

April 2, 1956

1149

The regular meeting of the Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford, Conn., was held on Monday, April 2, 1956, in the Cafeteria of the Walter Dolan Jr. High School, Toms Road, Glenbrook. The meeting was called to order by the President, Mr. George V. Connors, at 8:20 P.M.

INVOCATION was given by Rev. William Schmidt, Pastor of the Bible Protestant Church, Maple Avenue.

In the absence of the Clerk, John C. Macrides, it was moved, seconded and CARRIED that Mrs. Doris Zuckert be appointed the Temporary Clerk.

ROLL CALL was taken by the Temporary Clerk. There were 34 present and 6 absent. The absent members were: Mary Bankowski, Joseph Milano, Clifford Waterbury, John Macrides, Thomas Killeen, Alanson Fredericks and John Lilliendahl. Mrs. Bankowski arrived at 9:30 P.M., changing the roll call to 35 present and 5 absent.

ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES - Meeting of March 5, 1956.

MR. HUIZINGA called attention to page 1107, second line under remarks made by him. The word "initial" should be changed to "initiate".

MR. KAMENSKI called attention to page 1108, bottom of page, remarks made by him. The words "public hearing" should be changed to read "referendum".

MR. RHOADES MOVED for acceptance of the Minutes of March 5, 1956. Seconded by Mr. Findlay and CARRIED unanimously.

RESIGNATION: Thomas M. Killeen, 12th District Representative.

MR. CONNORS read the following letter of resignation from Mr. Killeen:

267 Soundview Avenue
Stamford, Conn.

March 17, 1956

Hon. Thomas Quigley
City Hall
Stamford, Conn.

Dear Mayor Quigley:

I submit to you herewith my resignation from the Stamford Board of Representatives as district Representative from the 12th voting district, effective immediately.

This resignation action has been arrived at after long and careful consideration both from a personal viewpoint and civic obligation. I sincerely hope that my desire to do so will be accepted.

Further, I should like to state at this time that at some time in the future I will be able to assume once again a small part in the progressive development of the City of Stamford.

April 2, 1956

Sincerely,

THOMAS M. KILLEEN

MR. GEORGOULIS MOVED the acceptance of the resignation. Seconded by Mr. Murphy.

MR. RHOADES MOVED that this resignation be accepted with regret. Seconded by Mr. Topping.

MR. KELLY spoke in reference to this resignation. He said: "having served on the Board of Representatives for the two terms I have served as a colleague of Thomas Killeen, I, for one, as well as the voters who elected him, will miss his wise counsel and his great activity for the greatest good of all whom he served, and until a person is appointed to take his place, the 12th District people will sorely miss him and the Board should go on record as extending a vote of thanks to Mr. Killeen for his splendid service to the City of Stamford, as a member of the Board of Representatives."

MR. KELLY MOVED that the Board of Representatives send a letter to Mr. Killeen expressing their regret at losing him as a fellow member of the Board, with a vote of thanks for his past services. Seconded by Mr. Rhoades and CARRIED unanimously.

MR. KELLY then read the qualifications for Mr. Gerald Rybnick, 907 Cove Road, Democrat, as a replacement for Mr. Killeen, for the duration of the present term of office, which expires November 30, 1957 and MOVED for the approval of the appointment of Mr. Rybnick. Seconded by Mr. Georgoulis. Mr. Longo MOVED the nominations be closed. Seconded by several and CARRIED unanimously.

MR. HANRAHAN, Corporation Counsel, who was present, gave Mr. Rybnick the oath of office and he assumed his place as a member of the Board of Representatives.

Mr. George V. Connors, as Acting Mayor, also gave the oath of office to Mr. RAYMOND ARNOW, as a member of the Sewer Commission, term to expire December 1, 1957.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Steering Committee:

Mr. Connors, Chairman, read the following report:

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT Meeting of March 27, 1956

The Steering Committee of the Board of Representatives met in the Mayor's office, City Hall, at 8:12 P.M. The following members were present: George V. Connors, Chairman; John C. Macrides, George E. Georgoulis, Joseph Milano, Stephen Kelly, Clement Raiteri, Norton Rhoades, Joseph Iacovo, Rutherford Huizinga, Helen Peatt and Vincent Vittl. The absent members were: Alanson Fredericks (on a business trip to the west coast), William Kaminski, Robert Lewis and Irving Snyder.

April 2, 1956

1151

The following resolution was introduced by Mr. R. G. Huizinga, Representative from the 20th District, and he moved its adoption. Seconded and CARRIED unanimously.

TO THE BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE
CITY OF STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT

WHEREAS, April 19, 1956 has been designated as one of the days for making voters, and,

WHEREAS, the Republican Primary will be held on this same day, namely April 19, 1956,

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, that April 18, 1956 or some other day convenient to the Registrars of Voters, be it hereby is designated as the day for making voters, in lieu of April 19, 1956.

The following communications were read:

- (1) Petition for acceptance of Research Drive, Glenbrook, from the Glenbrook Sand & Gravel Company, as a city street. Referred to Planning & Zoning Committee.
- (2) Letter dated March 19, 1956 from Mr. Alan H. Ketcham, 18th District Representative, enclosing petition for acceptance of CLAY HILL ROAD as a city street. Referred to Planning & Zoning Committee.
- (3) Letter dated March 19, 1956 from Mr. Ketcham, enclosing petition for acceptance of ARDEN LANE as a city street. Referred to Planning & Zoning Committee.
- (4) Letter dated March 19, 1956 from Mr. Ketcham, enclosing petition requesting change of street name from WOFSEY ROAD to ALPINE STREET. Referred to Legislative & Rules Committee to have Ordinance prepared.

Mr. Kelly MOVED and it was seconded and CARRIED that the Committee on Education be assigned Public Welfare matters and that this Committee's name therefore be changed to the EDUCATION & WELFARE COMMITTEE.

- (5) Letter dated March 6, 1956 from Mayor Quigley, requesting an expression of opinion from the Board in support of Bill S.3272 sponsored by Senator Bush, entitled "To increase and make certain revisions in the general authorization for small flood control projects in the Flood Control Act of 1948". Referred to Legislative & Rules Committee.
- (6) Carbon copy of letter dated March 17, 1956 from Thomas M. Killeen, Representative from 12th District, addressed to Mayor Quigley, resigning as a member of the Board of Representatives. Ordered placed on Agenda for April 2nd meeting.
- (7) Carbon copy of letter dated March 12, 1956 from the Corporation Counsel to the Prosecuting Attorney in regard to warning notice sent by Mr. Swinnerton to Crystal Lake Building Corp. on Nov. 30,

April 2, 1956

1955 which was ignored. Because the nature of this letter would be of interest to all members of the Board, Mr. Connors was directed to read it at the Board meeting.

- (8) Carbon copy of letter dated Feb. 28, 1956, from Corporation Counsel to Mayor Quigley re Quit Claim Deed to parcel of land in Laddin's Rock Section, deeding certain property to the city, with an offer of a \$2,500 donation for the purchase of picnic tables and benches, previously accepted by the Board. Mr. Connors was directed to read this letter at the Board meeting.
- (9) Carbon copy of letter dated March 8, 1956 from Mayor Quigley to the Stamford Community Council regarding the recommendations of their Housing Committee and offering a counter recommendation that an appropriate committee of the Board of Representatives meet with representatives of the Building Department, Health Department, City Housing Authority and Urban Redevelopment Commission in order to coordinate their activities with the goals outlined in the survey. Filed.
- (10) Carbon Copy of letter dated Feb. 24, 1956, from Corporation Counsel to Commissioner of Finance, enclosing check for \$1,300 from the State in payment for .09 acres, as shown on map on file in Town Clerk's office entitled: "Town of Stamford, map showing land acquired from Town and City of Stamford by the State of Connecticut, Greenwich-Killingly Express Way". Ordered filed.
- (11) Carbon copy of letter dated March 8, 1956 from the Newfield Parent Teachers Association, objecting to the Mayor's recent action in denying a request for the purchase of certain property for a school site. Ordered filed.
- (12) Carbon copy of letter dated Feb. 28, 1956 from U. S. Army Corps of Engineers to Mayor Quigley in regard to problem encountered by an obstruction of sewer line crossing Rippowam River at the Richmond Hill Avenue Bridge, recommending its immediate removal. Ordered filed.
- (13) Letter to President of Board from American Red Cross, dated March 12, 1956, expressing appreciation for his attendance at the blood donation meeting.
- (14) Carbon copy of letter dated March 12, 1956 to the Stamford Planning Board from the Newfield Parent Teachers Association regarding their request for purchase of property for school site. Ordered filed.

The meeting adjourned at 10:10 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

George V. Connors, Chairman
Steering Committee

Fiscal Committee:

174.3 Mr. Kaminski, Chairman, presented the following report:

April 2, 1956

1153

REPORT OF FISCAL COMMITTEE
BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES
Stamford, Conn.

March 12, 1956

The Fiscal Committee of the Board of Representatives held a meeting in the Mayor's office on Monday, March 12th, 1956 at 8:00 P.M.

Members present were: Mrs. Doris Zuckert, Messrs. Charles Bradbury, Edward Wynn and Rutherford Huizinga.

Also present was Mr. Haggerty of the Registrar's Office.

All items approved by the Board of Finance at their March 2nd meeting were considered, along with other deferred items.

(1) Letter of February 28, 1956, Registrars of Voters - \$14,480.00

A request for funds to cover cost of City Committee and Delegate primaries.

Code #100.53 \$14,480.00

We approve the amount of \$3,620.00 at our March 5th meeting, leaving a balance of \$10,860.00. The Fiscal Committee is unanimous in recommending that we approve the balance of \$10,860.00

(2) Letter of February 24, 1956, Deputy Assessor - \$100.00 Code 571.15

The Fiscal Committee was unanimous in recommending the approval of \$100.00 for this item, Code 571.15, Electricity & Bulbs.

(3) Letter of February 23, 1956, Chief of Police - \$8,600.00 Code 430.1

Covering payroll of special policeman used in emergency flood work. This item was reduced to \$5,000.00 by the Board of Finance.

The Fiscal Committee was unanimous in recommending approval of \$5,000.00

(4) Letter of February 8, 1956, Pension for Francis T. Tobin, Police Dept.

The Fiscal Committee was unanimous in recommending the approval of pension for Patrolman FRANCIS T. TOBIN, beginning February 15, 1956, 4½ months, in the amount of \$845.33 based on an annual pension of \$2,254.20 or 52% of his present annual salary of \$4,335.00.

(5) Letter of February 8, 1956, Pension for Lt. Ralph E. Knapp, Police Dept.

The Fiscal Committee was unanimous in recommending the approval of pension for Police Lt. RALPH E. KNAPP, beginning March 1, 1956, 4 months, in the amount of \$974.70, based on an annual pension of \$2,924.10 or 54% of his present annual salary.

April 2, 1956

(6) Letter of January 31, 1956, City Court - \$375.00

Code 823.10 Small Claims Court.....	\$250.00
Code 803.3 Stationery & Supplies.....	125.00
	<u>\$375.00</u>

The Fiscal Committee was unanimous in recommending that the amount of \$375.00 be approved.

(7) Letter of March 2, 1956, Board of Selectmen - \$200.00, Code 130.4

The Fiscal Committee was unanimous in recommending the approval of \$200.00 for Code #130.4, Advertising & Printing.

(8) Letter of February 23, 1956 - Classified Employees' Retirement Fund Evaluation - \$2,400.00

The Fiscal Committee deferred the item of \$2,400.00 requested for survey of Employees' Retirement Fund pending further information from Mr. Morrissey.

Respectfully submitted,

William C. Kaminski,
Chairman
Fiscal Committee
Board of Representatives

(1) Registrars of Voters - \$10,860, Code 100.53 (Cost of primaries)

MR. KAMINSKI MOVED for approval of this item, representing balance remaining, partially approved in amount of \$3,620 at March 5, 1956 meeting. Seconded by Mr. Georgoulis. (See Mayor's letter 2/28/56) CARRIED unanimously.

(2) Deputy Assessor - \$100, Code 571.15 (Electricity & Bulbs) (See Mayor's letter 2/24/56)

MR. KAMINSKI MOVED for approval of this request. Seconded by Mr. Longo and CARRIED unanimously.

(3) Chief of Police - \$5,000 - Code 430.1 (Covering payroll of special policemen used in emergency flood work.) See Mayor's letter 2/23/56

MR. KAMINSKI MOVED for approval of this request. Seconded by Mr. Longo.

MR. LEWIS: "In view of the fact that the Steering Committee neglected to refer this to one other Committee, I think we should postpone action at this time."

Mr. Kaminski explained the reasons why this money was needed, because of 24 hour duty needed on account of emergency flood patrol work, and MOVED for suspension of the rules in order to bring this up. Seconded by Mr. Rhoades and CARRIED unanimously.

April 2, 1956

1155

MR. KAMINSKI MOVED for approval of this request. Seconded by Mr. Lewis and CARRIED unanimously.

- (4) Pension, Francis T. Tobin, Police Department. (See Mayor's letter 2/8/56)

MR. KAMINSKI MOVED for approval of pension of \$845.33 for 4½ months, beginning 2/15/56, based on 52% of annual salary, or annual pension of \$2,254.20. Seconded by Mr. Iacovo and CARRIED unanimously.

- (5) Pension, Lt. Ralph E. Knapp, Police Department (See Mayor's letter 2/8/56)

MR. KAMINSKI MOVED for approval of pension of \$974.70 for 4 months, beginning 3/1/56 and based on annual pension of \$2,924.10 or 54% of annual salary. Seconded by Mr. Kelly and CARRIED unanimously.

- (6) City Court - \$375 (Mayor's letter 1/31/56)

MR. KAMINSKI MOVED for approval of the following:

Code 823.10 - Small Claims Court.....	\$250.00
Code 803.3 Stationery & Supplies.....	125.00
	<u>\$375.00</u>

Seconded by Mr. Kelly and Carried unanimously.

MR. SNYDER: "As a point of information: Is there anything in the by-laws which makes it mandatory for the members to rise?"

MR. KAMINSKI: "It is in the rules on appropriations - you have to stand when voting on appropriations. I would suggest that we look into this before our next meeting."

- (7) Board of Selectmen - \$200 - Code 130.4 (Advertising & Printing)
(Mayor's letter 3/2/56)

MR. KAMINSKI MOVED for approval of this request. Seconded by Mr. Kelly and CARRIED unanimously.

- (8) Classified Employee's Retirement Fund Evaluation - \$2,400 (See Mayor's letter 2/23/56)

Mr. Kaminski said the Fiscal Committee had deferred this request, until they receive further information.

Legislative & Rules Committee:

MR. RAITERI, Chairman, presented the following report of his Committee:

Report of Legislative & Rules Committee
Meeting of March 29, 1956

The regular monthly meeting of the Legislative & Rules Committee was held Thursday evening, March 29, in the Board of Representa-

April 2, 1956

tives' Office, City Hall.

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 P.M. by Acting Chairman Nolan. Also present were Messrs. Russell and Baker. Absent were Messrs Raiteri, Plo'kin and McLaughlin.

The following action was taken:

1. Unanimously voted to report out for adoption the proposed Ordinance re Consumption of Liquor on Municipally owned Property, as amended and passed for publication at the March meeting of the Board of Representatives.
2. Unanimously voted to report out for appropriate action the proposed Ordinance Regulating Width of Streets, as passed for publication at the March meeting of the Board of Representatives, with a reminder to the Board that the proposed Ordinance duplicates the provisions of State Statute #2141.

The Committee feels that rather than enact duplicate controls, the Board of Representatives may consider it to be equally effective to call upon the proper city officials to demand compliance with the existing Statute.

3. The Committee requests that the proposed change in name of Wolfsey Road to Alpine Street be referred back to the Legislative & Rules Committee and, also referred to the Planning and Zoning Committee to permit further study of correct procedure in view of the fact that Wolfsey Road is not an accepted city street. It is the feeling of the Committee that the change of name might better be effected at the time the street is presented for acceptance.
4. The Committee unanimously voted to recommend that a letter be transmitted to the U. S. Senators from Connecticut, expressing the Board's strong endorsement of pending Senate Bill S. 3272 entitled: "A Bill to increase and make certain revisions in the general authorizations for small flood control projects in the Flood Control Act of 1948". A copy of the proposed Bill is attached hereto as Attachment No. 1.
5. The Committee unanimously voted to recommend passage for publication of a proposed "Ordinance to Provide for the Impounding and Sale or Other Disposition of Personal Property Left on the Streets and Public Places in the City of Stamford". A copy of the proposed ordinance is attached hereto as Attachment No. 2.
6. The Committee unanimously voted to recommend favorable action, under suspension of rules, on a proposed "Ordinance Relating to the Keeping or Harboring of Dogs", a copy of which is attached hereto as Attachment No. 3. The Board may wish to consider waiving publication, in view of the serious condition existing with respect to this matter and the season involved. The Committee also recommends that, upon passage, a letter be sent by the Board to the Chief of Police and to the Dog Warden, requesting prompt and firm

April 2, 1956

1157

enforcement.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

E. B. Baker, Clerk

Approved: John Nolan,
Acting Chairman

MR. RAITERI MOVED for approval of the following Ordinance, explaining it had been published, having been approved for publication at the March 5th meeting. Seconded by Mr. Topping.

ORDINANCE NO. 50

ORDINANCE REGARDING CONSUMPTION OF
LIQUOR ON MUNICIPALLY OWNED PROPERTY

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF STAMFORD THAT no intoxicating liquor, except beer, shall be sold and/or consumed on any municipal owned property, nor shall any such liquor be served or caused to be served in combination with any other liquid or liquids on municipally owned property. An exception may be granted by the Board of Representatives

MR. IACVO: "In the second sentence, would this not cause some conflict with the State liquor law?" He asked for a ruling from Mr. Hanrahan, noting that he was present at the meeting, and so MOVED. Seconded by Mrs. Zuckert.

MR. HANRAHAN: "You cannot add to the powers under the permit. As to those locations where no permit exists, you might give permission to have liquor served either under a temporary permit or, in the event no sale is contemplated, no state permit would be necessary."

MR. FINDLAY: "Could you bring in your own bottle?"

ANSWER: "No."

MR. FINDLAY: "Even though it is not for sale?"

ANSWER: "No."

MR. NOLAN: "This might stop the consuming of liquor by a family on a picnic, because, wouldn't they be violating the law?"

MR. TOPPING: "I would say that they would be violating this particular Ordinance."

MR. NOLAN spoke at some length on this matter. He said: "If this is the case, I for one, will have to vote in objection to this Ordinance. If you are going to try and stop people that are just going down to the beach for a picnic to bring along a jug of Tom Collins or a favorite drink and make law violators out of these people who just want

April 2, 1956

to have a little picnic, I am afraid I am going to be against it."

MR. SNYDER moved the question.

VOTE taken on Ordinance No. 50 - 20 voting in favor and 13 opposed, with a total vote of 33. There being no majority vote, it was declared LOST.

MR. HUIZINGA MOVED for reconsideration of the vote on "the ordinance pertaining to serving liquor other than beer on municipally owned property."

MR. NOLAN: "I am afraid that Mr. Huizinga has already voted on this and cannot ask for a reconsideration."

MR. RAITERI: "What is the situation at the present time in regard to the consumption of liquor? At Hubbard Heights, for instance, if we have no regulations?"

MR. NOLAN asked that a vote for reconsideration of Ordinance No. 50 be brought up again.

MR. HUIZINGA MOVED for adoption of the ordinance as follows: Seconded by Mr. Hearing.

ORDINANCE NO. 50

ORDINANCE REGARDING CONSUMPTION OF
LIQUOR ON MUNICIPALLY OWNED PROPERTY

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF STAMFORD
THAT no intoxicating liquor, except beer,
shall be sold and/or consumed on any
municipal owned property, nor shall any
such liquor be served or caused to be
served in combination with any other
liquid or liquids on municipally owned
property.

(Note: Mr. Huizinga left out the following sentence, which was a part of the ordinance as voted on the first time for publication:

An exception may be granted by the
Board of Representatives.

(The Secretary questioned the President as to whether this sentence was meant to be included. He ruled that it was to be included.)

MR. NOLAN: "I think there are too many unenforceable laws on our books now."

MR. SNYDER: "I think people going to the beaches would like to see promiscuous drinking prohibited."

There was some discussion as to certain situations that exist at public beaches in regard to littering, etc., and Mr. Nolan asked if there was not an ordinance to control this and was assured that one did exist.

Mrs. Bankowski arrived at 9:10 P.M., changing the roll call to 35 present and 5 absent.

MR. HUIZINGA: "At the moment we have no ordinance controlling this kind of situation which the law enforcement officers can use."

MR. NOLAN: "Would the speaker yield to a question?"

MR. HUIZINGA: "I am sorry, but I have the floor."

MR. MURPHY: "This ordinance is for the sale or consumption. Isn't there another word we could use instead?"

MR. NOLAN: "Do you think we should adopt a bad law?"

MR. RAITERI: "The Park Commission has this rule in their rules and regulations -- I don't recall that anyone was ever brought up on charges for having a jug of Tom Collins at the beach."

MR. BRADBURY: "I protest on voting on any law based on whether or not it can be enforced. Either it is a good ordinance or a bad ordinance --the enforcement of it is irrelevant."

MR. RUSSELL: "Maybe a part of this is due to a condition which exists at Cummings Park which has troubled the city for some time."

VOTE taken on adoption of Ordinance No. 50. CARRIED, 21 in favor and 13 opposed.

MR. RAITERI MOVED for approval of the following Ordinance, explaining it had been published, having been approved for publication at the March 5th meeting. Seconded by Mr. Georgoulis.

ORDINANCE NO. 51

ORDINANCE REGULATING WIDTH OF STREETS

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF STAMFORD THAT no person, company, or corporation, shall lay out or construct any street or way within the City of Stamford, less than forty-nine and one-half (49½) feet in width.

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

MR. RUSSELL: "We do get 50 feet according to our planning rules at the present time."

MR. MURPHY: "I think that question would have to come up again -- we would have to have another conference with the Planning Board."

MR. HUIZINGA: "I don't quite see that this has anything to do with the Planning Board."

Mr. Russell and Mr. Huizinga carried on a conversation in regard to this question.

April 2, 1956

MR. RUSSELL: "It depends on the interpretation of the Ordinance."

MR. NOLAN: "I would just like to say that since Mr. Huizinga says this is a copy of the State Statute, it is redundant. As long as we already have a State law on this, I can see no reasons for a duplication."

MR. MURPHY: "All you are doing is making the rules and regulations of the Planning Board into a law, as the rules of the Planning Board call for 50 feet."

MR. HUIZINGA: "There is a road that is only 25 feet wide, entering into a piece of property that I happen to know of now. If we have an ordinance which duplicates the State law, then our citizens will not have to go to law to force them to make them wider."

MR. TOPPING read from the regulations on width of streets. He stated that any street built in this city has to be at least 50 feet wide, with 30 feet of paved road.

MR. FINDLAY: "Can't we resolve this ordinance to be amended to read: 'level or usable land'."

MR. SNYDER MOVED that the matter be returned to Committee for re-wording and re-phrasing.

MR. PLOTKIN: "The Planning Board has the power over the width of City streets, etc. I think we should go together with the Planning Board. I don't think it is the province of this Board."

MR. RHOADES offered an AMENDMENT to go after the words "49½ feet in width" that there be inserted the words "....." ".....of land meeting the City Engineer's specifications as an acceptable road". Seconded by Mr. McLaughlin and Mr. Russell.

MR. RUSSELL: "I think the answer is we are leaving it up to the City Engineer. I think we are going to put the city to an expense that the contractor should assume."

MRS. PEATT: "Maybe we should use the words 'usable land' and that would cover it."

MR. LEWIS MOVED that this be referred back to committee and they should investigate and report back to the Board. Seconded by Mr. McLaughlin.

VOTE taken on sending this back to committee. LOST, 11 in favor and 22 opposed.

MR. RHOADES withdrew his AMENDMENT.

MR. HUIZINGA MOVED to AMEND the ordinance as follows: Right after the words "49½ feet in width" it should read: ".....of usable land of approximate grade of the road surface." Seconded by Mr. Findlay.

MR. HUIZINGA MOVED for acceptance of the Ordinance as amended. CARRIED, 33 in favor and 1 opposed.

MR. RAITERI MOVED for acceptance of the following ordinance for

April 2, 1956

1161

for publication, with the request that the Secretary make arrangements with the Mimeographing Department to have copies made of proposed ordinances for each member of the Board in the future. Seconded by Mr. Kolich.

AN ORDINANCE TO PROVIDE FOR THE IMPOUNDING AND SALE
OR OTHER DISPOSITION OF PERSONAL PROPERTY LEFT ON THE
STREETS AND PUBLIC PLACES IN THE CITY OF STAMFORD.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF STAMFORD, THAT:

Section 1: Definitions: (a) When used in this Ordinance "street" shall include a street, avenue, road, alley, lane, highway, boulevard, concourse, driveway, culvert and cross walk, and every class of road, square, place or municipal parking field used by the general public. (b) When used in this Ordinance the word "person" shall mean and include a natural person of either sex, corporations, partnerships, associations, joint stock companies, societies and all other entities capable of being sued.

Section 2: It shall be unlawful for any person, his agent or employee, to leave or to suffer or permit to be left, any vehicle other than motor vehicle, or any cart, wagon, box, barrel, bale of merchandise or other movable property either owned by him or in his possession, custody or control, upon any street, sidewalk or municipal parking field, excepting, however, that this section shall not apply to materials lawfully placed at the curbs or side of streets for collection by the Bureau of Sanitation.

Section 3: The Chief of Police shall remove or cause to be removed any of the items of property listed in Section 2 of this Ordinance, when found upon any street, sidewalk or municipal parking field and shall take same, or cause same to be taken to property or premises of the City of Stamford, where same shall be held until redeemed or sold, as hereinafter provided.

Section 4: Any person violating any of the provisions of this Ordinance shall be liable for and forfeit and pay a penalty of Ten (\$10.00) Dollars for each violation and it is further ordained that the violations of any provisions of this Ordinance shall constitute disorderly conduct and the person so violating the same shall be and is hereby declared a disorderly person. This is in addition to any fees for redemption of impounded property or costs of sale chargeable to an owner or person entitled to possession of impounded property as hereinafter provided.

Section 5: Whenever the Chief of Police shall receive any property containing identification of ownership or right to possession, a notice shall be sent by ordinary mail to such person advising that such property is held by the Chief of Police and advising the amount necessary to redeem.

Section 6: Such property may be redeemed by the owner thereof at any time prior to the sale, dismantling, destruction or disposal thereof and he shall be entitled to receive such property upon tendering the sum of Five (\$5.00) Dollars plus the sum of One (\$1.00) Dollar per day, commencing the third day, Sundays excluded, after the property is re-

1752

April 2, 1956

moved to the date of redemption. In addition, the person seeking to redeem shall be required to pay the cost of advertising the sale thereof, if any. No property shall be delivered to a person seeking to redeem unless proof establishing to the satisfaction of the Chief of Police such person's ownership or right to possession is submitted. Any delivery to a person apparently entitled thereto, shall be a good defense to the City of Stamford against any other person claiming to be entitled thereto, but if the person to whom delivery is made is in fact not entitled thereto, the person to whom the same ought to have been delivered may recover the same with interest and costs from the person to whom the same shall have been delivered.

Section 7: Where any such property remains in the custody of the Chief of Police for a period of fifteen (15) days after removal and with respect to which no person has presented to the Chief of Police proof establishing to his satisfaction such person's ownership or right to possession as herein-above stated, the Chief of Police shall give public notice in a newspaper circulated daily in the City of Stamford advising that at a specified place and time, not less than five (5) days after such notice is published, such property will be sold at public auction for the best price he can obtain. A general description in such notice of the property to be sold shall be sufficient. Said sale shall be conducted by the Chief of Police or any person designated by him.

Section 8: In the event that said property shall remain unsold at public auction, the Chief of Police may offer said property for sale at a subsequent public auction held pursuant to this Ordinance or he may dismantle, destroy or otherwise sell or dispose of such property. Any such sale or other disposition of such property pursuant to this Ordinance shall be without liability on the part of the City of Stamford to the owner of such property or other person lawfully entitled thereto or having an interest therein.

Section 9: Immediately after property is redeemed, the Chief of Police shall pay over to the municipal treasury the amount received for redemption, costs and expenses of the article redeemed, together with an itemized statement thereof. Immediately after a sale or other disposition of such property the Chief of Police shall pay over to the municipal treasury the proceeds of sale or other disposition of such property, with an itemized statement of the article sold, the price received, and the costs and expenses of sale. The amounts so paid to the municipal treasury shall be retained and credited to the General Fund to cover the cost of removing and storing the property and of the disposition thereof.

Section 10: The provisions of this Ordinance shall not apply to any property which may come into the possession or custody of the Chief of Police pursuant to any other Ordinance, law or regulation.

MR. SNYDER: "Would it be correct, Mr. Raiteri, under this ordinance that any super market can make a ruling that under this law the carts cannot leave the premises, and therefore the principle sufferer would be the shoppers who would have to carry all their groceries to their car?"

April 2, 1956

1163

MR. TOPPING: "Most of our super markets have a notice right on the cart to the effect that this cart shall not be taken from the premises. Whether this would relieve the market from any liability I do not know."

MR. BAKER: "The Village of Rockville Center adopted this ordinance and it was very successful there. I got in touch with the Village Clerk and had him give me a copy of their ordinance. It is intended rather as a preventative than as a cure."

MR. KELLY: "Would that prevent baby carriages and children's toys from being left on the streets?"

VOTE taken on this ordinance for publication and CARRIED unanimously.

Re change of street name from Wofsey Road to Alpine Street

The petition from the residents of Wofsey Road for change of name was referred back to the Legislative & Rules and Planning and Zoning Committees for the reason that it is not yet an accepted City street. Mr. Raiteri explained that the committee felt the street should be accepted by the City as a city street at the same time the street name is changed.

MR. RAITERI MOVED that Senate Bill No. S.3272, sponsored by Senator Prescott Bush, entitled: "A Bill to increase and make certain revisions in the general authorizations for small flood control projects in the Flood Control Act of 1948" be endorsed by this Board and that a letter be transmitted to the United States Senators from Connecticut, giving the Board's endorsement of this Bill. Seconded by Mr. Iacovo and Mrs. Zuckert and CARRIED unanimously.

MR. RAITERI MOVED for suspension of the rules in order to bring up a proposed ordinance as follows: Seconded by Mrs. Bankowski.

AN ORDINANCE RELATING TO THE KEEPING OR HARBORING OF DOGS

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF STAMFORD THAT:

Section 1. No owner or person possessing or person harboring a dog shall suffer or allow the same to run loose or at large at any place in the City of Stamford. All dogs, when not confined within the dwelling or premises of the owner or keeper, or when not confined in any other inclosure, must be kept on a leash, and when led on a leash, all dogs must be curbed.

Section 2. It shall be the duty of the Dog Warden of the City of Stamford or of any policeman of said City or of any other person appointed as Dog Catchers, to restrain or cause to be restrained and impound any dog running at large in said City.

Section 3. The Dog Warden, on impounding such dog, shall immediately notify the owner or harbinger of such dog, if the owner or harbinger be known to the dog warden, or can with reasonable diligence be ascertained, that such animal has been and is impounded. Any such dog so seized may be redeemed by the owner of same upon the payment of Five (\$5) Dollars to the Clerk of the City of Stamford and by the payment

1754

April 2, 1956

of the established license fee to said Clerk if such dog is unlicensed. Said Clerk shall issue to said owner an order to the Dog Warden for the delivery of such dog. All dogs not so redeemed within a period of one week after such seizure shall be destroyed or otherwise disposed of. Any funds collected under this Section shall be paid over to the municipal treasury and credited to the General Fund.

Section 4. No person shall entice any dog out of the enclosure or house of its owner or harbinger, or seize or molest any dog while held or led on a leash by any person, for the purpose of taking up, distraining or impounding the same.

Section 5. No person shall have or keep or permit to be kept on any premises owned or occupied in whole or in part by him within the City of Stamford any dog which by its howling or whining or barking, shall disturb the neighborhood.

Section 6. Any person or persons violating Sections 4 and 5 of this ordinance shall be liable for and forfeit and pay a penalty of Five (\$5) Dollars for each violation thereof and any violation of such Sections shall constitute disorderly conduct, and the person so violating such Sections shall be and is hereby declared a disorderly person.

This Ordinance shall take effect immediately upon passage.

MR. LEWIS: "With reference to this ordinance as proposed by Ellis Baker: Two years ago we had to pass an ordinance in order to find the Dog Warden. I MOVE that this be referred back to Committee."
Seconded by Mr. Brett.

MR. NOIAN: "The State law has restrictions on dogs. If we could hear from Mr. Hanrahan on this, perhaps he could clarify it."

MR. TOPPING: "I would like to see this changed so that it would not create a hardship."

MR. BAKER read a petition which he had received and which he said had prompted the introduction of the ordinance.

MR. KAMINSKI said he thought there should be some modification of the ordinance.

MR. FINDLAY stated that he is opposed to passing so many ordinances.

MRS. PEATT said she was thoroughly in agreement with Mr. Baker and that dogs running loose and in packs were dangerous to small children.

MR. LEWIS MOVED that this ordinance be referred to the Health & Protection Committee and the Legislative & Rules Committee, with instructions to the Police Chief that the Dog Warden must report daily to the Chief of Police.

Mr. Topping Seconded the motion.

There was considerable discussion at this point in regard to the Dog Warden and the performance of his duties.

April 2, 1956

1165

MR. BAKER: "The Dog Wardens should receive a fee instead of a salary and perhaps he might do a better job."

MRS. ZUCKERT said she was opposed to such a high fee and thought perhaps if roaming dogs were muzzled, it would be better than to keep them confined.

MR. RHOADES: "I assume this is not to recommit, but to send to Committee. All the calls I have received have been in favor of the ordinance."

MR. IACOVO: "I have also received numerous calls in favor of the ordinance."

MR. RAITERI: "I think the ordinance is a little too strongly worded."

VOTE taken on Mr. Lewis' motion and CARRIED, 26 in favor and 7 opposed.

MR. RAITERI MOVED for suspension of rules in order to present a letter from Mr. Connell, Superintendent of Parks. Seconded by Mr. Rhoades and CARRIED unanimously.

April 2, 1956

Cal:

In order to get some reasonable control over beer drinking in parks, could the proposed ordinance of Mr. Topping be amended as follows:

Insert after "property" on 4th line "except as may be prohibited by Department of Parks' rules and regulations".

If the ordinance is passed as amended above, then our proposed #11 regulation would not be in conflict with the Topping resolution.

Ed. Connell,
Supt. of Parks

MR. RAITERI MOVED that this request be referred back to the Legislative and Rules Committee for report back at the next meeting. Seconded by Mr. Baker and CARRIED unanimously.

Appointments Committee:

(1) Edward J. Frattaroli, 5 Brinckerhoff Avenue

Mr. Georgoulis MOVED for approval of Mr. Frattaroli's appointment as a member of the Flood and Erosion Control Board, term to expire December 1, 1956. Seconded by Mr. Baker. Vote taken by Ballot, and CARRIED, 34 in favor and 1 opposed.

(2) W. Gardner Edwards, 1270 Hope Street, Springdale

Mr. Georgoulis moved for approval of Mr. Edwards' appointment as

April 2, 1956

a member of the Flood and Erosion Control Board, term to expire December 1, 1957. Seconded by Mr. Baker. Vote taken by ballot and CARRIED, 32 in favor and 3 opposed.

(3) Alfred G. Kanzler, 49 Parker Avenue, Glenbrook

Mr. Georgoulis MOVED for approval of Mr. Kanzler's appointment as a member of the Flood and Erosion Control Board, term to expire December 1, 1958. Seconded by Mr. Baker. Vote taken by ballot and CARRIED, 31 voting in favor, 3 opposed and 1 blank.

(4) George L. Hickey, 99 Saddlerock Road

Mr. Georgoulis MOVED for approval of Mr. Hickey's appointment as a member of the Flood and Erosion Control Board, term to expire December 1, 1959. Seconded by Mr. Baker. Vote taken by ballot and CARRIED, 27 in favor and 8 opposed.

(5) Edward W. Curran, 236 Greenwich Avenue

Mr. Georgoulis MOVED for approval of Mr. Curran's appointment as a member of the Flood and Erosion Control Board, term to expire December 1, 1960. Seconded by Mr. Baker. Vote taken by ballot and CARRIED, 33 in favor and 2 opposed.

Public Works Committee:

Mr. Topping, Chairman, presented the following report of his Committee:

Public Works Committee Report

Meeting held at Dolan School, March 28, 1956. The following members were present: Anthony Kolich, Alan Ketcham and Thomas Topping, Chairman. Absent members: Eugene Barry and Vincent Vitti.

Re: letter from Mr. Louis T. Olive of Dyke Park (See page 1124 of Minutes of March 5, 1956)

Above letter discussed and the Committee decided that inasmuch as the Park Commission has an item in its Capital Budget regarding this boat basin, and that the Assistant Public Works Commissioner has assured us that the Channel marker will be put in place when the time comes, this Committee agreed to take no action on this petition.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas J. Topping, Chairman

Planning & Zoning Committee:

Mr. Czupka MOVED for suspension of the rules in order to present a petition for acceptance of Research Drive, Glenbrook, by Glenbrook Sand and Gravel Company, York Research Corporation and Hewitt-Robins, Inc. Seconded by several voices and CARRIED unanimously.

April 2, 1956

1167

MR. CZUPKA MOVED for acceptance of this road.

MR. TOPPING said he would favor the acceptance of this road and named four things that would have to be taken care of first: (1) Box culvert, (2) excavation not closed for 10 feet, (3) two stone fences 29' 6" which make the road less than the minimum width, (4) one edge of the 50 foot drive goes over property owned by Hewitt-Robins.

MR. MURPHY: "This all stems back to the extension of Cowing Place. The cost would have run up into the hundreds of thousands of dollars."

There was considerable discussion as to the problems presented, Mr. Czupka assuring the members that he has talked with the Assistant City Engineer and was assured that the piles would be removed and the topping of the culvert will be done as soon as black topping is available.

MR. SNYDER spoke strongly in favor of accepting this street, pointing out that the connecting of Research Drive with Larkin Street will help industry to locate here.

Mr. Scarella, Commissioner of Public Works, who was present, explained what was going to be done and the problems involved and recommended that the Board accept this street.

MR. GEORGOULIS MOVED for acceptance of Research Drive. Seconded by Mr. Rhoades and CARRIED unanimously.

Mr. Findlay asked to be excused and left at this time.

Mr. Rhoades MOVED to hear from Mr. Wachter who also was present. Seconded and CARRIED unanimously.

Mr. Wachter spoke on the problem of release of bonds before acceptance of roads, and said he would take it up with his Board.

Mr. Hanrahan explained that the bond is released when the road is brought up to city specifications.

The Secretary was instructed to write to the Board of Finance, notifying them that Research Drive had been accepted as a city street.

Parks & Recreation Committee:

Mr. Kelly, Chairman, presented the following report:

The Recreation and Parks Committee of the Board met on Wednesday evening, March 28, 1956, at the Dolan Jr. High School, immediately after the special meeting of the Board, and discussed the only item on their agenda, which was the idea of notifying the Board of Recreation that, as has been the custom in the past, the committee would like to have the Secretary of the Board of Representatives notify the Board of Recreation and the Park Commission that the Committee on Parks and Recreation would like to request that both the above mentioned Boards grant permission to the chairman, or alternate, of this committee, to attend the regular meetings

1708

April 2, 1956

of both Boards

The purpose of this request is to further acquaint our committee with the requirements of these boards, and form a better liaison between all three boards, and I so move.

Stephen E. Kelly,
Chairman,
Parks & Recreation Committee

Personnel Committee:

Mr. Barry, Chairman, read the following letter from Mr. Hanrahan, Corporation Counsel, in regard to pensions for sisters of former city employees, Miss. Mabel O'Keefe, 54 Courtland Hill Street and Miss Katherine T. Quinn, 25 Bell Street:

CITY OF STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT

April 2, 1956

Personnel Committee of the
Board of Representatives
Stamford, Connecticut

Gentlemen:

In reference to the material turned over to me by your Chairman on the question of the pension for the Sister of David O'Keefe, a mechanic in the Board of Education who completed 17 years of service prior to his death, and the sister of Michael F. Quinn, who retired under the classification plan on August 1, 1952, I submit the following-

The general power over pensions is set forth in sub-section 66 of Section 40 of the Charter as follows:

"To establish pension systems for the
municipal employees....."

Section 710 of the Charter authorizes the Board of Representatives to enact ordinances "not inconsistent with the provisions of the Charter, for payment of pensions to any officer or employee who shall have held office or employment in the town or city for a period of 25 years or more, or to his widow or dependents". It appears to limit sub-section 66 by requiring at least 25 years of service.

By Special Act #463 of the 1951 General Assembly, a pension program was set up entitled "Classified Employees Retirement Fund". It was not stated specifically in that Act that it was to be a provision of the Stamford Charter. However, it would appear that the Board of Representatives treated it as though it was to be an amendment to the Charter and its administration has been so closely aligned

April 2, 1956

1169

to the Charter that, for all practical intents and purposes, it must be regarded as a portion of the City's Charter.

Consequently, it would appear that with respect to the dependent sister of Mr. O'Keefe, neither the Custodian's Retirement Plan, nor the Classified Employee's Retirement Fund plan at present provide the basis for a pension to a deceased employee's sister. Miss O'Keefe's only remedy for a pension appears to be a Special Act of the General Assembly, specifically granting her a pension, or amending Section 71C in such fashion that the City may in the future, make provision for pensions for employees, or their dependents, who have less than 25 years of service.

Mr. O'Keefe's estate is, however, entitled, under Section 10 of the Custodian's Pension Plan to payments of his contributions to that plan, plus accrued interest.

Likewise, since Mr. Quinn was a member of the Classified Employee's Retirement Fund and accepted retirement thereunder, his death three years after retirement would not form the basis for a claim for a pension by his sister.

Sub-section E of the Section 749 of the Charter permitted Mr. Quinn, had he been married, to elect a reduced pension at the time of his retirement with a provision that two-thirds of the reduced pension elected be continued after his death to his spouse. It contained no provision whatsoever permitting a widow, widower, or unmarried person to elect a reduced pension which would be continued to his dependent children or other dependents, such as a sister.

The problem, then, is to determine whether or not the granting of a pension under Section 710 to a dependent sister or a retired former city employee would be inconsistent with the provisions of this Charter. It is submitted that the use of Section 710, in view of the lack of provision in the Classified Employees Retirement Fund for survival of pensions of retired employees to dependents other than spouses, would not necessarily be inconsistent with the provisions of the Charter. It would appear, however, to be inconsistent with the spirit and intent of the Classified Employees Retirement Fund Plan.

I believe that the better practice would be to have your Board consider an amendment to Sub-Section E of Section 749 to permit the retiring employee an election in favor of not only his spouse, but other classes of dependents as may be determined by your Board, so as to take care of matters that may arise in the future.

For the purpose of disposing of the matter presently before your Board involving Miss Quinn:

1700

April 2, 1956

In view of the inequities alleged to be involved, it would appear that the Board could provide for a payment of a pension by ordinance of two-thirds the amount of pension received by the deceased brother, bearing in mind the question of offsets against such pension by the receipt of any social security benefits to the dependent sister.

Very truly yours,

John M. Hanrahan
Corporation Counsel

MR. BARRY MOVED that we hear from the Corporation Counsel. Seconded by Mr. Kelly. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Hanrahan explained the situation more fully to the members of the Board.

MR. HUIZINGA: "We have a very definite responsibility to the citizens of this City by our making exceptions of these cases. If you make an exception here, we are going to get into a lot of trouble in the future. I think we will get into a great deal of trouble by changing our pension plan.

MR. HANRAHAN: "In the past we used to go to the State Legislature in these cases for special legislation, but the City adopted a pension plan to take care of these cases."

MR. RAITERI: "Let's discuss each case separately. Let's discuss the O'Keefe case first.

MR. BARRY MOVED this be sent back to Committee. Seconded by Mr. DeForest. Mr. Barry said the committee had not yet had a chance to study the report. CARRIED unanimously.

Committee on Education:

In the absence of Mr. Macrides, Chairman, Mr. Brett, presented the committee report:

The Committee on Education and Welfare met at 2:00 P.M. on March 31, 1956, at the offices of John C. Macrides. Mr. Brett and Mr. Macrides were present. Dr. Lilliendahl, Mr. Czupka and Mr. Gilbert were absent. Mr. Julius Markiewicz of the Stamford Education Association and Mr. Lester J. Myers of the Stamford Federation of Teachers were present to indicate the reasons for the request for a raise in pay of teachers which is reflected in the operating budget requested by the Board of Education. These reasons shall be reported on at the time when our Board is faced with deciding on appropriations for the aforesaid budget.

With respect to the school bus situation, the prohibitive cost of marking buses in conformity with the new Statute would make the only remedy available, a request to the State Legislature that the requirements be changed to

April 2, 1956

1171

something less costly which could be just as effective.

Respectfully submitted,

John C. Macrides,
Chairman

Re: Change of name of Committee on Education:

MR. GEORGOULIS MOVED that the name of this committee be changed to the Committee on Education and Welfare. Seconded by Mr. Baker and CARRIED unanimously.

Mr. William Kaminski asked to be excused at this time.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE MAYOR

CITY OF STAMFORD, CONN.

March 6, 1956

Mr. George V. Connors, President
Board of Representatives
Stamford, Connecticut

Dear Mr. Connors:

I am attaching herewith Bill S. 3272 presented by Senator Bush, entitled, "To increase and make certain revisions in the general authorization for small flood control projects in the Flood Control Act of 1948".

An expression of opinion by your Board, I believe, would be of invaluable aid in the support of this Bill.

It is indeed necessary for us to get as much Federal aid as possible to help us overcome the tremendous expense involved due to the recent floods.

Very truly yours,

Thomas F. J. Quigley, Mayor

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER BOARDS AND INDIVIDUALS

Ordered read by Steering Committee:

(1) Carbon copy of letter to Mayor Quigley from Corporation Counsel:

February 28, 1956

The Honorable Thomas F. J. Quigley
Mayor of Stamford, Connecticut

Dear Mayor Quigley:

This is to advise you that I am in receipt of a deed from the First Stamford Corporation (Jesse Hartman) to the City

1742

April 2, 1956

of Stamford, quit-claiming a parcel of land 13.702 acres in area in the Laddin's Rock section.

This deed represents the final action in connection with the offer of dedication made by Mr. Hartman to the City of the land in question, together with a donation of \$2,500.00 to defray the cost of picnic tables and benches, which offer I understand, was accepted by the Board of Representatives several years ago.

I have reminded Mr. Hartman's attorney that we shall expect the check for \$2,500.00 at his earliest convenience.

I also took the liberty of expressing the thanks of the community to Mr. Hartman for his public spirited gesture.

Very truly yours,

John M. Hanrahan,
Corporation Counsel

MR. HUIZINGA MOVED that a letter of appreciation be sent to Mr. Jesse Hartman. Seconded by Mrs. Bankowski, and CARRIED unanimously.

There ensued some discussion as to the history of this gift, Mr. Murphy saying that it went back to 1949 or 1950 when this land was first accepted by the City and that there had been some question that it be named after Mr. Hartman's deceased wife. He said the property in question is along the westerly border of Stamford.

Mrs. Zuckert said she was in favor of this park being named in memory of Mr. Hartman's wife, to show the City's appreciation for his generosity.

- (2) Carbon copy of letter to Prosecuting Attorney, Mr. Joseph P. Zone from Corporation Counsel, dated March 12, 1956. Ordered read by Steering Committee:

March 12, 1956

Mr. Joseph P. Zone
Prosecuting Attorney
City Hall
Stamford, Connecticut

Dear Mr. Zone:

As you are aware, in the last few years, the Board of Representatives was greatly concerned with the question of excavations, particularly those in resident zones wherein a builder abandoned his plans to build after initial excavation.

Mr. Swinnerton has referred to me a problem involving the Crystal Lake Building Corporation, whom he sent a warning notice to on November 30, 1955, a copy of which is attached. No action has been taken by the property owner to date.

April 2, 1956

1173

Will you kindly examine the matter and advise me whether or not action might be taken under the provisions of Sections 10 and 11 of Chapter 13 and under Supplemental Ordinance No. 15 of the Stamford General Ordinances.

Very truly yours,

John M. Hanrahan
Corporation Counsel

MR. HUIZINGA MOVED that the President write a letter to the Prosecuting Attorney informing him that this regulation is not being enforced. Seconded by Mrs. Zuckert and CARRIED unanimously.

(3) Re: J. M. Wright Technical School, Smith Street & Schuyler Avenue

CITY OF STAMFORD, CONN.

March 28, 1956

Planning Board
Board of Finance
Board of Representatives

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Re: J. M. Wright Technical School,
Smith Street & Schuyler Avenue

At present, the State of Connecticut operates this vocational school on property owned by the City of Stamford. In the very near future, the State plans to build new vocational facilities in Woodside Park.

In April 1954, the pastor of Sacred Heart Church, Reverend Sugrue, requested that the City entertain an offer to convey the site and building on Schuyler Avenue to his parish for the purpose of being altered into a parochial elementary school.

The present pastor of Sacred Heart Church, Reverend R. Nadile, has recently advised Mayor Quigley that the church is anxious to have an expression from the city as to whether or not such an arrangement can be developed. He, as did Father Sugrue, stresses the fact that operation of such a school by the parish of Sacred Heart Church would, in effect, be a contribution to the educational facilities of the City of Stamford in that it would relieve the city taxpayers of the necessity of maintaining and operating facilities for those students who would attend.

Mayor Quigley has requested me to transmit this matter to Honorable Boards in order that you might have an opportunity to study the problem for the purpose of making a recommendation to him as to whether or not you believe that such a transfer should be made.

1741 Father Nadile informed the Mayor that in the event the city would undertake to convey the property, that the

April 2, 1956

church would make an offer to purchase same at a price that would be within its means considering the amount of money that would be necessary to rehabilitate the structure for use as an elementary school.

Very truly yours,

John M. Hanrahan,
Corporation Counsel

MR. RAITERI MOVED that this Board indorse any action that is to be taken in the future by the appropriate city officials or boards in order to deed the property to the church.

MR. RHOADES: "Should this not be referred to Committee?"

Referred to Legislative and Rules Committee and Education and Welfare Committee.

The following resolution, introduced at a meeting of the Steering Committee held March 27, 1956, and approved by them, was presented by MR. HUIZINGA, who MOVED for its approval. Seconded by Mr. Snyder and CARRIED unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 215

WHEREAS, April 19, 1956 has been designated as one of the days for making voters, and

WHEREAS, the Republican Primary will be held on this same day, namely April 19, 1956,

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, that April 18, 1956, or some other day convenient to the Registrars of Voters, be designated as the day for making voters, in lieu of April 19, 1956.

BUSINESS ON THE CALENDAR

(1) Reactivation of Housing Committee

Mr. Connors named the following members:

Frank W. Longo, Chairman
Gerald Rybnick
Anthony Kolich, Jr.
Doris M. Zuckert
Irving G. Snyder

(2) Change in Chairman of Charter Revision Committee

Mr. Connors announced that Mr. John Macrides would be the Chairman of this Committee in place of Mr. George Georgoulis, originally named as Chairman.

Mr. Connors also announced the following changes in Committees:

174.5

Stephen Kelly is taking Mr. Killeen's place on

April 2, 1956

1175

the Health and Protection Committee.

John R. Nolan is replacing Stephen Kelly on
Legislative and Rules Committee.

Eugene F. Barry is replacing Clifford Waterbury as
Chairman of the Personnel Committee.

NEW BUSINESS

The following resolution was introduced by Mr. Vittl, seconded by Mr. Georgoulis and referred to Health and Protection Committee by unanimous vote.

WHEREAS, the City of Stamford Police Department will shortly take occupancy of a new and modern headquarters at the corner of Hoyt and Bedford Streets, and

WHEREAS, this building has become a reality because of the efforts of many city officials and private citizens, and

WHEREAS, the chief impetus which changed general discussion about a new police building into tangible action came from the late J. FLEMMING RUTLEDGE, Chairman of the Board of Public Safety until his death on June 2, 1955, and

WHEREAS, the late J. Flemming Rutledge was a distinguished citizen, intelligent and humane city official, and a man of high moral purpose and civic dedication, and

WHEREAS, it has become a laudable and accepted custom in Stamford to name public buildings, chiefly schools, in honor of those who have contributed signally to the well-being of our community,

THEN BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Representatives hereby designates the new police building at the corner of Hoyt and Bedford Streets as THE RUTLEDGE BUILDING, or THE J. FLEMMING RUTLEDGE BUILDING, or THE RUTLEDGE MEMORIAL BUILDING, or THE J. FLEMMING RUTLEDGE MEMORIAL BUILDING, or THE RUTLEDGE POLICE BUILDING, or THE J. FLEMMING RUTLEDGE POLICE BUILDING, whichever designation may be made by the Board of Representatives.

There being no further business to come before the Board, upon motion of Mr. Nolan, seconded by several voices, the meeting was adjourned at 12:15 A.M.

Respectfully submitted,

George V. Connors, President
Board of Representatives