

May 26, 1955

Mr. John W. Cook, Fire Chief of the Glenbrook Fire Department, spoke briefly, welcoming the members of the Board of Representatives.

MR. MULREED MOVED that a letter be written expressing the thanks of the members of the Board for being invited to use the facilities of the Glenbrook Fire House for their meeting. SECONDED and CARRIED unanimously.

MR. CONNORS informed the members of the Board that they had been invited to attend the ceremonies of the opening of the Bridge Street Bridge on Monday, May 30, 1955, and that they were also invited to attend a cocktail party being given by the Ridgeway Center merchants after the formal opening of the new bridge.

MR. LIVOLSI MOVED for the suspension of rules so that he might be given the opportunity to speak regarding the report of the Housing Committee relative to people affected by the Thruway.

MR. HUIZINGA said that it was his understanding that the meeting had been called for only one purpose and that was to discuss the Helen Smith property.

MRS. BROMLEY arrived at this time.

MR. LONGO explained that it will not be possible to have a public hearing on this matter in Hartford, because of a full calendar.

MR. HUIZINGA replied that the Board could have an informal discussion about the reports of the Legislative and Rules and Planning and Zoning Committees.

MR. LIVOLSI explained that there was nothing personal -- he just wanted to bring it up in order to get the necessary approval of the Board.

MR. CONNORS called on the Legislative and Rules Committee.

Report of the Legislative and Rules Committee - May 26, 1955

The Committee recommends that:

1. That there be no public hearing.
2. That the appeal be considered on the basis of the transcript alone without additional testimony.

Paul A. Plotkin
Chairman

Report of Planning and Zoning Committee:

MR. IACOVO, in the absence of the Chairman of the Planning and Zoning Committee, Mr. William D. Murphy, gave the following report:

The members of the Planning and Zoning Committee unanimously agree to recommend to the Board of Representatives at its special meeting on May 26, 1955, that a public hearing need not be held regarding the appeal from the decision of the

Planning Board changing the Master Plan from the R5 to RMF in that section wherein the land known as the "Helen Smith Estate" is located.

Our decision is based upon the fact that a stenographic report of the joint public hearing by the Planning and Zoning Boards of the City of Stamford on March 15, 1955 is comprehensive and complete. Another hearing would merely be a repetition and reiteration of the information contained in this report.

We also wish to state that a copy of the report was received by the members of this committee in sufficient time to allow careful consideration and study of the problem before us.

Patrick J. Fortunato
Joseph F. Iacovo

William Murphy
P. Wardham Collyer

MR. MULREED MOVED that this Board resolve the issue which is before us - the appeal from the decision of the Planning Board to amend the Master Plan without further public hearings and based on the transcript of the public hearing which was held on March 15th, 1955. SECONDED by Mr. Topping.

MRS. BROMLEY MOVED that this be resolved without further public hearing. SECONDED by Mr. Huizinga.

MR. HUIZINGA stated that we, as a Board, go on record as accepting the recommendations of the Committee to resolve the issue without a public hearing.

MR. HUIZINGA MOVED that the Board adopt the recommendations of the Legislative and Rules Committee and Planning and Zoning Committee, as presented to this Board this evening, which recommendation is that we resolve the issue at hand without further public hearing.

MR. JACHIMCZYK SECONDED the motion.

MR. IACOVO moved to AMEND that these words be added to the end of that motion: "at our June 6th meeting".

MRS. BROMLEY stated that before we accept that, that we should discuss the problem tonight in this motion.

MR. IACOVO said their Committee - the Planning and Zoning Committee - is ready to come to a decision either one way or the other, and are now waiting to see whether the Board is going to recommend another public hearing, and that after tonight his Committee will be ready.

MR. COLLYER MOVED that this issue be resolved at the June 6th meeting of the Board.

MR. MULREED said he is opposed to the motion because he does not think

May 26, 1955

it is feasible to have this entered on the Agenda of the next regular meeting, as this should be done prior to the next regular meeting, because the discussion would take up too much time from the other business of the Board.

MR. HUIZINGA agreed with Mr. Mulreed, saying "This is too much in advance to put that amendment in - leave the motion stand as it is".

MR. PLOTKIN spoke in order to clarify the issue. He said he thought the only problem before the Board was to discuss the public hearing.

MR. TOPPING read the "Call" again. He stressed its purpose in calling the special meeting.

MR. PLOTKIN said "We are here tonight to discuss procedure and not the merits. We will discuss the merits when we discuss the issue. The amendment is to decide the merits of this at the June 6th meeting and if we do not have time enough, it should be the first item of business on the agenda at the following meeting. We should not discuss the merits tonight".

MRS. ZUCKERT said it was her understanding that since the Legislative and Rules Committee and the Planning and Zoning Committee do not feel we should have an additional public hearing, that is the only reason for the meeting tonight - it is too big a matter to be discussed now.

MR. COLLYER agreed with this statement.

General discussion ensued.

MR. MULREED said he did not mean to infer when he spoke against the amendment, that we were to review the issue tonight. That copies of the court stenographer's report of the public hearing were placed in the hands of each member of the Board to study to give them everything they needed to decide whether to reverse the decision of the Planning Board. He stated that it was not necessary to place on the Agenda of a meeting any item that would take up so much time, but that we do have time between now and the date of the June 6th meeting to call a special meeting of the Board, and that the Board is not prepared to discuss this tonight, but should have another special meeting devoted entirely to this matter.

MR. RHOADES asked a question on parliamentary procedure "When the vote is taken on this - what will be necessary for passage - will it be necessary to have approval of two-thirds of the members of the Board?"

MR. IACOVO stated that there would have to be a majority of the members of the Board.

MR. TOPPING said "I think Mr. Mulreed has the best thought on the discussion of the whole matter - we should have a special meeting and not try to place it on the agenda of the next regular meeting".

QUESTION. MR. IACOVO read Section 529.1 on page 50 of the Charter, and stated that an affirmative vote of the majority of the members would be needed to sustain a decision.

May 26, 1955

870

MR. JACHIMCZYK left at this time, after MOVING the Board adjourn.

VOTE taken on MR. IACOVO'S amendment: "at our June 6th meeting" which was amendment to Mr. Huizinga's motion. LOST by a vote of 7 in favor and 18 opposed.

VOTE taken on MR HUIZINGA'S MOTION that the Board adopt the recommendations of the Legislative and Rules and Planning and Zoning Committees that there be no further public hearing. CARRIED by a vote of 24 in favor and 1 opposed.

MRS. ZUCKERT MOVED that a special meeting of the Board be called prior to a regular meeting, at which time this matter will be discussed and a decision reached. SECONDED by Mr. Cook.

MRS. BROMLEY said "Before we vote on that matter, it should be discussed further. It would seem to me that we are not going to have a public hearing and I do not see why this should be discussed tonight".

MR. COLLYER MOVED that the motion be tabled until the end of the meeting.

MR. MULREED said it would not be remiss to point out what the issue is that is being discussed, and clarified this by stating that the issue before the Board is the appeal from the decision of the Planning Board to amend the Master Plan of Stamford and said "I am sorry that the Planning Board did not see fit to wait to make their decision after we had acted upon it".

MR. HUIZINGA: "May I ask Mr. Mulreed what was the Planning Board's reason to amend the Master Plan?"

MR. MULREED: "I saw the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Board. They, as a matter of fact, simply noted the rules change at that time."

MRS. WINSOR: Addressing the Board generally "Wouldn't that be called 'spot zoning'?"

MR. MULREED: "In a sense this would be spot zoning, inasmuch as on either side of Glenbrook Road are two tracts that would be affected."

MR. COLLYER: "Mr. Mulreed has done a good job of explaining the background. According to my understanding, the area in question is now designated on the Zoning Map as permitting only single family residences. R5 zoning is multi-family low density, while R7½ residential permits nothing more than one family on a lot. The petition to the Planning Board was to permit them to go from R7½ residential to R5 residential."

MR. TOPPING: "May I ask Mr. Collyer what R5 means? And, what does 7,500 sq. ft. per family mean?"

Long discussion ensued here while this was explained.

MRS. ZUCKERT: "I think at this time it should be brought up that there was a special hearing held at which a change was made from 1,000 to 600 square feet per family."

May 26, 1955

MR. PLOTKIN: "I doubt very much if Mrs. Zuckert is helping the situation any."

General discussion here.

MR. MULREED: "There has been one application filed with the Planning Board concerning that whole area and the Planning Board acted upon that application and that one only. I said at the outset of this meeting that we are considering only an appeal to the Zoning Board. Zoning is the immediate problem and the Zoning Board's decision in respect to future development."

MRS. BROMLEY stated that she agreed with Mr. Mulreed.

MRS. ZUCKERT said she attended the special hearing before the Planning Board and it was mentioned that there was a definite connection between the two.

MR. RUSSELL stated that this is the only chance that the Board has to talk on this subject.

MR. MULREED stated that if this Board does not want its authority taken away from it, it should be willing to decide whether or not they want the right of appeal removed from their jurisdiction.

MR. LIVOLSI requested the right to have the Board listen to his Committee report.

MR. IACOVO spoke about the sewer extension and how this would affect the situation regarding multi-family dwellings in this area.

MR. TOPPING stated that Mr. Iacovo "brings up a good point". He further stated that an apartment building does not pay as it goes, but means an increase of sewers and increased enrollment of children in the schools which means an added burden on the existing facilities.

MRS. BROMLEY, in answer to Mr. Iacovo, read a petition from the property owners surrounding the Helen Smith property. This petition was handed out to the various Board members and to the press and radio and was dated May 24, 1955.

MR. HUIZINGA: "We are just now getting to the point where we would like to see the Planning and Zoning Committee come up with a report on the following:

1. I think we ought to know how much it will cost the City to increase their sewer capacity in order to take care of that big building. The Committee should contact the Public Works and find this out.
2. This Committee should contact the Board of Education, or Mr. Neuwien and get a definite report from him as to what he thinks about the educational problem that will be created by the additional school children.

3. I think this Committee should contact the Police Department and get an answer from them as to how the additional cars in this area will affect the traffic congestion in this area.

I believe that the Committee should get the answer to these questions and get a definite answer."

MR. MULREED: "I am afraid that I must repeat that we are not concerned with this." He repeated his previous statements that we are considering only the appeal from the decision of the Planning Board to amend the Master Plan.

MR. LIVOLSI: "I would like to suggest that if anyone has any questions pertaining to the Public Works Department that they give it to Mr. Topping in order that he may get the answers to these questions. The question is whether or not the sewer is adequate to take care of an apartment house. This is more important than wondering about the sewers. The important thing is, what type of housing we are going to need to meet Stamford's requirements."

MR. RUSSELL stated that he would like to add to the third question: "we get from the Engineering Department an estimate of costs of widening building lines on Glenbrook Road and Hope Street".

MR. TOPPING: "As Chairman of the Public Works Committee, I would like to state that if you want to find out the cost, you can easily find this out by looking into past budget allocations. Two years ago we spent close to \$100,000 on Bedford Street for storm drains. Look in your budget to find out how much it will cost to widen the streets."

MRS. ZUCKERT: "On October 28, 1953 the Master Plan was accepted, and was expected to take care of the next five to ten years."

MR. IACOVO: "Mr. Chairman: In answer to Mr. Huizinga's question about the school children - look on page 13 of the transcript of the testimony of the public hearing and read Mr. McCroskey's statement as to what it will cost for education for the additional school children."

At this point there was a general discussion about added cost to the City for school children because of the apartment building.

MR. HUIZINGA: "Mr. Neuwien has statistics in his office which show figures on how many school children can be expected from multi-family dwellings from which we could arrive at an estimate of what to expect."

MR. LIVOLSI: "We are out of order in discussing matters which have no bearing on the question."

MR. HUIZINGA: "The question is whether or not to amend the Master Plan....."

MR. MULREED: "I still think we have got to divorce Zoning from Planning. Two Bills are now in Hartford which would settle this whole matter under the Charter, as it is at present. The question

May 26, 1955

before the Planning Board was should multi-family construction be allowed? Should the Master Plan be amended so this can be done?"

MR. RUSSELL: Read from page 57 of the transcript of testimony at the public hearing on the Helen Smith property, as to question and answer put to the Superintendent of the Fairlawn Apartments.

MR. COLLYER: "I think what Mr. Mulreed has emphasized is that we should limit ourselves to the question before us. Taking into consideration the number of people that will be served and considering the housing shortage in Stamford, as I feel the particular use this tract will be put, I would be in favor of it. However, the major need for housing in Stamford is needed by the low-income families. These people would not be able to take advantage of the facilities offered by this type of housing."

MR. LIVOLSI: "Asking a question of Mr. Russell: 'Do you believe in this type of housing for Stamford?'"

MR. RUSSELL: "To a certain extent."

MR. LIVOLSI: "I might not like an 8 story apartment house in Glenbrook, but it might be better somewhere else."

MR. RUSSELL: "There is a need for low-rent housing in Stamford, not high."

MR. LIVOLSI: "We have no right to decide what kind of building that they can build - whether designed for low-rent housing or for high."

POINT OF ORDER raised by Mr. Mulreed. "No question has been raised as to what type of apartment - we are only concerned with an amendment to the Master Plan."

MR. McLAUGHLIN: "Will this particular apartment pay for itself in the future plans of our City? Will we get enough revenue from this to take care of our increased population in this area?"

MR. HUIZINGA: "The City of Stamford has an area as large as the City of Buffalo. It doesn't seem good planning to me to build in a congested area when our City line goes so far out."

MR. CONNORS: "If there are no further questions, a vote will be taken on Mrs. Zuckert's motion to hold a special meeting of the Board, prior to a regular meeting, at which time this matter will be discussed and a decision reached."

MR. IACOVO: QUESTION: "How many people were prepared with an answer before this discussion?"

MR. RUSSELL spoke on the Zuckert motion. "If we are not going to discuss this question at our June meeting, a written report should be prepared and given to each member so that all members know what went on tonight."

MRS. ZUCKERT: stated that she would withdraw her MOTION.

MR. LIVOLSI MOVED that a Special Meeting, prior to the June meeting,

May 26, 1955

874

be held. SECONDED by Mr. Russell.

MR. COLLYER spoke against Mr. LiVolsi's motion, saying there would be too many meetings this month and suggested that we take up this issue on June 6th at the regular meeting of the Board, and if necessary, the June 6th meeting can be adjourned. Mr. Collyer MOVED that the Board take up this issue at the June meeting.

MR. IACOVO said he would go along with this.

MR. TOPPING: "It is part of our duty as representatives to review all the questions that concern the people we represent."

General discussion ensued.

VOTE taken on MR. MULREED'S MOTION that there be a special meeting of the Board prior to the June 6th meeting regarding appeal from the ruling of the Planning Board. 9 in favor, 16 against. Motion LOST.

MR. TOPPING: "I think we should give Mr. LiVolsi a chance to get over what he has." MOVED to adjourn. SECONDED by several voices. CARRIED.

HOUSING COMMITTEE

MR. LIVOLSI, Chairman of the Housing Committee, spoke regarding the housing situation in Stamford and asked for questions.

General discussion followed as to rents, number of rooms, etc., set up by Housing Authority and what constitutes eligibility for low and moderate rent housing.

MR. LIVOLSI spoke regarding another recommendation of his Committee, which is home ownership to provide the opportunity for home ownership at low interest rates.

MR. COULTER MOVED the meeting be adjourned. SECONDED by several voices. CARRIED. Meeting adjourned at 11:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

George V. Connors
President

May 12, 1955

Report of the Fiscal Committee of the Board of Representatives covering the following City of Stamford Budgets for the fiscal year 1955-1956:

- 1. Operating Budget
- 2. Capital Projects Budget
- 3. Board of Education Budget

The Fiscal Committee approached the tremendous task of reviewing these budgets with one thought in mind, namely, - - - "It is our responsibility to approve the absolute minimum appropriation in each individual account, which is necessary to provide the taxpayers of the City of Stamford with the kind of schools and public services they demand, and to which they are entitled in exchange for the taxes they pay."

You will find that, with a few exceptions, most of the reductions recommended by this Committee have been comparatively small, so small that we honestly believe no department head will have any difficulty adjusting the costs of the operations of his department so that they will fall within the recommended budget, and at the same time provide the necessary services required by the taxpayer.

The budgets which have been requested by the Mayor, reduced and approved by the Board of Finance, have been further reduced by the recommendations of the fiscal committee as follows:

Capital Budget: After careful consideration of all the capital projects it is the opinion of this committee that on Page 11, Woodside Park, \$5000.00 Parking area, in view of the fact that \$5000.00 was granted last year for parking area and that the new school will change the road plans this item should be deferred.
 Page 7 Broad Street Extension - We support the Board of Finance and our Public Works Committee regard their suggestion on the establishment of street line on Broad Street extension.

Board of Education:

The feelings of this committee, due to the changing economic situation of the City of Stamford makes it necessary to try to effect certain savings and therefore, recommends a reduction of \$40,000.00
 We feel that certain items when they can be put out for competitive bidding and other planned projects can be utilized to effect the small reduction recommended, since the total reduced budget will then be \$4,876,000.00

Operating Budget:

The total recommended reduction in appropriations of the operating budget is \$7754.00

Page 9 - Bureau of Accounts and Records - 482.5
 Telephone deduct \$50.00 - Remain the same as last year.

May 12, 1955

863

- Operating Budget: Page 13 - Patriotic & Holiday Celebrations 486.70
Memorial Day - Deduct \$520.00 - Remain the same as last year. Six Musical Units.
- Page 17 - Assessors Office 571.14 - deduct \$100.00
Maintenance & Machine Rental - Reduce to last year.
- Page 35 - Welfare Department - 460.22 deduct \$680.
Automobile & Dictaphone. Postpone the purchase of a new dictaphone.
- Page 37 - Sunset Home, - 462.22 - deduct \$550.00
Buy enough equipment as that amount will cover. (New Equipment 462.22)
- Page 49 - Civilian Defense - Stationery & Postage
444.3 - deduct \$200.00 - Based on unencumbered balance figures.
444.4 - deduct \$250.00 - Based on unencumbered balance figures. Advertising & Printing
444A. deduct \$2000.00 Operational equipment Based on unencumbered balance figures.
444B. Personal equipment. Deduct \$500.00 based on unencumbered balance figures.
- Page 69 - City Hall Maintenance 416A.18 Alterations & Miscellaneous. Deduct \$1000.00. We have spent quite a bit of money in this account in the last two years.
- Page 73 - Hubbard Heights
413A.1 Salaries deduct \$1404.00. Got along with less last year regarding Starters.
- Page 73 - Hubbard Heights.
413A.17 Gas, Oil deduct \$500.00 the building will not be in use for the full heating seasons.

The item of rent for departments housed outside of City-owned buildings totaling some \$25,000 a year has concerned us as it did the Board of Finance. We also have approved the amounts requested this year, but we urge study immediately of the feasibility of using the Elm Street School.

/s/Samuel Picciallo
/s/Helen L. Huben
/s/Dr. F.V. Dolan
/s/Helen J. Bromley

HOUSING COMMITTEE OF BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVESREPORT ON REGISTRATION

Meeting of Committee on Monday,
May 24th, at 7:00 p.m. in the
Office of the Mayor.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Joseph Caputo, Patrick Fortunato, Robert Demms (City Housing Authority), John Cook, Frank Longo, John Mrus (Town Housing Authority), Senator Benton Grant, Dwight Marshall, Murray Meld (Community Council), P. Wardham Collyer, Mark Harris (Urban Redevelopment Commission, Mrs. Leo Malloy (Red Cross), Paul Osterby (Red Cross,) Robert Connor and Frank LiVolsi, Chairman.

FINDINGS: As a result of the registration in the public schools on May 19, 20 and 21, the following information has been obtained in regard to families being effected by the Thruway. There were 433 families who registered on the above dates. Of this total, 298 reported from the Thruway, 83 from the Quonset Huts, 33 from the Urban Redevelopment Commission, and 23 from other sources.

It is important to note that from the 298 reporting from the Thruway there was an indication that a total of 608 dwelling units existed. The figure of 608 probably indicates more closely the number of families to be displaced by the Thruway. Another factor to be considered is that many dwelling units were not reported at all. This would raise the figure of 608 considerably higher.

ELIGIBILITY FOR HOUSING:

The eligibility for various types of housing has been broken down as follows: (These figures are based upon the 433 families that registered.)

178.....Low Cost Housing
100.....Moderate Rental
155.....Ineligible for either Low Cost Housing or
Moderate Rental.

This latter group also constitutes a problem due to the fact that they cannot afford a down payment or the type of housing available to them in Stamford.

OVERALL HOUSING NEEDS:

The overall housing needs in Stamford which include figures from the City and Town Housing Authorities; and the last registration are as follows:

645 families.....Eligible for Low Cost Housing
491 families.....Eligible for Moderate Rental
379 families.....(Ineligible) Inactive for possible eligibility
(This latter group registered formerly but did not report within the three month time requirement.)
460 families.....Ineligible for Low Cost or Moderate Rental.
(They do not have sufficient money for a down payment or for the types of houses available in Stamford.)

In addition, the only housing project under construction at the present time is the Moderate Rental, adjacent to Lione Park, which on completion will have only 216 units. In addition to the figures cited above which indicate present housing needs, there will be a need for 200 additional units per year due to additional marriages and the normal growth of families.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

The Special Housing Committee has suggested and recommended the following for the purpose of relieving this housing shortage.

- (1) Senator Benton Grant has been asked by the Committee to arrange an immediate hearing before the Senate so that the problem can be more forcefully presented to our Legislature where some bills are pending regarding additional state housing.
- (2) The Committee is requesting that Town Housing Authority take all necessary steps in asking for an extension for the remaining 87 units of Quonset Huts which are livable.
- (3) A sub-committee was appointed to look into the possibility of, "Low Interest Home Ownership" either by the state or by the City. Members of this committee are as follows: Mark Harris, P. Wardham Collyer, Robert Dens, and Harry Terhune.
- (4) A sub-committee was appointed to look into the construction of cooperative housing. Members of this committee are: Patrick Fortunato, Paul Osterby, John Cook, John Mrus, Joseph Caputo.
- (5) A sub-committee was appointed to assist displaced persons with their immediate daily problems - such as help with their water and electricity. Members of this committee are: Frank Longo, Chairman, Mrs. Leo Malloy, Dwight Marshall, Murray Meld, and Robert Connor.

Mrs. Leo Malloy of the Red Cross advised that the people were deeply appreciative of the opportunity afforded them to register.

The Committee suggested that the Board of Representatives, after becoming familiar with the recommendations and steps undertaken by the Committee, entertain a vote of confidence in order that the Committee can proceed with further reassurance.

*Note: This report presented
to Board at Special
meeting held on May 26, 1955
copies mailed to those not present
at meeting.
D.Y.*