

REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL  
OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO HELD IN  
THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL, ON  
THURSDAY, JUNE 15, 1972.

\* \* \* \*

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 A. M. by the presiding officer, Mayor John Gatti, with the following members present: HABERMAN, HILL, BECKER, HILLIARD, MENDOZA, GARZA, GATTI; Absent: NAYLOR, PADILLA.

72-27 The invocation was given by Reverend Carl Zimmerman, MacArthur Park Lutheran Church.

72-27 Members of the City Council and the audience joined in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of the United States of America.

72-27 The minutes of the meeting of June 8, 1972, were approved.

72-27 Mayor Gatti announced a change in the agenda saying that an Ordinance of an emergency nature would be considered first in the order of business.

72-27 The Clerk read the following Ordinance in its entirety:

AN ORDINANCE 40,806

RESCINDING AND REPEALING ORDINANCE NO.  
40625 PASSED AND APPROVED FOR PUBLICATION  
ON APRIL 20, 1972, AND PASSED AND APPROVED  
ON MAY 25, 1972, PURPORTING TO EXTEND THE  
BOUNDARY LINES OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO,  
TEXAS AND ANNEX SOME 40,565.01 ACRES OF  
LAND; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

\* \* \* \*

After consideration, on motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Mendoza, the Ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Becker, Hilliard, Mendoza, Garza, Gatti; ABSENT: Naylor, Padilla; NAYS: None.

72-27 The following Ordinances were read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. John Brooks, Director of Purchasing, and after consideration, on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Becker, Hilliard, Mendoza, Garza, Gatti; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Naylor, Padilla.

AN ORDINANCE 40,807

ACCEPTING THE LOW BID OF JAHN DENTAL  
SUPPLY COMPANY TO FURNISH THE CITY OF  
SAN ANTONIO WITH CERTAIN DENTAL EQUIPMENT  
FOR A TOTAL SUM OF \$2,450.00, LESS 2% -  
30 DAYS.

\* \* \* \*

June 15, 1972

img

## AN ORDINANCE 40,808

ACCEPTING THE LOW BID OF SIGNAL ENGINEERING COMPANY TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO WITH CERTAIN TRAFFIC CONTROL EQUIPMENT FOR A NET TOTAL OF \$7,470.00

\* \* \* \*

## AN ORDINANCE 40,809

ACCEPTING THE LOW BID OF ATLAS FLOOR COMPANY, INC. FOR CERTAIN FLOOR RENEWAL WORK AT THE GERMAN-ENGLISH SCHOOL BUILDING FOR A NET TOTAL OF \$1,622.00.

\* \* \* \*

72-27 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

## AN ORDINANCE 40,810

ACCEPTING THE LOW BID OF ROBERT L. SCOTT, INC. FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THE TRACON - FAA ADDITION AT INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A CONTRACT FOR SAID WORK, APPROPRIATING FUNDS FROM THE UNAPPROPRIATED SURPLUS, FUND 801, AND AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF \$187,500.00 TO SAID CONTRACTOR, AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF \$1,125.00 TO VERNON HELMKE AND ASSOCIATES FOR ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES, AND AUTHORIZING \$9,375.00 TO BE USED AS A MISCELLANEOUS CONTINGENCY FUND.

\* \* \* \*

The Ordinance was explained by Mr. Thomas Raffety, Director of Aviation, who stated that under this contract approximately 6,900 square feet will be added to the second floor of the airport terminal building. It will house a Terminal Radar Approach Control Unit to be installed by FAA. There will also be some other modifications and improvements made to the terminal building. He recommended that the Ordinance be approved.

After consideration, on motion of Mr. Becker, seconded by Mr. Hill, the Ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Becker, Hilliard, Mendoza, Garza, Gatti; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Naylor, Padilla.

72-27 Mayor Gatti asked Mr. Raffety for the present status of the requested planning grant for the airport.

Mr. Raffety said that the application has cleared the District Office of FAA in Houston and the Regional Office in Fort Worth. It is in Washington, D. C. now for consideration. He said that he expects it to be acted upon no later than the early part of July.

72-27 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. Thomas Raffety, Director of Aviation, and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mrs. Haberman, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Becker, Hilliard, Mendoza, Garza, Gatti; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Naylor, Padilla.

AN ORDINANCE 40,811

MAKING AND MANIFESTING A TWO YEAR  
EXTENSION OF THE CURRENT CONTRACT  
HELD BY O. ROLAND FROST, JR., D/B/A  
FROST AIRPORT CONSULTANT SERVICES.

\* \* \* \*

72-27 Mayor Gatti was obliged to leave the meeting and Mayor Pro Tem Garza presided.

72-27 The following Ordinances were read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. W. S. Clark, Land Division Chief, and after consideration, on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Becker, Hilliard, Mendoza, Garza; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Naylor, Padilla, Gatti.

AN ORDINANCE 40,812

APPROPRIATING FROM CERTAIN FUNDS AMOUNTS  
IN THE TOTAL SUM OF \$2,410.50 IN PAYMENT  
FOR EXPENSES INCURRED IN CONNECTION WITH  
LEON CREEK OUTFALL, SPECIAL PROJECT #172-  
BARRETT PARK (HUTCHINS SCHOOL AREA),  
BABCOCK ROAD WIDENING, MIRA VISTA PARK  
SITE, NORTHERN HILLS SANITARY SEWER OUTFALL,  
TURNER PROPERTY SANITARY SEWER OUTFALL,  
EXPRESSWAY INDUSTRIAL PARK SEWER OUTFALL,  
WALTERS-MOORE OVERPASS, ROSILLO CREEK OUTFALL  
AND OLD FARM SANITARY SEWER OUTFALL PROJECTS.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 40,813

APPROPRIATING \$70,400.00 OUT OF PARK BONDS  
FUND NO. 409-10, ACCOUNT NO. 49-10-10 FOR  
THE PURPOSE OF ACQUIRING TITLE TO CERTAIN  
PROPERTY IN CONNECTION WITH THE DENTON PARK  
SITE.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 40,814

GRANTING A LICENSE TO SOUTHWESTERN BELL  
TELEPHONE COMPANY TO OCCUPY SPACE UNDER  
CERTAIN STREET RIGHTS-OF-WAY ON MARTIN  
AND NAVARRO STREETS AND AUDITORIM CIRCLE,  
ADJACENT TO NEW CITY BLOCK 412, AND  
MANIFESTING AN AGREEMENT IN CONNECTION  
THEREWITH.

\* \* \* \*

72-27 Mrs. Haberman asked Mr. Clark to please give the Council a memorandum report on the effect the current sewer policy is having on easement acquisitions and difficulties being encountered as a result of the off-site sewer main existing policy.

72-27 The following Ordinances were read by the Clerk and explained by members of the Administrative Staff and after consideration, on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Becker, Hilliard, Mendoza, Garza; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Naylor, Padilla, Gatti.

AN ORDINANCE 40,815

APPROVING THE ASSIGNMENT OF THE LEASE OF BUILDING 515B AT HEMISFAIR PLAZA (KOREAN HOUSE) BY MRS. YOUNG JA PARK TO MRS. SAM YOON TAK.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 40,816

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE AN AGREEMENT WITH LYNWOOD HERRING, D/B/A L. E. HERRING GLASS BLOWING CO., FOR LEASE OF BUILDING 561 IN HEMISFAIR PLAZA FOR A ONE-YEAR TERM AT \$50.00 PER MONTH RENTAL, SAID BUILDING TO BE USED FOR THE PRACTICE OF GLASS BLOWING AND DISPLAYING GLASS-BLOWN PRODUCTS.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 40,817

ACCEPTING GRANT FROM THE U. S. DEPT. OF HOUSING & URBAN DEVELOPMENT FOR THE PROJECT INVOLVING DEVELOPMENT OF TWO PARKS IN THE MODEL NEIGHBORHOOD AREA, AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A CONTRACT WITH SAID AGENCY, AND MODIFYING THE BUDGET FOR SAID PROJECT.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 40,818

MANIFESTING AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY AND G. W. ANDERSON FOR A PERIOD OF ONE YEAR TO SPRAY PECAN TREES AND HARVEST THE 1972 PECAN CROP IN MUNICIPAL GOLF COURSES AND CERTAIN CITY PARKS.

\* \* \* \*

72-27 The Clerk read the following Resolution:

A RESOLUTION  
NO. 72-27-35

REQUESTING THE TEXAS HIGHWAY  
COMMISSION TO EXPEDITE THE WIDENING  
OF INTERSTATE LOOP 410.

\* \* \* \*

Mr. Stewart Fischer, Director of Traffic and Transportation, stated that the section of Loop 410 between Wurzbach Highway on the East and Fredericksburg Road on the West is badly overloaded. The Texas Highway Department has had plans completed for over two years for the widening of this section. The project has been held up for lack of funding. Recently, Secretary of Transportation Volpe announced the release of sizeable amounts of highway construction funds. This Resolution is simply to remind the Highway Commission that there is a serious problem and asks them to do something about it.

After consideration, on motion of Mr. Becker, seconded by Mr. Mendoza, the Resolution was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Becker, Hilliard, Mendoza, Garza; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Naylor, Padilla, Gatti.

72-27 Mayor Gatti returned to the meeting and presided.

72-27 The following Ordinances were read by the Clerk and explained by members of the Administrative Staff and after consideration, on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Becker, Mendoza, Hilliard, Garza, Gatti; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Naylor, Padilla.

AN ORDINANCE 40,819

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO SUBMIT  
AN APPLICATION TO THE GOVERNOR'S HIGHWAY  
TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION FOR A GRANT  
TO MAKE A TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICE INVENTORY.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 40,820

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN PERSONNEL TO SIGN  
CITY CHECKS AND WARRANTS AND HAVE ACCESS  
TO LOCK BOXES IN THE CITY DEPOSITORY.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 40,821

ACCEPTING \$480.31 FROM "NIGHT IN OLD  
SAN ANTONIO" AND \$548.18 FROM THE SAN  
ANTONIO CONSERVATION SOCIETY FOUNDATIONS  
AS CONTRIBUTIONS TO BE USED IN THE FUTURE  
TO RESTORE THE ESPINOSA HOUSE AND THE  
KOEHLER HOUSE IN HEMISFAIR PLAZA, ESTABLISHING

TRUST FUND 705 FOR RECEIPT OF SUCH  
GIFTS, AND EXPRESSING THE GRATITUDE  
OF THE CITY FOR SUCH CONTRIBUTIONS.

\* \* \* \*

72-27 The following Ordinances were read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. Robert MacDonald, Director of Intergovernmental Services, and after consideration, on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Becker, Mendoza, Garza, Gatti; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Hilliard, Naylor, Padilla.

AN ORDINANCE 40,822

APPROVING THE SUMMER YOUTH TRANSPORTATION  
PROJECT-1972 UNDER THE CITY 1972 SUMMER  
RECREATION SUPPORT PROGRAM, APPROVING A  
TOTAL PROJECT COST THEREFOR, AND AUTHORIZING  
SUBMISSION OF AN APPLICATION FOR GRANT  
ASSISTANCE FOR SAID PROJECT.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 40,823

DIRECTING THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL  
SERVICES TO CONTINUE THE MODEL CITIES "OFFICE  
OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PLANNING SERVICES"  
PROJECT THROUGH JANUARY 15, 1973, RATHER THAN  
THE ORIGINAL TERMINATION DATE OF AUGUST 31,  
1972, AND AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF EXTENSION  
DOCUMENTS.

\* \* \* \*

72-27 Item No. 21 of the agenda being a proposed Ordinance to extend the term of the contract for the Model Cities Craftsman Training Proposal "Build" Project was withdrawn from consideration at the request of the City Manager.

72-27 The following Ordinances were read by the Clerk and explained by Dr. William R. Ross, Director of the San Antonio Metropolitan Health District, and after consideration, on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Becker, Hilliard, Mendoza, Garza, Gatti; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Naylor, Padilla.

AN ORDINANCE 40,824

AUTHORIZING THE ESTABLISHMENT AND OPERATION  
OF A SMALL ANIMAL HOSPITAL AT 9324 I. H. 35  
NORTH.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 40,825

AUTHORIZING THE CONSTRUCTION, ESTABLISHMENT  
AND OPERATION OF A SMALL ANIMAL HOSPITAL AT  
3810 PLEASANTON ROAD.

\* \* \* \*

72-27 The following Resolution was read by the Clerk, and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Becker, seconded by Mr. Hill, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Becker, Hilliard, Mendoza, Garza, Gatti; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Naylor, Padilla.

A RESOLUTION  
NO. 72-27-36

SUPPORTING THE EFFORTS OF GOODWILL  
INDUSTRIES AND EMCO DEVELOPERS, INC.  
TO OBTAIN FUNDS FOR CONDUCTING A STUDY  
CONCERNING DEVELOPMENT OF A "BARRIER-  
FREE" FACILITY TO PROVIDE HOUSING AND  
TRAINING FOR HANDICAPPED CITIZENS,  
AND DIRECTING ALL CITY DEPARTMENTS TO  
COOPERATE IN PREPARATION OF THE GRANT  
APPLICATION.

\* \* \* \*

72-27 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk, and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Garza, seconded by Mr. Mendoza, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Becker, Hilliard, Mendoza, Garza, Gatti; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Naylor, Padilla.

AN ORDINANCE 40,826

APPOINTING MEMBERS TO THE MAYOR'S  
COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN  
FOR TERMS ENDING MAY 6, 1973.  
(MRS. JOHN H. BRAUBACH REPLACING  
MISS DIANE SMITH WHO HAS RESIGNED,  
AND MRS. JOYCE SHEFTS APPOINTED AS  
ALTERNATE MEMBER.)

\* \* \* \*

72-27 The following Ordinances were read by the Clerk, and explained by Mr. Bob Macdonald, Director of Intergovernmental Services, and after consideration, on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Becker, Hilliard, Mendoza, Garza, Gatti; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Naylor, Padilla.

AN ORDINANCE 40,827

THE ACCEPTING A GRANT OF \$324,000.00 FROM  
THE U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR FOR  
OPERATING A RECREATION SUPPORT PROGRAM

FOR SUMMER, 1972, ESTABLISHING AN OPERATING BUDGET AND PERSONNEL COMPLEMENT, AND AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF SUBCONTRACTS WITH TWENTY-FIVE SUBCONTRACTING AGENCIES FOR CARRYING OUT PORTIONS OF SAID PROGRAM.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 40,828

ACCEPTING AN INCREASE OF \$297,699.20 IN THE GRANT FROM THE U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOR ESTABLISHING AND OPERATING A SPECIAL FOOD SERVICE FOR CHILDREN FOR SUMMER, 1972, PROVIDING CHANGES TO THE PROJECT BUDGET THEREFOR, AND AUTHORIZING TEMPORARY TRANSFER OF FUNDS PENDING RECEIPT OF FEDERAL FUNDS.

\* \* \* \*

72-27

LEGAL DEFENSE FOR POLICE OFFICERS

Mayor Gatti inquired of City Manager Loyd Hunt if he has any recommendations with reference to the idea of the City representing police officers in certain legal suits.

City Manager Hunt stated that a policy and procedure has been evolved which will be formally presented to the City Council for consideration. The policy would provide legal defense for police officers except for cases not in line of duty or for an unlawful act. This will be ready for presentation next week.

72-27

CITY MANAGER REPORTS

BUDGET

City Manager Loyd Hunt stated that under the budget schedule, it was intended that the tentative budget be submitted to the Council today. However, this submission will not be ready until June 22, 1972.

COLLEGE WORK-STUDY PROGRAM

Mr. Hunt reported that under the college work-study program which is in operation, 85 positions have been filled. The remaining 25 positions will be filled by July 1, by students from San Antonio College.

72-27

ZONING HEARINGS

A. CASE 4592 - to rezone a 21.279 acre tract of land out of Tract 3 and 4, NCB 11607, being further described by field notes filed in the office of the City Clerk, 5700, 5800 and 5900 Block of Callaghan Road,

from Temporary "R-1" and "A" Single Family Residential District to "B-1" Business District; and a 20.005 acre tract of land out of Tract 1, NCB 11607, being further described by field notes filed in the office of the City Clerk, 4700 and 4800 Block of N.W. Loop 410, from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District to "B-3" Business District.

The 21.279 acre tract of land is located between N.W. Loop 410 and Callaghan Road; being 650.44' southwest and 2353.58' west of the cutback between N.W. Loop 410 and Callaghan Road; having 1315.59' on Callaghan Road, 293.66' on N.W. Loop 410 and a maximum depth of 1762.61'.

The 20.005 acre tract of land is located on the south side of N.W. Loop 410 being 1065' west of the cutback between N.W. Loop 410 and Callaghan Road having 1288.58' on N.W. Loop 410 and a maximum depth of 1162.55'.

Mr. Gene Camargo, Planning Administrator, explained the proposed change, which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, Mr. Becker made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that proper replatting is accomplished and that a six foot (6') solid screen fence be erected on the southwest property line from Callaghan Road to the "R-3" zoning and there be a 50' building setback line of which a minimum 10' will be landscaped as a buffer for residential area. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hill. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Becker, Garza, Gatti; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Hilliard, Mendoza, Naylor, Padilla.

#### AN ORDINANCE 40,829

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS A 21.279 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF TRACT 3 AND 4, NCB 11607, BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, 5700, 5800 AND 5900 BLOCK OF CALLAGHAN ROAD, FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" AND "A" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-1" BUSINESS DISTRICT; AND A 20.005 ACRE, OUT OF TRACT 1, NCB 11607, BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, 4700 AND 4800 BLOCK OF N.W. LOOP 410, FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER REPLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED AND THAT A SIX FOOT (6') SOLID SCREEN FENCE BE ERECTED ON THE SOUTHWEST PROPERTY LINE FROM CALLAGHAN ROAD TO "R-3" ZONING AND THAT THERE BE A 50' BUILDING SET-BACK LINE OF WHICH A MINIMUM OF 10' WILL BE LANDSCAPED AS A BUFFER FOR RESIDENTIAL AREA.

\* \* \* \*

B. CASE 4460 - to rezone Lot 73, Block 2, NCB 14132 and Lots 1 and 2, Block 11, NCB 14141, 2916 Whisper View, 14121 Whisper Valley and 11631 Whisper Valley, from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District to "R-6" Townhouse Residential District, located on the west side of Whisper Valley. Lot 73, being south of the intersection of Whisper Valley and Whisper View; having 127.36' on Whisper Valley and 255.82' on Whisper View. Lots 1 and 2, being northwest of the intersection of Whisper Valley and Whisper View; having 228.26' on Whisper View and 1234.32' on Whisper Valley.

Mr. Gene Camargo, Planning Administrator, explained the proposed change, which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, Mr. Garza made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that proper replatting is accomplished. Mr. Becker seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Becker, Garza, Gatti; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Hilliard, Mendoza, Naylor, Padilla.

AN ORDINANCE 40,830

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE  
 THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE  
 ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN  
 ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION  
 AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY  
 DESCRIBED HEREIN AS LOT 73, BLOCK 2,  
 NCB 14132 AND LOTS 1 AND 2, BLOCK 11,  
 NCB 14141, 2916 WHISPER VIEW, 14121  
 WHISPER VALLEY, AND 11631 WHISPER  
 VALLEY, FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" SINGLE  
 FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "R-6"  
 TOWNHOUSE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, PROVIDED  
 THAT PROPER REPLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

\* \* \* \*

C. CASE 4579 - to rezone 31.055 acres out of NCB 8644, being further described by field notes filed in the office of the City Clerk, 11400 Block of Jones-Maltsberger, from "A" Single Family Residential District to "I-1" Light Industry District, located on the southeast side of Jones-Maltsberger Road, 1948' southwest of the cutback between Jones-Maltsberger Road and Bitters Road; having 1241.49' on Jones-Maltsberger Road and a maximum depth of 1162.52.

Mr. Gene Camargo, Planning Administrator, explained the proposed change, which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, Mr. Hill made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that proper replatting is accomplished. The motion was seconded by Mr. Becker. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Becker, Hilliard, Garza, Gatti; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Mendoza, Naylor, Padilla.

AN ORDINANCE 40,831

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS 31.055 ACRES OUT OF NCB 8644, BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, 11400 BLOCK OF JONES-MALTSBERGER ROAD, FROM "A" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "I-1" LIGHT INDUSTRY DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER REPLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

\* \* \* \*

D. CASE 4590 - to rezone Lot 105 and the west 25' of Lot 106, Block 12, NCB 9312, 1138 S. W. Military Drive, from "C" Apartment District to "B-3" Business District, located southeast of the intersection of S. W. Military Drive and Garnett Avenue; having 152.1' on Garnett Avenue and 75' on S. W. Military Drive.

Mr. Gene Camargo, Planning Administrator, explained the proposed change, which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, Mr. Becker made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that proper replatting is accomplished. Mr. Hill seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Becker, Hilliard, Garza, Gatti; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Mendoza, Naylor, Padilla.

AN ORDINANCE 40,832

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS LOT 105 AND THE WEST 25' OF LOT 106, BLOCK 12, NCB 9312, 1138 S. W. MILITARY DRIVE, FROM "C" APARTMENT DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER REPLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

\* \* \* \*

June 15, 1972

-11-

nsr

738  
JUN 15 1972

E. CASE 4596 - to rezone Lot 82 and the west 25' of Lot 83, Block 9, NCB 9309, 1422 S. W. Military Drive, from "C" Apartment District to "B-3" Business District, located on the south side of S. W. Military Drive approximately 225' west of the intersection of S. W. Military and Burton Avenue having 75' on S. W. Military Drive and a depth of 152'.

Mr. Gene Camargo, Planning Administrator, explained the proposed change, which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, Mr. Garza made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that proper replatting is accomplished and that a six foot (6') solid screen fence be erected along the south property line. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hill. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Becker, Hilliard, Garza, Gatti; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Mendoza, Naylor, Padilla.

AN ORDINANCE 40,833

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS LOT 82 AND THE WEST 25' OF LOT 83, BLOCK 9, NCB 9309, 1422 S. W. MILITARY DRIVE, FROM "C" APARTMENT DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER REPLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED AND THAT A SIX FOOT (6') SOLID SCREEN FENCE BE ERECTED ALONG THE SOUTH PROPERTY LINE.

\* \* \* \*

72-27 PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE

MAYOR JOHN GATTI: We will now open the public hearing to consider an ordinance amending the City Code pertaining to the PUD ordinance. We will hear from Mr. Mel Hughes, Chairman of the Planning Commission, first.

MR. MEL HUGHES: Mr. Mayor and members of the Council, it is my pleasure on behalf of the Planning Commission to present to you for your study and action the Commission's recommended draft of the Planned Unit Development article to be added to our City Code.

The incorporation of the Planned Unit Development concept into our land use regulations is probably somewhat overdue. Due to the press of more important business on the part of the Planning Department staff and also a limited staff which has now been substantially rectified, there has been some delay in presenting this matter to you.

This concept has been in the thinking of the Planning Commission and the Planning staff for approximately two years. This particular version of the PUD article has been in development since last June when the Planning Director at the request of the City Manager assigned Mr. Fred Kizer and Mr. Dan Taylor of our Planning staff the responsibility of coming up with a Planned Unit Development article for

your consideration. These two gentlemen have worked long and hard on this proposal. They have met with many interested groups.

On last January 16, the Planning Commission had a public hearing on this Planned Unit Development article. We recessed our hearing and reconvened it on February 16, and, after several other work sessions, we had another informal session again with the various interested groups that appeared at the original hearing. We had some additional staff meetings on the matter and then finally we came up with what we felt was as good a recommended article as we could present to you on April 17.

We, of course, met with the home builders and the other interested people, and we have resolved many differences with regard to this matter. There are, I think, probably one or two that still remain for your decision. We didn't want to solve all of the problems. I understand that since that time there have been other recommendations made, and I know that the Planning Commission received a recommendation from a citizen yesterday. As a result of this hearing today and your very serious consideration of this amendment to our Code, I am most hopeful on behalf of the Planning Commission that, and I know, that we will come up with a provision and an amendment to our Code that will be workable and one that will give our City a new tool to go forward.

I appreciate the opportunity to present our draft to you. If I might just take a second, I would like to present our new Vice Chairman of the Planning Commission, Mrs. Margaret Lecznar.

MAYOR GATTI: Mel, before you go back, I really want to thank you and the Planning Commission for the Council for the agonizing job that I know you have gone through on this PUD ordinance as well as all of the other things that you have been doing. Probably, I guess the Planning Commission is the board that spends more time at civic activities than any other board we have. We are indebted to you and thank you very much.

MR. HUGHES: Thank you very much, Mr. Mayor. We enjoy our work.

MAYOR GATTI: You've also got the attitude that you can't please everybody. So, we will begin the hearing with that in mind. We have citizens to be heard on this, and we are going to follow the same procedure that we do in other hearings. There will be a five minute time limit and those of you that are going to make a presentation please give us your name and your business and address.

MR. ED DAVIS, PLANNING DIRECTOR: Thank you, Mayor Gatti. Mr. Dan Taylor, Principal Planner on our staff, who has been the prime staff person working up the PUD article would like to make some brief staff comments at this time.

MR. DAN TAYLOR: Mr. Mayor, members of the Council, I'd like to make some brief explanation before we start the public hearing. First of all to members of the audience that may be confused, the Council has the official copy and legal order and way it will be put into the Code. Members of the audience may have this old version which is exactly the same but page numbers are different and some of the section numbers are different but the material is the same. If there is any confusion, I have both copies, and I will try to correct it.

June 15, 1972  
nsr

-13-

I'd like to talk just very briefly about what the Planned Unit Development concept is and what we are trying to do with it. I will cover one or two points before we open this public hearing.

First, I'd like to explain that the first eight pages of this proposed ordinance are simply changes that have to be made in the subdivision regulations and other parts of the zoning ordinance to make the Planned Unit Development article compatible.

We do gain one or two benefits. One is in the townhouse regulations. We have now modified the ordinance and townhouses are allowed in R-3, B-1, B-2, B-3, and B-4 Districts. This was not the case before which does improve the ordinance. It gives it more flexibility. That makes the Planned Unit Development article work and is just generally helpful.

We also have the possibility now of requiring safety lanes in Planned Units if we desire. This was necessary to make Planned building groups and other developments compatible with planned units when they are adjacent. We do need safety lanes in Planned Unit Developments. Now, we have the concept and can use it as we wish. This is a vehicle whereby the Traffic Department and Police Department can enforce parking regulations on the safety lanes so we can have access by emergency vehicles.

I'd like to talk just very briefly about the goals of Planned Unit Developments. They are set out in the article. I think they can be very briefly summarized by two ideas. One is better living and working environment which will be possible through this more flexible approach to our existing standards. Two, is the possible cost savings to the developer, homeowners and to the City. The developer by, when appropriate, being able to overcome some of our rather rigid standards the way we have to handle them in our existing ordinances, can build a unit cheaper and better than he can do so under conventional developing. These savings can be passed on to the homeowner. The homeowner also gains because he gets economy of scale if he chooses this type of living. For example, his common area can share a swimming pool with his neighbor. He doesn't have to build his own pool. He can share tree maintenance, lawn cutting with a whole group, rather than each individual being strapped with that cost. The City gains because we do not have to build as many neighborhood parks in areas where Planned Unit Developments are. Neighborhood parks are one of our more difficult parks to plan for and very expensive to develop. In some cases, we will not have to provide them because they will be handled internally in the Planned Unit Development.

I'd like to talk just very briefly about the differences between conventional development condominium PUD-1 and PUD-2 which we are proposing in this article. Conventional land use controls are designed to protect the health, safety, morals and general welfare of the public, but they are related to conventional ownership. They do not allow for the idea of a common area privately owned. Also, the way they have to be handled, first zoning and later subdivision control, we cannot relax our standards. We are likely to be more rigid than we like to be because when a person comes in for a zoning change we do not know what his ultimate use is going to be. By looking at a plan of development we can put all of these things together and relax some of our standards and still conform to the needs to provide for the health, safety, morals and general welfare of the public.

Condominiums attack the first problem of the ownership problem. In other words, a condominium does allow for mixed ownership where an individual can own a unit, and he can own a fractional part of common open space. But, it does not get at this problem of combining the controls - the land use controls, subdivision regulations and zoning ordinances.

Planned Unit Developments do the same thing as condominiums in terms of ownership except slightly differently. A condominium is a fractional ownership with a common area. In a Planned Unit Development you are assessed, and you get one vote to the association that is taking care of the common space on the basis of the one lot that you own. If you own two or more lots you have two or more votes and you are assessed on two or more lots. The main point is that Planned Unit Developments do bring together the zoning ordinance and the subdivision regulations and therefore allow standards to be relaxed that normally have to be rather rigidly enforced.

Now, we have two concepts in this article - PUD-1 and PUD-2. I'd like to explain briefly the difference between those. Neither one is a zone. Both of them are simply a tool that is used within the existing zoning. PUD-1 is envisioned to be used in any one zone or combination of zones. You can require zoning changes to make PUD-1 work the way you want it to, but it is not envisioned that PUD-1 has to come to be approved by the City Council. It will be handled at the Planning Commission level just as a subdivision plat is handled except that it will be a slightly more complex procedure involving some various City departments that are not involved with plats reviewing the planned development.

It was not envisioned when this article was first written that there be even a public hearing for PUD-1. It was intended that PUD-1 conform as closely as possible on its perimeter to the conventional development that might be around it. Therefore, what we are saying is that the side yard setback on the perimeter would be very similar to what is in the conventional development. Once you got into the interior of the Planned Unit Development that's where the flexibility begins. Therefore, there should be no need for a public hearing as you are not conflicting with your neighbors in the conventional development. It is now questionable whether this is so or not because we have relaxed a few points which should carefully consider this problem. We need to relate the idea of no public hearing for PUD-1 in a very small minimum size of two acres and relaxation of standards. We need to take a re-look at all of this because it is questionable whether we need a public hearing or not. From a staff point of view we gain efficiency by not having a public hearing. However, it may even be questioned legally now, and I'm sure there are many people in the audience who think this is a sore point.

A PUD-2 is a different type of animal all together. It is a radical departure from existing standards. It has no relation at all to conventional development. Therefore, it does require a special zone which has to be passed by the City Council. In addition, it requires a public hearing at the Planning Commission level. It is designed to be used only in specific areas such as the central business district and other centers of like intensity - say the area around North Star Mall. This could develop into a major high density node where we would like the concept of PUD-2 to be used. It is extremely radical in that there are very few guidelines or controls. The intention is that it should not only be used for concepts that we can't envision now - mega-structure type things, where we are talking about parking, light

industry, residential, whatever, all-in-one buildings, but we don't want to be strapped with regular zoning regulations. It is anticipated to be used that way and is also anticipated to be used experimentally because there are very few controls. It offers the ultimate in flexibility and at the same time the ultimate possibility for municipal arbitrariness. In other words, we have no guidelines when we evaluate a project and therefore we treat each one as it comes up, and we aren't necessarily going to be fair or equal or uniform in our treatment. That is inevitable. That's why we do envision it to be a very limited tool, but one we think is worth having now and experimenting with.

That, briefly, wraps up the two concepts. I'd like to talk about one last item that is somewhat controversial also which I think is really the heart of our proposal. That is land use intensity ratings. We have added one additional concept to the traditional density and that is this idea of land use intensity. We will look at floor area ratios, in relationship to total site area, open space and livability space ratios in relationship to floor area. Open space is everything that isn't the primary building. This can include - we do allow some structures to fall into this category. Livability space, however, is precisely open space that is grass or trees or at least developed recreation space - something other than paved parking, streets, whatnot. Many cities do not use land use intensity. Rather they have something such as use of simple percentage requirement for open space. The trouble with this is it provides no sliding scale. Land use intensity does allow a difference in a concept between R-1 up to R-3. We require more a one level and less at the higher density level so that a person can really choose life style. The fixed percentage does not do that. It also offers more control than fixed percentage because we have to remember that when we relax all of our interior controls now we do not have any overall coverage requirements or yard requirements that you have in conventional zoning. We do need this as a tool for when we evaluate Planned Unit Developments. This does help the staff to have a guideline to go by and make a much more rapid evaluation on whether a project is good or bad because they do have these fixed guidelines.

There are a number of problems yet to be resolved in administrative level problems. One of this is "How do we deal with Planned Unit Developments in the ETJ?" It was our intention that it be allowed in the ETJ, however, we have no controls over that area. One way suggested by Mr. Henckel was that we require annexation - a request for annexation - at the time a person applies for a Planned Unit Development. That would solve that problem. It might create problems of having spots way out - five miles in our ETJ.

There are other problems that have to be worked out but can be handled at the administrative level such as taxing, lot numbering, street names, etc. There are a few points that have been lost in the current proposal that the planning staff would like to see back in. In attempting to resolve these issues between the various groups we did lose the concept of a landscaping plan. We feel that would be a useful tool to put back in. As I mentioned previously we also think a careful look should be taken at this idea of minimum size of two acres versus no public hearing versus the relaxed standards in PUD-1.

There are also, as Mr. Hughes mentioned, a number of new ideas that have been introduced since April 17. Some of these people have come up today with very good ideas and we think they should be looked at, such as the concept of staging which will be presented to you. We have it in the article now, but it is very weak. We found this out when we attempted to use it, and we feel some of the suggestions being made today will improve the wrinkles that exist now. We do feel that we are very close to having a good article, and we do feel that it should be put on the books as rapidly as possible so that we can begin to evaluate. Thank you very much.

June 15, 1972

-16-

nsr

MR. CHARLES BECKER: May I ask Mr. Taylor a question? In order to clarify a matter for me that I am vague on, does this encompass any commercial activity?

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, sir, in two ways. First of all, it can be a commercial PUD if that is to the advantage of a developer. He could simply use it as a commercial tool.

MR. BECKER: All right. Now the reason I'm asking you that is because there seems to be somewhat of a trend nationwide, perhaps, to try to plan the number of filling stations, convenience stores, super markets, hot dog stands, hamburger drive-ins, or whatever. Now, I always have to question this sort of thing because, naturally, I'm on the other side of the fence. Oddly enough, and I guess it's been coincidental, I've helped zone some property while I've been on this Council that has since turned into sites for competitive stores. I might say that I'm very happy to have done so. I welcome this type of thing. As a matter of fact one of them is going to be developed into a super market location directly in back of a store that we presently have. This is the way I like it, because there is nothing better than good competition. I do look askance and with suspicion upon attempts to number the facilities in the neighborhood such as the number of convenience stores, service stations and whatnot. I don't know that this is compatible with what I prefer to call, for lack of a better term, the free enterprise system. Does this sort of thing envision any of that type of activity? Any of those restraints?

MR. TAYLOR: No, sir. I must qualify that remark. We do now allow in addition to being able to build commercial type Planned Unit Development, we also allow the existing residential zone if we do use the PUD tool very minor commercial activity, but these activities have to be small enough to serve only the residents in the Planned Unit Development.

MR. BECKER: The point I'm trying to make is that if a person wants to spend their money and go into competition with another identical business, whether there is one there or a dozen, I think that should be his determination.

MR. TAYLOR: This article does not get into that at all.

MR. BECKER: Good. Thank you, Mr. Taylor.

MRS. CAROL HABERMAN: Does a PUD-1 and PUD-2 apply to the ETJ area?

MR. TAYLOR: The problem is we can't do anything about it. We can't enforce it.

MR. DAVIS: One thing that I would like to stress is that the PUD is an optional development guide for the developers to use. It is not a mandatory ordinance.

MAYOR GATTI: Okay, Mr. Garza.

MR. ROY GARZA: Mayor Gatti, Council members, my name is Roy Garza. I am an architect and I am here representing the local chapter of the American Institute of Architects. Interested members and my committee from the chapter have reviewed and have been kept abreast of the working sessions and have followed this ordinance since its inception, and we have worked with the Planning Commission and have made some recommendations some of which have been incorporated, some of which have not. Other interested groups have made recommendations. We feel that all in all this is a good ordinance. It is a compromise, but I think it is a

fair compromise to everyone concerned and everyone that is going to be affected by it. Some of the groups have, and they might today, raise some points that they would like to have no set back requirements, no land use intensity rating, no landscaping plan and I think if these things are incorporated you might as well do away with your existing subdivision ordinances because everything will be a PUD and everything will be under this requirement, and they can do anything they want. We feel that the ordinance as presented, with the minor exception, we agree with the Planning Department, that the landscaping requirement should be in there. Other than this point, we would ask you to consider adopting the ordinance as presented.

June 15, 1972  
nsr

-18-

MAYOR GATTI: Thank you, Mr. Garza.

MR. DOUG L. SAUNDERS: My name is Douglas L. Saunders, I am a real estate developer and I am here to speak in my own behalf and not for any particular group. I first want to commend the City of San Antonio and the City Council and Planning Commission and everyone on the staff involved for their efforts in this direction. It is a very timely proposition throughout the United States as you are all well aware. It is certainly a step in the direction of proper planning, creating environments that are beneficial to our area rather than detrimental.

I direct my comments to several points that I feel, and this information I did gain through consultations since the ordinance was proposed with people that are very knowledgeable on this subject, Mr. Ed Cohee who is with the firm of Sacautee, Walker, and Buckley in California, and Mr. Frank Spink with the, who is the director on the Community Builders' Council for the Urban Land Institute, who, as you probably know is the foremost professional organization in the Country dealing with real estate developments. They were both very adamant on the point of phase approval. First of all they said that our ordinance was basically a good one, but they said it did have several minor flaws which they thought could be incorporated, and this is something, of course, that if you wish to go ahead and adopt the ordinance, which I certainly would recommend that can be handled by later review and amendment. They felt that it is absolutely mandatory to make this ordinance workable for larger developments and for increasing the quality of the developments that we have a phase approval system which the present ordinance is weak on. If I may read from Mr. Casey's letter, I think that it will probably point out more clearly exactly what he's referring to. Now, in this let me point out that while the ordinance covers a parcel, as I understand it, as little as two acres, you still have to think in terms of perhaps two, three, or four hundred acres. He said, of course, first of all, he thinks the City should be commended and encouragement should be given to the Planned Unit Approach to developments and should result in better environments. "However, many of these ordinances have been written in such a way as to make it very difficult if not impossible for a prospective developer to use them. The big problem in this regard is the requirement of a very detailed information such as finished grades and final building locations and lay outs even before planning approval can be considered. Such detailed information cannot be meaningfully supplied in the planning phase of any large project. What can be supplied, is information about the main features of the proposed development such as overall land use, housing types, densities, road circulation and open space. This should then be followed up in a second step approval of a detailed plan for any subsequent phase of work." In other words, if you had a 200, 300, or 400 acre involvement, you'd submit a master plan, get a tentative approval on the master plan, and then come in with the subsequent individual planned unit developments encompassing 2 to 5, 10 or whatever acreage they might involve. "This kind of two step approval, PUD ordinance is quite common and in use throughout the country. I would urge that you press the City to adopt an ordinance which embodies such a two step approval procedure." The other point which is brought up, I think, primarily by Mr. Spink, with the Urban Land Institute, is the recommendation that there be established, excuse me just a minute, let me find this. "I would suggest that to achieve this the City should create a PUD development committee which would have a representative of each department plus any other appropriate agency, school district, utility company and so forth. The members of this committee should have the full authority to act for their departments or agency and should meet as a group to review each proposal. It is my opinion that the processing time could be reduced to a minimum using this approach. In fact, processing of PUD would be faster than a normal development submittal. This is simply to create a PUD committee which would be chaired by members of the Planning Commission, Planning Department, and would contain members with the authority to act in each of the departments." The only other thing which Mr. Spink pointed out and I think which is very important is the fact that it would be very important if the City Council would establish a policy resolution, and not necessarily an ordinance, but pointing out the philosophical guide lines which should guide the developer in making the proposals for consideration. In other words, he has heard that in the Planning Department, Mr. Spink has heard in the Planning Department in some cities in California that have this Planned Unit Development Ordinances and he says it's very helpful

June 15, 1972  
mg

in those cases for the City to adopt a policy resolution setting out what was intended by these Planned Unit Developments rather than just rigid control. He said it was very helpful in forcing the intent of the ordinance.

MAYOR GATTI: Thank you, Mr. Saunders.

MR. JIM UPTMORE: Mayor, I'm Jim Uptmore and I'm just representing myself. Members of the Council, some of these things that you work on for a long time, this PUD ordinance has been worked on since Gilbert Garza was on the Planning Commission and we just can't always seem to come to some type of agreement because I guess we're just people. But, it's interesting to me to meet with the Planning Department and in hearings and such as that and see the ordinance written with still the same things written in it, that we agreed not to do. For instance, yards abutting streets we have a, all we have to do is change one letter and if you've turned to that, I sure would like for you to turn to it and see that this change be made because I think it was agreed upon in various hearings. Page 5, I guess, but I don't know if they're listed, yards abutting streets, it doesn't have a page number.

MAYOR GATTI: What section is it?

CITY CLERK: Provision 2, Section 42-108. Paragraph 3 B.

MAYOR GATTI: Paragraph 3 B. Yards abutting streets.

MR. UPTMORE: What this proposes here is a minimum sight line of 50 feet from the intersection of the paving lines. Presently, under all ordinances, it's 25 feet from property lines and to take a unit under this, just this little item, and of course, all we do is propose the change be where it says "the minimum sight line shall be a line adjoining two points 50 feet from the intersection of paving lines of a public street with another public street, private street or driveway, measured along pavement lines of the street or driveways involved." We just say, simply change that to 25 feet. Here is an example of this situation. This shows a 20 about 20 feet, change it to 20 feet instead of 25. Your sight lines and your set back line on this street actually going 50 feet from this point which is what is being shown here which I thought we agreed upon. This eliminates another unit completely. And, it doesn't help any of the traffic situation because the length of a normal automobile is about 21 feet. So, we're putting enough sight lines clearance on this private street or any street abutting a new street that's way in excess of what our present requirements are. So, we request that you would consider changing that point there from 50 to 20. Now, there's one other on the next page.

MR. BECKER: Can I ask a question please? I don't know what your copy says and I don't know what I'm reading here but in the same Section-Paragraph 3, Section C, Yards abutting streets, it starts off this way. Structures adjacent to a public street shall maintain a minimum average set back of 20 feet with no structure closer than 10.

MAYOR GATTI: Down further, Charlie.

MR. BECKER: Right, but does that particular sentence doesn't cover what Mr. Uptmore is talking about, or does it?

(ALL TALKING AT ONCE)

MR. BECKER: We can clear this up maybe as we go along, Mr. Mayor.

MAYOR GATTI: Well, you know, let's...

MR. BECKER: In other words, what I'm really trying to determine in my own mind, is it in there or isn't it in there? In the present one that we have, you see.

MAYOR GATTI: Well, down here, I think that's what he's talking about.

MR. BECKER: Down there, but up at the front, what is that referring to?

MAYOR GATTI: That's different, that's a set back.

MR. UPTMORE: Building set back, from the street, they are happy about that. However, Mr. Becker, that you see it's a minimum average set back but which is fine, you see, it's a minimum average set back from the front line of the street, but if you follow further down in the next paragraph, not paragraph but sentence, it says 50 feet, you see.

MR. BECKER: I appreciate that, but it also says right here at the front, structures adjacent to a public street, shall maintain a minimum average set back of 20 feet, now wouldn't that structure be adjacent to a public street, the one on the corner there. Or would it be? See, that's the reason I'm asking questions.

MR. GILBERT GARZA: Charlie, I think we're belaboring a point. I don't think that the Planning Department is that much against the proposals submitted by Mr. Uptmore. If I read you right, Mr. Taylor.

MR. TAYLOR: Yes sir, I'd like to make one other clarification. He's brought up two points the intersection idea we are pretty much in agreement with. It's just that we are reviewing now the April 17 draft that is the new idea that we concur with.

MR. GARZA: Well, all right in other words, if this ordinance, that we're reviewing today, were to be changed at this particular time, the department would not be opposed to it, in other words.

MR. BECKER: Does that satisfy your requirements?

MR. UPTMORE: To change that to 20 feet, 25 feet.

(ALL TALKING AT ONCE)

MR. UPTMORE: In order to save time, if we could move on to one other item Mr. Hill, do you have a question?

MR. ED HILL: No, sir.

MR. UPTMORE: The other item was on the LUI, the land use intensity situation and, personally, in building condominiums, and we've built a few of them in this town...

MR. BECKER: May we refer to that, where is that to be found?

MR. UPTMORE: The Enchanted Village area in Harmony Hills...

MR. BECKER: But where is...

MR. UPTMORE: The next page.

MR. BECKER: Where?

MR. UPTMORE: Under 4, density, 3 just the very next page, it says, table 1, Land Use and Density.

MR. BECKER: Residential developments, is that what's it under?

MR. UPTMORE: Yes sir, land use intensity, you see all those little figures and the definitions of those figures down below of how to do those multiplication situations. Table 1, Land Use and Density. We just feel, and I'm talking about the practical thing, and there's a little bit of difference when a planner plans something and talks about controls, people control, all using figures, it's kinda of a people controlled, living controlled all using figures it's kinda of a ridiculous thing to me because, in the case of a planner that talks about these things in comparison to a person who does things for people and understands their needs and desires. Any time you have a figure that sets how much living space, you can have, and open patio space you can have, how much closed patio space you can have, how much floor area ratio you should have in that particular intensity situation, or density situation you're regulating by numbers and simply we ask that these

floor area ratios, the open-space ratio, the livability space ratio be eliminated and a definition pertaining to those items be restricted from this ordinance. Simply, here's the whole thing. If I'm going to come in and ask for a PUD development, I'm going to analyze the thing from a planning standpoint, from a livability standpoint, from an open space standpoint, from a landscaping standpoint, because I want to sell that particular item. To have somebody say, well let's look at the ratio based upon this ordinance, you're then trying to tell people that they have to do things by the numbers and I'm very much opposed to that. I don't want anybody telling me how big my patio ought to be or how small it ought to be. We feel like in the private industry situation, that we're not going to be foolish enough to not provide these things that people want. We also don't want to be regulated as to how much we have to provide for them when they don't want what we're providing.

MAYOR GATTI: Do you have previous discussions on it?

MR. UPTMORE: Yes sir, about a year and a half.

MR. GARZA: Jim, however, if I understand, you know, from many meetings we have had on this thing, that this other item that you brought up there was no objection from the Planning Department as I understand it, or Planning Commission. There is quite a bit of opposition on land use intensity.

MR. UPTMORE: By the department.

MR. GARZA: By the department, right. As you recall, I met with you and Cliff Morton on this thing and I thought that we had resolved that we would leave it as it is, try to work with it for at least a year, and as Mr. Saunders just pointed out just a while ago we can come in with later amendments if some of these things prove to be unworkable, or at least where the developer is strapped so much but he can't do anything or whether the department is strapped so much that it can't do anything. But, you know, we're going to beat this horse to death, and we ought to get this ordinance passed and start amending or adding or subtracting as we go along. Otherwise, we'll be here another year, Jim.

MR. UPTMORE: Well, I think that we can and I ask in your good judgement to consider the fact that we're trying to ask here and in developing this land use intensity further staff requirements, further needs for people to figure out what you're doing based on the criteria set forth. I don't think it's the purpose of the ordinance.

MR. GARZA: Yes, I think the architect or your planner is going to have minimum requirements for open land use, etc. etc. However, there may be someone that could care less about open space. Maybe, he doesn't feel the same way you do and this is the reason for some requirement by this City for land use intensity. I realize that it's going to take a little bit of effort on the part of your planner, but and it's going to take a little extra effort on the part of the department, but I don't see a great, that much of a conflict.

MAYOR GATTI: We've had now about ten minutes, Jim.

MR. BECKER: I'd like to ask a question, Mr. Mayor, please. On this subject here and I would ask this also of Mr. Davis and Mr. Taylor, to the best of your knowledge, are there any developments occurring in San Antonio at this time or in recent months, in the last couple of years, whether the north side of town, south side, or wherever, in a respectable area, that new houses for sale where these various criteria here have been violated, to the best of your knowledge, have any homebuilders, developers violated?

MR. GARZA: No, Charlie, because you've got ordinance that set out these land sizes at this time.

MR. BECKER: I'm just asking that question, Gilbert, excuse me, but there are not, at this time, any violations with respect to this?

June 15, 1972  
mg

MR. TAYLOR: No, sir, because in conventional developments, the yard requirements are set out, are so restricted.

MR. GARZA: You're talking about a new ordinance, here, Charlie.

MR. DAVIS: Mr. Becker, we have had, as you know, in the last five, six months some three or four PUDs that have been processed through City Council through our department, and I think all of these PUDs have been developed and planned in conjunction with land use intensity development guide as it's been proposed in the departments and you can trace the most recent one more than adequately conforms to the very minimum that we're setting out. We're not regulating what the size of the patio, minimum size, anything of that nature in this LUI. This is the developer's prerogative.

MR. BECKER: Jim, do you know whether or not this has been found to be onerous by any developer than you have knowledge of or yourself, for that matter.

MR. UPTMORE: Well, no, but I am trying to point out that let's say in the "R-3" area or the "R-6" area you had a number of requirements there on the item of density per acre. So you put in 33 units then you have to start getting into the multiplication figures and I just think that you have a good control when you have the number of units that can be placed on an acre of ground and you do have the density requirements and you do allow a maximum density and actually no minimum, but all of these other figures are just ridiculous to have to sit down and work with because they are really not practical. There're no practical applications of these numbers to a project.

MR. BECKER: But, people are conforming to it now and don't seem to be suffering from it. Is that right?

MR. UPTMORE: For Loan purposes, for all practical purposes you have to provide parking space and open space and you know.

MAYOR GATTI: Okay, Mr. Uptmore, thank you sir. Mr. Taylor.

MR. STEVE TAYLOR: I don't need to appear.

MAYOR GATTI: Okay, Mr. Guy Shown.

MR. GUY SHOWN: Good morning, gentlemen, my name is Guy Shown, and I'm in the same business Jim Uptmore is in. I would like to take just a few minutes and address some comments to the Land Use Intensity portion of the Subdivision Ordinance on this PUD. I'm very much in favor of our PUD plan, but I would like to make some comments about that. I've got some notes here that were provided for our firm by the folks in California who have been responsible for PUD Ordinances and PUD Projects in about 28 different cities in America and twelve different states and we feel like they're some of the most knowledgeable folks in the country. I'd like to pass these notes out so that you'll have them for reference. What we feel like is happening in Land Use Intensity, if we include that in the ordinance is simply this with the idea of PUD what we're trying to do is broaden the possibility of residential environment for the citizens of this City. If we're going to broaden that possibility then we need some freedom from restriction in ordinance so that we can, as developers, provide this housing for these folks. But, then we turn right around in our ordinance and constrict that right back to limits as supplied by the LUI. What that does is, it looks like about three different areas there that become difficult to work with. Number one, by including LUI we effectively eliminate a large segment of the market of people who need housing but if we conform to the LUI requirements there, couldn't afford to buy housing in the first place and it also leaves out special groups like older citizens who have housing requirements that are different from those of with a full family let's say. We are shutting those people off and at the same time we are saying that we are broadening housing for our citizens. We feel like such a plan would really-that the LUI is so comfortable a dillusion that it removes the fundamental responsibility of our commissions to pass upon development proposals that we developers bring forward and put it in the hands of this

June 15, 1972  
mg

LUI. In other words it inverts the flow of decision from the down up rather than from the top down. There was a comment made by a staff member awhile ago that LUI makes the use of land very precise. Well, you couldn't be more correct. It does make it precise but I look at that precision in terms of stereotyping and instead of broadening the opportunities for housing what we are doing is stereotyping the housing in our City. Essentially, if we conform to a numbers game in the case of LUI all of our housing will look essentially alike. It probably will all be, in the case of PUD, two story and will have to conform to certain limits all the way down the line. These remarks that Economic Research Associates provided for us-I would like to send Item 8. "This fundamental problem with the Land Use Intensity scale is that it mistakenly assumes that the basic intensity of land use in a broaden area should be the measure of how intend future development in the same area should be. It basically abrogates to a questionable numbers game the fundamental discretion normally exercised by local government as to the merit or lack of merit of a particular environmental development proposal. What took place in the past is not a rational measure of what should take place in environmentally in the future. That's why the use of the land use intensity scale as a part of the PUD is a weakling and a thoughtless inclusion in what might other wise be an excellent step in the right direction as far as inviting superior residential environments to be built in San Antonio."

MR. BECKER: Isn't it a minimum guideline actually? Aren't these figures here a minimum?

MR. SHOWN: They could be considered such as that. But actually what they do is they spell out requirements all the way across the board.

MR. BECKER: Some of them are maximum, some of them are minimum, some of them are minimum figures, are they not?

MR. SHOWN: Yes sir.

MR. BECKER: In other words, if a developer did want to allocate more open space ratio, livability space ratio, floor area ratio or whatever, he is entitled to do so, is he not?

MR SHOWN: If he wanted to include more....

MR BECKER: If he wants to increase these ratios and make a bigger patio for example, that was the example that was used.

MR. SHOWN: Yes he could do that provided that he changed everything else across the line, yes.

MR. BECKER: When you say that I don't quite follow you. I'm not trying to argue with you. I'm merely trying to understand this thing. If you change the patio space and make the patio twice as big as the figure here would permit, then how does that change everything else? Im just curious.

MR. SHOWN: In other words you can't eliminate that item entirely.

MAYOR GATTI: Well he'd just have to cut out his change the density, it would lower the density if he would increase the size of the patio, wouldn't he?

MR. GARZA: Not necessarily. Your density is still there.

MR. BECKER: Well there's only so many square feet to an acre. Right. Now then, so if you start with that premise you are permitted to get on this thing here so many maximum density, 8, 8, 10, 20, 33, 33 and so forth. Now if you want to take and only put six for example in "R-1" instead of the eight figures you are permitted to do that, are you not? Charge more for the house because you are allocating more land and all that sort of thing, isn't that correct? So that's the reason I am asking. Now, of course, Gilbert knows a lot more about this than I'll ever know, but I am trying to understand the thing and see where the difficult parts of it are.

MR. SHOWN: They are difficult in that they are market segments where we may not need each and every one of those items that are spelled out as a requirement under LUI.

MAYOR GATTI: Well, I think one thing we've got to remember--no matter what we do here there is going to be a need for another look at it and some changes. We could go on and have hearings. I'm listening to these people and so far I haven't had anything that convinces me that this is onerous. But, I think that we have listened to you, sir, enough. I think that is sufficient.

MR. BECKER: I take part of his time asking questions.

MR. SHOWN: I just want to make one more comment Mr. Mayor if I may. If we are concerned about experimenting with LUI in our ordinance really there are enough PUD Ordinances around.....

MAYOR GATTI: We are not experimenting. We have had input from, God knows, everybody within 4,000 sq. miles of San Antonio for how long. Thank you!

MR. CLIFFORD MORTON: Mr. Mayor, and members of the Council, my name is Clifford Morton and I have been asked to come here today to speak on the PUD Ordinance as representative of Greater San Antonio Association of Builders. If it will refresh you for a moment may I address my remarks to another section of the PUD Ordinance other than LUI. I am a little confused Mr. Taylor by the various drafts that you have of this thing. I have my little outline all drafted up according to the page numbers that you gave me earlier in the week and you told me today you've got a brand new draft here. But specifically one of the things that we had is a typographical error that was significant in the draft that I have which was April 17 was the question of a sewer fee. The sewer fee for planned unit development was indicated as \$250 per unit when the unit was located outside the City but within the ETJ. Well, I believe it was a typographical error because on a single family unit it would only be \$150 per unit. But it is significant and I just wondered whether I cannot find it in this one.

MRS. CAROL HABERMAN: It's in here. It's in the next to the last page.

MR. TAYLOR: The way it should read 0 to 5 units per acre, it should be sewer fee \$50 per unit inside the City and \$150 per unit outside the City. There's an error in there that says \$250. Then for density of five units per acre or more should be \$250 inside the city limits and \$750 outside the city limits.

MR. MORTON: Mr. Mayor, I think there was a subconscious effort here on the part of folks that have been drafting this thing up. You know, it seems to me that we have a little baby here that we are just about to incubate to death. We are trying to make it different from the housing that we know today whether its apartments, townhouses or single family or whatever. But really there would be no reason to have a different sewer fee per unit for a planned unit development, a living unit than it would be for a single family house. If I may be serious for a moment about the LUI thing I would like to approach it from perhaps a little bit different light than you have looked at it today. As you, I am assuming that you all have this draft which is brand new to me.

MRS. HABERMAN: Before we leave the sewer fee, what if this is built close to the five mile limit in the ETJ. The City is responsible for the sewer all the way out to the units. Right, but let me ask you, all the condemnations and all the other proceedings are all the responsibility of the City?

MR. MORTON: No, not necessarily so. Again, Mrs. Haberman, you will have no difference here in the sewer fee or sewer policy on a Planned Unit Development that we would have in a single family houses or apartments that were built either in or outside the City. Exactly the same responsibility as far as extension of sewer mains versus, in some cases, where it is not economically feasible to extend the main out so far, you might go to a temporary sewer plant just as you would in a single family development.

MRS. HABERMAN: When you ask for a permit, at that time how long does it generally take for us to clear the land from a condemnation standpoint.

MR. MORTON: First of all, are we talking about a sewer permit? The time that we would have to pay the sewer fee I believe would be at the time we drew a plat. It depends on how far out we are talking about within the ETJ. But we are not talking about any different policy here on PUD's as I see the intent of the Planning Department or Planning Commission then we are on any other type of housing.

MRS. HABERMAN: I was just going to ask our staff to review this. Something tells me that with all the condemnation proceedings necessary this could be a long, long time before we could clear that land for this purpose.

MR. MORTON: It would be no different for PUD than it would be for single family.

MRS. HABERMAN: For now it's all right.

MR. SAM GRANATA: I think it's all right for now. I think what you are getting at is the fact that it's possible sometimes that they'll start the on site development be it in this or any other subdivision and the City may not be able, because of condemnation, get the right of way required for the approach main and the houses may be built and occupied and we could find ourselves in the position of the honey wagon of having to pump the existing system until we get the approach.

MAYOR GATTI: You have two more minutes Mr. Morton.

MR. MORTON: I am going to use my draft. On the LUI again, the background on LUI was that it was something that was developed by the Urban Land Institute the National Association of Home Builders in cooperation in conjunction with FHA. It was something that FHA used as a part of their submittal criteria on all family projects that were submitted for FHA insurance. It has not been satisfactory in practice with FHA and that they no longer require land use intensity ratings on apartments which is where the majority of the experience has been. I have checked and I believe in their notes that Mr. Shown gave you, only 1,000 total planned unit developments that have been FHA insured across the country. You will also note in there is a letter to one of the local administrators of FHA saying get out there and sell those planned unit developments. One reason that they have trouble with those planned unit developments in my opinion and that's all it is, is one of the requirements they had in planned unit they still have the LUI. I don't think they have had the experience factor to say whether it is good or bad. The thing that we are really talking about here on the LUI, as I see it, is this. First of all, I want to tell criteria that we have - I don't think there's an apartment house in this town that has been built in the last ten years that wouldn't meet the requirements. All we are talking about is the clerical time to sit there and compute these balconies, these patios, and all the various spaces that you have, and we are talking about square footages, and it may sound like this is not much of a task, but, really, when you get a site plan and start on a 200 unit project doing all these computations of curves and so forth, and the various and sundry ratios that you to develop, you are talking about an awful lot of time. Now, if you feel the people that are going to be buying these units are going to derive some benefit out of it which would justify you spending more money or the taxpayer's money by putting more people on the staff to do these computations and check the developer to make sure that he is doing it right. That's what you should do. But, in our opinion, we don't think it gives people anything that they are not going to get with the density requirements that you have set up. I think one thing it does do and I would ask Mr. Davis this question because I don't want to say something that's not true. It seems to me that the one thing that the LUI does that probably is the worst of all is that it does tend to create more two story type units. Would you say so the way the ratios work against each other? You tend to develop two story type units and I don't believe this is what the older people really want. The ones that we talked to would prefer, the old folks would prefer, a one story unit because of their health. I think this is bad and what it doesn't do, it just doesn't recognize the difference in ages, family proposition or anything else. You've

got a Federal planning criteria here that we are using that makes no distinction between economic circumstances, age, or anything else. I think this is wrong. Are there any questions?

MAYOR GATTI: Thank you, Mr. Morton.

MR. GARZA: Ed, did you have an answer to that question? Is that a true statement.

MR. DAVIS: Mr. Garza, actually, in response to Mr. Morton's question, Mission Trace was just developed using LUI criteria and this is one of our latest PUD's and they developed primary story and a half units. If a developer is trying to utilize the particular article to get maximum density there is a tendency to have to go to two story units. But, remember, in the LUI in the increasing of the densities we are increasing "R-1" density to 8 units per acre, which is increasing density some thirty percent. This provides the subdivider with that many more units per acre. So what we are saying is that the LUI is the companion type relationship complementary open space and land use that will accrue the benefits to people living in the area.... (inaudible)

MR. GARZA: Essentially what you are saying is that right now the ordinances that we have allow approximately four-maybe five units per acre. We are going to about eight units per acre in "R-1". If we still allow the eight units per acre under PUD for one acre that if we don't require certain amounts of LUI there will be no open space if we go to one story units.

MR. DAVIS: I think there would be a tremendous tendency for this to happen.

MR. BECKER: Ed, May I ask a question? Are you acquainted with the Sutton Place Apartments out there on Starcrest Drive. It's way out there. You know, the apartment building, well I don't know whether they subscribe to this LUI thing or not but it's one of the nicest apartment developments that I know of. I happen to know of another apartment development that I almost guarantee would subscribe to this and the land thing is one of the sorriest things I think that I have ever seen too. Would Sutton Place subscribe to this thing, do you think? I am not trying to advertise Sutton Place.

MR. MORTON: Mr. Becker very frankly, the way the criteria are watered down would be willing to bet that every apartment project that has been developed in Bexar County in the last five years would meet these requirements. They are absolutely meaningless. It's just to make work. It's a planners type device.

MAYOR GATTI: I declare the hearing closed. Would you read the caption.

CITY CLERK: (Read the following ordinance)

AN ORDINANCE 40,834

AMENDING CHAPTERS 36 and 42 OF THE CITY CODE PERTAINING TO ZONING AND SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS BY ESTABLISHING CRITERIA IN REGARD TO THE CONSTRUCTION OF PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENTS: PROVIDING A PENALTY NOT TO EXCEED \$200.00 FOR VIOLATION AND PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY.

\* \* \* \*

MAYOR GATTI: We are going to incorporate those corrections. We will change the sewer fee to \$400 and the.... Call the roll.

MR. BECKER: I so move.

DR. HILLIARD: I second it.

June 15, 1972  
mg

MR. GARZA: Might I just request that during the time that we are utilizing this PUD Ordinance within the next year or so will you also look at the possibility of, having the Planning Commission look at the possibility of incorporating the landscaping plan.

MR. DAVIS: Pardon me Mayor Gatti, the T-intersection. The staff was along with the recommendation that they be in a 25....

MR. UPTMORE: If you are going to make some changes, I would like to hear the changes that are going to be recommended to be made to the staff.

MAYOR GATTI: We're gonna pass this Ordinance now. We can talk about changes after we see how it operates. Call the roll. That's all sir. Thank you very much.

AYES: Haberman, Hill, Becker, Hilliard, Mendoza, Garza, and Gatti.

NAYS: none ABSENT: Padilla and Naylor.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARDMR. ED HILL - FATHER OF THE YEAR

Rev. R. A. Callies, representing the Youth Leadership Conference, and Mrs. Edward Duncan stated that Councilman Ed Hill is being recognized for the services he has rendered to citizens of the east side for a number of years. In appreciation for his efforts, Mr. Hill has been selected as the "Father of the Year". Mrs. Duncan read the inscription on a plaque honoring Mr. Hill after which the plaque was presented to him.

MR. RAMON RODRIGUEZ

Mr. Ramon Rodriguez, 603 S. W. 39th Street, stated that he had been informed today by Mr. Bob Frazer that a park is to be built in his area. He thanked the Council and staff for making it possible.

Mr. Rodriguez complained of sanitary conditions in his neighborhood involving leaky sewers.

Mayor Gatti asked the Director of Public Works to follow up on this complaint and see what can be done about it.

MR. CHESTER BELKNAP

Mr. Chester Belknap, 347 East Rampart, spoke to the Council about violence, vandalism and veterans. He suggested that the City employ returning veterans to patrol school areas to stop vandalism.

HOUSTON TERRACE LITTLE LEAGUE PARK

Mrs. Helen Dutmer, 739 McKinley, spoke of her request several weeks ago that the Council look into the matter of taxation of the Houston Terrace Little League Park. She stated that she had researched state statutes and it is a matter of interpretation as to whether or not tax exemption for this organization is permitted. She stated that in her opinion it does meet qualifications and asked the Council's favorable consideration.

MRS. MARIA DOMINGUEZ

Mrs. Maria Dominguez, 250 Freiling Drive, complained that streets in new subdivisions are not planned for the future. She suggested that streets be made wider.

CONVENTION CENTER SOUND SYSTEM

Councilman Mendoza complimented Mayor Gatti and City Manager Hunt for their prompt action in resolving problems with the sound system at the Convention Center during the State Democratic Convention. He suggested that the sound problems be analyzed and permanently corrected.

NORTHEAST STADIUM

Mr. Loyd Jary, architect for the Northeast Independent School District, stated that considerable renovations are being made at Northeast stadium. In an effort to relieve congestion following athletic events, he had asked permission of the Traffic Department to put a large entrance to the parking lot at the corner of Jones-Maltsberger Road and Bitters Road. He showed the Council a diagram of the proposed changes.

Mr. Stewart Fischer, Director of Traffic and Transportation, expressed opposition to the proposal. He stated that the parking lot entrances should be at a distance from the intersection.

After discussion, Mayor Gatti advised Mr. Jary to work with Mr. Fischer and determine a proper solution to the entire problem.

72-27 The Clerk read the following letter:

June 9, 1972

Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council  
City of San Antonio, Texas

Gentlemen and Madam:

The following petitions were received by my office and forwarded to the City Manager for investigation and report to the City Council.

- 4/4/72 Petition of Mr. James A. Smith, President of Beautify San Antonio Association, requesting action to alleviate the conditions at 302 Mary Street.
- 4/27/72 Petition of Mr. J. V. Sotelo, 65 Ewing, requesting permission to retain a fence slightly over six feet which was erected around his back yard.
- 5/8/72 Petition of Jose V. Perez and Sons, 502 Rayburn, giving notice of appeal to the decision of the Home Improvement Advisory Board in denying his application for a Home Improvement Contractor's License.
- 5/8/72 Petition of Mr. Ronald W. Gilmer, Bee Zee Marine Center, requesting permission to construct an eight foot chain link fence along the property lines of Lot 20, NCB 7657, located at 1715 S. E. Military Drive.
- 6/6/72 Petition of Mr. Pete Tijerina and Associates, 302 International Building, requesting annexation of approximately 117.526 acres of land, known as High Country Estates.
- 6/8/72 Petition of Mr. Abelardo Barrios, 212 Robert E. Lee, requesting permission to keep his six foot fence which he erected on the premises at 212 Robert E. Lee.

/s/ J. H. INSELMANN  
City Clerk

There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting adjourned at 12:05 P. M.

ATTEST:

*J. H. Inselmann*  
City Clerk

A P P R O V E D  
*John Gatti*  
M A Y O R

June 15, 1972

-30-

nsr