

See below for Feb. 8

~~FEBRUARY 6, 1950~~

John L. Cameron, 20th District, stated he felt Mrs. Seeley should read the last two paragraphs on the Department of Education which she did.

Leon Staples, 7th District, remarked on the paragraphs concerning the School System, stating there were some places in the purchasing where fine decisions had to be made and that was in buying the text books. He stated they were sold to schools at a discount, and that if you buy them from agencies, as a rule you get old books. He went on to praise the purchasing done by the Superintendent of Schools.

John L. Cameron, 20th District, stated the reason he asked Mrs. Seeley to read the last two paragraphs was to show that the auditors did not criticize the handling by the Board of Education.

Michael Laureno, 3rd District, said that the auditors had in fact commended the Board of Education. They stated the Board of Education were taking all discounts.

A VOTE was then taken on the motion. The VOTE was 36 in favor, 2 against. The MOTION was CARRIED.

Mr. Pierson then requested Michael Laureno and Daniel Miller to nominate two members from their parties to serve on this committee.

Daniel Miller, Majority leader, nominated Louise T. Seeley and Hunt Sutherland.

Michael Laureno, minority leader, nominated James N. Mulreed, and Patrick J. Hogan.

Upon motion of Clifford Waterbury and seconded by Babette Ransohoff the nominations be closed.

It was then MOVED and seconded that the four members nominated be named to the committee. The motion was PASSED.

The President then read a letter from Robert G. Shepherd, 9th District, regarding a clarification of the Corporation Counsel's opinion on Personnel Appointments.

Mr. Pierson said he would check on this with the Corporation Counsel.

Upon motion of James N. Mulreed, 4th District, and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 12:00 PM until Wednesday night, February 8, 1950, at the Burdick Junior High School.

→ FEBRUARY 8, 1950

The adjourned meeting of the Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford was called to order by the President, Samuel F. Pierson, at 8:15 PM, EST, on February 8, 1950, at Burdick Jr. High School.

Roll call was taken with 34 present and 6 absent. See attached attendance sheet.

Mr. Pierson continued the Steering Committee Report. He referred to a letter from the Board of Public Safety concerning the notification to all applicants of the results of their examinations.

James N. Mulreed, 4th District, stated the Steering Committee had requested of the Corporation Counsel an opinion upon the right of the Safety Board to demand that these people who have already been accepted as supernumeraries take this mental test.

Mr. Pierson stated that had been done.

## COMMITTEE REPORTS

### Fiscal

Mrs. Seeley reported that with the Grand List increased by almost \$6,000,000 our borrowing capacity will be increased by \$295,000 plus, so if we borrow no more money between now and the 30th of June, our borrowing capacity for the next fiscal year would be over \$5,000,000. A copy of the Fiscal Committee report is attached to these minutes.

### Legislative and Rules

James N. Mulreed read three letters on which the committee is going to take action at the next meeting.

Mr. Pierson referred to Mayor Barrett's letter re nomination of Maurice Buckley to fill Judge Hannah's place on the Board of Taxation.

This was referred to the Appointments Committee.

### Public Welfare and Recreation

Helen J. Bromley read the report of her committee.

The President, Mr. Pierson, stated that the <sup>Board of Recreation</sup> ~~Department of Parks~~ asked the Corporation Counsel for a decision to clearly define the authority of the Board of Recreation and the Department of Parks. He further stated that most of us feel that supervision of the beaches should be under the supervision of the Board of Recreation.

Mrs. Bromley, stated that the Planning Board has plans for a swimming pool with not too much expense that could be put on the westerly side of Halloween Beach. "In regard to the bathhouses, a resolution was passed by us last August, and I can't see but that that is going to be stymied and nobody else seems to know just what action to take. It looks as though it will take that \$50,000 to put those bath houses in shape and to do the work that needs to be done there." Mrs. Bromley further stated, "Now, how can that be expedited, I do not know, but if you all will look over Page 65 of our minutes we were very definite last August on this problem."

Mr. Pierson asked if that matter had been included in anyone's Capital Budget, and Mrs. Bromley answered that it had been included in the Recreation Board's Capital Budget.

Mrs. Bromley continued to read report.

James N. Mulreed, 4th District, said that in connection with Mrs. Bromley's report the U. S. Government, through the Army Engineers, did appropriate a certain sum of money for the dredging of East Harbor, that part of the job had been accomplished, and that there was still an unexpended sum which has been appropriated by the U. S. Government which would in part take care of dredging the area in front of the pavilion, and that that in itself might partially solve the <sup>problem</sup> we're faced with; namely, in providing anchorage for some of the larger boats anchored in the lagoon.

FEBRUARY 8, 1950

Mr. Pierson stated that the Planning Board had taken up with the Federal Government the question of what happened to that appropriation.

Michael Wofsey, 1st District, stated that since it was apparent that the general feeling was that these projects, and specifically that covering the developments of the beaches, were urgently needed and would, in any event, be included in the Capital Expenditure Budget for the year beginning July 1, 1950, it would appear to be far more desirable to put them through immediately and thus solve the problems with which we will be faced in the summer of 1950. Thereupon, upon his motion, which was seconded and carried, the Board

## RESOLUTION 71

RESOLVED that we consider the beach problems urgent, since they involve all of the swimming facilities to be utilized during the coming summer, and we urge that the Department of Public Works ask for an immediate appropriation covering the beach projects rather than wait for the Capital Expenditure Budget in July, 1950.

and it was voted that copies of this resolution be sent to all of the Boards and Departments having jurisdiction over the matter.

Mrs. Seeley stated that the unexpended balance of the Bureau of Parks and Playgrounds was \$33,970.03.

Mrs. Bromley stated that she spoke to Mr. Bromfield about the unexpended balance in the Public Works Department and he assured her that there would be none. She further stated that all the lights in Halloween Park, and the wiring underground were all gone and that a man from the Connecticut Power Company had been down there with Mr. Tuttle and that the lights have to be put up higher, the drinking fountains are not usable, and to just put those things in condition was going to take the amount of money they now have. She further stated, "I don't think, from what Mr. Bromfield said, that would solve our problem. I do think that something ought to be gotten under way on that pavilion. It would pay all of you to look at that building."

George V. Connors, 10th District, stated that with all the work at Halloween Park he couldn't see why, instead of laying off six men as they did, the Parks Department couldn't go into that pavilion before the spring of the year and clean it up.

Mrs. Bromley stated "We can't count on the snow removal balance of \$28,000" Mrs. Bromley further stated that Mr. Bromfield expected to dredge out Halloween Pond and Mill River - as much as their equipment will permit them to do. All those projects are planned depending on weather conditions; and that Mr. Bromfield went in to all of it with her and said there was no money available.

Mr. Wofsey stated that he was talking strictly about bathing facilities and not the east branch of Stamford Harbor: and suggested that a copy of the resolution be sent to every possible agency that has anything to do with it.

The MOTION to adopt Resolution No. 71 was PASSED.

Mr. Pierson stated that one matter had been referred after the Steering Committee Meeting, namely, the question concerning the proposed parking lot on the corner of South and Bell Streets. It was decided at the meeting Monday night to defer it until this meeting so that there would be time for consideration. Mr. Pierson stated the option expires on February 15th and therefore he asked that this be considered an emergency so far as this Board is concerned and that it be placed on the Agenda.

R17

James N. Mulreed, 4th District, stated that the minutes of the previous part of this meeting stated that this matter be deferred to a postponed meeting, and therefore stated that the motion in itself is already placed on the Agenda.

Louise T. Seeley, 1st District, stated that the Fiscal Committee did not consider this at its meeting, because they did not have the facts in hand. Mrs. Seeley read the proposal from the Board of Finance.

Patrick J. Hogan, 10th District, asked if there was any over-all plan for the City by the Planning Board for parking areas where they were required, and Mr. Pierson answered that the Planning Board had a plan of four or five areas out of which parking lots would reasonably be made providing they could be purchased at a fair price.

Mr. Hogan read a personal report against the purchase of the parking lot. (This report is on file)

Louise T. Seeley, 1st District, MOVED, seconded by James Mulreed that RESOLUTION No. 72 be adopted.

RESOLUTION NO. 72

RESOLVED, that the offer of Realty Associates of Stamford, Incorporated to sell to the City of Stamford for Seventy Four Thousand Five Hundred (\$74,500.00) Dollars is hereby approved for the purchase of the following described properties:

FIRST TRACT

All that certain tract of land situated in the City of Stamford and bounded and described as follows: Northerly, 106.5 feet by Bell Street; easterly 153.81 by land of Elsie N. Parker et al, formerly of Lionial D. Rhinehart; Southerly, 101.65 feet by land of St. John's Roman Catholic Church and land of Frank N. Brantner and Westerly, 151 feet by the Second Tract hereinafter described.

SECOND TRACT

All that certain tract of land situated in the City of Stamford and bounded and described as follows: Northerly, 166.95 feet by Bell Street, Easterly, 151 feet by the First Tract hereinbefore described; Southerly, 161.60 feet by land of Frank N. Brantner and Westerly, 151.50 feet by South Street. All of the aforesaid several dimensions being more or less.

be and the same is hereby accepted provided the parking restrictions to be imposed on the use of said properties shall be as follows:

The said properties shall for a period of three years from the date of acquisition by the City of Stamford be used for public parking purposes, either with or without charge to users, and for no other purposes.

Be it Further Resolved, that the purchase price of \$74,500.00 be and the same is hereby approved for the purchase of said properties on the aforementioned condition, and that said sum be payable by a negotiable note of the City of Stamford for said sum payable in equal annual installments for a period of ten years commencing with the first payment one year from date of the acquisition of the properties and continuing annually thereafter until the principal sum shall have been paid in full with interest at the rate of 2% per annum on the unpaid balance payable semi-annually; said note shall contain in the right to the maker to pay the whole or any unpaid balance, or larger payments on account of principal on any interest date.

FEBRUARY 8, 1959 *affid*

George V. Connors, 10th District, asked if Mr. Barrett didn't think that the merchants had caused the parking conditions that exist now. He gave several examples of where there is no parking behind stores.

Babette S. Ransohoff, 15th District, stated that in all fairness to these merchants, the merchants who have provided their own parking space have people coming up to their back doors, whereas the merchants in the center of town have comparatively very little space that would enable their customers to come up to their back doors as they do in Ridgeway, Bedford Street, etc.

Edward J. Wojciechowski, 2nd District, stated that he looked into private owned parking lots and that there is a lot right on South Street in the vicinity of 200 feet of the proposed lot, and that there is lot parking on the honor system; that it can accommodate 20 to 25 cars; and that you can drive in there and there is always ample parking space.

Mr. Barrett stated that he can look out there at any time and can't see any vacant spaces; and that there is a man in this room that has people drive away from his lot every day in the week.

Discussion followed re employees of stores and owners driving their cars to work.

Mr. Glazer spoke on parking lots and parking situations in other cities; and Bedford Street merchants who had grouped together and offered parking space for shoppers, and explained that same condition is not prevalent in the center of town - bringing out that first of all it is prohibitive as to cost for merchants in the center of town to get together, because of higher assessments.

Jeanette L. Bell, 17th District, stated "We have an obligation of protecting the taxpayers' money and every month there is some emergency that comes in - some things we have to pass. All those things add up to quite a sizeable sum. Since I've looked over the figures I have been quite impressed with one provision: I don't like to see a whole chain of parking areas placed on the taxpayers. I would like to have an amendment to the motion, not to purchase any more parking lots until this has proven that it is of advantage.

Mr. Glazer answered, "You're not risking in this proposition and it is not burdening the taxpayers."

Mrs. Bell stated that she would be willing to go along if the Board would adopt some provision that they wait to see how it comes along.

Leonard J. DeVita, 5th District, asked if it would be at all possible to extend the option, that he still didn't know how he was going to vote on it, and that he would like some additional time.

Mr. Pierson stated that there are two separate ownerships; first Mr. Glazer and his associates, and Mr. Samuel Weiss, for whom Mr. Glazer has no right to speak.

Mr. Glazer stated that his group got together and purchased the lot for one purpose only, and that was to offer it to the City, to offer it at cost, to be used as a parking lot.

James W. Harrington, 9th District, asked if this property hadn't been offered to the City once before, to which Mr. Glazer answered "Not that I know of."

Mr. Harrington stated that he would like to look it up in the old minutes of the Common Council.

Michael Wofsey stated that the previous purchaser paid a great deal more for this property; that it was privately purchased some twenty years ago by Gillespie

Bros. and another owner for the purpose of erecting their own buildings, and they determined they were better off to stay where they were; also purchased by some others for the purpose of developing their private business and those plans also did not develop for the reason that Mr. Barrett pointed out some time back - that South St. had been standing still for so long. The Stamford Department Store determined that it was not a good enough location for them to erect on. Mr. Wofsey further stated that he was certain that it had never been offered to the City before.

A 10 minute recess was declared.

The MOTION was made and seconded that the acquisition of this parking lot be approved under the terms of the Board of Finance.

Sherman R. Hoyt, 19th District, said "It won't be very long before everybody that comes into Stamford to work, to shop, or to live is going to have a car and is going to want to have a place not where they can park it for an hour or two hours, but where they can park it as long as they want. Cars are no longer a luxury, but an everyday necessity. If we don't start right now making provisions for that future, which isn't too far off, the jam is going to keep right on getting worse and it will cost the taxpayers an awful lot of money if that trend continues and helps drive business out of what is now the center of Stamford. Another point that has been made, which I think should be given more importance is, from what I understand of the Planning Board's ideas, that this is a trial balloon in a large program of parking areas throughout the city. If the Board of Finance, who have the reputation of scrutinizing financial risks fairly well, have voted in favor of this thing it doesn't seem to me that the City stands to lose anything even if this should happen not to pan out financially. If they don't try it and give up the idea of community-owned parking lots much longer, it is going to cost the taxpayers a great deal more than if they bought this lot, I think we should consider our position in this matter not as of today or tomorrow, but as of ten years from now and then make up our minds how we're going to vote on it."

Louise T. Seeley, 1st District, stated that she is very much in favor of trying this for three years for these two reasons.

1. That it will be protecting that center commercial area of our town from deterioration;
2. It will be an incentive to other people to do the same thing.

She further stated that she thought it would be a great mistake not to try this,

James N. Mulreed, 4th District, stated that he was not interested in this property merely because of the need for additional parking, but because he knows the people in his district are interested in being able to acquire valuable property which may be twenty years from now will be needed by the City for some other purpose. "We can acquire this property today without an increased tax burden and I know the people I represent want me to acquire this property while it is available without any increased tax burden."

Sewell H. Corkran, 18th District, stated "I'm in favor of buying this property. We can't lose anything on it. The property is going to be self-sustaining. It is worth more than the price being offered to the City." Mr. Corkran further stated that if we don't provide parking facilities for the shoppers in the center of Stamford, then the value of the property in the center of Stamford is going to go down, and therefore he knows that if the assessed value

FEBRUARY 8, 1950

of that central property goes down, no matter where we live in Stamford, that our taxes are going up as sure as the assessed valuation in the center of Stamford goes down."

Edward J. Wojciechowski, 2nd District, stated that he was against the purchase of this property and that he felt that the taxpayers in his district have a great burden and that this will be a slightly higher burden on them.

Babette S. Ransohoff, 15th District, stated that it was just pointed out to her that this will very definitely be a boon to the small business man who cannot afford to establish parking facilities.

Leon C. Staples, 7th District, stated that he intended to vote against this thing but that the merchants of this town are vitally important to everyone of us here, and we've got to have the merchants satisfied, so "I'm changing my vote and I shall vote for it."

a Patrick Scarella, 3rd District, stated that he was in favor of buying this property.

John M. Canavan, 11th District, stated, "At the offset, I'm opposed to buying it. I think we have lots more to do with our \$100,000 - schools, and sewers, etc. The first thing you know none of us will be able to live in the City of Stamford if the taxes continue to go up much higher. I understand from Mr. Barrett that there was an acre of land over there and I believe, from what Mr. Glazer said, that by acquiring this land there would be 85 more cars placed in the property in question. As I understand it, half of that property is already used as a parking lot." Mr. Canavan further stated that if Ridgeway and all the others can provide parking space why can't others. He further stated "With everything that goes along, you lose the assessment value on it now if we take it over and it will cost well over \$100,000 in my opinion, and I certainly think that if we're going to spend money this way that we ought to look before we leap. I certainly am against it."

Helen J. Bromley, 20th District, stated, "I would like to say this, that I am for it for various reasons. I do not think that the parking meters and the car capacity will average 100 cars a day. I think that is very optimistic, but I do think that the merchants will use every means possible to fill that and make it a success. This is not like a capital expenditure of \$100,000 right now. It is over a ten year basis on a reasonable rate of interest and it will not amount to so much on a yearly basis and if we give this a try that frontage on South Street can be utilized for another reason. For that reason I'm in favor."

Jeanette L. Bell, 17th District, stated "I'm going to vote for this parking purchase tonight, but I would like to see the Board going on record as being opposed to any more appropriations for parking lots until giving this a fair try."

Babette Ransohoff, 15th District, objected to that provision by maintaining that, if we went on record to wait three or five years, we might be too late in obtaining needed parking areas. She pointed out that already the merchants in Glenbrook were worried about the parking problem, and were trying to solve it themselves; but they might need City help.

Michael Wofsey stated that he can think of a dozen things that can be done with the Bell St. property if it isn't used for a parking space.

The motion was PASSED, 27 in favor, 11 opposed.

George W. Lockwood, 14th District, MOVED, seconded by Samuel Cook, that the Board of Representatives authorize the proper authority to install parking meters

at the earliest possible moment at the City owned parking lots which we now have - Center School and Canal Street. *Code motion was PASSED.*

Mrs. Bell proposed that the Board go on record not to purchase any more parking spaces until this one has proven itself.

James N. Mulreed stated that he didn't think Mrs. Bell took into consideration that there might possibly be some other civil-minded business men willing to offer to the City a tract of land at \$1.00 and he didn't think Mrs. Bell would have us refuse. He further stated that the motion is rather dangerous, and that we can't foresee what might be offered to us before this particular venture has proven successful.

Mrs. Bell stated that she would be very glad to withdraw her motion.

Mrs. Bell requested that every member of the Board be provided with copies of the auditors' report. The Clerk was so instructed.

Mr. Pierson then called on Daniel Miller and left the room during the following discussion.

Daniel Miller read resolution No. 73

RESOLUTION NO. 73

BE IT RESOLVED that the Mayor request of The Board of Finance an appropriation in the amount of \$2,000 to be used as a fund from which to compensate any acting Mayor for services rendered in that capacity. Such person to be compensated after (3) days continuous service, retroactive to the first day of service at the rate of Twenty (\$20.00) dollars per day and such sums as may be due shall be paid by the Commissioner of Finance upon requisition of the Mayor, retroactive to July 1, 1949.

Mr. Miller stated that he received correspondence from the Mayor agreeing in part to this resolution, but the Mayor objected to compensation on the same basis as the Mayor. Therefore, the amount has been changed to \$20.00 per diem.

John Canavan, 11th District, moved that the resolution be approved, seconded by Louise T. Seeley, 1st District.

Stephen E. Kelly, 12th District, made an amendment to the motion that the Acting Mayor be paid in proportion to the motion.

James N. Mulreed, 4th District, moved that we make it retroactive to the beginning of the fiscal year.

John L. Cameron, 20th District, moved to amend waiting period to three days. This was agreed to.

The resolution was passed as follows: RESOLUTION NO. 73

BE IT RESOLVED that the Mayor request of the Board of Finance an appropriation in the amount of \$2,000 to be used as a fund from which to compensate any acting Mayor for services rendered in that capacity. Such person to be compensated after three (3) days continuous service retroactive to the first day of service at the rate of Twenty (\$20.00) dollars per day and such sums as may be due shall be paid by the Commissioner of Finance upon requisition of the Mayor, retroactive to July 1, 1949.

Samuel Pierson stated that he had not been able to secure a copy of the Poltrack Lease from the Board of Finance and, therefore, unable to act on it because they haven't got the actual document to approve.

Upon motion made, seconded and carried the meeting adjourned at 12:00  
Midnight-

Respectfully submitted, BABETTE S. RANSOHOFF, Clerk