelled to object, for the reason that they have spent a great deal of time on this and the very questions that were brought up by the first published version, the Committee felt that this proposed revision would deal with these, which are basic questions of constitutionality. He said the Committee feels they have done the best job they can with it. He recommended publication of the present form and then if the Board feels at the next Board meeting that this is not what they want or designed to meet the needs, they can vote it down.

MR. FUSARO said he does not want, in any way to impugn the abilities of the Committee or their workmanship, but since this has been revised, amended and torn apart and finally put together again and outside of other Committees that would be interested, such as the Public Works Committee, he feels that the original form should come directly from this Board and the Board should be apprised of it sufficiently in advance of publication to produce what they feel is the Ordinance that they want.

After considerable further debate, the matter (item #3 under Legislative & Rules Committee) was REFERRED BACK TO THE LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE for further study.

- (4) Mayor's letter of 6/1/66 CONCERNING EXCHANGE OF EASEMENTS BETWEEN CITY OF STAMFORD AND DALENE & RUSSACK, INCORPORATED, covering land situated partly in the City of Stamford and partly in the Town of New Canaan (to correct an ambiguity in an easement which was given to the City of Stamford by the subdivider

MR. RICH said the Committee has reviewed this proposed exchange of easements and finds it to be in order for publication as a proposed Ordinance and SO MOVED. Seconded and CARRIED:

#### PROPOSED ORDINANCE

CONCERNING EXCHANGE OF EASEMENTS BETWEEN CITY OF STAMFORD AND DALENE & RUSSACK, INC., COVERING PROPERTY LOCATED ON SLICE DRIVE (TO CORRECT AMBIGUITY IN ORIGINAL EASEMENT GIVEN TO THE CITY BY THE SUBDIVIDER)

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF STAMFORD THAT:

In conformity with Section 488 of the Stamford Charter and notwithstanding any provisions of Chapter 2, Sections 2-24 to 2-27, inclusive, of the Code of General Ordinances of the City of Stamford, the exchange of property between the City of Stamford and Dalene & Russack, Inc. of the following described property:

Property deeded to Dalene & Russack, Inc. by the City of Stamford:



Minutes of July 11, 1966

ALL those said pieces, parcels or tracts of land situated in the City of Stamford, and partly in the Town of New Canaan, County of Fairfield and State of Connecticut, known and designated as Lots 3, 5, 12, 13, 14, 16 and 18 on a certain map entitled: "Map No. 2 of Property in Stamford, Connecticut Prepared For Anne G. Waters et al," which map is on file in the Office of the Town Clerk of said Stamford as Map No. 8032.

Property deeded to the City of Stamford by Dalene & Russack, Inc.:

On the "Drainage Easement" portion of those certain pieces, parcels or tracts of land, situated in the City of Stamford, and partly in the Town of New Canaan, County of Fairfield and State of Connecticut, known and designated as Lots 3, 5, 12, 13, 14, 16 and 18 on a certain map entitled: "Map No. 2 of Property in Stamford, Connecticut Prepared For Anne G. Waters, et al," which map is on file in the Office of the Town Clerk of said Stamford as Map No. 8232,

is hereby authorized.

The Mayor of the City of Stamford is hereby authorized and empowered to act for the City of Stamford and to execute and deliver all documents necessary to transfer title to such above described property to grant the easement aforesaid.

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

\*\*\*\*\*

- (5) Request for WAIVER OF BUILDING PERMIT FEE for construction of proposed Senior Citizen building on Washington Court (letter dated 5/27/66) under provisions of Article 100, Sec. 6, paragraph 14 of Building Code (Ordinance No. 80.7)

MR. RICH MOVED for approval of the above request. Seconded by several and CARRIED.

- (6) Proposed Resolution Concerning CLOONAN JR. HIGH SCHOOL DETERIORATION  
(Presented in letter dated 6/6/66 from Paul Kuczo, 8th District Representative)

MR. RICH said this item came to the attention of the Committee too late to be considered at its regular June meeting and therefore no consideration of the matter has taken place by the Committee.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE:

Proposed Resolution Concerning the Feasibility of Converting the OLD CLOONAN JR. HIGH SCHOOL PROPERTY into a NEIGHBORHOOD RECREATIONAL COMMUNITY SERVICE CENTER - (Presented by Joseph Bitetto, 14th District Representative on 6/30/66 meeting of Steering Committee)

MR. MOSCA, Vice Chairman of the above Committee, filling in for Mr. Bitetto, presently on vacation, presented the following resolution and MOVED its adoption; seconded by Mr. Fusaro.



Minutes of July 11, 1966

477  
478

RESOLUTION NO. 495

CONCERNING FEASIBILITY STUDY OF CONVERSION OF OLD  
CLOONAN JR. HIGH SCHOOL INTO NEIGHBORHOOD RECREATIONAL  
SERVICE CENTER

BE AND IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED that the Board of Representatives submit to the Mayor the study prepared by the Sub-Committee on Old Cloonan Jr. High School of the Public Works Committee of the Board of Representatives for the purpose of continuing a detailed analysis of the feasibility of converting the Old Cloonan Jr. High School property into a neighborhood recreational community service center, by such means as he sees fit, as will most expeditiously resolve this question.

\*\*\*\*\*

MR. FARMEN spoke against the resolution for the reason that we have already had one survey, which went into all aspects of the situation and came out with a conclusion and we are now being asked to run another survey, not knowing how much it will cost or will accomplish. He said he feels that those who insist on making this a recreational area are possibly treading on a "Primrose Path", as a survey could easily show that the cost would be too great and there would go their recreation center. He said if another survey has to be made he would rather see it be a wide-open survey, or in other words: What's best to do with Cloonan School?

MR. WALDEN said he would like to disagree with what has just been said. He said it is the job of this Committee to study Cloonan School for all types of use and if it has been pin-pointed that the best possible use is for a recreational service center and now to further that study is all that the Committee is asking.

MR. BUCHANAN said he served on this Committee and feels that at this point we would be unwise to reject their findings and not ask for a more detailed cost analysis of what it might mean. He said it may prove in the long run that it would be too costly to use this property for such purposes, but we should find this out from the standpoint of dollars and cents. He said in the initial survey that was made, their finding was that it was better used for industrial property use and this may or may not be the ultimate outcome, but until we find out what the costs would be for such uses as are proposed in the resolution, we can't fairly say what it should be.

MR. KUCZO said the use of Cloonan School has been more than well aired and he supports the stand of the Public Works Committee on the resolution.

MR. CASALE said he also served on this Committee and a great deal of thought went into the preparation of the resolution and to the entire findings of the Committee. He said if the resolution is adopted tonight, the people doing the study will come out with a cost analysis and then we will know, once and for all, whether or not the Cloonan School is fit for a recreational center, and we can then come in with a report, telling us what it is good for and get it off our Agenda once and for all.

442  
443

4780  
4685

Minutes of July 11, 1966

MR. KELLY said he has been 21 months working on the problem of what to do with Cloonan School and the Committee after all this time has come up with the recommendation to adopt this resolution here tonight and it is not to be just for recreation, but is to be for the use of the Senior Citizens and for Clinics and other uses.

THE PRESIDENT pointed out that the resolution, as read, limits its use for a recreational-service center.

MR. RICH said he would like to know if there is in mind a Consultant to do this proposed survey.

MR. MOSCA said the resolution reads that the Mayor will have to comply with this in this area.

*corrected 9/16/66 J.F.*  
*Farmen*  
MR. BUCHANAN said we are putting the Mayor in an interesting position of having conducted one survey and coming up with a proposed solution and now we are asking him to conduct another one, because we don't believe him. He said if we are going to do this, let's find out just where it should go.

MR. CHIRIMBES said he thinks what we are asking the Mayor to do is to bring in a feasibility report on the issue - which is the use of the School for a recreational center. He said in order to avoid a two-hour session on the merits of the resolution, he would MOVE THE QUESTION.

After much further discussion, a VOTE was taken on the motion to approve the adoption of Resolution No. 495. CARRIED with several "No" votes.

HEALTH & PROTECTION COMMITTEE:

- (1) CONDITIONS EXISTING AT THE REAR OF THE NEWFIELD SHOPPING CENTER (REQUEST THAT THEY BE INVESTIGATED) - (Brought up by Mr. Buchanan 4/1/66 under "New Business" & referred to Public Works Committee on 4/18/66 by Steering Committee (See page 4658, 4663 of Minutes - Also brought up again in letter of 5/23/66 by Thomas Morris and Wm. Caporizzo to Public Works Committee - Referred also to Health & Protection Committee 5/23/66 by Steering Committee - See page 4727, Minutes of 6/6/66)

MR. KAPLAN said he would turn over this part of the Committee report to Mr. Chirimbes on the above matter. The report follows:

I, Peter Chirimbes, contacted the Building Inspector, and was assured that no certificate of occupancy has been issued, as yet, outside of a verbal one, for a few store occupancies and that Certificates would not be issued until the Shopping Center conformed to requirements.

I was also told that a bond had been posted. An appointment was made with Mr. Thomas Morris and a visit was made to the area on Saturday, May 28, 1966 at 9:00 A. M. at which time he pointed out various things that were promised to be corrected. It was an ideal time for the inspection, as it was raining.

I contacted the representative of the Shopping Center and made a 12 443 clock appointment, at which time we inspected the conditions and he briefed me on the problems in connection with the delay in correcting the existing situation because of delay in correction of waivers to access of properties. At that time I met one of the

Minutes of July 11, 1966

owners of the Development. He agreed to confirm their intentions by letter, which would go into detail.

All of the people contacted - the Building Inspector, the representative of the Development, and owner, and Thomas Morris, were very cooperative and I feel that all concerned were sincere in their interest in the situation.

The Health & Protection Committee will follow up with a progress report.

MR. CHIRIMBES read a lengthy letter, dated June 6th, addressed to him from the President, August Salony, of the Newfield Improvement Corporation, explaining what they have done to overcome the problems of bad drainage. He said that they have complied with every suggestion of the Planning & Zoning Boards, the Police Department and the Department of Public Works, with the cost of all of these improvements amounting to over \$30,000 and at this time they are supposed to be finished with their work by the end of June.

MR. CHIRIMBES presented a follow-up of his first report, confirming the work was done as stated by the developer and that all of the area in the rear of the development has been graded, and planted and fences replaced; the grading of roads have been made with pitching towards the drains so as to eliminate runoff onto adjoining property. He said the lights, which had been the subject of complaint, have been shaded so as to eliminate most of the reflection into nearby homes. He said any further report to do with the capacity of drains, etc., are an engineering problem, which should be referred to the Public Works Department to ascertain if they are correctly installed, etc.

- (2) Concerning FIRE TRUCK (65 foot Maxim aerial replacement) damaged, and finally replaced by a new one, but not with the same specifications as original truck (Letter dated 4/18/66 from Thomas Morris and William Caporizzo, 15th District Representatives - See Minutes of 4/6/66, page 3955, item #14 and Minutes of 5/2/66, pages 4662, 4676-77-78 - Deferred 6/6/66)

MR. KAPLAN presented his Committee report. He said the Committee met on May 5th at 8 o'clock and present were himself, Mr. Arruzza, Mr. Morris and Mr. Benevelli, Purchasing Agent, at his office. He reported that another meeting was held on May 11th with Chief Richardson and Mr. McAuliffe.

MR. KAPLAN'S report went into great detail, and after summing up the findings of his Committee, he said they could report that all decisions were made in good faith and upon the facts which the Committee looked into, they could see no reason to criticize any of the parties involved, although there seemed to be a difference of opinion on some matters.

MR. MORRIS said he has no doubt that Mr. Kaplan is a very good lawyer, but as a diesel engineer, he has a few questions he would like to ask him. One, he said he just stated that on the water temperature that --- in other words, saying that the radiator is not being used on the engine, because if the water does not get to temperature, evidently the thermostats are not open and this engine is just running with the water it contains in the motor block and can only assume from his report that this is what happened. Also, he said he attended the meeting and can remember Chief Richardson saying that the Mack engine on the bid, even though they came within the bid, was worth \$1,400 more than a two cycle. He said when you look at a chart, it is one thing, but when you take an engine in actual use --- we



are not saying that on a high torque, which a two cycle engine is and if you keep up the speed it is good and on the Thruway it is terrific, but when you take an engine, two cycle and are driving a ladder truck and are going to a fire and a car pulls in front of you and you have to hit the brakes, the torque goes down very fast and the truck does not have quick recovery and you have to start shifting. He said he does not imagine Cummings Diesel is a foolish company, because they make a Diesel four cycle, which we did not buy. He said they are one of the older Diesel companies and the most progressive in the country and Mack Motors also. Also, he said he failed to mention that this is the first time that this company from which we purchased, has ever put out a Diesel truck. He said he thinks that one of the problems they have is that they have a Diesel engine with a gasoline radiator on it.

MR. MORRIS said he was not criticizing anyone. He said he was one of those on the Committee who suggested they buy a new 100 foot ladder truck rather than a 65 and one of the reasons they made this suggestion was because the ladder truck that was in an accident - the motor in that was also under powered. He said he never took into consideration that they would wind up with a replacement that was also underpowered.

PLANNING & ZONING COMMITTEE:

Concerning LINDSTROM ROAD - (Processing under Chapter 64 and Sec. 641 of Charter - Requested in letter of 6/6/66 from J. W. Herman)

MR. MORRIS said this will have to go through the usual channels.

MR. LINDSTROM said he wants to ask a question and it is - Is this going to start to roll now?

THE PRESIDENT said there is a very definite procedure to be followed.

MR. LINDSTROM said he realizes that, and that is what he is trying to follow, but is it going to start.

THE PRESIDENT said it starts with a resolution of this Board and there is one part that has to be corrected first by Mr. Lindstrom.

MR. CONNORS said he wants to know why Birch Road was not put into Planning & Zoning.

THE PRESIDENT informed Mr. Connors that BIRCH ROAD was on a list that the Commissioner of Public Works had and we are waiting to hear from his department on not only this road, but on quite a few other roads.

MR. CONNORS said he hopes this is not going to fall into that same old category, where someone is always asking "What happened to Weed Avenue, or what happened to Webb Avenue and Home Court?"

THE PRESIDENT said he thinks Mr. Morris will have to contact the Commissioner on that group of roads and try to get an answer on the various ones.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE:

MR. KEGGI presented his report, which follows:



478  
4003

Minutes of July 11, 1966

The regular monthly meeting of the Urban Redevelopment Committee was held on June 29, 1966 at 8 P.M. in the Democratic Caucus Room of the Board of Representatives. Present were Messrs. Casale, Karl, Keggi, Longo and Murphy of the Committee; Mr. Morris, Majority Leader of the Board and Mrs. Marshall, and Messrs. McCulloch, Batiste and Hawthorne of the Commission and staff.

There being no matters requiring action before the Committee, no votes were taken. Mr. Batiste reviewed the operations of the Family Relocation Office and Mr. Hawthorne discussed problems of property management.

With acquisitions now over one-third completed, about 43% of the cases anticipated on the basis of the initial site survey have been placed on the active caseload and nearly half of the active caseload has been relocated to date. Thus, family relocation is keeping reasonable pace with the rest of the Project. However, all concerned are acutely aware of the tight housing situation in Stamford and are looking forward to the construction of the first 221-d-3 housing. It is without doubt a very critical aspect of Urban Renewal and a potential source of complex problems and dangerous delays. The entire area will continue to receive close attention of this Committee.

As a property owner and landlord, the Commission is about breaking even in the balance of rents received and the necessary maintenance, utilities, insurance, taxes and other expenses, while, at the same time, improving living conditions and whenever possible, lowering rents.

MR. KEGGI said he wishes to comment that when the URC moves a family, they do try to move them into a place with decent living standards. In addition, he said he is submitting the following URC Progress report for June, 1966:

Relocation of residents and businesses moved ahead during June, and more than 1/3 of the parcels have been acquired.

Five parcels were acquired during the month, bringing the total, to date, to 139, for which just under \$6 million has been disbursed, at an average price of just over \$42,800. Final prices on 33 cases will be determined by the Courts.

In addition, during June the legal staff moved forward on 10 other parcels, which were acquired just after the first of this month.

More than 47 per cent of the households in properties acquired by the URC have been re-located to date, of which less than 16 per cent have gone into public housing. Nine families and four roomers were re-located during June.

Four businesses were re-located during the month, and three commercial properties were vacated. In addition, the nuns of St. John's Convent re-located from 48 South Street to 178 Strawberry Hill Avenue. Just under 40 per cent of the firms that have re-located within the City have stayed in the central business district, and follow-up surveys indicate that most firms have experienced an improvement in business in their new locations.

-44-

4784  
~~4687~~

Minutes of July 11, 1966

Engineering and appraisal work for acquisition, disposition and public improvements progressed during the month, and negotiations continued with sponsors and affected property owners concerning disposition, property lines and access to properties not to be acquired.

The Commission, staff and coordinating engineers worked with the Mayor and the Public Works and Park Departments in planning for disposal of demolition debris in a land fill operation at Dyke Park which will create some 11 acres of new park land.

\*\*\*\*\*

After Mr. Keggi finished his report, there followed a question and answer period.

MR. LOCKHART and MRS. LILLIENDAHL asked to be excused - Mrs. Lilliendahl left at 11:15 P.M. and Mr. Lockhart was excused at 11:40 P.M.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM MAYOR:

MR. RUSSELL read the following communication at this time:

June 14, 1966

Mr. George Russell, President  
Board of Representatives  
Municipal Office Building  
429 Atlantic Street  
Stamford, Connecticut

Dear Mr. Russell:

Enclosed, herewith, please find copy of  
Public Act No. 551. I would appreciate it if your Board would  
designate an Administrator in accordance with said Act.

Many thanks.

Sincerely,

Enclosures

Thomas C. Mayers, Mayor

\*\*\*\*\*

The following was enclosed in the Mayor's letter:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
Public Works Department  
State Office Building  
Hartford, Connecticut

447

COMMISSION ON DEMOLITION  
Room 473 State Office Bldg.

Minutes of July 11, 1966

478  
4525

Pursuant to the authority contained in Sec. 19-403c General Statutes of Connecticut, Revision of 1958 as amended to 1965, there was established a Commission on Demolition. A copy of Public Act #551 which created this Commission is enclosed.

Therefore, in accordance with the provisions of this Act, there shall be no demolition permits issued AFTER MARCH 1, 1966, UNLESS the Applicant has obtained a State Demolition License.

If there are any questions pertaining to this Act, please feel free to communicate with our office.

For the record, we would appreciate your informing us the name and address of your Administrative Officer.

Yours very truly,

S. A. McGann, Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

The following is an excerpt from Public Act No. 551 (1965) pertaining to above:

"....Sec. 5. The legislative body of each town shall appoint an officer to administer sections 7 to 16 of this act, inclusive. Each such officer shall have a minimum of five years' experience in building demolition, and shall be generally informed on demolition practices and requirements and on the equipment necessary for the safety of persons engaged in demolition and the public. Such officer shall pass upon any question relative to the manner of demolition or materials or equipment to be used in the demolition of buildings or structures."

Note: Copies of above communications and P. A. #551 were sent to all Board members on 6/15/66.  
VF.

\*\*\*\*\*

THE PRESIDENT called for a motion to appoint an ADMINISTRATOR OF DEMOLITION, as required above.

MR. MORRIS MOVED that the Building Inspector of the City of Stamford shall also be known as Administrator of Demolition, as required by Public Act No. 551 (1965 session of Legislature). Seconded by Mr. Chirimbes and CARRIED.

CONCERNING COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

THE PRESIDENT said at this time while we are reviewing Communications, Petitions, Resolutions, Communications from the Mayor, etc., the President has noted that most of these items would normally be presented to the Steering Committee, and unless it is imperative, these items should not be read at the end of a Board meeting, because it is merely repetitious and has to go to the Steering Committee



4724  
4636

Minutes of July 11, 1966

anyway for proper referral to Committee. He said if, by coincidence, any correspondence comes in after a meeting of the Steering Committee has been held, he will ask that these not be brought up at a Board meeting, until it has been properly referred to the Steering Committee first.

He said in regard to the Mayor's letter - it should have been placed on the Agenda, and the Steering Committee "goofed".

RESOLUTIONS:

Concerning Resolution No. 496, protesting increased Water Rates for Stamford

MR. BENNETT MOVED for approval of the following resolution; seconded by Mr. Fusaro and Mr. Kaplan and CARRIED with several "No" votes:

RESOLUTION NO. 496

CONCERNING PROTEST TO PUC ON INCREASED WATER RATES FOR  
CITY OF STAMFORD (Application of Stamford Water Company,  
Docket No. 10464 pending before PUC)

WHEREAS, the Stamford Water Company has applied to the Public Utilities Commission for a sharp increase in water rates, ranging from 25% for most customers to 78% for the City's fire needs; and

WHEREAS, such an increase would confront the City and every water user with substantial new water costs; and

WHEREAS, the Water Company has attributed this rise to expenditures which it has made in order to meet the recent water crisis; and

WHEREAS, this Board of Representatives, upon detailed study by its Water Conservation Committee, concluded by unanimous resolution that one significant cause of the water shortage was the failure of the Water Company itself to properly anticipate or keep pace with the growth of the City by constructing expanded water storage facilities over the past generation;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford hereby finds that the proposed rise in water rates constitutes an attempt by the Water Company to compensate itself for expenses brought upon it by its own manifest lack of providence. Accordingly, this Board opposes the proposed rate schedule in the name of the people of Stamford. We urge the Public Utilities Commission to reject it in its entirety.

\*\*\*\*\*

OLD BUSINESS:

Concerning Picture of President, Alan H. Ketcham, President of 8th Board

MR. RYBNICK asked if anything was being done about obtaining a picture of the former President of the Board, so that it can be framed and placed on the wall with the pictures of all former Board Presidents.

A 13

Minutes of July 11, 1966

4727  
4-27

THE PRESIDENT said this is being taken care of and he hopes it will be received in time to be placed on the wall by the next Board meeting.

Concerning COMPLAINT FROM RESIDENT RE NOISE AT POLYCAST (Letter of 7/8/66)  
(Presented by John Boccuzzi, 2nd District Representative)

MR. JOHN BOCCUZZI said he sent in a report on the above matter a few months back and was told by the Chairman that after the case had gone to the State Supreme Court, he would act upon it. He said it now has gone through the Supreme Court, Polycast has been found guilty and as of July 8th, they have still not complied with the Ordinance 20-2 which states that after nine o'clock at night and before 8 o'clock in the morning, they cannot conduct the type of business that disturbs the residents around their factory. He said he realizes that this is an industrial area, but the Ordinance pertains to this. He said these people have been harrassed around two o'clock in the morning with noise, and still can't sleep at 6 o'clock in the morning. He said he has called the Mayor, the Chief of Police and has about called everybody but the Dogcatcher and thinks that this Board, which is supposed to represent a city of over 100,000 people can make an establishment like Polycast abide by the law. He said even though these people have been awarded damages, and yet Polycast continues to act as if they don't care. He said it seems like they are trying to make a fool out of the City and wishes some Committee on this Board, who has the authority to go to the Mayor and request these people to carry on their business according to the Ordinances of the City of Stamford. He said this has been going on since 1961 and these people around the factory, who pay taxes to the City, deserve some kind of representation from the City on their grievance.

THE PRESIDENT said he realizes this is a problem and has been before this Board well over a year and that one of the complaints is in regard to noise made by employees leaving the plant and this is one of the more difficult problems to try to handle. He said you might like to control people who talk loud at night when they are walking by in front of houses, but there is no direct answer. He said if the complaint is in regard to fumes, that is more easily controlled.

MR. MORRIS said he thinks this is a matter for the Health and Protection Committee and should be turned over to that Committee to look into.

THE PRESIDENT said it will have to go to the Steering Committee and be referred by them to the Health & Protection Committee.

Concerning letters from Mr. Kuczo to the Board on various matters

MR. KUCZO said he would like to see some action on various matters he has brought to the Board's attention over a period of some time - that awhile back he brought up the subject of the Cove Dam investigation - why the City has substituted cheaper gates, when this Board appropriated money for the original type of gates to be replaced, which was supposed to be hinged gate and also why these gates have not been lifted to date, which was supposed to have been done. He spoke of Ordinance No. 97 regarding "Snow-Tow" which was mis-used, resulting in harrassment and inconvenience of all those people who were involved in this particular situation and as of this date, he has had no report on it. He said the Cloonan investigation

4758  
4688

Minutes of July 11, 1966

continues to be passed around and he would like to know who the guilty parties are who are responsible for this deterioration, as well as all those who have neglected this building which has been devaluated so much. He said the Board of Representatives more than two years ago was asked to investigate the Personnel Commission and instead has "passed the buck" by passing it off to another Committee and they have still not come in with a report.

MR. KUCZO said in view of the laxity in the way in which these matters have been handled, he is going to take these matters up with the State's Attorney General, because the present Administration seems to be covering up all of these blunders.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business to come before the Board, on MOTION, duly seconded and CARRIED, the meeting was adjourned at 12:20 A.M.

*Velma Farrell*  
Velma Farrell  
Administrative Assistant  
(Recording Secretary)

vf

APPROVED:

*George E. Russell*  
George E. Russell, President  
Board of Representatives

Note: The above meeting was  
broadcast over Radio Station  
WSTC until 11:00 P.M.

VF