

May 5, 1958

1896

A regular meeting of the Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford, Conn. was held in the Cafeteria of the Dolan Jr. High School, Toms Road, Glenbrook, on Monday, May 5, 1958.

The meeting was called to order by the President, Mr. Norton Rhoades, at 8:10 P.M.

INVOCATION was given by Rev. Richard A Johnson, Pastor, St. Andrews Episcopal Church.

ROLL CALL was taken by the Clerk. There were 38 present and 2 absent. The absent members were: Ellis Baker and Edward Wynn.

ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES - Meeting of April 7, 1958

The Minutes of above meeting were approved by unanimous vote.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

STEERING COMMITTEE:

MR. RHOADES, Chairman, presented the following report of the Steering Committee:

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT Meeting held April 21, 1958

The Steering Committee met in the Mayor's Office, City Hall, on Monday, April 21, 1958. The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Mr. Norton Rhoades, at 8 P.M.

The following members were present: Norton Rhoades, Alanson Fredericks, Doris Zuckert, Thomas Topping, Robert Lewis, Ellis Baker, Stephen Kelly, Rutherford Huizinga and George Russell.

Absent were: Clement Raiteri, Jr., John Nolan, John Macrides, William Murphy, Rocco Colatrella, George Connors, Vincent Vitti and Bernard Geronimo. (They were unable to attend because of a conflict of meetings)

The following matters were discussed:

- (1) Petition signed by residents of Knickerbocker Avenue, regarding unsanitary conditions in rear of Bongo's Dept. Store. REFERRED TO HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE.
- (2) Petition from Pepper Ridge Place - REFERRED TO PLANNING & ZONING COMMITTEE.
- (3) Letter dated 4/10/58 from office of Wofsey, Rosen, Kveskin & Kuriansky, representing client, Mrs. Angelina Colamónico, owner of property at 132 Richmond Hill Avenue, in regard to playground area called "Hatch Field" and damage to her property by school children. REFERRED TO EDUCATION, WELFARE & GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE, and a copy sent to Mr. Kelly.
- (4) Letter dated 3/27/58 from law firm of Weissman & Weissman, asking for approval of change of name of road known as Lady Slipper Lane, to Country Club Road. REFERRED TO PLANNING & ZONING COMMITTEE.
- (5) Letter dated April 10, 1958 from residents on Lady Slipper Lane, asking that the name of their street be retained. REFERRED TO PLANNING & ZONING COMMITTEE.
- (6) Traffic light at Bull's Head (From Mr. DeForest, 19th District Representative. REFERRED TO HEALTH & PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

1897

May 5, 1958

- (7) Letter dated April 15, 1958, from Mayor Givens regarding meeting between City officials and the Housing and Home Finance Agency of URC. REFERRED TO HOUSING COMMITTEE.

(8) Special Board meeting

The question of the date of April 28th for a Special Meeting of the Board to consider and act upon the Budget for the next fiscal year was discussed. The Chairman of the Fiscal Committee said there would not be time enough for the Committee to prepare a report if the meeting was held at the time first selected.

(9) Parking fees in city parks

This matter was referred to the Parks & Recreation Committee.

- (10) Appointment - Raymond Cushing, Corporation Counsel. REFERRED TO APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 9:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Norton Rhoades, Chairman
Steering Committee

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE:

- (1) Park Commission - T. FRANK COWLIN (Republican) - Term Expiring December 1, 1962

MR. LEWIS, Chairman, said the Committee met in the Mayor's office the evening of April 29th at 5:30 P.M. and interviewed the Candidate for the Park Commission and the candidate for the office of Corporation Counsel.

MR. LEWIS: "In keeping with the tradition of the Appointments Committee, we have interviewed the candidates and reported back to our respective parties of the qualifications of the individuals."

Mr. Lewis presented the qualifications of Mr. Cowlin. Ballots were distributed by the Tellers.

VOTE on Mr. Cowlin: 36 Yes
2 No

- (2) Corporation Counsel - RAYMOND G. CUSHING (Republican)

MR. LEWIS presented the qualifications of Mr. Cushing for the position.

MR. RHOADES instructed the members that ballots would not be distributed until after discussion had ended.

MR. MAFFUCCI asked if Mr. Cushing had ever tried a case in court before his appointment by the Mayor.

MR. LEWIS replied that this question was raised at the meeting of the committee, and to his knowledge the answer was "yes".

MR. VITTI asked the Chair for permission to ask a question of Mr. Macrides, one of the members of the Appointments Committee. Permission was given.

MR. VITTI: "Mr. Macrides, when you asked that question, was an answer given to you that he never tried a case in Court - that he was a deed searcher and had never presented a case in Court?"

MR. MACRIDES: "Yes, that is pretty well correct. Mr. Cushing said that he had prepared a number of cases for presentation to Court, but had never actually tried one himself."

MR. LEWIS: "Mr. Chairman, it is not that I wish to dispute this, but I do believe that Mr. Macrides should have spoken up at the time this was discussed with Mr. Cushing. I do not wish to debate this issue, but do not wish to be placed in a compromising position myself. The Appointments Committee meeting consisted of Mr. Macrides and your Chairman, myself. However, the Appointments Committee was consulted afterward, and as is indicated by the application, all of its members have signed. I don't know whether this is in order or not, but I do think the gentleman should have an opportunity if I didn't hear him correctly, to correct this."

MR. DEFOREST asked if we had ever had a Corporation Counsel in Stamford who had not practiced prior to becoming Corporation Counsel.

MR. FREDERICKS quoted from the Charter in which it indicates five years experience is necessary for appointment to this post.

MR. VITTI wanted to know if the provisions of the Charter had been followed, and stated a public hearing had been demanded by certain taxpayers to inquire into the reasons for the dismissal of the Corporation Counsel, Mr. Frank Pimpinella, who had been first appointed.

MR. VITTI: "This is the first time in my 50 years of experience in living in the City of Stamford that I ever heard of a Corporation Counsel being fired. If this is a personal issue, it certainly should not be taken at the burden of the taxpayers."

MR. VITTI MOVED that this be referred back to committee. Seconded by Mr. Longo.

MR. NOLAN MOVED for a ten minute recess. Seconded by Mr. Milano.

MR. FREDERICKS asked the purpose of the recommittal motion.

MR. VITTI: "For further information on the case."

MR. FREDERICKS: "As to his qualifications?"

MR. VITTI: "Qualifications - yes, that's one of them, and second, is it legal to fire the man? Has the Mayor acted legally by making this move?"

MR. FREDERICKS: "Any decision as to legality would not be something that the Appointments Committee could decide. As to the legality, if any question there be as to the legality, that would be a question which would have to be decided by the Courts."

The President suggested that the question of Mr. Nolan's motion for a recess be considered, after Mr. Huizinga is heard from, as he originally had the floor.

MR. HUIZINGA: "The question has been specifically put by Mr. Vitti that the Republicans wrote the Charter, so they certainly ought to be able to explain it. If I may, I would like to bring up a point that has not been mentioned heretofore, and I consider

it to be the crux of the whole matter - the question about ambiguity. In one place in the Charter it says the Mayor has the power to remove and in another place it says the department head has to have a public hearing. It's so very simple that I think we have all missed it. Section 401 of the Charter says:

' unless otherwise provided in this Charter, the Mayor shall appoint and may at pleasure remove.....'

"The key word there is 'pleasure'. If you go down to another sentence in this paragraph which we are all talking about, it says:

'...the Mayor may remove any Department Head for cause, after a public hearing'

"After a public hearing, he may remove him for cause. Now the reason the people who wrote this Charter mentioned it in two places, was because in the first place it says the Mayor may at pleasure remove and in the second place it says the Mayor may remove for cause after a hearing. Now, obviously, if you are going to say to somebody 'you are through' because of this and that, he certainly has the right to have a public hearing and find out whether or not those accusations are correct. Therefore, the key to this thing is to look at the Mayor's letter, which he wrote terminating this employment, and I took the trouble to do that. The Mayor was very specific....."

MR. NOLAN rose to a point of order and suggested this be discussed after the recess.

The President ruled Mr. Huizinga should be allowed to finish his sentence.

MR. HUIZINGA: "In the Mayor's letter, in which he ordered the termination, he gave no cause whatsoever in his letter. Therefore, the discharge comes under the first sentence in the Charter regarding dismissal, and not under the second sentence."

The President said he did not think the Board was in a position to rule on the legal interpretation of Sec. 401 of the Charter or of any other section of the Charter, which was a matter for the Courts to determine and does not belong as a part of any discussion before this Board.

Recess was declared at 8:45 P.M. The Board resumed its session at 8:55 P.M.

The President stated the vote would now be taken on Mr. Vittti's motion to recommit.

MR. NOLAN MOVED to AMEND Mr. Vittti's motion that this matter also be committed to Education, Welfare and Government Committee along with the recommitment to the Appointments Committee. Seconded by Mr. Fortunato.

Mr. Nolan explained his reasons for this was because there seemed to be a question as to the legality of whether the Board is able to resolve this issue, or whether there should be a public hearing held on the matter, or whether the Mayor has the right to rid himself of a Corporation Counsel without a public hearing. He said he thought the proper committee to obtain a legal opinion would be the Education, Welfare and Government Committee and not the Appointments Committee, and that it might be feasible to submit the question to the Attorney General's office.

The President ruled that this would begin an investigation, which would require a two-thirds vote of the total membership of the Board.

Mr. Nolan stated he thought it was merely a matter of obtaining a legal opinion and could see no reason why it would not be possible to obtain a two thirds vote.

The President stated the Board has the right to vote the Corporation Counsel into office, or to recommit to the Appointments Committee, and also has the right to investigate, but this was the limit of the Board's powers under the circumstances.

MR. RHOADES said he would be glad to accept a substitute motion from Mr. Nolan which would in effect be a substitute for the original motion to recommit. He also stated that if a two thirds vote is taken on this motion that Mr. Vittti's motion will no longer be before the Board.

MR. LEWIS rose to a point of personal privilege. He said: "I would like to clarify one point. As an unbiased Chairman of the committee conducting the interview, I asked the question that was brought up a few moments ago. To reassure my hearing, I asked the candidate for the position of Corporation Counsel as to the answer given at the time of the interview and he reaffirmed the fact that he had stated that he did, as a trial lawyer, try several cases. This was the answer given at that time."

MR. VITTI withdrew his motion.

The President stated that the vote would now be taken on a motion to investigate, which would then require a short recess in order to prepare a proper resolution.

MR. FREDERICKS said he could see no point in holding a public hearing as the investigation would not resolve the question as to the legality. He said: "I hold no brief for the manner in which the removal was made. Be that as it may, the fact still remains that the Charter says the Mayor may remove at pleasure. We, who have worked with the Charter of the City of Stamford, be they Republicans or Democrats, and particularly those who have served on the Charter Revision Commission, are only too aware that some of the language is unhappy, and, in some cases, is ambiguous. I do not believe, however, that the language here is ambiguous. I do not see what result could be obtained from a public hearing. This would be our situation as I see it: The Charter does not give to the Board of Representatives any power of appointment in the office of Corporation Counsel. The Charter does not give to the Board of Representatives any power to make recommendations to the Mayor which he must follow as to the appointment. We can deny and refuse to approve any appointment made by the Mayor to the office of Corporation Counsel, and, as you also may be aware, that name must come up three times and that is all. The Mayor can completely ignore any action taken by the Board of Representatives as a result of its investigation - as a result of its public hearing - we get absolutely nowhere with it if the object is to have Judge Pimpinella put back as Corporation Counsel. If that be not the object, then I would like to know what the object is.

"If the object, on the other hand, is to see how much trouble can be raised, then, of course, a public hearing would be a most delightful situation. But, I am telling you that the Board of Representatives can not remove Raymond Cushing or any other appointee or nominee of Mayor Givens to the Office of Corporation Counsel by its own act, nor can we declare the office vacant. We can sacrifice Ray Cushing, not because he is Ray Cushing, but because Judge Pimpinella was removed, and our Mayor can then put up 'Charlie Smith' and 'Charlie Smith' can then draw a salary for three successive actions by this Board.....You cannot get Judge Pimpinella back in office by any action taken by the Board of Representatives - that is the point. I do not see what point a public hearing would do, except to wash dirty linen in public - that I am opposed to and cannot see."

MR. RHOADES called Mr. Fredericks' attention to the fact that Sec. 204.2 of the Charter which sets up the investigative process does not call for a public hearing.

1901

May 5, 1958

MR. FREDERICKS said he knew that.

MR. GEORGIOULIS spoke in favor of a public hearing, so that any charges may be clarified.

Re VOTE on the question of investigation. The President stated this would require the affirmative of 27 members of the Board in order to obtain a two-thirds vote, which meant two-thirds of the members of the Board and not two-thirds of the members present.

MR. HUIZINGA: "I rise to a point of parliamentary procedure. As I understand it, there was a motion made and seconded to vote on the appointment of the Corporation Counsel, then it was committed. Then, Mr. Vittl withdrew his motion to commit, so therefore it refers back to the original motion. We have got to get rid of the original motion first."

MR. RHOADES: "Mr. Huizinga is correct. Mr. Nolan, we obviously cannot vote on this motion until after action has been taken on the original motion. However, it seems to me, that this is the key note in this whole situation. Either it carries or it doesn't carry. And, at some level in the course of this meeting it is going to be necessary, if this matter is to be continued any further, to have these 27 votes anyway, and we can solve the problem this way, or in several ways. One is, that Mr. Lewis can temporarily withdraw his motion after this been voted on."

MR. NOLAN said what he had done was to amend the motion in order to commit it to another committee, but that he did not agree that it was to be an investigation. He said he did agree with the President that to commit the question to another committee would be in order to have them possibly request an opinion from the Attorney General as to the legality of the matter. He said, in essence that might possibly be construed as being an investigation. He said: "However, I do not agree with the Minority Leader. I cannot see any reason why we cannot get the two-thirds vote, because we want to know whether or not we are acting legally."

MR. HUIZINGA: "The Chair ruled, Mr. Nolan, that this motion to investigate was not a recommittal motion. Therefore, it has not preference. Now, the motion to commit was withdrawn. Therefore, we must revert back to the original motion."

MR. NOLAN: "Are you talking about setting up an investigation committee?"

MR. HUIZINGA: "After it has been decided whether this man is to be appointed or not, then you can make your motion to set up an investigating committee."

MR. NOLAN: "I feel that my motion was definitely in order. I will have to appeal from the ruling of the Chair."

MR. FREDERICKS "Mr. Huizinga's point is well made. I think it would clarify the situation considerably if Mr. Lewis would withdraw his present motion."

MR. NOLAN said he thought this was definitely out of order and would appeal the ruling of the Chair.

MR. RHOADES stated the motion before this body was to approve the appointment of Mr. Cushing as Corporation Counsel. He said he agrees with the Majority Leader, tentatively, that this involves an investigation and there are many questions in regard to the wording of a resolution of investigation that would have to be carefully ironed out, and the mere sending this to the Education, Welfare and Government Committee to investigate would by no means satisfy the requirements of the Board. He stated that at sometime during the meeting a two-thirds vote will be necessary on the matter of investigation, at which time the will of the Board will be indicated.

MR. RHOADES: "In my opinion, there are several ways in which this can be done. One of the ways would be for Mr. Lewis to withdraw his motion of approval so that we can vote on the matter of investigation. The other one is to go ahead and vote on Mr. Lewis' motion which is definitely on the floor. You can make a simple motion to recommit, if you wish, and at that point you will not be going into the extraneous factors of investigation. As a matter of fact, you can make a motion to recommit. If it carries, you can then go into the matter of investigation."

MR. NOLAN said the point was that many of the members felt there was a legal point that needed clarification. He said: "I don't want to see us put into the position of voting against Mr. Cushing, because they want to see this legal question cleared up - that is what we are trying to do."

MR. RHOADES: "The normal procedure, Mr. Nolan, under those circumstances, would be to vote first to recommit and then to set up whatever investigating bodies are needed."

MR. VITTI MOVED this matter be recommitting to the Appointments Committee. Seconded by Mr. Longo and CARRIED by a vote of 22 in favor and 11 opposed.

MR. NOLAN MOVED for suspension of the rules to consider the matter of investigating the office of Corporation Counsel of the City of Stamford. Seconded by Mr. Vitti. LOST by a vote of 24 in favor and 14 opposed.

RE: HOUSING COMMITTEE REPORT

MR. LONGO, Co-Chairman, MOVED for suspension of the rules in order to bring in the report of the Special Housing Committee at this time. Seconded by Mr. Colatrella and CARRIED unanimously.

MR. RUSSELL, Co-Chairman, presented the following report:

A REPORT TO THE BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE HOUSING COMMITTEE

In accordance with the actions and wishes of the March meeting of the Board of Representatives, whereby the Housing Committee was reactivated and requested to investigate housing conditions at Southfield Low Cost Housing Project as under the supervision of the City Housing Authority, this committee now reports its findings and resulting recommendations.

The conditions which have been verified by this committee indicate that there has been a laxity in the administration at the Southfield Village Low Cost Housing Project. It is understood, that the tenants in part, contribute to these conditions.

This committee has held innumerable meetings with many tenants, Director and Manager of Southfield Village, City Housing Authority, Chief of Police, Chief of Fire Department, Board of Public Safety, Health Commissioner and his assistant, Board of Finance, and the Southfield Neighborhood Development Advisory Group.

May 5, 1958

This report is presented in three sections:

- (1) Summary of factual findings
- (2) Details of the findings and meetings held
- (3) Recommendations

(1) Summary of Factual Findings

- (a) Statistical information
- (b) "Fear" - "Sex"
- (c) Health violations and unsanitary conditions
- (d) Fire violations and infractions
- (e) Lack of sufficient recreational facilities and activities and programs

(2) Details of the Findings and Meetings Held

(a) At Southfield Village there are 524 families and approximately 1200 Children. There are 250 families in the old Section and 274 families in the four 8 story 'High Rise' buildings.

(b) 'Fear' - This was found to be one of the major contributing problem factors. The fear to ride elevators. It was repeatedly pointed out that tenants and visitors (adults) use the elevators freely as lavatories, as well as women in constant fear of being molested and insulted. Typical is the following letter addressed to one of the Commissioners of the Board of Public Safety.

"To Whom it may concern

April 28, 1958

Commissioner of the Safety Board

Dear Mr. A. Rich

I would like to make a report to you which I think it will interest you very much. Last Mon. night my husband my twelve year old daughter and I went to visit some very good friends of ours at the Southfield Village. This was my first visit there. We waited to take the elevator up to the fifth floor, as we stepped on the elevator, a colored man was getting off and buttoning his trousers, which I do believe he had used the elevator for a bathroom. I was so shocked that didn't realize had stepped right into the dirty mess the three of us. There was nothing we could but just stay on until we had to get off. My husband and I was so upset, for the reason that my young daughter had to see all this. Mr. Rich I do hope that something could be done about this matter, for the protection and respect of the children and also for the good families that live there.

Sincerely Mrs. A. Gaspari

Fear by tenants to walk streets after dark. Fear to send children to store or out to play areas, children have groceries seized, destroyed and money taken from them in transit; also are repeatedly threatened by older children. In some cases, dangerous weapons, such as knives, are used. Fear to use basement drying areas because women fear being violated, as well as having clothes regularly stolen.

'Sex' - Moral standards are at the danger point. Sex violations are openly practiced by adults in parked cars on the main streets, in open and bold view of passing pedestrians; on park benches and lighted play areas within close proximity to the buildings. Many instances of perversion involving children as young as 8, 9 and 10 years of age are brought to our attention. In fact, basement areas of the 'High Rise' buildings had to be locked as a preventive measure because of teenage boys and girls using the area for sexual carrying ons.

(c) Health violations and unsanitary conditions - Roaches and bedbugs were a constant complaint in most apartments, and repeatedly seen by this committee. In one apartment the State Welfare, in a short period of time, because of the uncontrollable volume of bedbugs, replaced mattresses three times, and wood head boards and and foot boards twice. Vermin was also prevalent in the hallways, particularly in the areas surrounding the incinerator chutes. It was indicated to this committee repeatedly that the fumigating program is haphazard and completely inadequate in coping with the existing situations. Raw garbage was visible and prevalent throughout. Incinerator disposal chutes on the various floors of the 'High Rise' units were most unsatisfactory and of a poor design, which lends to a continual collection of scattered garbage in these areas. Washing machines and dryers in basements were removed because of their frequent use as lavatories.

(d) Fire violations and infractions - Emergency red lights and fire stairway lights were found either broken or out. It is not uncommon to replace as many as 80 light bulbs after a week-end. In one case, a fire hose was found disconnected from its standpipe, making it completely useless for tenants in case of emergency. Caps for Fire Department connections on outside of buildings are regularly removed, creating a serious fire department violation. The Fire Department responds to many calls resulting from rubbish fires started as pure acts of vandalism or accidentally in halls and basements. This committee has seen rubbish piled on floors and basements as high as five feet. Also pointed out by the Fire Department, they are called upon to respond to many false alarms at a great cost to the City, as well as a serious risk to the men riding the fire department equipment.

(e) Recreational Facilities, Activities and Programs - Although there is a most earnest and commendable effort on the part of the Neighborhood Development Advisory Program Group at Southfield to carry on this work, this committee must make mention the fact that there is an insufficient recreation and activity program, as well as a serious lack of recreational areas to cope with the need of approximately 1200 children and 800 adults. This was particularly noted where teenage groups would participate.

(3) Recommendations

(a) The elimination in the future of 'High Rise' type buildings similar to those at Southfield Low Cost Housing Project.

(b) Projects of lower density concentration of families. It has been proven nationally that the lower density projects are more easily controlled and less likely to divert back to conditions that eventually would make them even greater slums than the ones they replaced.

(c) The Health Department is requested to make a monthly, or more if necessary, complete inspection of buildings and grounds. It is imperative that any infractions be followed up for correction, also to submit a monthly report to the Board of Representatives and the City Housing Authority.

1905

May 5, 1958

(d) The Fire Department is requested to make a monthly, or more if necessary, complete inspection of buildings and grounds. It is imperative that any infractions be followed up for correction, also to submit a monthly report to the Board of Representatives and the City Housing Authority.

(e) That the City Housing Authority investigate their exterminating and fumigating contracts. A more thorough fumigating and exterminating program must be instituted and maintained, and that incoming tenants and furnishings be checked as possible carriers.

(f) That vandal-proof flush mounted lighting in public halls and passageways, fire escapes, etc., be investigated and installed.

(g) That more adequate street and alley way lighting should immediately be installed. It is suggested that the new mercury vapor lights be used, as present type lighting is antiquated and insufficient for this area.

(h) That the Park Commissioner take immediate steps to make ready for public use the 14 acres known as Laddin Rock Park. Due to its close proximity to Southfield Village, it will do much to increase recreational facilities in this area. In addition to this, more play areas for children of various age groups be acquired.

(i) That the City Housing Authority maintain a semi-annual inspection of all apartments and insist on families maintaining good housekeeping policies. Violators should be handled under the regulations of the City Housing Authority. More frequent inspections should be made when necessary.

(j) That the City Housing Authority increase its maintenance staff to where it will bring this project to a state of maximum of efficiency, cleanliness and safety, also to so maintain it throughout its existence.

(k) That a committee comprised of the Mayor, the City Housing Authority, the heads of various departments of the City of Stamford, the Housing Committee of the Board of Representatives, and representative members of the Social Aide Groups and Welfare Agencies, meet and establish an educational program for the purpose of instructing families as to how to live in Public Housing Projects.

(l) That an adequate number of police officers be assigned on a permanent basis to walking beats in this immediate area. Due to unusual conditions and past experiences, these police officers must be carefully selected. This committee cannot express through the use of words alone, the absolute necessity of having police constantly present in this immediate area.

Housing Committee of Board of Representatives

F. Longo - G. E. Russell, Co-Chairman

R. Colatrella, Recording Secretary

Members - J. Cullen, M. DeVito, A. Marciano,

W. Murphy, T. Roche

May 5, 1958

MR. GEORGIOULIS MOVED for acceptance of the report. Seconded by Mr. DeForest and CARRIED unanimously.

Mr. Nolan asked to be excused at 9:35 P.M., which changed the roll call to 37 present.

2655

May 5, 1958

1906

MR. HUIZINGA MOVED that a copy of this report be sent to the members of the Housing Authority, with a letter charging the Commissioners to see to it that these recommendations are put into effect and to report back to this Board that each and every one on these recommendations have been put into effect.

It was also suggested that the Mayor and all department heads involved also get a copy. Mr. Huizinga agreed to this.

There was some discussion as to who would see to it that these recommendations are carried out.

MR. HUIZINGA asked Mr. Longo if he did not think the responsibility for carrying out the recommendations be definitely in the hands of the Housing Authority. Mr. Longo replied that he thought this should be the case.

MR. HUIZINGA reworded his motion as follows: MOVED that the following through with the recommendations of the Housing Committee regarding conditions at Southfield Village shall be the direct responsibility of the City Housing Authority Commissioners, and that these Commissioners shall report to this Board what action they have taken to comply with said recommendations. Seconded by Mr. Geronimo and CARRIED unanimously.

FISCAL COMMITTEE:

Mr. Huizinga, Chairman, said the Fiscal Committee met in the Mayor's office on Wednesday, April 30, 1958. Present were Mrs. Doris Zuckert and Messrs. Thomas Topping, Edward Wynn, Anthony Kolich, Peter Robertucci, Patrick Fortunato and R. G. Huizinga. Mr. Cummings was absent.

(1) \$492.00 - Public Works Department (Also referred to Personnel Committee)

Code 414B.1, Salaries, Incinerator, Reclassification on 9/17/57 of position, Clerk-Incinerator, Grade 2 to: Clerk-Sanitation, Grade 7 (See Mayor's letter of 3/14/58)

MR. HUIZINGA MOVED for approval of the above request. Mr. Rybnick, Chairman of the Personnel Committee, presented a letter, clarifying the above matter. Mr. Rybnick said the Personnel Committee concurs with the approval of this item. Mr. Topping seconded Mr. Huizinga's motion. CARRIED unanimously.

(2) \$4,650.00 - Police Department (Also referred to Health & Protection Committee)

Code 430.17, Maintenance Police Cars (See Mayor's letter 3/14/58)

Note: The first two items in Mayor's letter of above date approved 4/7/58. The last item in this letter (see above) was recommitted.

MR. HUIZINGA MOVED for approval of the above request. Mr. Milano, Chairman of the Health & Protection Committee said his committee concurred in the approval, and seconded the motion. CARRIED unanimously.

(3) \$6,000 - Public Works Department - (Also referred to Public Works Committee)
(See Mayor's letter 3/26/58)

Note: The following two items in Mayor's letter of 3/26/58 were deferred at the 4/7/58 Board meeting.

2656

(a) Code 414C.15 Pumping Stas., Water, Power -----\$1,500.00

May 5, 1958

(b) Code 414B.15 Treatment Plant, Water, Power	\$4,500.00
Total	\$6,000.00

MR. HUIZINGA MOVED for approval of item (a) above. Mr. Topping said the Public Works Committee also approved and seconded the motion. CARRIED unanimously.

MR. HUIZINGA MOVED for approval of item (b) above. Mr. Topping said the Public Works Committee concurred in the approval and he seconded the motion. CARRIED unanimously.

MR. HUIZINGA: "The next item on our agenda is the following: At the Special meeting of the Board of Representatives held on May 1, 1958, the Fiscal Committee recommended a reduction of \$194,170.78 in the total operating budget of the Fire Department. The Fiscal Committee report indicated that this reduction was recommended because appropriations in excess of that which was recommended could very well be construed as explanatory, because our Police Department was required to wait several years before they were able to...."

MR. RAITERI: "Isn't it necessary, Mr. President, for the speaker to request suspension of the rules in order to bring this on the floor? It does not refer to any of the items on our Agenda. I MOVE that the speaker needs to ask for suspension of the rules before bringing this on the floor."

MR. RHOADES ruled that because this could not be definitely tied to any of the items on the Agenda, this would be necessary.

MR. HUIZINGA: "The item is a move to rescind the action taken by this Board at our last Special meeting on the Budget held May 1, 1958, insofar as it applies to the Police Department Budget."

MR. RHOADES said this would necessitate a vote for suspension of the rules, requiring a two-thirds vote.

MR. RHOADES: "The President would like to explain what the present situation is in regard to the Budget. The President probably should have signed the letters of transmittal that accompany the budget books in their journey to the Town Clerk's office on Friday morning. He did not do so. He has not done so up to now, and does not intend to do so until after this meeting tonight. Consequently, the budgets have not been officially transmitted to anybody. It is therefore possible to reconsider any of the items in the budget. It will have to be done in each case under suspension of the rules. That means there would have to be a definite move for suspension, including definite code numbers and it will require a two-thirds vote of those present. After which, the person wishing to bring the matter up again will have to move for reconsideration, and after those votes are passed, it would then be possible to change the amounts in the budget. Therefore, Mr. Huizinga, at this time you will have to move for suspension of the rules to discuss the possibility of reconsidering the budget of the Police Department."

Re: Police Department Budget, as adopted at May 1, 1958 Board meeting:

MR. HUIZINGA MOVED for suspension of the rules in order to bring this on the Agenda, not to reconsider, but to rescind action taken at the Budget meeting of May 1, 1958. Seconded.

MR. RAITERI said he was opposed to this motion because the Board stayed until nearly 2 a.m. in the morning to consider the budget on May 1st, and at that time there was a full membership present and everything was considered on its merits, with all information available. He said: "We based our opinions on the committee report at

that time. I understand that since then there have been some statements and misunderstandings between department heads and our Fiscal Committee. They appeared with the Park Commission, the Police Department, the Fire Department. If we open this up for discussion this evening, we are going to be confronted with each one of those departments bringing up the rescinding of action previously taken. Many of our members are not prepared with their budget books, as it was not their understanding that the budget was to be reconsidered tonight. I feel that the only intelligent way to act upon the reconsideration of any item that was in the budget, is to have it go back to our Fiscal Committee and that they then clear up any misunderstandings which may exist with these particular department heads and report back to this board at our next meeting and the members will then be prepared to act upon it intelligently."

MR. RHOADES ruled that this could not be done for the reason that the terminal date for the Board of Representatives in reporting the budget is May 15th and the next Board meeting will not be until June.

VOTE taken on suspension of the rules. (Needs 24 votes to pass) LOST by a vote of 19 in favor.

MR. ROCHE MOVED for suspension of the rules to reconsider the Park Budget. Seconded by Mr. Milano.

MR. KETCHAM spoke against this.

VOTE taken on Mr. Roche' motion and LOST by a vote of 12 in favor. (Not a 2/3 vote)

LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE:

MR. RAITERI, Chairman, read the report of his Committee. He said they met on April 30th and on May 3rd, and that both meetings were joint meetings with the Parks & Recreation Committee. He said all members were present at these meetings, and at the May 3rd meeting also present were Walter Kennedy and Robert Nolan of the Park Commission and Frank Zezima of the Board of Recreation.

(1) Rules and Regulations of Public Recreation Areas

MR. RAITERI MOVED for suspension of the rules in order to consider the above. He explained that at the time the agenda was prepared he did not know the rules and regulations of either the Recreation Dept., the Hubbard Heights Golf Club and the Park Commission would be ready. Seconded and CARRIED unanimously.

MR. RAITERI MOVED for adoption of the following: Seconded by Mr. Fortunato and CARRIED unanimously: Mr. Kelly, Chairman of the Parks & Recreation Committee, read his committee report and said they were in approval of this item.

RESOLUTION NO. 273

1. Rules and Regulations of Public Recreation Areas.

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford that under the provisions of Ordinance #64 Supplemental Sec. 1, it is forbidden to:

1. Wantonly damage any property, equipment, or apparatus.
2. Disobey posted signs or warnings.
3. Serve or consume intoxicating or alcoholic beverages on any playground or recreation area, except that beer in cans or

May 5, 1958

keg beer in paper cups may be permitted with prior approval of the Superintendent of Recreation.

4. Play ball or organized games except in designated areas.
5. Hold picnic or light fires except in designated areas.
6. Use rubber inner tubes, water wings, or any other inflated object or floating device, or aid to swimming.
7. Approach to within 10 feet of lifeguard towers.
8. Take any glass or crockery objects on any beach or recreation areas.
9. Land boat, vessel, or water skis on beach.
10. Bring dogs or other pets on bathing beach.
11. Use *specialized recreation facilities or areas without obtaining permission from Board of Recreation and paying such fees as may be set by the Park Commission and approved by the Board of Representatives.
*"Specialized recreation facilities or areas" include baseball and softball diamonds, and playgrounds.

MR. RAITERI MOVED for adoption of the following resolution. Seconded by Mr. Roche. Mr. Kelly stated his committee went along with the approval of this resolution. Vote taken and CARRIED unanimously:

RESOLUTION NO. 274

2. Rules & Regulations of Hubbard Heights Golf Club.

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford that under the provisions of Ordinance #64 Supplemental Sec. 3. the following rules and regulations shall have the force and effect of law.

1. The Course officials may exclude from the Course, without refund, until readmitted by the Hubbard Heights Golf Commission, any player who does not comply with the posted rules, which have been adopted for the benefit and protection of all players.
2. Non Resident Regulation-Any non resident of Stamford who misrepresents or falsifies his or her identity of address, in order to gain admission to the Golf Course at Resident Golfers' fees, shall be barred from admission and the privileges of the Golf Course until readmitted by the Hubbard Heights Golf Commission.
3. Resident Identification Cards-Resident Identification cards for the current season may be obtained at the desk upon presentation of proper identification. These identification cards must be shown when purchasing tickets.
4. Offensive behavior, obscene language or wilful damage to the Course or property shall be cause for exclusion or expulsion

from the Course until readmitted by the Hubbard Heights Golf Commission.

5. The drinking of liquor is prohibited on these premises.
6. No refunds or rain checks on tickets. Any players caught in the rain shall continue from where they left off the same day.
7. Abbreviated or extremely styled wearing apparel will not be permitted on the Course.
8. Children under twelve (12) years of age are positively not permitted on the Course.

(2) Rules and Regulations of Public Parks

MR. RAITERI: "The following resolution was approved by a five to one vote. Mr. DeForest objecting only to the parking fee, as outlined in Rule #19.

"I think, Mr. President, what I would like to do is to present Rule #19 first, and when we straighten that out, then present the entire resolution for adoption."

MR. RHOADES agreed with this procedure.

*

MR. RAITERI: "Rule 19. Use specialized facilities or restricted parking areas without obtaining permit from the Park Commission and/or paying such use fee as may be specified by the Park Commission and approved by the Board of Representatives.

*"Specialized facilities" include beach lockers, bath-houses, marina docks or moorings, launching ramps, boat storage, racks or lockers, tennis courts, lawn bowling greens, picnic areas, beach chairs or umbrellas, miniature bus or railroad transportation inside parks, etc.

"This will mean that the Park Commission will establish the fees which will be placed upon these specialized facilities. That will include the parking areas and they are subject to the approval of the Board of Representatives, which means that your liaison between the Park Commission and the Board will report to us as the season approaches just what the charges will be and we will act upon them accordingly, which will be either approval or rejection. At this time we are interested in a vote as to whether or not this Board is in favor of a \$1.00 parking fee for this coming season. I have some other information which I think will help the Board in their decision on this matter.

"One is the reasons of the Park Commission for wanting parking fees. They are:

1. There can be little doubt that parking in our parks is insufficient to accommodate all people wishing to use the facilities. The expense of extending these areas is indirectly defrayed by the returns from these fees. We have noticed that it has helped make the parking more orderly.
2. This is in keeping with the practice of all municipal parking, except that this is a one time fee, rather than a per use fee.
3. Permit holders have become more conscious of their responsibilities because of their small contribution to the park program.

"The Park Commission has also given me a copy of just how they intend to enforce the permits for parking, who will be permitted in the parks, when the stickers will be sold and the cost."

1911

May 5, 1958

MR. RAITERI then presented the following:

PARK AND BEACH PARKING PERMITS

The Park Commission points out the following facts regarding the 1958 "beach permit" or "\$1.00 windshield stickers":

1. Posted parking areas in Cummings, Cove Island, West Beach, Dyke, Southfield and Chestnut Hill Parks and West Beach are for the use of cars with windshield permits. These parking areas will not have parking meters as do public beach parking areas in some city and state parks with daily parking fees ranging from 10 cents to \$1.00 per day per car. The Stamford park and beach parking areas will be available to cars having Park Commission windshield permits obtainable at a cost of \$1.00 for the entire season of 96 days or approximately 1 cent per day.
2. Signs will be posted conspicuously in the restricted parking areas in the six parks and beaches reading: "This parking area reserved for cars with Park Commission stickers. Unauthorized use is a violation of city ordinance and subject to penalty."
3. Taxicabs or automobiles having legitimate brief business in the six parks will not require stickers.
4. Local buses bringing groups to the six parks must have stickers if they wish to park.
5. Parking stickers will be required from 6 AM on Friday, May 30th through 12 Midnight on Monday, September 1st, 1958.
6. All proceeds from the sale of stickers goes directly into the General Fund. All expenses of the sticker system (printing, clerical, parking area attendants, etc.) are paid from Park Department operating funds.
7. Stickers will go on sale beginning Monday, April 14th. Publicity will be given to the sticker sale in the press and radio during the month of April.
8. City of Stamford cars owned by the city and driven by city officials on city business will be given stickers without charge.
9. Persons may drive through a park without stickers. Stickers are required only for use of parking stalls.

PARK COMMISSION

March 7, 1958

MR. RAITERI also offered the following letter from Mayor Givens on the same subject, said: "However, the Mayor in this letter has taken no stand on this matter, either for or against. He has just asked that the Board of Representatives draw their own conclusions in regard to the matter. However, he has attached the Minutes of a meeting, which he attended with the Park Commission, from which I will quote excerpts.

May 5, 1958

1912

CITY OF STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT

April 10, 1958

Mr. Norton Rhoades, President
Board of Representatives
City Hall
Stamford, Connecticut

Dear Mr. President:

I am enclosing the Park Commission's stipulation regarding the fee charged for parking in the parks, and I am also enclosing a copy of Minutes of meeting held between the Park Commission and myself on February 14.

I would like to ask your Honorable Board whether or not this fee was ever considered as a proper charge for the Park Department. As you know, the responsibility of fee charges has been going back and forth between the Board of Recreation and the Park Commission for some time. We have hopes of resolving this matter so that agreement can be reached on all sides.

I would ask you to refer the enclosures to your Parks and Recreation Committee.

Sincerely,

Webster C. Givens, Mayor

MR. RAITERI quoted the following excerpts from the Minutes of meeting held on February 14, 1958 with members of the Park Commission:

"The Mayor asked if the Board of Representatives ever approved this fee of \$1.

"Mr. Connell: All our charges have to be approved each year.

"Mr. Nolan asked the Mayor why he objected, and the Mayor replied, because it is double taxation. These people should not pay to park.

"Mrs. Gillespie said 'Isn't it double taxation to put money in a parking meter?' The Mayor said he was not involved in the policy of running the Park organization, but all the people he talked to are not in favor of a fee.

"Mr. Nolan said he thought those who object are the ones you hear from. Those in favor will say nothing.

"Mr. Kennedy: Are we to understand we can present this to the Board of Representatives and that you will tell them you do not approve it?

"Mayor Givens: Yes.

"Mr. Kennedy: You oppose it as a fee to the park."

MR. RAITERI: "However in his letter the Mayor did not say he was definitely against it. I think that the Board is prepared to vote on the \$1.00 parking fee at this time."

2662

May 5, 1958

MR. RHOADES: "Mr. Raiteri, the President is very interested in the answer to this question. The Board can vote definitely on this and express an opinion, but does this have legal standing?"

MR. RAITERI: "If you vote in favor of the \$1.00 parking fee, yes."

MR. RHOADES: "If they vote in opposition to the \$1.00 parking fee, will it affect this years parking fees?"

MR. RAITERI: "I would say that then it would have to be removed, Mr. Chairman according to your State Statutes."

MR. KELLY: "In explanation of the \$1.00 fee for parking and why I intend to vote against it is that no matter how it is dressed up, it will still be a form of double taxation, with the proceeds not being used to provide increased parking areas or the maintenance of same, and I believe that it should be taken out of rules for fees to be voted on and placed on its own, with a separate vote being taken by the Board of Representatives."

A great deal of discussion ensued on this matter.

MR. FREDERICKS MOVED that item #19 be removed from the Rules and Regulations of Public Parks. Seconded by Mr. Topping. (Mr. Fredericks later withdrew his motion)

MR. COLATRELLA asked if this portion of the rules is removed is there any substitute to take the place in order to prevent out of towners from using the parking areas and thereby crowding out Stamford residents.

MR. ROCHE said he did not think the matter of the \$1.00 parking fee was properly before the Board - that all we are voting on at this time is a set of rules, including the fact that they have the right to set the fees on everything. Then, those fees have to be brought again for the Board for approval.

MR. LEWIS MOVED to hear from Mr. Nolan, Chairman of the Park Commission. Seconded by Mr. Roche. CARRIED by a vote of 28 in favor.

MR. ROBERT NOLAN, Chairman of the Parking Commission, spoke briefly and explained their reasons for establishing the parking fees.

Mr. Fredericks withdrew his motion. He was excused at 10:40 P.M., leaving 36 members now present.

MR. RAITERI MOVED for adoption of the following resolution in its entirety. Seconded by Mr. Lewis and CARRIED unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 275

RULES AND REGULATIONS OF PUBLIC PARKS

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Representatives that under the provisions of Ordinance No. 64 Supplemental, Section 2, it is forbidden to:

1. Wantonly damage lawns, trees, shrubs, or any other property or equipment.

May 5, 1958

1914

2. Discard paper, trash, or rubbish, except in containers provided for such purposes.
3. Play ball or organized games except in areas plainly designated for such activities.
4. Have an unleashed animal except in a vehicle.
5. Disturb birds or other wild life.
6. Pollute lakes, brooks, lagoons, or other waters.
7. Peddle or sell goods or merchandise without permission of the Board of Representatives and acquisition of a city license, or post any signs without permission of the Park Commission.
8. Light fires except in picnic grills or fireplaces placed by the Department of Parks.
9. Hold mass meetings or public assemblies except with a City permit.
10. Serve beverages from concession stands except in paper containers.
11. Serve or consume intoxicating or alcoholic beverages except beer in cans or keg beer in paper cups.
12. Drive a vehicle at speeds over posted speed limits or to park such vehicle except in areas designated for such purpose.
13. Drive a commercially licensed vehicle without permission.
14. Bathe or swim in restricted areas or change clothes except in places provided for such purpose.
15. Use rubber inner tubes, water wings, or other inflated objects or devices designed as swimming aids.
16. Leave a boat without permission. Any boat left without permission will be impounded by the Department of Parks.
17. Wash or polish automobiles.
18. Disobey posted signs or warnings.
19. Use specialized facilities or restricted parking areas without obtaining permit from the Park Commission and/or paying such use fee as may be specified by the Park Commission and approved by the Board of Representatives.

*Specialized facilities: Include beach lockers, bath-houses, marina docks or moorings, launching ramps, boat storage, racks or lockers, tennis courts, lawn bowling greens, picnic areas, beach chairs or umbrellas, miniature bus or railroad transportation inside parks, etc.

Fees for parking in beaches and city parks (Park and beach parking stickers)

2654 MRS. ZUCKERT inquired as to what provisions were made for allowing out of towners

1915

May 5, 1958

to park in city parks and beaches.

Mr. Nolan, of the Park Commission, explained that no provisions have been made for out of town parkers.

MR. ROCHE MOVED for approval of the parking fee of \$1.00. Seconded by Mr. Wilensky and Mr. Colatrella. Standing VOTE taken and CARRIED by a vote of 30 in favor and 5 opposed. (the President not voting)

Designating Stamford as "RESEARCH CITY"

MR. RAITERI: "I have another item, Mr. President, which I MOVE for suspension of the rules on, and that is the request from the Mayor's Advisory Committee to designate Stamford as "Research City". (See Mayor's letter to Board dated April 21, 1958 attaching this recommendation)

MR. RHOADES: "It is the President's opinion that suspension of the rules is not necessary on this matter as it appears on our Agenda under Communications from the Mayor. However, I see nothing wrong with your making sure, if you so wish."

MR. RUSSELL said the Planning and Zoning Committee also approve of this and seconded the motion.

MR. MURPHY MOVED that the matter be tabled. Seconded, and LOST by a vote of 16 in favor and 17 opposed.

MR. RAITERI MOVED for adoption of the following resolution: Seconded by Mr. Longo and CARRIED unanimously:

RESOLUTION NO. 276

WHEREAS, we have many research concerns located in Stamford, and

WHEREAS, we are desirous of having others locate here,

BE AND IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED that Stamford be designated as "RESEARCH CITY" so that all may know of our intention.

Lease, property adjacent to Bell & Atlantic Street Parking Lot (presently held by the Jemez Company, owners of the C. O. Miller's Dept. store parking lot) (See request contained in letter dated 4/14/58 from Parking Authority)

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

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE:

MR. TOPPING, Chairman, presented his Committee report. He said they held a committee meeting in the office of the Board of Representatives on Tuesday, April 29th at 8 P.M. The members present at said meeting were: Mr. Nilan, Mr. Maffucci, Mr. Geronimo and Mr. Ketcham. Mr. Ketcham presided as Chairman of the meeting. Mr. Vitti, Mr. Marciano and Mr. Topping were absent.

- (1) Re: Westover Road area - Complaint re drainage problem (See letter 3/21/58 from Alan Ketcham, 18th District Representative)

MR. TOPPING: "This project has been temporarily stopped by the Public Works Commissioner, pending the securing of easements for off site drainage.

- (2) Intervale Road and Newfield Drive - Bad road conditions (per letter Mr. Ketcham, 18th District Representative)

MR. TOPPING: "The Public Works Department has repaired these roads and is studying a Capital Project which would provide for widening and improving Intervale Road.

- (3) Holbrook Estates (See Resolution as printed on page 1848 of 3/3/58 Minutes)
(Note: Also referred to Planning & Zoning Committee 4/7/58)

MR. TOPPING: "Because of the heavy schedule of last month, the Planning & Zoning and the Public Works Committees were unable to hold a joint meeting. Therefore, I MOVE that this item be referred back to these committees."

Mr. Topping's motion was seconded by Mr. Marciano and CARRIED unanimously.

- (4) Flooding condition, rear of stores on Summer Street

MR. TOPPING: "Part of this flooding is on private property and part caused by run off from a parking lot. The Public Works Department has written a letter to Food Fair, asking them to give immediate consideration to the elimination of this condition. This committee will follow this up further.

- (5) Public Works problems in various city districts

MR. TOPPING: "The Chairman of this Committee requests that when Board members have Public Works problems in their Districts, that they will present the problems to the Board in writing. Then, this Committee will have something definite to work on.

- (6) Conditions of Catch Basins on Horton Street in front of K. T. Murphy School

(Presented by Mr. Rybnick in letter of April 7, 1958 and referred to Public Works Committee)

MR. KELLY: "Mr. Topping, it says here 'flooding conditions brought up under 'New Business' at 4/7/58'. Don't you have something on Horton Street in the Cove?"

MR. TOPPING: "That was taken care of by the Public Works Department."

MR. KELLY: "I beg your pardon, but it has not been taken care of."

MR. TOPPING: "I was assured by Mr. Maguire that they were looking into it."

- (7) Re: Houston Terrace and Home Court

MR. CONNORS: "I referred an item on the same date (see above title) regarding water draining down into Houston Terrace. What happened to that?"

MR. TOPPING: "If you would put these complaints properly in writing, then they would be taken care of."

MR. CONNORS: "I referred it at the last meeting."

MR. Topping said it was not referred in writing.

1917

May 5, 1958

HEALTH & PROTECTION COMMITTEE:

- (1) Petition dated March 30, 1958, complaining about conditions in rear of Bongo's Department Store in Springdale

MR. MILANO: "In reference to this petition, from residents of Knickerbocker Ave., in Springdale, complaining about a private outside incinerator being operated on the property of Bongo's Store on Hope Street, in Springdale, creating an unsafe and unhealthy condition.

"Your committee referred this matter to the Health Department for action. Mr. Andrew Thorpe of the Health Department informed me that they have issued a summons to the owner of Bongo's to comply with the Health Department orders. If the owner of Bongo's does not correct these conditions, then the matter will be turned over to the Prosecutor for violation of City and Health Department Ordinances."

- (2) Police protection in and around harbors (for protection of waterfront property and boats (See Mayor's letter 3/25/58)

MR. MILANO requested that this matter be held in Committee for further information from the Board of Public Safety and the Park Commission.

- (3) Additional parking meters (as contained in letter from Parking Authority dated April 21, 1958)

MR. MILANO requested that this matter also be referred back to Committee for further study.

- (4) Traffic light at Bull's Head (Request from Mr. DeForest 19th District Representative, dated 4/11/48)

MR. MILANO: "In reference to this matter, regarding proposed rotary traffic at Bull's Head and the lacking of traffic signs at the newly cut through streets. Chief Kinsella informs the Committee that the proposed rotary at Bull's Head is contemplated on completion of the widening of High Ridge Road and that he will ask Captain Lockwood to investigate the need for traffic signs at the newly cut road at Bull's Head."

PLANNING & ZONING COMMITTEE:

MR. RUSSELL presented his committee report. He said: "Due to many interfering factors, such as the Democratic and Republican primaries, the budget, with its many meetings of the Fiscal Committee, as well as many meetings involved by the Housing Committee, we were not able to hold our regularly scheduled meeting. However, the following two matters were discussed informally and the committee agreed to present them this evening.

- (1) Final adoption of Ordinance changing the names of certain city streets
(Adopted for publication at the April 7, 1958 meeting)

MR. RUSSELL MOVED for final adoption of the following Ordinance: Seconded by Mr. Marciano and CARRIED unanimously.

ORDINANCE NO. 75 SUPPLEMENTAL
CHANGING THE NAMES OF CERTAIN CITY STREETS

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF STAMFORD THAT:

The following street names shall be changed as shown below:

May 5, 1958

1918

Change Brookside Place to BROOKSIDE DRIVE, and extend to Hamilton Avenue;

Change that portion of Stafford Road from Main Street to dead end and north side of Turnpike to NOROTON HILL PLACE:

Extend Courtland Circle into a loop, also continue westerly to intersect with Blachley Road;

Extend North State Street from South Street, westerly and northerly to Richmond Hill Avenue;

Extend Grenhart Road from West Avenue easterly to Wilson Street;

Change that portion of Victory Street between Pressprich Street and Waverly Place to SOUTHFIELD VILLAGE COURT;

Extend Ursula Place from Orange Street northerly and easterly to Maher Road;

Change East Lane (West Stamford) to Hatch Lane.

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

- (2) Change of City nickname to that of "RESEARCH CITY" instead of former name of "Lock City"

MR. RUSSELL said this matter had already been taken care of under Legislative and Rules Committee and had the approval of the Planning & Zoning Committee also.

PARKS & RECREATION COMMITTEE:

MR. KELLY presented his Committee report. He said the committee met at City Hall on Wednesday, April 23, 1958 at 8 P.M. and present were Messrs. McLaughlin, Hart, Colatrella, Roche and Kelly. Absent were Messrs DeVito and Wynn.

- (1) Hatch Field - Use as play field and damage to property of Mrs. Angelina Colamonico

MR. KELLY: "A letter addressed to the Board of Representatives by the law firm of Wofsey, Rosen, Kveskin and Kuriansky, was referred to our committee, concerning city owned property on Richmond Hill Avenue, known as "Hatch Field", which they claim is being used as a play area without supervision, resulting in considerable damage being done to the property of Mrs. Colamonico of 132 Richmond Hill Avenue. Complaints have been made to the Board of Education, Board of Recreation and also to the Park Department, with each one disclaiming any responsibility for the children using the play area and for the maintenance of same. Your Committee has not as yet been able to get all the information requested by the law firm at this time, but will endeavor to secure it as soon as possible."

- (2) Petition from Yankee Division, Veterans' Association, requesting permission to hold a parade during the Convention on June 20, 21 and 22nd.

MR. KELLY MOVED for suspension of the rules in order to take this up, inasmuch as it came in too late for the Steering Committee meeting. Seconded by Mr. Connors and CARRIED unanimously.

1919

May 5, 1958

Petition No. 244 - Request for permission to hold parade during Convention

MR. KELLY MOVED for approval of this petition. He outlined the line of march and said the Police Department had assured the committee that the parade would be supervised by them. Seconded by Mr. Georgoulis and CARRIED unanimously.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE:

MR. RYBNICK, Chairman, presented his Committee report. He stated that the committee met with the Personnel Commission on Monday, April 21, 1958 in the offices of the Personnel Commission and was attended by Mrs. Horner, William Hearing, George Connors, George Georgoulis and Gerald Rybnick.

MR. RYBNICK: "The only other items taken into consideration were the discussion of the Clerk-Sanitation report and the matter of asking the Mayor to reconsider the \$312 wage increase for Classified employees. Also considered were other reclassifications which was referred to a later date."

MR. RAITERI asked Mr. Rybnick what was the position of the Mayor at this time in regard to a replacement of the third member (employees' selection) to the Personnel Commission.

Mr. Rybnick said he had heard nothing further in regard to this matter. He said all he knew that had been done recently was a meeting was held and the Firemen and Mr. Pimpinella, Corporation Counsel (at that time) and the Public Works and other interested parties. He said: "Then, Pimpinella lost his job and I have not heard anything further about it."

MR. RAITERI MOVED that a letter be sent to the Mayor, asking him for information concerning the replacement of a third member to the Personnel Commission. Seconded by Mr. Colatrella and CARRIED unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

Re: Flooding problem - Complaint from Mr. Frederick Marshall, 31 McMillan Avenue

MR. KELLY: "I believe that this can be brought up under "New Business". Mr. Marshall of 31 McMillan Avenue and other neighbors on the street wish to have a problem of flooding of their property and cellars, as a result of a catch basin located on Soundview Avenue overflowing and running through their property. A test was run in my presence and the above fault was proven. They claim if relief is not afforded these people, they will institute suit against the City of Stamford. REFERRED TO PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE.

Re: Pension Plan

MR. CUMMINGS: "I may be out of order, but the matter of the Pension Plan is resting for the moment with the Mayor, as a result of that letter to the Board of Representatives, as you will recall, in February.

Re: Letter to Mr. Gerald Rybnick, 12th District Representative - Subject: Custodian Mr. Walter J. Broderick, in the employ of the Board of Education

MR. RYBNICK presented the following communication and MOVED that it be referred to the Fiscal Committee and the Education, Welfare and Government Committee. Seconded and CARRIED unanimously.

May 5, 1958

1920

STAMFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
151 Broad Street
Stamford, Connecticut

April 24, 1958

Mr. Gerald Rybnick
907 Cove Road
Stamford, Conn.

Dear Mr. Rybnick:

I am writing this letter to you at the suggestion of the Personnel Commission on the subject of Mr. Walter J. Broderick, a Custodian in the employ of the Board of Education, and presently on leave of absence because of illness.

Because of the conscientious attitude of Mr. Broderick during his employment with the Stamford Schools and also because of his unfortunate illness, I have requested of the Personnel Commission an extension of the sick leave benefits for Mr. Broderick. Specifically, I request that retroactively the sick leave benefits be extended for Mr. Walter Broderick through May 5, 1958. This would mean an extension of the benefits from Feb. 4, 1958 to the date mentioned above.

I sincerely hope that your committee can see fit to make approval of this extension.

Sincerely yours,

R. A. Neuwien
Superintendent of Schools

cc: Mr. McCutcheon
Mr. Broderick

MR. RHOADES announced that the next Steering Committee meeting would be held on May 19th, two weeks from tonight, and the regular Board meeting on June 2nd.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Ketcham, seconded by Mr. Cummings, the meeting adjourned at 11:25 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Norton Rhoades

Norton Rhoades, President
Board of Representatives

vf

2670