

REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF  
THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO HELD IN THE CITY  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL, ON WEDNESDAY  
JULY 5, AT 8:30 A.M.

\* \* \* \* \*

The regular meeting of the City Council was called to order by the Presiding Officer Mayor Walter W. McAllister with the following members present:

McALLISTER

DE LA GARZA

PASSUR

KAUFMAN

GUNSTREAM

GATTI

PADILLA

PARKER and;

BREMER;

ABSENT: None

The invocation was given by Councilman Roy Padilla.

On motion of Mr. Passur the reading of the minutes of the previous meeting was dispensed with.

Mrs. Sid Cockrell, President of the League of Women Voters, presented to each Council Member a copy of a citizens handbook entitled "Key to the City" which was prepared by the League in the belief that a more thorough knowledge of local government will help citizens take an active part and intelligent share in the responsibility of self-government.

Mayor McAllister thanked Mrs. Cockrell and the League for the handbook and the fine work it is doing.

First Zoning Case heard was Case 1408 to rezone Lot 21, Block 49, NCB 8458 located between Roden Street and Ramona Street 133' north of ~~Fredericksburg~~ <sup>FREDERICKSBURG</sup> Road from "B" Residence District to "E" Office District.

The Planning Director briefed the Council on the change. No one appeared in opposition.

On motion of Mr. de la Garza, seconded by Mr. Bremer, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by passage of the following ordinance by the following vote:

AYES: McAllister, de la Garza, Passur, Kaufman, Gunstream, Gatti, Padilla, Parker and Bremer;

NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

July 5, 1961

## AN ORDINANCE 29,639

AMENDING SECTION 2 OF AN ORDINANCE ENTITLED "AN ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING ZONING REGULATIONS AND DISTRICTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, ETC.," PASSED AND APPROVED ON NOVEMBER 3, 1938, BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND RE-ZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS THAT PORTION OF LOT 21, BLOCK 49, NCB 8458 WHICH IS ZONED "B" RESIDENCE DISTRICT FROM "B" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "E" OFFICE DISTRICT.

\* \* \* \* \*

Full text in Ordinance Book L L, Page

Next heard was Case 1448 to rezone Tract 2, Blk. 1, NCB 12806 located northwest of the intersection of Lasses Drive and Quig Drive, from "B" Residence District to "D" Apartment District; Tract 2, Blk. 2, NCB 12807 located on the south side of Lasses Drive 175.83' east of South New Braunfels Avenue, from "B" Residence District to "D" Apartment District; Tract 1, Blk. 1, NCB 12806 located northeast of the intersection of Lasses Drive and South New Braunfels Avenue, from "B" Residence District to "F" Local Retail District and Tract 1, Blk. 2, NCB 12807 located southeast of the intersection of Lasses Drive and S. New Braunfels Avenue, from "B" Residence District to "F" Local Retail District.

The Planning Director reviewed the proposed change. No one spoke in opposition.

On motion of Mr. Padilla, seconded by Mr. Bremer, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by passage of the following ordinance by the following vote:  
 AYES: McAllister, de la Garza, Passur, Kaufman, Gunstream, Gatti, Padilla, Parker and Bremer;  
 NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

## AN ORDINANCE 29,640

AMENDING SECTION 2 OF AN ORDINANCE ENTITLED "AN ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING ZONING REGULATIONS AND DISTRICTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, ETC.," PASSED AND APPROVED ON NOVEMBER 3, 1938, BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS TRACT 2, BLK. 1, NCB 12806 AND TRACT 2, BLK. 2, NCB 12807 FROM "B" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "D" APARTMENT DISTRICT; TRACT 1, BLK. 1, NCB 12806 AND TRACT 1, BLK. 2, NCB 12807 FROM "B" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "F" LOCAL RETAIL DISTRICT.

\* \* \* \* \*

Full text in Ordinance Book L L, Page

Next heard was Case 1452 to rezone Lot 69, Blk. 5, NCB 6793 located on the north side of East Myrtle Street approximately 168' east of North St. Mary's Street, from "D" Apartment District to "JJ" Commercial District and that portion of Lot 68, Blk. 5, NCB 6793 which is not already zoned "J" Commercial District located on the north side of East Myrtle Street, 118.0' east of North St. Mary's Street, from "D" Apartment District to "J" Commercial.

The Planning Director briefed the Council on the proposed change. No one spoke in opposition.

On motion of Mr. Padilla, seconded by Mr. Bremer, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by passage of the following ordinance by the following vote:

July 5, 1961

AYES: McAllister, de la Garza, Passur, Kaufman, Gunstream, Gatti, Padilla, Parker and Bremer;  
 NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

## AN ORDINANCE 29,641

AMENDING SECTION 2 OF AN ORDINANCE ENTITLED "AN ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING ZONING REGULATIONS AND DISTRICTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, ETC.," PASSED AND APPROVED ON NOVEMBER 3, 1938, BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS LOT 69, BLK. 5, NCB 6793 FROM "D" APARTMENT DISTRICT TO "JJ" COMMERCIAL DISTRICT AND THAT PORTION OF LOT 68, BLK. 5, NCB 6793 WHICH IS NOT ALREADY ZONED "J" COMMERCIAL FROM "D" APARTMENT DISTRICT TO "J" COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.

\* \* \* \* \*

Full text in Ordinance Book L L, Page

Next heard was Case 1470 to rezone Lot 7, NCB 3857 located on the south side of Brahan Boulevard, 269.75' east of Broadway and Lot 8, NCB 3857 located northwest of the intersection of Cunningham Avenue and Haywood Avenue, from "D" Apartment District to "F" Local Retail District.

Mr. Pat Swearingin, Attorney for the Gillespie Realty Company applicant in the case, stated they had asked for a change from "D" TO "H" but the Planning Commission has asked them to agree to "F" which did <sup>NOT</sup> permit construction of garage facilities. These lots are adjacent to "J" Commercial zone. They also own Lots 5 and 6 which are "D" Apartment zone for which no change was asked. The present restrictions on Lots 7 and 8 make it impracticable to use the property properly. He stated that Brahan and Haywood have been screened to protect the property across the street. They have agreed, on the request of the Planning Commission, to a non-access easement on Brahan and Haywood, a<sup>nd</sup> 50 feet on Cunningham, this having been done by plat. This, he said, would provide more protection to the people across the street than before. The property in question would be used as part of the Ford dealership. He presented pictures showing the screening that has been provided.

Col. S. M. Crim of 310 Brahan protested the change and read the following statement:

This is the eighth time in four and one-half years that owners of residential property in my area have appeared at public hearings in City Hall, held by official bodies of the City government. All of these appearances have been actuated by applications for special privileges, and concessions favoring the same group who are the applicants in the present case. There were also two other hearings held last year, but we were not invited.

All of the previous applications, as well as this one, have sought privileges and favors potentially destructive, insofar as out property values and environments for pleasant living are concerned. It seems terribly unfair that law-abiding citizens, who have invested hard earned money in homes for their families, or other families, should be continually subjected to harassment by any individual, or group, seeking by devious methods to encroach on a firmly established residential area. They seek to establish non-essential commercial activities in an area where they should not exist. This effort, of course, is prompted by a desire for private financial gain.

July 5, 1961

Almost everyone recognizes, and concedes, the right of individuals to invest private funds in business ventures with a profit motive in mind, provided such ventures are legitimate and do not, by their very nature and location, deny or destroy even more important and essential rights of others, in the process.

When the Gillespie Realty Company bought the property in question from David C. Benthiff of Houston and W. L. Moody of San Antonio, in 1957, the firm was fully aware of the restrictions pertaining to use of the areas in Tracts 2 and 4. They were not forced to buy it.

At a City Council hearing in November, 1956, the senior member of the firm involved in today's case requested a change in zoning to permit commercial use of the entire area bounded by Broadway, Brahan Boulevard, Haywood Street, and Cunningham Avenue, an area containing 5.6 acres. The request was denied.

At another Council hearing June 6, 1957, commercial use of Tract 1 was approved. Tracts 2, 3 and 4 remained zoned for Residential Use Only. Several weeks subsequent to this hearing, the legal transfer of the property to its present owners took place.

Without going into details at this time, it can be emphatically stated that an 8-1/2 ft. mesh fence, including barbwire on top, was erected around the outer perimeter of Tracts 2 and 4 during June and July, 1958, enclosing these tracts with parts of the commercial area. No permit was obtained for this fence. Since that time, the two tracts in question have been used almost continuously for commercial purposes.

At a hearing before the Zoning Adjustment Board on July 30, 1958, this firm sought and obtained authority for off-street parking of customers' and employees' cars on these tracts. Even at that very hour, company owned cars and wrecks were on them. Since then employees' cars have been parked on both sides of Brahan and Cunningham each working day. We were given numerous promises by City officials to eliminate violations on the property, but it was not done.

At public hearings on this continuing case, representatives of the applicant firm have used the absurd argument that because there is other commercial activity in the general vicinity, the firm's request should be granted. In view of their repeated emphasis on the extent of commercial area in the vicinity, let us look at a comparative score sheet. The figures I quote are approximately correct.

Directly across Cunningham from the applicant's premises, the property abutting north Alamo has a commercial zone extending east 375 ft. along the south edge of Cunningham. The Gillespie property abutting Broadway has an approved commercial zone extending east 700 ft. along the north edge of Cunningham. If the present application were approved, that zone would stretch to 850 ft.

Going north on Broadway from Gillespie's, the maximum width of the commercial strip in the next three blocks is as follows: 2400 block, 240 ft.; 2500 block, 160 ft.; 2600 block, 285 ft. Thus we see who is the undisputed champion in annexation of commercial privilege adjacent to resident districts in that vicinity; and they are still grasping for more.

If the present request is granted, a more glaring example of "spot" zoning would indeed be difficult to find.

If this zoning change is approved, then, as you well know, the present owners, or any future owners of the property, will be authorized to erect and operate, on the premises, any of the following commercial establishments: bakery, bank, office, ice station, dyeing or cleaning works, laundry, filling station, restaurant, theater, moving picture show, tourist or trailer camp, retail store, etc.

All of the above named activities are perfectly proper, and useful, if located in appropriate areas. There is certainly no need for them in our area, and I believe every person in this room will admit inwardly that if permitted they would reduce still further the market value of residential property in the vicinity. I believe they will also admit these activities would detract immeasurably from the desirability and enjoyment of such property as homes.

After the Council hearing on this in June, 1957 (when commercial use of Tract 1 was authorized) a City official remarked, "We can assume with confidence that a reputable firm will abide by the rules, and will be considerate of the area's interests." Will a study of the record prove that assumption well founded? What will the result be if the present application is approved?

July 5, 1961

The zoning change sought by the applicant would also permit new and used car lots on the property. Both tracts in question have already been used for parking new and used company-owned cars for almost three years. During the greater portion of this period such use was in open violation of well-known zoning laws of this city. No one can truthfully deny that such use was and still is commercial in nature.

In March of last year, the law firm representing the applicant here sent a letter to the head of a City department, in which reference was made to an enclosed suggested form of ordinance pertaining to parking of vehicles in "D" and "E" apartment districts.

This suggested form, with minor revisions, became City Ordinance No. 28463-A, May 12, 1960, and has been added to the City Code on zoning as sub-section (14) of Section 42-31.

The ordinance referred to above contains the following: "In the "D" and "E" Apartment Districts, vacant land adjacent to property with "F" Local Retail or a less restricted zoning classification may be used for the off-street parking of vehicles, that is, parking without charge of vehicles belonging to the owner, lessee, or tenant of the premises." You will note it does not limit such parking to personally owned vehicles.

The record shows that no member of the City Council as now constituted was present when the ordinance was passed. Perhaps past Council members who were present were not aware of the motives and implications involved in the project. I prefer to believe it happened that way.

When I saw the official records on that case at City Hall in July, 1960 (two months after passage of the ordinance) I found no mention of the real applicant for the change.

My thoughts pertaining to the actions of certain other people connected with the City government cannot be quite so generous. This is due to the fact that during this episode, and others, in which they were under moral and legal obligations to assist in the protection of our rights, they failed to do so. Furthermore, they were not even neutral in the matter, and gave covert assistance to sponsors of the ordinance.

This ordinance was devised and enacted as an amendment to a general ordinance. This procedure avoided any requirement for individual notices to nearby property owners, when hearings were held, although a major change in authorized use of land was involved.

Contained in this ordinance are four insidious words not there by chance. These words are "vacant land adjacent to..." Because Tracts 2 and 4 (now Lots 7 and 8) join Tract 1 (J Zone), the firm was apparently authorized to keep company-owned cars on those areas. Lot 5 is also adjacent to Tract 1, and the only weapon they need to convert it into commercial use is a permit to remove the house on it. This leaves only Lot 6 (corner of Brahan and Haywood) in the entire 5.6 acre tract not in commercial use, or vulnerable to such use.

The key to completion of what an imaginative person might call a master plan seems to be hidden in the application before you. This application seeks rezoning of Lot 8 to "F" Local Retail, and since it is adjacent to Lot 6, approval by your body would lay open this corner lot for commercial use, if the owner chooses to remove the house from it. In that case the intrusion would be complete, and the three blocks of residential property (i.e. 3855-56 and 58) as well as the owners thereof, will have received a humiliating and completely unjustified beating.

If the present Council desires to correct a grave injustice already inflicted on innocent citizens, if it desires to prevent further damage to personal and property rights, it can and should rescind Ordinance #28463-A. We earnestly urge to do so.

There are individuals and groups in the world who are misled by delusions of grandeur, or other miscalculations, and seem to assign unto themselves certain vested rights without basis, and in their efforts to attain their goal, appear to adopt a code which does not recognize the rights of others vitally affected by the plan. Enthusiasm for their project may even cause an oversight of laws and regulations covering that field.

If it is called progress when commercial activities are permitted to intrude upon residential areas in a manner that will disrupt and blight such areas; if it be progress to allow individuals or groups, seeking financial gain, to go unchecked while they in their mad rush trample the rights of others, then we pray for a bit of retrogression. Let us go back to a point where a picture of the dignity and serenity of home environment is given a status at least on a par with the dollar sign. Back to a point where the rights of the small property owners are weighed in the same balance as the rights sought by the large property owners.

In reaching decisions on zoning cases, I don't know how much weight is given to the "in favor" or "opposed" votes as shown by property owners who return their notification slips. At the hearing in this case by the Planning Commission, April 26th, the record showed eight votes "in favor." A later check of the file showed those favorable votes were as follows: (a) three votes by Gillespie Realty Company; (b) three votes by the owners of Prince's Drive-In on Broadway; (c) one by the owner of Lot 16 in the commercial zone of NCB 3856; (d) one by the owner of Lot 18 adjoining the commercial zone in the same block.

This reference does not imply criticism of any City agency or procedure. It is made simply to prevent any misunderstanding as to the sentiment of residential property owners concerning this case.

The owners of residential property in the three blocks I have mentioned do not deserve, nor request, any special favors from the Council or other City officials in this case, but

July 5, 1961

they do deserve, need, and seek your help.

That help can be given by disapproval of the zoning change you are now considering; by rescinding the ordinance I have referred to; and finally by strict enforcement of existing City laws and regulations applicable to the area. We respectfully request that such action be taken.

Also protesting the change was Mrs. Charles Rice of 231 Brahan, Mrs. J. H. Compton of 227 Brahan and Mrs. Nell Clard<sup>k</sup>, also a resident of Brahan Boulevard.

Mrs. Compton asked that a Committee of one or two Councilmen check their claims regarding violations.

Mrs. Mary Rylander, owner of property at 225 Brahan, recommended the change so that the business may expand and create more jobs. In view of the amount of business Gillespie does and amount of cars going in and out it is comparatively quiet.

Mr. Gunstream discussed the location of stables across Cunningham in Ft. Sam and about the zoning which would require "L" zone if in the jurisdiction of the City.

Mr. Gatti and Mr. Bremer questioned Mr. Swearingin about the possibility of a non-access easement being placed on Lots 5 and 6 so that they could not be used for non-commercial parking as Lots 7 and 8 are now being used.

Mr. Swearingin replied that he could not answer the question without consulting with his client, but that Lots 5 and 6 have apartments on them. There is a non-access easement provided for and there is no contemplated change in the use of Lots 5 and 6 nor Lots 7 and 8, the lots in question.

Planning Director Taylor, to a question, explained that on Lot 7 the main building could be expanded, this being the only thing they could do that they can't under present zoning. As to violations, the only thing he knew about it, was the erection of the fence and that Lot 7 was used for parking and storage of cars, which is not allowed under the present zoning.

After further discussion Mr. de la Garza moved that decision in the case be postponed one week to see if the applicant is willing to have a non-access easement on Lots 5 and 6 from Tract 1, 7 and 8. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bremer. The motion carried by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, de la Garza, Passur, Kaufman, Gunstream, Gatti, Padilla, Parker and Bremer; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

The Mayor requested that copies of the Parking Ordinance be presented to the Council Members next week for consideration.

July 5, 1961

Next heard was Case 1488 to rezone Lots A, 1 and 2, Block 9, NCB 8340 located south-east of intersection of Craig Street and St. Cloud Road from "B" Residence District to "GG" Local Retail District.

Mr. Jay Sam Levy representing the applicant, Dr. W. A. Lawrence, stated that the Planning Commission denied the request because the School Board and the Archbishop opposed the change. He said the opposition has been withdrawn and no objection was filed with the City Council. He described the property in question and the surrounding properties and its uses. He read letters in favor of the change from Les Edgar, W. L. "Bill" Allison, Robert Holden of the Y.M.C.A. and one from the Northwest Catholic Athletic Association. The matter was heard by the Planning Commission on May 17th and not anticipating any opposition he did not present any witnesses. He stated that it was planned to move the washateria from the corner of French and St. Cloud which is a traffic hazard to this location where parking is available.

Mr. Padilla then moved that the Council over-rule the Planning Commission and rezone the property "GG" Commercial. The motion was seconded by Dr. Parker.

Mr. Gunstream discussed the information presented regarding objection of the School Board and church authorities and the fact that no report was made by the Traffic Engineer in the matter.

Mr. de la Garza then made a substitute motion that action be postponed for one week in order to determine whether the School Board and church officials were opposed to the change. The motion failed for lack of a second.

The ~~V~~ote to over-rule the Planning Commission and rezone the property failed as seven affirmative votes are required to over-rule the Planning Commission. The vote was as follows: AYES: Passur, Kaufman, Gatti, Padilla, Parker and Bremer; NAYS: McAllister, de la Garza, and Gunstream; ABSENT: None.

Mr. Gunstream qualified his vote by stating that there was no evidence that the Traffic Engineer made a recommendation.

Discussion then took place as to whether the Council could reconsider its action. The City Attorney stated he would check to see and make a report. If they could reconsider, the action taken the Council could vote on it next week.

The Mayor then announced that final decision would be held in abeyance until next week.

Mr. Levy stated he would obtain evidence that objections had been withdrawn and the City Manager was requested to have the Traffic Engineer make a report on the case.

Next heard was Case 1498 to rezone the South Irregular 81.99' of Lot 30, NCB 7896 located at the northeast intersection of Stonewall Avenue and I. H. 35 Expressway from "B" Residence District to "F" Local Retail District.

The Planning Director briefed the Council on the proposed change which the Planning Commission recommended be denied by the Council.

July 5, 1961

Mr. Henry Lee Taylor, representing the applicant, gave a description of the neighborhood. He said it was proposed to operate a television repair shop in the existing building. The noise from the expressway made sleeping impossible from 3 A.M. to 8 A.M. and the property was no longer suitable for residential purposes. There was no one present in opposition to the change.

Mr. and Mrs. Clarence Riddles, applicants, also addressed the Council and asked the request be approved as all the neighbors were in favor of the change.

After consideration, Mr. Gatti moved that the Planning Commission be over-ruled and the property be rezoned "F" Local Retail District. The motion was seconded by Mr. de la Garza. The motion carrying with it the passage of the following ordinance prevailed by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, de la Garza, Passur, Kaufman, Gunstream, Gatti, Padilla, Parker and Bremer; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

## AN ORDINANCE 29,642

AMENDING SECTION 2 OF AN ORDINANCE ENTITLED "AN ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING ZONING REGULATIONS AND DISTRICTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, ETC.," PASSED AND APPROVED ON NOVEMBER 3, 1938, BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS SOUTH IRREGULAR 81.99' OF LOT 30, NCB 7896 FROM "B" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "F" LOCAL REATIL DISTRICT.

\* \* \* \* \*

Full text in Ordinance Book L L, Page

Next heard was Case 1502 to rezone Lot 38, Block 11, NCB 9214 located on the north side of Fresno 130.0' east of Blanco Road from "B" Residence Distaiect to "E" Office District.

The Planning Director briefed the Council on the change. No one appeared in opposition. On motion of Mr. Bremer, seconded by Dr. Parker, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by passage of the following ordinance by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, de la Garza, Passur, Kaufman, Gunstream, Gatti, Padilla, Parker and Bremer; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

## AN ORDINANCE 29,643

AMENDING SECTION 2 OF AN ORDINANCE ENTITLED "AN ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING ZONING REGULATIONS AND DISTRICTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, ETC.," PASSED AND APPROVED ON NOVEMBER 3, 1938, BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS LOT 38, BLOCK 11, NCB 9214 FROM "B" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "E" OFFICE DISTRICT.

\* \* \* \* \*

Full text in Ordinance Book L L, Page

Case 1454 (which had been continued from June 21) to rezone Lot 408, NCB 7850 located on Pyron Road through to Mayfield Boulevard from "B" Residence Distaiect to "J" Commercial District was next heard.

On motion of Mr. Gatti, seconded by Mr. Padilla, the case was again postponed one week to July 12th because the applicants attorney was unable to be present to represent

July 5, 1951

him. The motion carried unanimously.

Items one through seventeen on the Agenda were explained by the Purchasing Agent and recommended that the low qualified bids to furnish the supplies and service be accepted.

The following ordinances were then passed and approved, the vote in each case being as follows: AYES: McAllister, de la Garza, Passur, Kaufman, Gunstream, Gatti, Padilla, Parker and Bremer; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

AN ORDINANCE 29,644

ACCEPTING THE PROPOSAL OF AND MANIFESTING A CONTRACT WITH STRAUS FRANK COMPANY TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO WITH ALL REQUIREMENTS OF CERTAIN RADIO PARTS FOR A ONE YEAR PERIOD COMMENCING AUGUST 1, 1961 AND TERMINATING JULY 31, 1962.

\*\*\*\*\*

Full text in Ordinance Book L L, Page

AN ORDINANCE 29,645

ACCEPTING THE PROPOSAL OF AND MANIFESTING A CONTRACT WITH THE PERRY SHANKLE COMPANY TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO WITH ALL REQUIREMENTS OF CERTAIN RADIO PARTS FOR A ONE YEAR PERIOD COMMENCING AUGUST 1, 1961 AND TERMINATING JULY 31, 1962.

\*\*\*\*\*

Full text in Ordinance Book L L, Page

AN ORDINANCE 29,646

ACCEPTING THE PROPOSAL OF AND MANIFESTING A CONTRACT WITH RADIO & TELEVISIONS PARTS COMPANY TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO WITH CERTAIN RADIO PARTS FOR A ONE YEAR PERIOD COMMENCING AUGUST 1, 1961 AND TERMINATING JULY 31, 1962.

\*\*\*\*\*

Full text in Ordinance Book L L, Page

AN ORDINANCE 29,647

ACCEPTING THE PROPOSAL OF AND MANIFESTING A CONTRACT WITH MODERN ELECTRONICS COMPANY TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO WITH ALL REQUIREMENTS OF CERTAIN RADIO PARTS FOR A ONE YEAR PERIOD COMMENCING AUGUST 1, 1961 AND TERMINATING JULY 31, 1962.

\*\*\*\*\*

Full text in Ordinance Book L L, Page

AN ORDINANCE 29,648

ACCEPTING THE PROPOSAL OF AND MANIFESTING A CONTRACT WITH SHERMAN ELECTRONICS SUPPLY INC., TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO WITH ALL REQUIREMENTS OF CERTAIN RADIO PARTS FOR A ONE YEAR PERIOD COMMENCING AUGUST 1, 1961 AND TERMINATING JULY 31, 1962.

\*\*\*\*\*

Full text in Ordinance Book L L, Page

July 5, 1961

AN ORDINANCE 29,649

ACCEPTING THE PROPOSAL OF AND MANIFESTING A CONTRACT WITH WADEL-CONNALLY COMPANY TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO WITH ALL REQUIREMENTS OF AUTOMOTIVE OIL FILTER & AIR CLEANERS FOR A ONE YEAR PERIOD COMMENCING AUGUST 1, 1961 AND TERMINATING JULY 31, 1962.

\* \* \* \* \*

Full text in Ordinance Book L L, Page

AN ORDINANCE 29,650

ACCEPTING THE PROPOSAL OF AND MANIFESTING A CONTRACT WITH JESS McNEEL MACHINERY CORPORATION TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO WITH ALL REQUIREMENTS OF CAPTIVE PARTS FOR CERTAIN HEAVY EQUIPMENT FOR A ONE YEAR PERIOD COMMENCING AUGUST 1, 1961 AND TERMINATING JULY 31, 1962.

\* \* \* \* \*

Full text in Ordinance Book L L, Page

AN ORDINANCE 29,651

ACCEPTING THE PROPOSAL OF AND MANIFESTING A CONTRACT WITH MID-CONTINENT TAB CARD COMPANY AND INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINE CORPORATION TO FURNISH ALL REQUIREMENTS OF CERTAIN TABULATING CARDS FOR A ONE YEAR PERIOD COMMENCING AUGUST 1, 1961 AND TERMINATING JULY 31, 1962.

\* \* \* \* \*

Full text in Ordinance Book L L, Page

AN ORDINANCE 29,652

ACCEPTING THE PROPOSAL OF AND MANIFESTING A CONTRACT WITH McDONOUGH BROTHERS TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO WITH ALL REQUIREMENTS OF CERTAIN HOT-MIX ASPHALTIC MATERIALS AS LISTED FOR A ONE YEAR PERIOD COMMENCING AUGUST 1, 1961 AND TERMINATING JULY 31, 1962.

\* \* \* \* \*

Full text in Ordinance Book L L, Page

AN ORDINANCE 29,653

ACCEPTING THE PROPOSAL OF AND MANIFESTING A CONTRACT WITH UVALDE ROCK ASPHALT COMPANY TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO WITH ALL REQUIREMENTS OF COLD-MIX LIMESTONE ROCK ASPHALT PAVEMENT FOR A ONE YEAR PERIOD COMMENCING AUGUST 1, 1961 AND TERMINATING JULY 31, 1962.

\* \* \* \* \*

Full text in Ordinance Book L L, Page

July 5, 1961

AN ORDINANCE 29,654

ACCEPTING THE PROPOSAL OF AND MANIFESTING A CONTRACT WITH GULF STATES ASPHALT COMPANY, INC., AND WRIGHT ASPHALT PRODUCTS TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO WITH ALL REQUIREMENTS OF CERTAIN ASPHALTS AND OILS FOR A ONE YEAR PERIOD COMMENCING AUGUST 1, 1961 AND TERMINATING JULY 31, 1962.

\* \* \* \* \*

Full text in Ordinance Book L L, Page

AN ORDINANCE 29,655

ACCEPTING THE PROPOSAL OF AND MANIFESTING A CONTRACT WITH BEXAR CONCRETE COMPANY TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO WITH ALL REQUIREMENTS OF ASPHALTIC MATERIALS AS LISTED FOR A ONE YEAR PERIOD COMMENCING AUGUST 1, 1961 AND TERMINATING JULY 31, 1962.

\* \* \* \* \*

Full text in Ordinance Book L L, Page

AN ORDINANCE 29,656

ACCEPTING THE PROPOSAL OF AND MANIFESTING A CONTRACT WITH WHITE'S UVALDE MINES TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO WITH ALL REQUIREMENTS OF ASPHALTIC MATERIALS AS LISTED FOR A ONE YEAR PERIOD COMMENCING AUGUST 1, 1961 AND TERMINATING JULY 31, 1962.

\* \* \* \* \*

Full text in Ordinance Book L L, Page

AN ORDINANCE 29,657

ACCEPTING THE PROPOSAL OF AND MANIFESTING A CONTRACT WITH ROLAND SCHMIDT TO FURNISH THE CITY WITH ALL REQUIREMENTS OF CERTAIN BASE MATERIAL AS LISTED FOR A ONE YEAR PERIOD COMMENCING AUGUST 1, 1961 AND TERMINATING JULY 31, 1962.

\* \* \* \* \*

Full text in Ordinance Book L L, Page

AN ORDINANCE 29,658

ACCEPTING THE PROPOSAL OF AND MANIFESTING A CONTRACT WITH BEXAR CONCRETE COMPANY TO FURNISH THE CITY WITH ALL REQUIREMENTS OF CERTAIN BASE MATERIALS AS LISTED FOR A ONE YEAR PERIOD COMMENCING AUGUST 1, 1961 AND TERMINATING JULY 31, 1962.

\* \* \* \* \*

Full text in Ordinance Book L L, Page

July 5, 1961

AN ORDINANCE 29,659

ACCEPTING THE PROPOSAL OF AND MANIFESTING A CONTRACT WITH ACME GRAVEL COMPANY TO FURNISH THE CITY WITH ALL REQUIREMENTS OF BASE MATERIALS AND COVERSTONE AS LISTED FOR A ONE YEAR PERIOD COMMENCING AUGUST 1, 1961 AND TERMINATING JULY 31, 1962.

\* \* \* \* \*

Full text in Ordinance Book L L, Page

AN ORDINANCE 29,660

ACCEPTING THE PROPOSAL OF AND MANIFESTING A CONTRACT WITH UNIVERSAL BOOK BINDERY INC. TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO WITH ALL REQUIREMENTS OF REBINDING OF BOOKS AND MAGAZINES FOR A ONE YEAR PERIOD COMMENCING AUGUST 1, 1961 AND TERMINATING JULY 31, 1962.

\* \* \* \* \*

Full text in Ordinance Book L L, Page

The Purchasing Agent Al Tripp then presented a report showing what other cities in Texas are paying for Captive Ford Parts.

After consideration it was decided that State Law required that a drawing be held to award a contract in case of the bids, <sup>with it</sup> This would be followed.

Representatives of Jordan Motor Company, Gillespie Motor Company and Austin-Hemphill Motor Company drew lots, with Jordan Motor Company drawing the winning high number. The following ordinance was then passed and approved by the following vote:  
AYES: McAllister, de la Garza, Passur, Kaufman, Gunstream, Gatti, Padilla, Parker and Bremer;  
NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

AN ORDINANCE 29,661

ACCEPTING THE PROPOSAL OF AND MANIFESTING A CONTRACT WITH JORDAN FORD INC., TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO WITH ALL REQUIREMENTS OF FORD CAPTIVE PARTS FOR A ONE YEAR PERIOD COMMENCING AUGUST 1, 1961 AND TERMINATING JULY 31, 1962.

\* \* \* \* \*

Full text in Ordinance Book L L, Page

The following ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, de la Garza, Passur, Kaufman, Gunstream, Gatti, Padilla, Parker and Bremer; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

AN ORDINANCE 29,662

ACCEPTING THE ATTACHED LOW QUALIFIED BID OF MIKE PERSIA CHEVROLET, INC. TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT WITH ONE MOTOR VEHICLE FOR A TOTAL OF \$1539.95

\* \* \* \* \*

Full text in Ordinance Book L L, Page

Mr. Gatti instructed the City Manager to prepare a report listing all vehicles being used by City employees.

The following ordinance was read by the City Clerk:

AN ORDINANCE 29,663

APPOINTING MEMBERS OF THE ELECTRICAL EXAMINING AND SUPERVISING BOARD.

\* \* \* \* \*

Full text in Ordinance Book L L, Page

Mr. Victor Speert representing the Alamo City Contractors Association stated the organization was in accord with the appointments except that it would like to see Mr. Jesse Villareal appointed in place of Mr. Frank Allen.

The Mayor stated the Council had considered his letter recommending Mr. Villareal but that it had already been decided to appoint Mr. Allen in this case. He was told that the Council in all cases welcomes and considers recommendations made by professional organizations but, of course, is not bound by them.

On motion of Mr. Kaufman, seconded by Mr. Gunstream, the ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, de la Garza, Passur, Kaufman, Gunstream, Gatti, Padilla, Parker and Bremer; NAYS: None, ABSENT: None.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned.

A P P R O V E D :

*Wm. W. Weston*  
MAYOR

A T T E S T :

*J. H. Janselmann*  
Asst. City Clerk