

REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL  
OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO HELD IN  
THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL, ON  
THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1975.

\* \* \* \*

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 A. M., by the presiding officer, Mayor Lila Cockrell, with the following members present: PYNDUS, BILLA, CISNEROS, BLACK, HARTMAN, ROHDE, TENIENTE, NIELSEN, COCKRELL; Absent: NONE.

75-56 The invocation was given by The Reverend Ade Windisch, Central Catholic High School.

75-56 Members of the City Council and the audience joined in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of the United States.

75-56 The minutes of the meeting of September 11, 1975 were approved.

75-56 ZONING HEARINGS

1. CASE 6209 - to rezone Lot 1, Block 1, NCB 8645, 10010 Jones Maltsberger Road, from "A" Single Family Residential District to "I-1" Light Industry District, located on the northeast side of Jones Maltsberger Road being approximately 890' southeast of the intersection of Isom Road and Jones Maltsberger Road, having 126.8' on Jones Maltsberger Road, and a depth of 435.6'.

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. Billa made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that proper replatting is accomplished. Mr. Pyndus seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Rohde, Teniente.

AN ORDINANCE 45,718

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 1, BLOCK 1,  
NCB 8645, 10010 JONES MALTSBERGER ROAD,  
FROM "A" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DIS-  
TRICT TO "I-1" LIGHT INDUSTRY DISTRICT,  
PROVIDED THAT PROPER REPLATTING IS  
ACCOMPLISHED.

\* \* \* \*

September 18, 1975  
el

2. CASE 6200 - to rezone a 0.392 acre tract of land out of NCB 15588, being further described by field notes filed in the office of the City Clerk, from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District to "B-3" Business District, 6800 Block of S. W. Military Drive, located northwest of the intersection of S. W. Military Drive and Oak Gate Drive, having 141.73' on Oak Gate Drive and 122.89' 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. Pyndus made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that proper platting is accomplished. Mr. Billa seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Rohde, Teniente.

AN ORDINANCE 45,719

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 0.392 ACRE TRACT  
 OF LAND OUT OF NCB 15588, BEING FURTHER  
 DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE  
 OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, 6800 BLOCK  
 OF S. W. MILITARY DRIVE, FROM TEMPORARY  
 "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT  
 TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED  
 THAT PROPER PLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

\* \* \* \*

3. CASE 6189 - to rezone Lots 1 and 2, Block 1, NCB 16052, Lots 1 through 3, Block 2, NCB 16053, 13000 Block of Brook Hollow Blvd., from Temporary "A" Single Family Residential District to "R-6" Townhouse District.

Lots 1 and 2, Block 1, NCB 16052 are located northeast of the intersection of Brook Hollow Blvd. and Henderson Pass having 75.57' on Henderson Pass and 238.14' on Brook Hollow Blvd.

Lots 1 through 3, Block 2, NCB 16053 are located on the southwest side of Brook Hollow Blvd. being 420' southeast of the intersection of Autumn Woods Drive and Brook Hollow Blvd. having 264.73' on Brook Hollow Blvd. and a maximum depth of 188.27'.

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, Dr. Nielsen made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved. Mr. Billa seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Rohde, Teniente; ABSTAIN: Pyndus.

AN ORDINANCE 45,720

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 LOTS 1 AND 2, BLOCK 1, NCB 16052, LOTS 1 THROUGH 3, BLOCK 2, NCB 16053, 13000 BLOCK OF BROOK HOLLOW BLVD., FROM TEMPORARY "A" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "R-6" TOWNHOUSE DISTRICT.

\* \* \* \*

4. CASE 6208 - to rezone Tract A-2, NCB 8416, 3119 Fredericksburg Road, from "F" Local Retail District to "B-3" Business District, located southwest of the intersection of Babcock Road and Fredericksburg Road, having 93' on Babcock Road and 125' on Fredericksburg Road.

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, Dr. Nielsen made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that proper platting is accomplished. Mr. Hartman seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Rohde, Teniente.

AN ORDINANCE 45,721

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 TRACT A-2, NCB 8416, 3119 FREDERICKSBURG ROAD, FROM "F" LOCAL RETAIL DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER PLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

\* \* \* \*

5. CASE 6206 - to rezone Parcel 31, save and except the east 166', NCB 15684, 10419 Perrin Beitel Road, from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District to "I-1" Light Industry District; and the east 166' of Parcel 31, NCB 15684, 10419 Perrin Beitel Road, from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District to "B-3" Business District.

The "I-1" zoning is located on the west side of Perrin Beitel Road being 1176.82' north of the intersection of Perrin Beitel and the I & G. N. Railroad R.O.W., being 166' east with a maximum width of 132' and a maximum length of 452'.

The "B-3" zoning is located on the west side of Perrin Beitel Road being 1176.82' north of the intersection of Perrin Beitel Road and the I & G. N. Railroad R.O.W. having 132' on Perrin Beitel Road and a maximum depth of 166'.

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. Pyndus made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that proper platting is accomplished. Mr. Billa seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Rohde, Teniente.

AN ORDINANCE 45,722

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 PARCEL 31, SAVE AND EXCEPT THE EAST 166', NCB 15684, 10419 PERRIN BEITEL ROAD, FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "I-1" LIGHT INDUSTRY DISTRICT; AND THE EAST 166' OF PARCEL 31, NCB 15684, 10419 PERRIN BEITEL ROAD, FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER PLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

\* \* \* \*

6. CASE 6130 - to rezone Lots A16 and A17, NCB 494, 1522 - 1526 N. Panam Expressway, from "C" Apartment District to "B-1" Business District, located on the south side of N. Panam Expressway, being 83.33' west of the intersection of N. Panam Expressway and N. Olive Street, having 83.32' on North Panam Expressway with a depth of 90.27'.

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. Billa made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that proper replatting is accomplished. Mr. Pyndus seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Rohde, Teniente.

AN ORDINANCE 45,723

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 LOTS A16 AND A17, NCB 494, 1522 - 1526 N. PANAM EXPRESSWAY, FROM "C" APARTMENT DISTRICT TO "B-1" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER REPLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

\* \* \* \*

7. CASE 6163 - to rezone Lots 11F and 11C, NCB 12051, 500 Block of Sandau Road, from "A" Single Family Residential District to "I-1" Light Industry District, located on the southwest side of Sandau Road, being 918.26' northwest from the intersection of Isom Road and Sandau Road, having 90.43' on Sandau Road and a maximum depth of 830'.

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, Dr. Nielsen made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that proper replatting is accomplished. Mr. Hartman seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Rohde, Teniente.

AN ORDINANCE 45,724

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 LOTS 11F AND 11C,  
NCB 12051, 500 BLOCK OF SANDAU ROAD,  
FROM "A" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DIS-  
TRICT TO "I-1" LIGHT INDUSTRY DISTRICT,  
PROVIDED THAT PROPER REPLATTING IS  
ACCOMPLISHED.

\* \* \* \*

8. CASE 6171 - to rezone Tract C, NCB 10845, 4327 S. E. Military Drive, from "B" Two Family Residential District to "B-3" Business District, located between Utopia Avenue and S. E. Military Drive, being approximately 590' southwest of the cutback between Utopia Avenue and S. E. Military Drive, having 233' on Utopia Avenue, 220' on S. E. Military Drive and a maximum distance of 434' between Utopia Avenue and S. E. 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. Billa made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that proper replatting is accomplished. Mr. Pyndus seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Rohde, Teniente.

AN ORDINANCE 45,725

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 TRACT C, NCB 10845,  
4327 S. E. MILITARY DRIVE, FROM "B"  
TWO FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO  
"B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT  
PROPER REPLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

\* \* \* \*

9. CASE 6174 - to rezone a 3.30 acre tract of land out of NCB's 12191 and 16095, being further described by field notes filed in the office of the City Clerk, 4600 Block of Rittiman Road, from Temporary "A", Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential Districts, "F" Local Retail District and "J" Commercial District to "I-1" Light Industry District, located 150' north and 50' east of the cutback between I. H. 35 Expressway and Rittiman Road, having 88.81' on I. H. 35 Expressway and 451.20' on Rittiman Road.

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. Cisneros made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that proper replatting is accomplished. Dr. Nielsen seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Rohde, Teniente.

AN ORDINANCE 45,726

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 3.30 ACRE TRACT  
 OF LAND OUT OF NCB'S 12191 AND 16095,  
 BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES  
 FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK,  
 4600 BLOCK OF RITTIMAN ROAD, FROM TEM-  
 PORARY "A", TEMPORARY "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY  
 RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS, "F" LOCAL RETAIL  
 DISTRICT AND "J" COMMERCIAL DISTRICT  
 TO "I-1" LIGHT INDUSTRY DISTRICT, PROVIDED  
 THAT PROPER REPLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

\* \* \* \*

10. CASE 6175 - to rezone Tracts P-23 and 24, NCB 16095, 4800 and 4900 Blocks of Rittiman Road, from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District to "I-1" Light Industry District, located northwest of the intersection of Rittiman Road and Fratt Road, having 619.63' on Rittiman Road and 360' on Fratt Road.

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. Cisneros made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that proper replatting is accomplished. Mr. Billa seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Rohde, Teniente.

AN ORDINANCE 45,727

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 TRACTS P-23 AND 24,  
NCB 16095, 4800 AND 4900 BLOCKS OF RITTIMAN  
ROAD, FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY  
RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "I-1" LIGHT INDUSTRY  
DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER REPLATTING  
IS ACCOMPLISHED.

\* \* \* \*

11. CASE 6176 - to rezone a 0.590 acre tract of land out of NCB 9594, being further described by field notes filed in the office of the City Clerk, 727 Bandera Road, from "F" Local Retail District to "B-3" Business District, located south of the intersection of Varsity Drive and Bandera Road, having 175' on Varsity Drive and 131' on Bandera Road.

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. Billa made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that proper platting is accomplished. Mr. Cisneros seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: Pyndus; ABSENT: Rohde, Teniente.

AN ORDINANCE 45,728

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 0.590 ACRE TRACT  
OF LAND OUT OF NCB 9594, BEING FURTHER  
DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE  
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, 727 BANDERA  
ROAD, FROM "F" LOCAL RETAIL DISTRICT  
TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED  
THAT PROPER PLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

\* \* \* \*

12. CASE 6187 - to rezone Lots 14 and 15, Block 27, NCB 1990, 2320 N. Zarzamora Street, from "F" Local Retail District to "B-3" Business District, located southeast of the intersection of N. Zarzamora Street and Craig Place having 157.66' on N. Zarzamora Street and 102.56' on Craig Place.

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. Pyndus made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that proper replatting is accomplished. Mr. Hartman seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Rohde, Teniente.

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 LOTS 14 AND 15, BLOCK 27, NCB 1990, 2320 N. ZARZAMORA STREET, FROM "F" LOCAL RETAIL DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER REPLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

\* \* \* \*

13. CASE 6190 - to rezone Lot 26, Block 1, NCB 13528, 7800 Block of Broadway, from "O-1" Office District to "R-3" Multiple Family Residential District, located on the east side of Broadway being 263.22' south of the intersection of E. Terra Alta Road and Broadway having 111.78' on Broadway and a maximum depth of 181.37'.

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. Cisneros made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved. Mr. Pyndus seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Rohde, Teniente.

AN ORDINANCE 45,730

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 26, BLOCK 1, NCB 13528, 7800 BLOCK OF BROADWAY, FROM "O-1" OFFICE DISTRICT TO "R-3" MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT.

\* \* \* \*

14. CASE 6195 - to rezone a 16.114 acre tract of land out of NCB 15911, being further described by field notes filed in the office of the City Clerk, 11500 Block of I. H. 35 Expressway, from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District to "I-1" Light Industry District, located northwest of the intersection of I. H. 35 Expressway and O'Connor Road, having 431.57' on I. H. 35 Expressway, 1527.76' on O'Connor Road and 70.14' on the cutback between I. H. 35 Expressway and O'Connor Road.

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, Dr. Nielsen made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that proper replatting is accomplished. Mr. Cisneros seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Rohde, Teniente.

AN ORDINANCE 45,731

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 16.114 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF NCB 15911, BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, 11500 BLOCK OF I. H. 35 EXPRESSWAY, FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "I-1" LIGHT INDUSTRY DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER REPLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

\* \* \* \*

15. CASE 6162 - to rezone Lot 13, save and except the south 32', NCB 11687, 4402 Vance Jackson Road, from "O-1" Office District to "B-2" Business District, located on the east side of Vance Jackson Road being approximately 766.63' north of N. W. Loop 410 Expressway and Vance Jackson Road, having 297.20' on Vance Jackson Road and a maximum depth of 290'.

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. Billa made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved. Dr. Nielsen seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Rohde, Teniente.

AN ORDINANCE 45,732

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 13, SAVE AND EXCEPT THE SOUTH 32', NCB 11687, 4402 VANCE JACKSON ROAD, FROM "O-1" OFFICE DISTRICT TO "B-2" BUSINESS DISTRICT.

\* \* \* \*

16. CASE 6179 - to rezone Lots 13, 14, 15 and 16, Block 1, NCB 7253, 1014 Basse Road, from "F" Local Retail District to "B-3" Business District, located 145' west of the cutback between San Pedro Avenue and Basse Road, having 100' on Basse Road and a depth of 130'.

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

Mr. Camargo said that Mr. Gordon Davis, Attorney for the applicant in this case had requested a one month postponement.

After consideration, Dr. Nielsen moved that the request for a 30 day postponement of Case No. 6179 be granted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pyndus and carried on the following roll call vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Rohde, Teniente.

17. CASE 6152 - to rezone a 3.258 acre tract of land out of NCB 15149, being further described by field notes filed in the office of the City Clerk, 5400 Block of S. W. Loop 410 Expressway, from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District to "B-2" Business District; and a 7.148 acre tract of land out of NCB 15149, being further described by field notes filed in the office of the City Clerk, 5400 Block of S. W. Loop 410 Expressway, from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District to "B-3" Business District.

The "B-2" zoning is located between Valley Hi Drive and S. W. Loop 410 Expressway, being 485' southwest of the intersection of Valley Hi Drive and S. W. Loop 410 Expressway and 775.57' southeast of the intersection of Valley Hi Drive and S. W. Loop 410 Expressway, having 120' on Valley Hi Drive and 120' on S. W. Loop 410 Expressway with a maximum distance of 1279.71' between these two streets.

The "B-3" zoning is located southwest of the intersection of Valley Hi Drive and S. W. Loop 410 Expressway, having 485' on Valley Hi Drive and 775.57' on S. W. Loop 410 Expressway.

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. Billa made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that a six foot solid screen fence is erected and maintained adjacent to the single family residential district. Mr. Hartman seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Rohde, Teniente.

AN ORDINANCE 45,733

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 3.258 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF NCB 15149, BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, 5400 BLOCK OF S. W. LOOP 410 EXPRESSWAY, FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-2" BUSINESS DISTRICT; AND A 7.148 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF NCB 15149, BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, 5400 BLOCK OF S. W. LOOP 410 EXPRESSWAY, FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT A SIX FOOT SOLID SCREEN FENCE IS ERECTED AND MAINTAINED ADJACENT TO THE SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT.

\* \* \* \*

18. CASE 6124 - to rezone the west 62.25' of Lot 20, Block 5, NCB 7447, 6200 Block of W. Commerce Street, from "C" Apartment District to "B-2" Business District, located on the north side of W. Commerce Street, being 555.25' west of the intersection of Hortencia Street and W. Commerce Street, having 62.25' on W. Commerce Street and a depth of 350'.

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. Hartman made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that proper replatting is accomplished. Mr. Cisneros seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Rohde, Teniente.

#### AN ORDINANCE 45,734

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 THE WEST 62.25' OF  
LOT 20, BLOCK 5, NCB 7447, 6200 BLOCK  
OF W. COMMERCE STREET, FROM "C" APARTMENT  
DISTRICT TO "B-2" BUSINESS DISTRICT,  
PROVIDED THAT PROPER REPLATTING IS ACCOM-  
PLISHED.

\* \* \* \*

19. CASE 6192 - to rezone Lot 10 and the southwest 5' of Lot 11, save and except the southeast 75', NCB 15687, 4251 Stahl Road, from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District and "B-3" Business District to "I-1" Light Industry District; and the south 75' of Lot 10 and the southwest 5' of Lot 11, NCB 15687, 4251 Stahl Road, from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District and "B-3" Business District to "B-3" Business District.

The "I-1" zoning is located on the northwest side of Stahl Road being 1548.74' southwest of the intersection of Stahl Road and Jung Road, being 75' northwest with a maximum width of 105.60' and a maximum depth of 502.12'.

The "B-3" zoning is located on the northwest side of Stahl Road being 1548.74' southwest of the intersection of Stahl Road and Jung Road, having 105.60' on Stahl Road and a maximum depth of 75'.

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, Dr. Nielsen made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that proper replatting is accomplished. Mr. Billa seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Rohde.

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 10 AND THE SOUTHWEST 5' OF LOT 11, SAVE AND EXCEPT THE SOUTHEAST 75', NCB 15687, 4251 STAHL ROAD, FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT AND "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT TO "I-1" LIGHT INDUSTRY DISTRICT; AND THE SOUTH 75' OF LOT 10 AND THE SOUTHWEST 5' OF LOT 11, NCB 15687, 4251 STAHL ROAD, FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT AND "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER REPLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

\* \* \* \*

20. CASE 5994 - to rezone Lots 6 and 22, NCB 14854, 15800 Block of Old Fredericksburg Road, from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District to "P-1(B-3)" Planned Unit Development Business District, located on the north side of Bacon Road between Old Fredericksburg Road and I. H. 10 Expressway, having 551.78' on Bacon Road, 575.1' on Old Fredericksburg Road and 638.85' on I. H. 10 Expressway.

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

Mr. Camargo said that this area lies over the Edwards recharge zone.

Mrs. Rowena Rodgers, President of the League of Women Voters, asked that this rezoning be postponed until the Edwards overlay ordinance is passed.

Mayor Cockrell advised Mrs. Rodgers that the public hearing on the overlay ordinance would be held before the City Council on October 2nd. This property is requested PUD B-3 under which the plans for development would have to be brought back to the Planning Commission for review.

Mr. Camargo explained that when a person is ready to develop a tract as a Planned Unit Development he is required to submit a preliminary plan to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission is required to mail notices of a hearing to persons owning property within 200'. If the plan is approved then a final plan with platting is submitted to the Planning Commission. There is no public hearing on the final plan approval.

Mr. Camargo pointed out that there are some non-conforming uses in existence at the present time.

Mr. Cisneros said that there have been some questions of enforcement and monitoring over the recharge zone. He questioned the advisability of proceeding with rezoning in this area until all these matters are settled. He suggested that Mr. Hugh Yantis, Chairman of the Texas Water Quality Board, be invited to meet with the Council to discuss enforcement over the aquifer.

Mayor Cockrell said that the Council has already approved some zoning changes requiring that the PUD designation be included. This case is consistent with decisions that the Council has already made.

After consideration, Mr. Teniente made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that proper replatting is accomplished. Mr. Billa seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Black, Hartman, Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: Cisneros; ABSENT: Rohde.

For the record, Mr. Pyndus said that he voted for this ordinance because of existing conditions on the property.

AN ORDINANCE 45,736

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 LOTS 6 AND 22, NCB  
14854, 15800 BLOCK OF OLD FREDERICKSBURG  
ROAD, FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY  
RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "P-1(B-3)" PLANNED  
UNIT DEVELOPMENT BUSINESS DISTRICT, PRO-  
VIDED THAT PROPER REPLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

\* \* \* \*

21. CASE 6103 - to rezone a 21.500 acre tract of land out of NCB 14865, being further described by field notes filed in the office of the City Clerk, 8000 Block of Hausman Road, from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District to "P-1(B-3)" Planned Unit Development Business District; and a 77.460 acre tract of land out of NCB 14865, being further described by field notes filed in the office of the City Clerk, 8000 Block of Hausman Road, from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District to "P-1(B-2)" Planned Unit Development Business District.

The "P-1(B-3)" zoning is located on the north side of Hausman Road, 1073.7' east of the cut-off line to F. M. 1604, having 900' on Hausman Road and a depth of 1427.27'.

The "P-1(B-2)" zoning is located between F. M. 1604 and Hausman Road being 1973.7' east of the cut-off line to F. M. 1604, having 944.54' of F. M. 1604 and 1068.84' on Hausman Road.

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

Mr. Camargo said that this area is also over the Edwards Aquifer recharge zone.

Mrs. Rowena Rodgers reiterated her statement made in Case No. 5994 in opposing this rezoning.

Mr. Cisneros said that he also opposed the rezoning for the same reasons as stated in Case No. 5994.

Mr. Mel Sueltenfuss, Director of Public Works, said that his department is inspecting all subdivision improvements at the present time and said that he is very comfortable with the situation. He said that the U. S. Geological Survey has agreed to monitor well samples and run off samples in the area.

In answer to Mr. Cisneros' question, Mr. Sam Jorrie, the applicant, said that he would not want a decision in this case postponed. He has already agreed to a PUD classification to provide extra safeguards and asked that the matter be acted on today.

City Manager Granata said that he will invite Mr. Yantis and the County Judge to meet with the City Council on October 2nd.

After consideration, Mr. Hartman made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved and the request for rezoning granted. The motion was seconded by Dr. Nielsen.

A substitute motion was offered by Mr. Pyndus to delay action on this request for rezoning until after the public hearing on the overlay ordinance to be held on October 2nd. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cisneros and on the following roll call vote, failed to carry: AYES: Pyndus, Cisneros; NAYS: Billa, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell; ABSENT: None.

On the following roll call vote, the original motion, carrying with it approval of the following ordinance was passed and approved: AYES: Billa, Black, Hartman, Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: Pyndus, Cisneros; ABSTAIN: Rohde; ABSENT: None.

#### AN ORDINANCE 45,737

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 21.500 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF NCB 14865, BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, 8000 BLOCK OF HAUSMAN ROAD, FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "P-1(B-3)" PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT BUSINESS DISTRICT; AND A 77.460 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF NCB 14865, BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, 8000 BLOCK OF HAUSMAN ROAD, FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "P-1(B-2)" PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER REPLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

\* \* \* \*

22. CASE 6188 - to rezone Lots 19 through 22, Block 15, NCB 16525, 6447 Old Highway 90 West, from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District to "I-1" Light Industry District, located on the northwest side of Old Highway 90 West being 50' northeast of the intersection of Westfield Drive and Old Highway 90 West having 200' on Old Highway 90 West and a maximum depth of 396.7'.

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, Dr. Nielsen made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that proper replatting is accomplished. Mr. Hartman seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

AN ORDINANCE 45,738

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 LOTS 19 THROUGH 22, BLOCK 15, NCB 16525, 6447 OLD HIGHWAY 90 WEST, FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "I-1" LIGHT INDUSTRY DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER REPLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

\* \* \* \*

23. CASE 6184 - to rezone Lots 11 through 14, Block 62, NCB 7217 900 Block of Fresno Drive, from "B" Two Family Residential District and "F" Local Retail District to "B-3" Business District, located northwest of the intersection of Blanco Road and Fresno Drive having 140' on Blanco Road and 200' on Fresno 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, Dr. Nielsen made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that a six foot solid screen fence is erected and maintained adjacent to the residential district. Mr. Hartman seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

AN ORDINANCE 45,739

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 LOTS 11 THROUGH 14, BLOCK 62, NCB 7217, 900 BLOCK OF FRESNO DRIVE, FROM "B" TWO FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT AND "F" LOCAL RETAIL DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT A SIX FOOT SOLID SCREEN FENCE IS ERECTED AND MAINTAINED ADJACENT TO THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT.

\* \* \* \*

24. CASE 6094 - to rezone Lots 1 and 2, Block 6, NCB 9039, 3600 Block of S. Zarzamora Street, 1402 - 1406 W. Theo Avenue, from "H" Local Retail District to "B-3" Business District, located on the south side of W. Theo Avenue between S. Zarzamora Street and Phyllis Street, having 136.54' on W. Theo Avenue and 124.9' on both S. Zarzamora Street and Phyllis Street.

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. Teniente made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that a six foot solid screen fence is erected and maintained along the east property line. Mr. Rohde seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Billa.

AN ORDINANCE 45,740

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 LOTS 1 AND 2,  
BLOCK 6, NCB 9039, 3600 BLOCK OF S.  
ZARZAMORA STREET, 1402 - 1406 W. THEO  
AVENUE, FROM "H" LOCAL RETAIL DISTRICT  
TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED  
THAT A SIX FOOT SOLID SCREEN FENCE IS  
ERECTED AND MAINTAINED ALONG THE EAST  
PROPERTY LINE.

\* \* \* \*

25. CASE 6093 - to rezone the north 28.35' of Lot 1 and the south 25' of Lot 2, Block 1, NCB 6584, 1505 N. W. 24th Street, from "B" Two Family Residential District to "B-3" Business District, located on the west side of 24th Street, being 288.40' south of the intersection of W. Laurel Street and 24th Street, having 53.35' on 24th Street and a depth of 137.25'.

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, Dr. Nielsen made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that a six foot solid screen fence is erected and maintained on both sides of the subject property abutting the single family residences. Mr. Rohde seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: Pyndus; ABSENT: Billa.

AN ORDINANCE 45,741

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 THE NORTH 28.35' OF LOT 1 AND THE SOUTH 25' OF LOT 2, BLOCK 1, NCB 6584, 1505 N. W. 24th STREET, FROM "B" TWO FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT A SIX FOOT SOLID SCREEN FENCE IS ERECTED AND MAINTAINED ON BOTH SIDES OF THE SUBJECT PROPERTY ABUTTING THE SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCES.

\* \* \* \*

26. CASE 6182 - to rezone the south 100' of Lot 47 and the south 100' of the west 30.72' of Lot 48, Block 22, NCB 11410, 3607 Culebra Road, from "F" Local Retail District to "B-3" Business District, located on the north side of Culebra Road being 120' northwest of the intersection of Hillcrest Drive and Culebra Road having 80.96' on Culebra Road and a depth of 100'.

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, Dr. Nielsen made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that proper replatting is accomplished. Rev. Black seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Black, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Billa, Cisneros, Hartman.

AN ORDINANCE 45,742

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 THE SOUTH 100' OF LOT 47 AND THE SOUTH 100' OF THE WEST 30.72' OF LOT 48, BLOCK 22, NCB 11410, 3607 CULEBRA ROAD, FROM "F" LOCAL RETAIL DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER REPLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

\* \* \* \*

27. CASE 6203 - to rezone Lot 8, Block 15, NCB 7227, 4226 Blanco Road, from "F" Local Retail District to "B-3" Business District, located southeast of the intersection of Blanco Road and San Angelo Blvd., having 50' on Blanco Road and 135' on San Angelo Blvd.

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. Teniente made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that proper replatting is accomplished. Mr. Rohde seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Black, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Billa, Cisneros, Hartman.

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 8, BLOCK 15,  
 NCB 7227, 4226 BLANCO ROAD, FROM "F"  
 LOCAL RETAIL DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS  
 DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER REPLATTING  
 IS ACCOMPLISHED.

\* \* \* \*

28. CASE 6172 - to rezone Lot 1, Block 2, NCB 14282, 9200 Block of Wurzbach Road, from "O-1" Office District to "B-2" Business District, located east of the intersection of Wurzbach Road and Parkdale Drive, having 200' on Wurzbach Road and 203' on Parkdale Drive.

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

Mr. Bill Eman, representing the applicant, said that there is no plan for this property as yet. He said that he has developed other properties in the same area which are very nice developments and whatever is put here would be just as nice. He asked for the Council's favorable consideration.

Mr. W. D. Henderson, 8700 Crownhill, spoke on behalf of the owner of an office building on Parkdale Avenue just outside the 200' distance. He said that there is enough business now on Wurzbach Road and that business zoning should stop where it is. He claimed that strip centers are ruining the area.

Mr. Emans spoke in rebuttal saying that this is business property on a heavily traveled entry and should be zoned for business.

After consideration, Mr. Teniente made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that proper replatting is accomplished. Dr. Nielsen seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: Pyndus; ABSENT: Billa; ABSTAIN: Rohde.

AN ORDINANCE 45,744

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 1, BLOCK 2,  
 NCB 14282, 9200 BLOCK OF WURZBACH ROAD,  
 FROM "O-1" OFFICE DISTRICT TO "B-2"  
 BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER  
 REPLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

\* \* \* \*

29. CASE 6159 - to rezone Lot 32, NCB 12457, 2751 Nacogdoches Road, from "B" Two Family Residential District to "R-3" Multiple Family Residential District for a day care center with over twenty (20) children, located north of the intersection of Middlebury Drive and Nacogdoches Road, having 75' on Middlebury Drive and 112' on Nacogdoches Road.

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. Teniente made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that the property be replatted and that a non-access easement be imposed along Middlebury Drive and Nacogdoches Road. Mr. Cisneros seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None; ABSTAIN: Pyndus.

AN ORDINANCE 45,745

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 32, NCB 12457, 2751 NACOGDOCHES ROAD, FROM "B" TWO FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "R-3" MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT FOR A DAY CARE CENTER WITH OVER TWENTY (20) CHILDREN), PROVIDED THAT THE PROPERTY BE REPLATTED AND THAT A NON-ACCESS EASEMENT BE IMPOSED ALONG MIDDLEBURY DRIVE AND NACOGDOCHES ROAD.

\* \* \* \*

30. CASE 6166 - to rezone Lot 28, Block 1, NCB 12451, 2735 Nacogdoches Road, from "B" Two Family Residential District to "O-1" Office District, located on the northwest side of Nacogdoches Road, being 75' southwest of the intersection of Middlebury Drive and Nacogdoches Road, having 66' on Nacogdoches Road with a depth of 130.77'.

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. Cisneros made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that a six foot solid screen fence is erected along each side of the property that abuts the single family residences. Mr. Hartman seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Cockrell; NAYS: Pyndus; ABSENT: Teniente, Nielsen.

AN ORDINANCE 45,746

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 28, BLOCK 1, NCB 12451, 2735 NACOGDOCHES ROAD, FROM "B" TWO FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "O-1" OFFICE DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT A SIX FOOT SOLID SCREEN FENCE IS ERECTED ALONG EACH SIDE OF THE PROPERTY THAT ABUTS THE SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCES.

\* \* \* \*

31. CASE 6129 - to rezone a 0.252 acre tract of land out of NCB 13664, being further described by field notes filed in the office of the City Clerk, 5901 Danny Kaye Drive, from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District to "B-2" Business District, located north-east of Danny Kaye Drive, being 340.54' northeast of the intersection of Bogart Drive and Danny Kaye Drive, having a width of 90' and a length of 122'.

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

Mr. Charles Dempsey, representing the applicant, said that construction of a convenience store had begun on this property in December 1972 just prior to the area being annexed by the City of San Antonio. It was being constructed by the same company which was building the Medical Center apartments on adjoining property. The company had financial problems and finally went bankrupt being taken over by Rio Grande Building and Loan Association of Harlingen, Texas. The apartments were completed and now would like to complete the convenience store to serve the apartments and surrounding residential area. He submitted a petition with 130 signatures in favor of the rezoning.

The following persons spoke in opposition:

Mr. Russell Adams, 5827 Danny Kaye  
Mrs. Sue Adams, 5827 Danny Kaye  
Mrs. Mary Altman  
Mr. Joel Hudson  
Mrs. Helen Newell

The opponents all expressed a desire to keep the neighborhood strictly residential and were opposed to any business zoning. They said that there is insufficient traffic on Danny Kaye to support this type of business and in a while there would just be an empty building there. There was also fear that this business could add to traffic problems.

Mr. Harry Rawls, representing Rio Grande Building and Loan Association, explained how his company had acquired this property and said that they were ignorant of the annexation because of their location in Harlingen. He assured the Council that this development would be an asset to the area and asked for favorable consideration.

After discussion, Mr. Pyndus made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be overruled and the request for rezoning be denied. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cisneros.

Mr. Hartman offered a substitute motion to postpone a decision in this case pending clarification of possible non-conforming rights. The motion was seconded by Dr. Nielsen and on the following roll call vote the motion was defeated: AYES: Hartman, Nielsen; NAYS: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Rohde, Teniente, Cockrell; ABSENT: None.

After consideration, on the following roll call vote, the original motion by Mr. Pyndus to deny the rezoning carried: AYES: Pyndus, Cisneros, Black, Teniente, Cockrell; NAYS: Billa, Rohde; ABSTAIN: Hartman, Nielsen; ABSENT: None.

The rezoning was denied.

33. CASE 6105 - to rezone Lots 3 through 9, Block 8, NCB 15570, 7300 Block of S. W. Military Drive, from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District to "O-1" Office District, located on the east side of S. W. Military Drive access road between Remuda Drive and Westlawn Drive, having 696.85' on S. W. Military Drive access road and a maximum depth of 136'.

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. Cisneros made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that a six foot solid screen fence is erected and maintained along the east and south property lines. Mr. Rohde seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Nielsen.

AN ORDINANCE 45,747

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 LOTS 3 THROUGH 9,  
BLOCK 8, NCB 15570, 7300 BLOCK OF S. W.  
MILITARY DRIVE, FROM TEMPORARY "R-1"  
SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO  
"O-1" OFFICE DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT  
A SIX FOOT SOLID SCREEN FENCE IS ERECTED  
AND MAINTAINED ALONG THE EAST AND SOUTH  
PROPERTY LINES.

\* \* \* \*

39. CASE 6144 - to rezone a 0.399 acre tract of land out of NCB 13604, being further described by field notes filed in the office of the City Clerk, 1000 Block of Glamis Avenue, from "A" Single Family Residential District to "R-3" Multiple Family Residential District and the relocation of 1' non-access easement as required by Ordinance No. 41106 on August 24, 1972, located on the south side of Glamis Avenue being 312' east of the intersection of Stringfellow Drive and Glamis Avenue, having 50' on Glamis Avenue and a depth of 144.5'.

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

Mr. Malcom Hartman, Attorney for Calloway and Schlueter, Inc., the applicant, explained that the request to rezone this small area is to provide parking for the Pennystone Apartment Complex. Due to the objections expressed by surrounding property owners, he had had meetings with them and as a result, had reached an agreement to:

1. Delete the north 91.31' of property from the request which would be quitclaimed to the adjacent property owners.
2. The 1' non-access on the south side of the parcel is to be relocated to the north side of the rezoned parcel.
3. The 85' building setback line is reconfirmed.
4. Plant trees and shrubs along the north line to protect privacy of residents.
5. Provide a drainage cut extending from parking area.

A signed agreement between the applicant and the residents is to be attached to the rezoning ordinance.

Mr. R. A. Bernhard, 214 Chesterfield, speaking for the residents verified that the changes recited by Mr. Hartman were agreeable to the residents who were withdrawing their opposition.

After consideration, Mr. Billa made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be overruled and the rezoning be approved, provided that an existing 1' non-access easement on the south side of the parcel to be relocated to the north side of the rezoned parcel of land shall extend along the north property line and that a six-foot solid screen fence is erected and maintained on the north side of the rezoned parcel and that the 85' setback line as shown on plat of Pecan Valley Subdivision, Unit 1A, Lot 16, Block 1, NCB 13604 is hereby confirmed, and that trees and shrubs shall be planted to protect privacy as in the agreement between Callaway & Schlueter, Inc., and property owners, and that a drainage cut be installed extending from parking area and shall be at an angle in order to ease the runoff problems. All in accordance with the signed agreement between the residents and the property owners which is attached hereto. Mr. Pyndus seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

#### AN ORDINANCE 45,748

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 0.294 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF NCB 13604, BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, 1000 BLOCK OF GLAMIS AVENUE, FROM "A" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "R-3" MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT AND THE RELOCATION OF 1' NON-ACCESS EASEMENT AS REQUIRED BY ORDINANCE NO. 41106 ON AUGUST 24, 1972, PROVIDED THAT AN EXISTING 1' NON-ACCESS EASEMENT ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF THE PARCEL TO BE RELOCATED TO THE NORTH SIDE OF THE REZONED PARCEL OF LAND SHALL EXTEND ALONG THE NORTH PROPERTY LINE AND THAT A SIX FOOT SOLID SCREEN FENCE IS ERRECTED AND MAINTAINED ON THE NORTH SIDE OF THE REZONED PARCEL AND THAT THE 85' SETBACK LINE AS SHOWN ON PLAT OF PECAN VALLEY SUBDIVISION UNIT 1A, LOT 16, BLOCK 1, NCB 13604 IS HEREBY CONFIRMED, AND THAT TREES AND SHRUBS SHALL BE

PLANTED TO PROTECT PRIVACY AS IN THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN CALLAWAY & SCHLUETER, INC., AND PROPERTY OWNERS, AND THAT A DRAINAGE CUT BE INSTALLED EXTENDING FROM PARKING AREA AND SHALL BE AT AN ANGLE IN ORDER TO EASE THE RUNOFF PROBLEMS.

\* \* \* \*

Mr. Cisneros congratulated both the proponents and the opponents on this case on the spirit in which this case was resolved.

Mr. Bernhard said that this would never have come to pass without the very able staff in this department.

32. CASE 6186 - to rezone the northeast 193' of Lot 86, NCB 11566 5300 Block of Callaghan Road, from "A" Single Family Residential District to "R-3" Multiple Family Residential District for a day care center for over 20 children, located on the southeast side of Callaghan Road being approximately 150' southwest of the intersection of Nobhill Drive and Callaghan Road, with approximately a depth of 320.00'.

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

Mr. Bruce Lane, the applicant, spoke in favor of the application. He asked that the rezoning be approved so that La Petite Academy could put in a day care center for 100 children in the 2-6 year age range. The property fronts on a non-residential street which has high traffic density and is slated to be widened to 4 lanes. At the present time the property is vacant, infested with rodents and has accumulated trash on it. He had a photograph of a building which would be built on the property and had a plot plan also. He asked for the Council's favorable consideration.

Mr. Henry C. Morales, 4975 View Drive, also spoke in favor of the request. He said that he could not see how a day care center could be a nuisance to its neighbors. He spoke very highly of La Petite and said that he felt it would be an asset to the area.

Mr. Ray Matlock, representing La Petite Day Care Centers, said that his company now has 104 centers in 13 states. There are six centers in San Antonio now. He said that some of the opponents had said that if the property were zoned "R-3", it could be used for apartments. He assured the Council that his company has no interest in building apartments.

Mrs. Dawn Taylor, Manager of one of the La Petite Centers described her school. She said that meals are served and the Health Department inspects the place each month.

The following persons spoke in opposition:

Mr. Fred Berry, 5300 Block Callaghan Road  
Mr. W. A. George, 314 Nobhill  
Mr. J. C. Osborn, 218 Nobhill  
Mr. H. Ottman, 303 Nobhill

The opponents said that the Center would be an intrusion on their privacy. It would create noise and cause an increase in traffic on an already busy street. They all said that they wished to retain the neighborhood for single family residences.

Mr. Lane spoke in rebuttal saying that the traffic on Callaghan Road is already heavy and that it wouldn't be created by this school. He asked that the Council grant the rezoning.

After consideration, Mr. Billa moved that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be overruled and the rezoning denied. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pyndus and was passed and approved on the following roll call vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Rohde, Teniente, Cockrell; NAYS: Hartman, Nielsen; ABSENT: None.

The rezoning was denied.

34. CASE 6178 - to rezone Lots 26 through 30, 32, 35 and the northwest 50' of Lot 25, Block 2, NCB 11612, 2000 Block of Babcock Road, from "A" Single Family Residential District to "O-1" Office District.

Lot 35 is located south of the intersection of Babcock Road and Dorothy Louise Drive having 120' on Babcock Road and 245' on Dorothy Louise Drive.

Lot 32 is located on the southwest side of Babcock Road being 320' southeast of the intersection of Babcock Road and Dorothy Louise Drive having 100' on Babcock Road and a depth of 245'.

Lots 26 through 30 and the northwest 50' of Lot 25 are located on the southwest side of Babcock Road being 520' southwest of the intersection of Dorothy Louise Drive and Babcock Road having 550' on Babcock Road and a depth of 245'.

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

Mr. Joe Sage spoke as representative of several property owners who seek rezoning in this case. He said that this whole area is undergoing a transition due to the medical center and UTSA. He said that he felt that now is the time to change and that "O-1" Office District seemed appropriate for this property. There are no firm development plans at this time.

Mr. Mike Baucum spoke as representative of residents in the immediate area. He called attention to certain deed restrictions which state that the property will remain residential. He asked that the Council deny the rezoning.

Persons speaking in opposition were:

Mrs. Marian Perry, 7119 W. Beverly Mae  
Mr. Robert Egloff, 7203 W. Beverly Mae  
Mr. Wm. A. Steele, 4910 Belle Ellen  
Mr. Robert Goodnaugh

The opponents said that they had purchased their homes as single family residences with the understanding that the area would remain residential. To zone part of it, "O-1" would cause the neighborhood to begin to lose its character. They asked that the Council deny the request for rezoning so that the area would remain as it is.

Mr. Sage spoke in rebuttal describing the area. He said no one would want to build a single family residence on a six lane thoroughfare.

After consideration, Dr. Nielsen made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that proper replatting is accomplished and that a six foot solid screen fence is erected and maintained along the southwest property line and along the southeast property line in Lot 25. Mr. Rohde seconded the motion. On

roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Black, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen; NAYS: Pyndus, Billa, Hartman, Cockrell; ABSENT: None.

AN ORDINANCE 45,748

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 LOTS 26 THROUGH 30, 32, 35 AND THE NORTHWEST 50' OF LOT 25, BLOCK 2, NCB 11612, 2000 BLOCK OF BABCOCK ROAD, FROM "A" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "O-1" OFFICE DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER REPLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED AND THAT A SIX FOOT SOLID SCREEN FENCE IS ERECTED AND MAINTAINED ALONG THE SOUTHWEST PROPERTY LINE AND ALONG THE SOUTHEAST PROPERTY LINE IN LOT 25.

\* \* \* \*

35. CASE 6134 - to rezone Lots 55, 56, and 57, Block 3, NCB 11613 2100 Block of Babcock Road, from "A" Single Family Residential District to "O-1" Office District, located south of the intersection of Babcock Road and W. Beverly Mae Drive, having 268.7' on W. Beverly Mae Drive and 338.6' on Babcock Road.

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

Mr. Camargo said that he had received written opposition from owners of more than 20% of the surrounding property within 200' and, therefore, 7 affirmative votes would be required to approve rezoning.

Mr. James H. Gardner, attorney, asked that the case be postponed to allow him more time to get additional evidence.

Persons in opposition to the rezoning objected to a postponement and asked that the case be heard today.

Mr. Billa moved that the case be heard. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pyndus and was passed and approved by the following roll call vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Nielsen.

Mr. James Gardner then spoke in favor of the rezoning which is in the next block from Case No. 6178 which had just been heard. He described the surrounding area and the heavy traffic on Babcock Road. He said that his client wished to build a one story office building on the site.

Mr. John B. Johnson, architect, showed a rendition of the proposed building which would have space for about 120 vehicles.

Persons speaking in opposition were:

Mike Baucum, Attorney  
Marian Perry  
William Steele  
Robert Egloff  
Dorothy Huber  
Mary Catherine Adams

769  
All of the opponents expressed a desire to retain the area as residential and to prevent business from encroaching. Business would violate the neighborhood and cause an increase in crime.

In rebuttal, Mr. Gardner asked for a brief recess to allow him to discuss the matter with the residents and attempt to reach a compromise. His request was granted and he and the opponents left the Council Chamber to confer.

After a time Mr. Gardner said that he would like to modify his request to "R-6" Townhouse District, which, he thought, was agreeable to residents in the area.

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, Mr. Hartman moved that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be overruled and the property rezoned "R-6" Townhouse District. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pyndus and on the following roll call vote the motion, carrying with it approval of the ordinance, was passed and approved: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Nielsen.

#### AN ORDINANCE 45,749

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 LOTS 55, 56, AND  
57, BLOCK 3, NCB 11613, 2100 BLOCK OF  
BABCOCK ROAD, FROM "A" SINGLE FAMILY  
RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "R-6" TOWNHOUSE  
DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER REPLATTING  
IS ACCOMPLISHED AND THAT A SIX FOOT SOLID  
SCREEN FENCE IS ERECTED AND MAINTAINED  
ALONG THE SOUTHWEST PROPERTY LINE.

\* \* \* \*

36. CASE 6191 - to rezone the south 75' of the north 150' of the west 161.2' of Lot 25 and the south 150' of the west 90.2' of Lot 25, NCB 11887, 249 W. Sunset Road, 514 Everest Drive, from "A" Single Family Residential District to "B-3" Business District, located northeast of the intersection of Sunset Road and Everest Avenue, having 225' on Everest Avenue and 90' on Sunset Road.

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

Mr. John L. Surber, the applicant, stated that there are two dilapidated buildings on this property that should be removed. If the property is rezoned to make it economically feasible, the buildings would be removed and a new commercial building erected. He pointed out the other commercial zoning in the area and the other "B-2" zoning across the street. He asked for the Council's favorable consideration.

Mr. and Mrs. Russell Noel, 243 W. Sunset Road, along with Col. Raymond Brake, 250 W. Sunset Road, protested the proposed "B-2" zoning. They said that traffic in this area is extremely heavy now. They each said that they would accept "B-1" zoning because it would have a lighter use.

In rebuttal, Mr. Surber said that he would be limited under "B-1" zoning and could not build a building large enough and insisted upon at least "B-2" zoning.

After consideration, Mr. Billa made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be overruled and the property be rezoned to "B-1" Business District. Mr. Pyndus seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Nielsen.

AN ORDINANCE 45,750

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 THE SOUTH 75' OF THE NORTH 150' OF THE WEST 161.2' OF LOT 25 AND THE SOUTH 150' OF THE WEST 90.2' OF LOT 25, NCB 11887, 249 W. SUNSET ROAD, 514 EVEREST DRIVE, FROM "A" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-1" BUSINESS DISTRICT.

\* \* \* \*

37. CASE 6169 - to rezone Lot 1, Block 1, NCB 14341, 900 Block of Babcock Road, from "R-3" Multiple Family Residential District to "B-2" Business District, located west of the intersection of Sunshine Ranch Road and Babcock Road, having 130' on Sunshine Ranch Road and 585' on Babcock Road.

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

Mr. Stewart Alexander, the applicant, pointed out that this irregular piece of land is buffered from residential neighborhood by a drainage easement and streets. It does not abut any residential property. At the present time, it is vacant and overgrown with weeds and harbors rodents and insects. He said that the proposed convenience store would be an asset to the neighborhood.

Speaking in opposition were:

Mr. and Mrs. W. C. Hudson, 454 Concord  
Mr. John Hendry, 8700 Crownhill  
Mrs. Victor Chue, 3611 Crosette  
Mr. B. W. Quinn, 363 Altgelt  
Mr. Martin Palmer, 411 Concord

The opponents said that this would be a blatant case of spot zoning. The entire area is residential. None of them wanted a convenience store on the property. They claimed it would cause litter, noise, traffic, and possibly crime. They were unanimous in asking that the request be denied.

Speaking in rebuttal, Mr. Cy Alexander said that he pays taxes on the land and should be entitled to use it. He asked that his request be approved.

After consideration, Mr. Billa moved that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be upheld and the request for rezoning be denied. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rohde and on the following roll call vote, the motion was passed and approved; AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

The rezoning was denied.

38. CASE 6097 - to rezone Lot 15, Block 28, NCB 15298, 5931 Stonybrook Drive, from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District to "B-1" Business District, located northeast of the intersection of Raintree and Stonybrook Drive, having 126' on Raintree and 113.14' on Stonybrook Drive.

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

Mr. Leocadio Fuentes, Jr., the applicant, said that he wished to convert a portion of his home so it can be used as a beauty shop to be operated by his wife and daughter.

Mr. Billa and Mr. Pyndus spoke against the rezoning saying that it would clearly be a case of spot zoning and an intrusion into a residential neighborhood.

Mr. Cisneros said that there was no one in the neighborhood opposed to the request. He made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be overruled and the request for rezoning approved. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hartman and on the following roll call vote, the motion, carrying with it approval of the following Ordinance, was passed and approved: AYES: Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente; NAYS: Pyndus, Billa, Nielsen, Cockrell; ABSENT: None.

AN ORDINANCE 45,751

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 15, BLOCK 28,  
NCB 15298, 5931 STONYBROOK DRIVE, FROM  
TEMPORARY "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL  
DISTRICT TO "B-1" BUSINESS DISTRICT.

\* \* \* \*

75-56

HISTORIC ZONING  
MAIN PLAZA AND MILITARY PLAZA

VIII. CASE 6081 - to rezone Lots 1, 2, 3, 4-A, 5-B, 6 through 11, A-20, 21, A-21 and A-22, NCB 100; Lots 8-A and 9 through 12, NCB 106; Lots 1, 2, A-3, B-3, 4 and 22, NCB 110; Lots 2, 4, 5, 14 through 19, the north 24' of A-23 and the north 218' of Lot 20, NCB 111; Lots 3, 4, 11 through 20, 26, and 27, NCB 122; Lots A-8, A-9, A-10, A-11, A-12, A-13, and A-14, NCB 909; Lots 2 and 3, NCB 913; the west irregular 120' of NCB 101; the west 112.65' of NCB 146; Lots 1, 3, A-3, A-4, B-4, NCB 118 and NCB's 117, 123, 136, 765, 864 and 865.

The case was explained by Miss Marge Jordan, Senior Planning Administrator, who said that the San Antonio Conservation Society had requested this zoning to designate the numerous properties surrounding Main and Military Plazas as "H" Historic District. The area is generally bounded by West Houston Street, West Nueva Street, San Antonio River and San Pedro Creek. The Planning Commission had recommended approval of the request.

Mr. Fred Burtner, President of the Greater San Antonio Chamber of Commerce, said that in the last month he has met with property owners in the area and agreed on some amendments which would make the proposed ordinance more palatable and more workable. Areas of compromise relate to a waiving of the 120 day waiting period for demolishing buildings, removal of height limitation, and the governing of this historic area by a board consisting primarily of property owners in the area.

Mr. Ralph Langley, attorney for the San Antonio Conservation Society, distributed copies of a letter outlining an agreement reached between the Society and the property owners in which they asked that the Council go ahead and consider rezoning today. Subsequently, they will attempt to arrive at amendments to the ordinance affecting this area. He asked that the Council proceed today as if there were nothing else pending. (A copy of the letter is attached to the ordinance).

The following persons spoke in favor of the historic zoning:

1. Mrs. Nancy Negley, President of the San Antonio Conservation Society
2. Dr. Donald Everett, Chairman of History Department, Trinity University
3. Mr. Carl Brenner, Solo Serve, Inc.
4. Mr. Boone Powell, Paul Kennison and Humberto Saldana representing the Urban Design Task Force, AIA.
5. Monsignor Janacek, representing Archbishop Francis Furey
6. Mr. Fred Pfeiffer, San Antonio River Authority
7. Dr. Robert Mullen
8. Mrs. Vivian Hamlin, Chairman of Bicentennial Committee
9. Mr. James Saunders, San Antonio Legacy
10. Miss Adela Navarro
11. Mr. Ralph Langley

Speaking in opposition were:

Mr. Karl Wurz, 820 Florida Street, spoke in opposition to the proposed rezoning but would give no reason.

Mrs. Nancy Dowkowitz, a property owner at the corner of Flores and Commerce, said that she does not object to the preservation of historic sites but felt that property owners would suffer. She felt that she would lose her tenants if it is zoned historic. She said that she has no assurance that the ordinance will be modified later.

Mr. Walter McAllister III said that his company has requested a permit to demolish a building at Soledad and Commerce but has been denied. The space is needed for parking space for the SASA Building.

Mr. Langley responded to Mr. McAllister. He said that this matter has been discussed and that it is believed that a wall of historic significance is in the building. It is hoped that the brick and stone in that wall can be utilized somehow in the parking area to be built.

Mr. Herbert Heiman spoke in opposition to the ordinance. He said that a lot of property owners were to be present to speak in opposition but when the agreement was reached with the Society, he had phoned the property owners and told them that their appearance would not be necessary. He said also that Solo Serve had been removed from inclusion in the historic district without discussing it with the other property owners.

After consideration, Mr. Cisneros made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved. Mr. Hartman seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None; ABSTAIN: Pyndus.

#### AN ORDINANCE 45,752

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 LOTS 1, 2, 3, 4-A, 5-B, 6 THROUGH 11, A-20, 21, A-21 and A-22, NCB 100; LOTS 8-A AND 9 THROUGH 12, NCB 106; LOTS 1, 2, A-3, B-3, 4 AND 22, NCB 110; LOTS 2, 4, 5, 14 THROUGH 19, THE NORTH 24' OF A-23 AND THE NORTH 218' OF LOT 20, NCB 111; LOTS 3, 4, 11 THROUGH 20, 26, AND 27, NCB 122; LOTS A-8, A-9, A-10, A-11, A-12, A-13, AND A-14, NCB 909; LOTS 2 AND 3, NCB 913; THE WEST IRREGULAR 120' OF NCB 101; THE WEST 112.65' OF NCB 146; LOTS 1, 3, A-3, A-4, B-4, NCB 118; AND NCB'S 117, 123, 136, 765, 864 AND 865, TO PLACE WITHIN AN "H" HISTORIC DISTRICT.

\* \* \* \*

Mr. Pyndus said that he abstained from voting because he felt that the vote taken has binding implications and a yes vote would also bind the Council so he abstained.

75-56

CITY PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD

The Clerk read the following Resolution:

A RESOLUTION  
NO. 75-56-81

BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS, APPROVING AS TO FORM AND CONTENT AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF \$50,000,000 "CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS, ELECTRIC AND GAS SYSTEMS REVENUE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, NEW SERIES 1975", AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

\* \* \* \*

MAYOR LILA COCKRELL: All right, gentlemen, you all know the long history of this. I do feel there is one point that I would like to bring to your attention at this time. On Page 20 and also on Page 20A, there are two provisions that the Council added last night. I do want to share my concern with the Council about those two provisions. Specifically, on Page 20A, the middle paragraph there.

As you know, just to recap the circumstances, when the Council received the draft ordinance, the Council was aware that we were moving toward this item and upon the recommendation of the Chairman of the City Public Service Board, Mr. Berg, a joint committee was appointed consisting of two members of the CPS Board, two members of the City Council and two citizens at large who were asked to try to adjudicate any policy differences in that ordinance. At the initial meeting, there were some policy differences that were brought forward. There was then set another meeting at which the issue of the method of selection of the members of the Board of Trustees was to be discussed.

As you all know, prior to going to that meeting, I did have the opportunity to have each member of the City Council appraised of a plan that would be offered at that joint meeting and it was my understanding of some staff consultations that each member of the City Council agreed to the plan that was offered as the compromise plan. This is the plan by which the City Public Service Board would appoint the successors to the Board but that one vote, that of the Mayor, must be included in the majority vote and also providing that the City Council, by a majority vote, must concur with the selection. Representing this Council and representing what was transmitted to me as the full concurrence of this City Council, I went to that meeting and I agreed on your behalf to that provision.

Now, I will have to share with you that I am concerned that last night we have added changes unilaterally without further discussion with the CPS Board and, in effect, changed an agreement that we had entered into. Had I simply entered into this on my own, I would have no reason for feeling any problem because it would have been my unilateral action. Because of the fact that I had checked with each member of the Council the decision that was to be reached and therefore went into the meeting representing this Council I do feel that the Council, in changing the agreement last night and in acting unilaterally, needs to just think this through one more time. In fact, I would urge that prior to doing this that either you follow one of two courses. Either you delete this addition or you have one additional meeting with the CPS Board to iron this out.

MR. HENRY CISNEROS: What addition is that, Mayor?

MAYOR COCKRELL: Now this was on page 20A, that's that middle paragraph and also on the preceding page. Now the middle paragraph provides that, notwithstanding the fact that the agreement was reached, that we are saying that any future City Council can adopt whatever method it chooses of changing the method of selection. Yes, now that was the one point and then in addition to that we added the other point about, in the event the City on three successive attempts fails to confirm the nominee...I felt those two provisions were added unilaterally by action on our part and, in effect, go contrary to what has been agreed to by the joint committee in terms of an agreement reached by all parties.

MR. CISNEROS: Mayor, so far what you said would indicate that your disagreement is a procedural one.

MAYOR COCKRELL: No.

MR. CISNEROS: But what I am asking is would you state the substantive reason why.

MAYOR COCKRELL: The substantive reason is that on behalf of this Council I agreed on your behalf that we had agreed on this settlement proposal.

MR. CISNEROS: That really is a procedural matter, is it not?

MAYOR COCKRELL: Well, it is to me, I have given my word. I have said that this is what I believe is the Council's.

MR. CISNEROS: This doesn't have anything to do with selling the bonds or their market value or anything like that?

MAYOR COCKRELL: No, it has to do with the fact that I entered into the negotiations as your duly named representative, along with Mayor Pro-Tem Teniente, and based on what I understood to be the Council's position, I gave my word in an agreement. Now, if the Council wishes to change this, of course you can, but I will have to say that I do feel a problem about it because I have given the word of the Council as your representative and not based on representing myself but based on representing what you had shared with me with your provision.

MR. BOB BILLA: I see no problem with this. When I ran for Council it was one of the sections of the platform that I ran on that eventually this Council would some day gain control in the appointment of the Trustees or whatever other means should be utilized to manage it and I really see no problem since it doesn't affect the sale of the bonds or anything like that. I think that it is a good thing and that we... but it happens somewhere way down the line not even in my lifetime. It was a commitment I made. I would like to stand by it myself.

MR. GLEN HARTMAN: Mayor?

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, sir.

773

MR. HARTMAN: Going back to the time in which the discussion did take place between yourself, Mayor Pro-Tem and members of the City Public Service Board and citizens. At that time, I think the matter was presented in the sense that if we were able to arrange this, would this be acceptable? And I think the answer - response to that, if we can go this far, yes, that would be acceptable. I think as a result of yesterday's discussions, I think there were additional options pointed out to us by a consultant and I think it was with that recognition that we had additional options. I think it was on that basis that I know I responded in the manner that I did. As I explained yesterday, my concern and my intent is to maintain the maximum options for the future. I think that to me, I think that any time a matter of, in a policy making situation, the policy making body should hold open to the absolute maximum its alternatives. I view this as being one method by which this could be done and it was therefore on that basis that I concluded that this would be a worthwhile addition and I still so believe.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes. As I said, it is not what the subject matter is, it is the fact that as your representative in good faith I shook hands on this agreement, and now the Council without going back to sit down around the table again has unilaterally made a change in the agreement.

MR. HARTMAN: Mayor, may I just respond to that. Inasmuch as the City Council is the policy board for the City and inasmuch as the City Public Service Board is a board that operates the utility that is owned by the City, I do not necessarily see where it is absolutely essential that we get their concurrence in order to affect a particular agreement. In other words, I think this is a policy making function that we as a Council have.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, Mr. Pyndus.

MR. PHIL PYNDUS: I think that we are overlooking the point that Mayor Cockrell is point out to us. Certainly, I would like to have your feeling, Mayor Cockrell, with regard to the action that we took even though it bent your word, and you made a public note of the fact that you felt that you had shook hands on a deal and I would like to see that honored. You did it in behalf of the Council and you are our representative and I think if we followed those logical steps your remarks are quite pertinent. I would like to have your feeling with regards to, would you vote with us, going beyond the procedures that you have described to the matter contained in the ordinance or whether you would feel compelled not to vote for the ordinance at this time.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Well, on that basis, I would vote for the substance of the ordinance but I would specifically call attention that I did not concur with adding the portion which I felt violates the agreement that we reached.

MR. BILLA: Mayor, I think that it reflects what the consensus of this Council was when we were discussing it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. In effect, what the affect of the change is, is that the agreement that was reached is totally scrapped because what you are saying is that in the future the City Council, whoever is in office at that time, will at that time decide what the method of appointment will be. That is really the effect.

REV. BLACK: Mayor.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, sir.

REV. CLAUDE BLACK: I can certainly understand your feelings in this matter. But I think that in the negotiation part of any representative of the Council is always discussed with an understanding that is subject to the action of the Council and I think that these men are wise in these

matters. Now, in addition to that I think that you have assumed your responsibility for your negotiation when you bring to the Council your position with reference to how you feel about it. Then the Council has an obligation to respond to that position with reference to its own relationship to the ordinance itself. We all share an individual responsibility. Now, in addition to that I believe that the decision made - agreement made certainly fulfills the period of your administration unless you plan to be here for the next ten years.

MAYOR COCKRELL: I don't think any of us will be.....

REV. BLACK: It fulfills the period of your administration. It simply delegates to someone who will come after you, or you grant to that person that comes after you an option that you had when you were negotiating that with these persons.

MAYOR COCKRELL: What we're saying is that in affect they will start from scratch. There will be no rules of that type.

MR. CISNEROS: There is one additional point I think that has to be made and it refers to the chronology which the decisions have taken place and the truth of the matter is that before the consultant was asked to look at this by us, and I'm talking about Mr. Harris, we really didn't know something we knew after he finished so that the agreement that was reached before was really reached on some information that we didn't have before yesterday afternoon and the decision that we made collectively hinged on new information which was made available to us yesterday and provided us with additional options. I think that with that new information it was possible to come to some new understanding in the situation and that's what a consultant is for and should do and my only regret is that we didn't have him earlier on, as you said yesterday, so we could collectively have a few more briefing sessions and so forth with the information that he provided us only yesterday.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Well, this is something Council will have to determine and I certainly have shared my feelings with you and that's all I can do.

MR. CISNEROS: I'd like very much, Mayor, if you see fit to when the time comes should the Council in its wisdom decide to vote as we did yesterday to uphold the substantive questions that you might be able to join with us as you have already indicated you do agree with the substantive principles involved and with the note that procedurally to this agreement.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Well, I will agree on the major substance of the ordinance, certainly. Dr. Nielsen.

DR. D. FORD NIELSEN: Just one clarification. I assume that your position substantially would be that if there were time to consider this again, regardless of the outcome, you would feel better back to the process again.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, and also regarding the substance of what we have done, we have written a blank check for the future. We have not, yes, sir, we have, we're saying that in the future the matter of how the board is selected totally up for discussion at that time and we have not given, we have not written in anything, in effect, when we say that a future Council can then determine the method of selecting the board. And so, that's the way it is. That may be exactly what you want to do but I want to be sure you understand that.

MR. PYNDUS: I want clarification on that, if I may, Mayor Cockrell. Would you clarify the selection with regards to the Council's blank check?

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. On page 20A where it says is - this follows the method that has been agreed to. And then it says - "not withstanding any of the foregoing provisions as contained in this Section 20B or any other section of this ordinance pertaining to the appointment

or selection of trustees of the board" and so forth, the City Council reserves unto itself the absolute right to at any time upon passage of an ordinance approved by a majority vote of its members to change the method of selection of any appointments to the Board of Trustees without the approval of any person, party, holder of parity bonds or board". That means that at any time in the future that each successive Council if it desires, could change the method of selection of the board.

MR. BILLA: Only after the present bonds are paid off. Which is way into the future.

MAYOR COCKRELL: That is what I referred to as a blank check.

MR. BILLA: It includes the commitment that I made.....

MR. PYNDUS: Would the change of the wording please you more?

MAYOR COCKRELL: Well, Mr. Teniente.

MR. RICHARD TENIENTE: Mrs. Cockrell, I would prefer to use instead of blank check, perhaps the terminology "options". The options being left to the people such as the options that we have with the City Water Board in the naming of the trustees of the City Water Board. I think that the previous Councils have done a pretty good job, and have done what they think is best. And we could go on and name other areas. A blank check, of course, can be expressed as such - in such a manner. I prefer to use the word options and the options going to the elected officials at the time, and I think everything is going to be - the voters are too sophisticated now to just allow anyone to come to Council. I'm - I want - I'm thinking that this is going to be even more significant in another two years. But I think the options are going to be up to the people and the elected officials and I don't see anything wrong with it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: I've just know of no other ordinance, and possibly I can be enlightened on this point, where there is not specified the method of selection. I don't know of any other utility ordinance that leaves indefinite and for future determination the method of selection of the trustees.

MR. BILLA: It's very plain that the City Council will reserve that right, Mayor.

MAYOR COCKRELL: ...will select a method.

MR. BILLA: And I have one other question on the procedures. Are we going to stay all evening to deliberate these points or are we going to have a certain procedure we're going to follow - we'll discuss it - those for it and opposition will be heard - and we can either vote yes or no on it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Well, I just wanted to make this one point before we - and perhaps the Council is ready to move. All right, there has not been a motion.

MR. BILLA: No, I so moved the adoption of it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: It's been moved - is there a second?

MR. CISNEROS: Second it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: It's been moved and seconded, is there any discussion?  
Dr. Nielsen.

DR. NIELSEN: I would like to amend the motion and speak strongly in favor of it to also include, back to the issue of yesterday, with very precise language this time to clear up all of the uncertainty that would simply say in Section 20 that the policy decisions affecting research and development and corporate planning will be consistent with Council policy or subject to Council review period. That takes out all of this

question of personnel and all of the other things that came up yesterday and, Mr. Harris, if you could we can flower it up into language but that very precise statement which deals with the policy decisions in CPS or the responsibility equally with the policy decision of the trustees, the policies decisions affecting research and development and corporate planning will be consistent with Council policy subject to Council review. Now, can you help us any in terms of how that should be changed, if you can see any legal language.

MR. RICHARD HARRIS: Of course, the Council has many options in that respect and if the Council prefer guidance as to the specific guideline you have in mind. If not, I'm confident that between the City Attorney and myself we can draft a statement consistent with the wishes expressed by the Council.

DR. NIELSEN: The problem that we were having yesterday that we didn't make very specific what areas of policy we were going to review or discuss or dialogue on. We just left the whole thing open. We could be meddling in administrative affairs, personnel, this deals only with research and development, corporate planning and I think that's pretty explicit, I don't know what the rest of the Council thinks.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. As of yesterday the Council did not pass this amendment. Is there any feeling that there.....

MR. HARTMAN: Yes, I would like to second the - I guess this is the substitute motion - that.....

DR. NIELSEN: No, this is an amendment to.....

MR. HARTMAN: An amendment to the motion that Dr. Nielsen has proposed. I think the problem yesterday was the fact that there had been some concern over the lack of specificity on this matter and I think this specifics into the area that I think is the intent of this action and I think is certainly consistent with the fact that, again, the Council is the policy body for the City.

MR. AL ROHDE: Mayor, I'd like to speak to the motion too because I felt yesterday we were going too far in the management of CPS and we weren't specific if the particular area but I think it's pinned down now and it doesn't get in their day to day operation and I would vote go for the motion.

MR. PYNDUS: I'd like to hear the amendment once more, please.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Is this - you're asking for the language along this line to be written up legally, is that correct?

DR. NIELSEN: Yes, but be very specific. All we're talking about is the policy decisions affecting research and development and corporate planning. I think we can probably do them together but I'm not sure. Well, he was saying yesterday that it would have to be a new paragraph. Those policy decisions that CPS trustees are making will be consistent with Council policy or subject to Council review.

MAYOR COCKRELL: I would like to have a legal interpretation of what that means. Could I ask the City Attorney, did you hear the statement by Dr. Nielsen? Can you give us some legal interpretation about what that means?

ACTING CITY ATTORNEY JIM PARKER: Well, it would be a - you've given in the ordinance as it's presently written and proposed you give the City Public Service Board, in effect, the whole apple as far as full authority as to what they're doing in the total complete operation of that system and the net result of Dr. Nielsen's proposal would be a big part of that slice, or slice a piece of that apple back out. They don't have the whole apple to use right now.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Does the City Manager or City staff have any recommendation?

DR. NIELSEN: I don't know if that's the legal implication. I don't think that will be a procedural implication. Is there anything that in any way changes the basic intent of the whole document, salability of....

CITY ATTORNEY PARKER: Well, saleability is a marketing question, that I don't know. I'm not an expert in that area.

MR. PYNDUS: Just to break down this amendment. We talk about Council review, now, do we not have this authority today?

CITY ATTORNEY PARKER: You have the authority today to change this ordinance. Once you pass this ordinance, you're not going to change it again until these bonds are retired.

MR. PYNDUS: Let's go beyond the ordinance. My question is, this statement will be included in the ordinance, however, outside the ordinance does this Council not have the authority to review the City Public Service policy?

CITY ATTORNEY PARKER: No.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: You just have the authority to pass on rates and the issuance of bonds.

CITY ATTORNEY PARKER: To that degree that you have control by virtue of that that will be your only control but that is going to be very limited by virtue of certain covenants and provisions that you have to do or you will have to do as a result of the ordinance.

MR. CISNEROS: We know and past Councils know that it has been difficult, with all due respect to everyone involved, that it's been difficult to perform anything that even approaches effective review because of the difficulty of getting information and that sort of thing and a lot of citizens have encountered that problem and members of the City staff and that problem and so forth, members of the Council and all. And, really, the City Public Service Board, as the City Water Board and our other public utility is an important arm of City policy with respect to the development of the City, the growth of the City and its expansion. All we're saying, I think, or all that would be said I hope what the intent here is and we could write the appropriate language is to say what we are after is some way to make consistent with City planning policy, with the policies that we are able to impose on the other utilities that CPS also the CPS growth and development and system expansion policy are made to be consistent with that to begin to approach something like a comprehensive plan for the City's growth utilizing this major growth generator and tool that the City Public Service system is. I think the language begins to approach that I'm not sure whether the word corporate planning can say that or not.

DR. NIELSEN: Corporate planning department is the only reason I used that.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mr. Rohde.

MR. ROHDE: The reason I pulled off yesterday was that I felt we were taking the whole apple. And this is how he described it to me and I didn't want the whole apple because I felt that I didn't want the - I think we were going too far the Council to take over management but I do feel that a piece of this apple is what makes this City tick - is growth should be controlled along the Council's policies and I'm going to support this.

MR. PYNDUS: I would like to reply to that if I may, Mrs. Cockrell. I still feel that a part-time, two year term Council reviewing a long range policy or being involved in corporate management is not the best thing. And I would vote against it, Mayor.

MR. ROHDE: Well, I hope you run again, maybe you'll be here for four years. You can keep a good eye on it, Phil.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Is there any further discussion. All right. Now, then as I understand it, this is a motion to amend the pending motion by having inserted language and will you state it again so that we will have it exactly in the minutes and it will have to be added. Now I'm not sure the formality of how this will be done.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: If you pass it, it will have to be added before you pass it.

CITY ATTORNEY PARKER: Before you pass it, we would have to reduce it in writing and attach it not only this ordinance but the third item or second item down from the agenda now.

MR. BILLA: You can't do anything till we add it.

CITY ATTORNEY PARKER: No, sir, you cannot do anything till it's reduced to writing and attached to the carbon copy.

DR. NIELSEN: That the policy decisions affecting research and development and corporate planning will be consistent with Council policy or subject to Council review.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mr. Berg, would you like to be heard before we vote?

MR. TOM BERG: Yes, I would like to have you reject the amendment, it being very improper. First of all, the City Council has no research and development program. So I don't know what you're voting on. It would be strange for any Council to have a research and development program. So, when you say to be consistent with the research and development program of the City Council, you have nothing for it to be consistent with.

The second point of why it should be rejected is that the Mayor sits on the Board. The Mayor's requirement, and we wrote into the agreed upon original management requirement, that the Mayor is the point of communication of the Board to the City Council. It was always understood and assumed in good faith that this would be done. This time we wrote it in to be sure that it would be. Now what you're saying, in effect, is that your elected representative, the Mayor, is not going to perform the duty, the responsibility of conveying what long range plan the City Council, the City staff, planning operations will have. It would be ridiculous for the CPS Board to start planning expansion of power lines into an area we don't intend to have the City grow. It just doesn't add up to certainly business sense, but certainly no common sense. So, I don't see anything more than further incumberances, not in a constructive way, since the City Council has no research and development program. I see you are taking from the Mayor again the requirements for her or he to be on the Board and have the Council input, and I think it should be rejected completely.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. Yes, sir.

DR. NIELSEN: The amendment does not address any research development policy regarding the City of San Antonio. The address is that research and development aspect of City Public Service Board, I hope that's very clearly. That's all. It doesn't say we have a research and development department.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, Mr. Berg.

MR. BERG: But you say it will be consistent with the City policy on research and development. But you don't have a City policy on it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. May I ask just one other little point and that is the intent and the how to be carried out when we say the City Council may review. And what will be the effect of review.

DR. NIELSEN: Policy decisions of the CPS trustees affecting research and development, corporate planning will be consistent with Council policy or subject to Council review. We don't have a policy we can at least review which brings up a certain sense of procedure, but it also brings up just the responsibility that these kinds of plans and policy decisions ought to at least be reviewed by the Council.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. Let me ask this, in terms of if we say the Council will review does that mean the Council can in effect reject a policy or they will review the policy and then confer on what would happen.

MR. CISNEROS: Just say it is subject to Council review.

MAYOR COCKRELL: What is the effect of Council review? If Council reviews it and doesn't like the policy, I'm saying, what happens?

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Do you keep them from implementing it or do you not?

MR. HARTMAN: Madam Mayor, I think that it perhaps I'm over-simplifying it but it would be like any other situation, let me use the parallel the fact that within once you have an established constitution that, for example, the Constitution of Texas that laws passed by that body must be consistent with that Constitution and are subject to review. I think it's a parallel to this sort of situation.

MR. CISNEROS: I think that what comes in is the kind of process of checks and balances because, of course, the Board of Trustees know that they rely on the Council for rates and for bonds. If one is reviewing a matter of system expansion or something like that early enough, then one can comment upon it and make early indications of what one stands is going to be on a later bond issue or bond request. But we have not just the final decision when you present it with fete acompli and you're locked into something you have backing up from there you maybe six months maybe a year, maybe two years of input into what can lead up to that bond decision. So it's those checks and balances that come in without having to stipulate the procedure.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. What I really want to know is, is it like a line item veto or a pocket veto of anything.

CITY ATTORNEY PARKER: Not as I understood it I think it all stated that they wanted to review, but I don't think it gives any, as I understood the wording of it.

MR. ROHDE: Mayor, I feel very comfortable with this because it does give the Council some review position that they can hire consultants, they can send an ordinance over there or things of this sort. And I've seen the Council send an ordinance over there and got some action one time.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: But there are no restraints. It's just a review.

MAYOR COCKRELL: There is a motion then that we have an amendment prepared which will provide along the line Dr. Nielsen has said that there will be that any action may be subject to Council review.

The motion was passed and approved by the following roll call vote: AYES: Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: Pyndus; ABSENT: None.

MAYOR COCKRELL: I guess I'll vote aye on that. Then at that point we will, I think we can go on to other items while that amendment is being prepared.

MR. TENIENTE: Somebody has the exact wording that they want in there.

MR. BILLA: Does this refer to the ordinance...(inaudible).

CITY ATTORNEY PARKER: Yes, sir.

MAYOR COCKRELL: It will have to be prepared for the first ordinance.

CITY ATTORNEY PARKER: It will have to be prepared for the first one and the third one.

MAYOR COCKRELL: No, it has to be included when we act. Is there any other change that anyone foresees in the pending ordinance?

CITY ATTORNEY PARKER: Would you like at this time for Mr. Harris to explain or go through the ordinance as is presented to you or explain to you the changes or not. All the changes have been made according to your instructions to my best knowledge and belief. The reason I've been saying that is Mr. Harris has other engagements that he has to go to and I want, if you want to get him you better get him now.

MR. RICHARD HARRIS: May I say this, I'm sorry. I'm willing to stay as long as I can but I am an officer in the Army Reserve and I'm assigned as instructor in the Command and General Staff School. I'm supposed to lecture three hours tonight contrary to what some other Councilmen thought my engagement might have been. If I could get the exact language of the motion and consult with the City Attorney and see if we understand the exact language in the motion and make it available to the Council. If it is possible, I would then like to be excused.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Fine. With that understanding, we will excuse you and the City Attorney. We then go to Item No. XII.

(NOTE: The City Attorney retired from the Chamber to write the amendment to the resolution. Later he returned to the meeting and the conversation resumed as follows:)

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. Are we ready with the.....

CITY ATTORNEY PARKER: Yes. I presented it to the Clerk and I think each member of the Council has a copy of the wording of the motion that I believe was asked to be added into this paragraph. It will be added following the last paragraph on page 20A. Page 20A of the proposed ordinance. It will also be added in the same position in the ordinance that will be acted on two ordinances down from this one regarding to the sale. It will be in the same relative position in that instrument.

MAYOR COCKRELL: We now have pending the motion that we had held in abeyance for adoption of the ordinance - resolution.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Roman numeral IX.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. Is there any further discussion? Clerk will call the roll.

On the following roll call vote, the resolution as amended was passed and approved: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

MAYOR COCKRELL: I vote aye but in particular, I do not concur with those sections which amended the agreement reached in the negotiations with the City Public Service Board regarding the selection of the members of the Board of Trustees.

CITY CLERK: Unanimous adoption.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. Item X.

MR. PYNDUS: Mayor Cockrell, may I make mention of the amendment that has been redone. With regards to the wording of policy statement, I'm comfortable with this, and I note that it concerns policy and it's well written and I commend you for putting this together...

CITY ATTORNEY PARKER: Well, that was Mr. Harris and Mr. Harris expressed his apologies, but he had a prior commitment that he had to go to, and he asked that I express his regrets and he hopes that you were not insulted by his leaving so abruptly.

MR. HARTMAN: We'd hate for him to be AWOL.

CITY ATTORNEY PARKER: Well, I understand he had a three hour meeting tonight.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. We go then to Item X.

The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 45,753

BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS, APPROVING AND AUTHORIZING THE GIVING OF NOTICE OF INTENTION TO ISSUE \$50,000,000 "CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS, ELECTRIC AND GAS SYSTEMS REVENUE BONDS, NEW SERIES 1975" AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

\* \* \* \*

MR. ROHDE: I so move.

MR. PYNDUS: I second it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: It's been moved and seconded. Any further discussion?

On the following roll call vote, the Ordinance was passed and approved: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 45,754

BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS, APPROVING THE "OFFICIAL NOTICE OF SALE" AND "OFFICIAL STATEMENT" PREPARED IN CONNECTION WITH THE ISSUANCE OF THE PROPOSED \$50,000,000 "CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS, ELECTRIC AND GAS SYSTEMS REVENUE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, NEW SERIES 1975"; AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF SAID DOCUMENTS AND THE PUBLICATION OF SAID "OFFICIAL NOTICE OF SALE"; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

\* \* \* \*

MR. PYNDUS: I so move.

MR. TENIENTE: I second it.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: For Council information, that same paragraph has been added to this document also at the appropriate page.

MAYOR COCKRELL: It's been moved and seconded for approval of the ordinance. Any further discussion?

On the following roll call vote, the Ordinance was passed and approved: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

MAYOR COCKRELL: The motion is carried.

75-56 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 45,755

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT WITH PAPE-DAWSON, INC., VICKREY & ASSOCIATES, INC., AND LOCKWOOD, ANDREWS & NEWMAN, INC., ACTING IN JOINT VENTURE, TO PERFORM PLANNING SERVICES FOR THE RILLING ROAD SEWER PLANT SYSTEM AND THE LEON AND SALADO CREEKS SEWER PLANTS SYSTEMS FOR THE AMOUNT OF \$1,100,000.00; ESTABLISHING FUNDS AND ACCOUNTS FOR THE PROJECTS; APPROPRIATING FUNDS; AND AUTHORIZING PAYMENT FOR SAID SERVICES AND \$205,000.00 FOR CONTINGENT PROJECT EXPENDITURES.

\* \* \* \*

The Ordinance was explained by Mr. Mel Sueltenfuss, Director of Public Works, who said that this is related to the "201" Plan. Council was furnished with descriptive material in their packet this week.

Dr. Nielsen called attention to the clause that says that this "201" plan will be coordinated with the AACOG which will be conducting "208" planning. He asked Mr. Sueltenfuss to describe the relationship between the plans.

Mr. Sueltenfuss said that it is essential to have very close coordination between the two plans. He said the detailed plan of study to the Council prior to final approval. He also said that an engineering firm from Houston was selected to joint venture in the project because of the experience in this type of work they already have. They have experienced with "201" plans and the other consideration is the infiltration - inflow study.

After consideration, on motion of Mr. Teniente, seconded by Dr. Nielsen, the Ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

75-56 REVIEW OF UNIVERSITY HILLS SUBDIVISION, UNIT I

Mr. Mel Sueltenfuss said that he had reviewed the plat on this subdivision with the Council last week. One matter that was not resolved was who would do the sampling of wells and streams. After discussing this matter with Mr. Weinert of the Edwards Underground District who has agreed to accept the responsibility for sampling of the monitoring wells and the stream gauging stations.

Mr. Cisneros said that he had visited with Mr. Kuper, the developer of this subdivision, this week and had the opportunity to see the design and plan for the development of this Unit as well as the adjoining units. He said they appeared to be well done, well regulated plans. He questioned the City's capacity to make the necessary on-site inspections.

Mr. Sueltenfuss said there is no problem with inspections. The City has always made subdivision inspections but there will just be a few extra items to inspect. Mr. Sueltenfuss recommended approval of the plat.

After discussion, the Council concurred in its approval and asked Mr. Sueltenfuss to relay to the Planning Commission the fact that the plat has been reviewed.

75-56 The following Resolution was read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. Glen Hartman, and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Hartman, seconded by Mr. Rohde, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

A RESOLUTION  
NO. 75-56-82

SUPPORTING THE EFFORTS OF THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN  
VOTERS TO PRODUCE MEANINGFUL PUBLIC DISCUSSION  
ON THE BICENTENNIAL AND ON DOWNTOWN REDEVELOP-  
MENT, AND OFFERING CITY CO-SPONSORSHIP OF THE  
UNDERTAKING.

\* \* \* \*

75-56 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Hartman, seconded by Mr. Pyndus, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

AN ORDINANCE 45,756

ALLOWING THE CONGREGATION AGUDAS ACHIM TO HAVE  
A BONFIRE AS A PART OF THE YOUTH ORGANIZATION  
INSTALLATION PROGRAM.

\* \* \* \*

75-56 Mayor Cockrell offered resolutions of respect for two members of the San Antonio Police Department who were killed in the performance of their duties this week. Upon motion duly made and seconded, the resolutions were adopted by the following roll call vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

A RESOLUTION OF RESPECT  
NO. 75-56-83

WHEREAS, Patrolman George Edward Copeland, III joined the San Antonio Police Department on March 13, 1968 and served honorably and well, and

WHEREAS, He was a dedicated police officer who gained the admiration and respect of his fellow officers with his devotion to duty and desire to serve, and

WHEREAS, he had just recently completed the course in Special Weapons and Tactics to enhance his effectiveness, and

WHEREAS, life came to a close for George Edward Copeland, III on September 13, 1975, while carrying out his duty in responding to a citizen's call for help; NOW, THEREFORE:

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO:

SECTION 1. That this Council, on behalf of City officials and employees as well as the citizens of this great City, does hereby express profound regret on the occasion of the death of George Edward Copeland, III.

SECTION 2. That this Resolution be spread upon the minutes of this meeting and a copy thereof be sent to the bereaved family.

\* \* \* \*

A RESOLUTION OF RESPECT  
NO. 75-56-84

WHEREAS, Patrolman James Wilson Bennett, Jr., joined the San Antonio Police Department on January 2, 1973, and served honorably and well, and

WHEREAS, he was a dedicated police officer who gained the admiration and respect of his fellow officers with devotion to duty and desire to serve, and

WHEREAS, life came to a close for James Wilson Bennett, Jr., on September 13, 1975, while carrying out his duty in responding to a citizen's call for help; NOW, THEREFORE:

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO:

SECTION 1. That this Council, on behalf of City officials and employees as well as the citizens of this great City, does hereby express profound regret on the occasion of the death of James Wilson Bennett, Jr.

SECTION 2. That this Resolution be spread upon the minutes of this meeting and a copy thereof be sent to the bereaved family.

\* \* \* \*

Members of the City Council were joined by the staff and audience in a minute of silent prayer.

75-56 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 45,757

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE  
AN AGREEMENT WITH THE DAUGHTERS OF THE  
REPUBLIC OF TEXAS AS CUSTODIANS OF THE  
ALAMO PARK COMPLEX.

\* \* \* \*

Mr. Luis Garcia, Assistant City Attorney, said that this agreement reduces to writing the agreement reached between the Council and the Daughters of the Republic of Texas.

After consideration, on motion of Mr. Rohde, seconded by Rev. Black, the ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

75-56

CITIZENS TO BE HEARDROMULO MUNGUIA

Mr. Raul Rodriguez read a letter for Mr. Romulo Munguia expressing his opposition to the rent subsidy program. (A copy of Mr. Munguia's letter is included with the papers of this meeting).

KARL WURZ

Mr. Karl Wurz, 820 Florida, again protested the purchase of park land by the Urban Renewal Agency. He asked that the Council stop the transaction. (A copy of Mr. Wurz's statement is included with the papers of this meeting).

RAUL RODRIGUEZ

Mr. Raul Rodriguez also protested the purchase of the Vexler property by the Urban Renewal Agency. He said that the price for the land is exorbitant.

Mayor Cockrell asked that the City staff investigate claims made by Mr. Karl Wurz and Mr. Raul Rodriguez to find out the facts in this proposed transaction and report back to the Council.

DEMOLITION OF BUILDINGS

Mayor Cockrell asked for a report on the legal processes taken by the City as a result of the demolition of buildings on Main Plaza without a permit.

Mr. George Vann said that a permit was refused. The owner demolished the buildings on a weekend. A complaint was filed against the owner in Municipal Court the following week but the result is unknown.

UTILITY BILLS

Mr. Cisneros said that the City Council should study steps which would result in lower utility bills. He suggested that a three-member Council Committee be appointed to study the matter.

NO SMOKING

Mr. Teniente said that he will introduce a resolution next week requesting that "No Smoking" signs be posted in the Council Chamber.

COMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Rev. Black commended the City Council for its action today with reference to the City Public Service Board.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MAYOR COCKRELL

Mr. Billa thanked Mayor Cockrell for the excellent manner in which she conducted herself and hosted the City's guests from Guadalajara last week. He also commended Mr. Teniente for the role he played.

75-56 The Clerk read the following letter:

September 12, 1975

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

Madam and Gentlemen:

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

September 8, 1975

Petition of Al Franz Fence Company,  
(Owner: Al Franz) 9822 Ball Street,  
requesting permission to install  
260 linear feet of eight (8) feet  
high chain link fence around the  
swimming area at Mini Skools of  
Texas at 2711 Mossrock Drive.

/s/ J. H. INSELMANN  
City Clerk

\* \* \* \*

There being no further business to come before the Council,  
the meeting adjourned at 6:45 P. M.

A P P R O V E D

*Lila Cockrell*  
M A Y O R

ATTEST:

*J. H. Inselmann*  
C i t y C l e r k

September 18, 1975  
el

-45-

788