

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Austin, Texas

Special Meeting -- April 15, 1969

The meeting of the Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Municipal Building.

Present

Samuel Dunnam, Chairman
Hiram S. Brown
Alan Taniguchi
Roger Hanks
Dr. William Hazard
R. B. Smith

Absent

Robert Kinnan
G. A. McNeil
William Milstead

Also Present

Hoyle M. Osborne, Director of Planning
Richard L. Lillie, Assistant Director of Planning
Wayne Golden, Planning Coordinator

ORDER OF BUSINESS

C2-69-1(b) AUSTIN DEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENT

Approximately 105 acres bounded on the north by Hamilton Lane, on the south by Balcones Drive (Mo-Pac Expressway), on the west by Old U. S. Highway 183 and on the east by New U. S. Highway 183

Mr. Wayne Golden reported that Mr. Rex Reitz, President of Polyplastics has requested a change in the Austin Development Plan on approximately 5 acres of land located on U. S. Highway 183 south of Hamilton Lane. The change requested is from Suburban Residential to Manufacturing and Related Uses. Approximately 100 acres bounded on the west by Old U. S. Highway 183, on the east by New U. S. Highway 183, on the north by Hamilton Lane and on the south by Balcones Drive (Mo-Pac Expressway) has been included as additional area for consideration. On the south side of new U. S. Highway 183 there are two industries, Electro-Mechanics Company along with a small manufacturing plant. Several other warehousing, contracting and open storage uses are scattered through the area. The area north of New U. S. Highway 183 and east of West Loop is designated in the Master Plan as industrial. In addition to the scattered industrial and industrial type uses in this particular area, there are approximately 50 to 75 houses existing. To the west of Old U. S. Highway 183 is a well-established residential area. There is a Redi-Mix Concrete plant and storage yard located near Mesa Drive.

Mr. Osborne explained that the issue is what is going to occur in the immediate and long term future. The land is becoming more valuable and is susceptible to the customary forms of manufacturing uses. There is some pressure for industrial land in the entire northwest area and some pressure in this immediate area. The problem of designating the land for industrial purposes is whether or not the area will be developed and used exclusively in this manner.

C2-69-1(b) AUSTIN DEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENT--contd.

Mr. Reitz advised the Commission that he proposes to build a small office and plant facility containing approximately 8,000 to 10,000 square feet. The proposed use is inoffensive and the area is well suited to this type of development. There are other industries in the area which indicates that the trend will be for industrial type uses.

Mr. and Mrs. Louis Lee stated that they own property south of Mesa Drive which is under consideration as additional area. They stated they are opposed to the change on the area south of Mesa Drive as this is an ideal location for apartments as the area would serve as a buffer between the industrial uses to the east and the residential uses to the west.

The Commission members discussed the issue of control if the entire area is redesignated for industrial purposes. They were of the opinion that the request is reasonable on the area north of the West Loop as this would allow for the expansion of existing uses; however, they felt that the area south of the West Loop should not be changed at this time. The members also felt that the uses should be restricted to light industrial uses and suggested that annexation of the area be considered. It was then

VOTED: To recommend that the land use designation of the area between Old U. S. Highway 183 and New U. S. Highway 183 between the West Loop and Hamilton Lane be changed from Suburban Residential to Manufacturing and Related Uses.

AYE: Messrs. Dunnam, Brown, Taniguchi, Hazard, and Smith

NAY: Mr. Hanks

ABSENT: Messrs. Kinnan, Milstead and McNeil

C2-69-1(c) AUSTIN DEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENT

Approximately 15 acres bounded on the north by the proposed extension of Braker Lane, on the south by Kramer Lane, on the west by a line approximately 1,700 feet west of and parallel to North Lamar Boulevard and on the east by a line approximately 1,000 feet west of and parallel to North Lamar Boulevard

The staff reported that this is a request by Angelos L. Paraskevas, represented by Mr. Travis Boykin, for a change in the Austin Development Plan from Suburban Residential to Commercial and Semi-Industrial uses for approximately 15 acres of land located south of Braker Lane and west of North Lamar Boulevard. To the east of the site located east and west of North Lamar Boulevard is approximately 100 acres of land, which was recently redesignated to Commercial Services and Semi-Industrial uses and the applicant is requesting that the change be extended to his property. There is residential property facing onto Kramer Lane as well as a substantial area of residential development to the north of Braker Lane. There are commercial and semi-industrial uses located to the east along Lamar Boulevard. Although there is mixed development in the area along Lamar Boulevard, the use surrounding the application is predominantly residential and the proposed change would be an intrusion into an established residential area.

C2-69-1(c) AUSTIN DEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENT--contd.

Mr. Travis Boykin and Mr. A. S. Duncan appeared on behalf of this request and were of the opinion that the requested change is a logical extension of the area which was recently changed by the Commission. There are commercial and industrial uses existing on the adjacent property and to deny the request would penalize the subject tract.

Mr. James Cummins, Paul Bledsoe and Gayle Day, nearby homeowners, opposed the change as it would devalue the residential property and be an intrusion.

The Commission members discussed the surrounding development and noted that there is residential development existing on three sides of the subject tract. A majority of the members felt that the request should be denied as an intrusion into a well-defined residential area. It was then

VOTED: To recommend that the request for a change in the Austin Development Plan from Suburban Residential to Commercial Services and Semi-Industrial uses on approximately 15 acres of land, located south of the proposed extension of Braker Lane be DENIED.

AYE: Messrs. Dunnam, Taniguchi, Hanks, Hazard and Smith

NAY: Mr. Brown

ABSENT: Messrs. Kinnan, Milstead and McNeil

C2-69-1(d) AUSTIN DEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENT

Approximately 7.5 acres bounded on the north by U. S. Highway 183, on the south by a line approximately 330 feet south of and parallel to the south property line of U. S. Highway 183 and Shoal Creek Boulevard and on the east by a line approximately 200 feet east of and parallel to the east property line of Shoal Creek Boulevard, on the west by Shoal Creek (Easement)

The staff reported a request for a change in the Master Plan from Manufacturing and Related Uses to Medium Density Residential for approximately 7.5 acres of land south of U. S. Highway 183. A small area adjoining the site to the east has been included in order to connect the residential uses. The subject tract is part of Allandale Estates, Section 3 Subdivision, a portion of which is being developed industrially. The staff has no objection to the requested change.

Mr. Richard Baker, attorney for the applicants, explained that the subject property lies both east and west of Shoal Creek drainageway and is under contract with Campbell-Crow in Dallas. The contract of sale will be disclosed as soon as the subdivision plat has been filed. The reason the subdivision plat has not been filed is because the Master Plan change was requested before the details could be put on the subdivision plat. It was elected to hold the filing of the plat until the Master Plan change was considered. There are some problems in relation to access to U. S. Highway 183 from Shoal Creek because of the design of a median strip. There has been concern about getting heavy truck traffic into the industrial area. It is proposed that the traffic will be brought off of U. S. Highway 183 west of the existing drainage facility,

C2-69-1(d) AUSTIN DEVELOPMENT AMENDMENT--contd.

into the industrial area. The developers feel that inasmuch as they plan to develop a portion of the area under a residential classification that the drainageway actually creates an area of division so that the property on either side can be utilized to its best advantage.

After further discussion, the Commission unanimously

VOTED: To recommend that the request for a change in the Austin Development Plan from Manufacturing and Related Uses to Medium Density Residential for approximately 7.5 acres of land bounded by U. S. Highway 183, Shoal Creek and Shoal Creek Boulevard including additional area on the southeast corner of the intersection of U. S. Highway 183 and Shoal Creek Boulevard be GRANTED.

C10-69-1(h) STREET AND ALLEY VACATION

Wabash Avenue between West 35th and West 38th Streets, alley extending 62.5 feet east of Wabash Avenue between West 37th and west 38th Streets, alley extending 108 feet east of Wabash Avenue between West 35th and West 37th Streets

The Director of Planning advised the Commission that the general information pertaining to this request was presented to the Commission at the last regular meeting at which time it was noted that the staff did not feel there was ample information as to the effect of the proposed vacations on the area. In addition, all of the abutting property owners did not receive adequate notice of the hearing and it was recommended that the request be postponed until this special meeting.

The request under consideration is for the vacation of Wabash Avenue from West 35th Street north to West 38th Street, approximately 150 feet of West 37th Street from Wabash Avenue east toward Lamar Boulevard, the alley extending 62.5 feet east from Wabash Avenue between West 37th and West 38th Streets, and the alley extending 108 feet east from Wabash Avenue between West 35th and West 37th Streets. The vacation request is in connection with the proposed development of Seton Hospital. The property adjacent to the Seton Hospital tract to Shoal Creek is developed with the Doctor's Office Building and the parking lot serving this function. Property on the east side of Wabash is to be developed by Seton Hospital and includes a Sister's Home planned to be constructed in the vicinity of West 37th and Wabash Avenue. All City Departments have approved this request for vacation subject to the retention of easements, or the re-location of lines, if necessary. If the lines are to be kept in place, easements would have to be retained.

Traffic circulation is the critical issue in the area between West 38th and West 34th Streets. West 34th Street is ultimately planned as an expressway from Guadalupe Street west to Mo-Pac Boulevard. There is a north-south circulation problem within this immediate area, some of which is being generated outside of the area. There is southbound traffic on Shoal Creek Boulevard on West 38th Street and traffic using Old Alice Avenue, now called Medical Parkway.

C10-69-1(h) STREET AND ALLEY VACATION--contd.

This traffic then has to turn on West 38th Street either east to Lamar Boulevard or west to Jefferson Avenue. The most desirable pattern from the standpoint of public traffic flow, would have been a north-south street about in the center of the area between Shoal Creek and Lamar Boulevard. There are certain features about the traffic on Wabash Avenue that are both good and bad. The street does provide for some circulation north and south from Medical Parkway, West 38th Street and West 34th Street; however, circulation on this street will continue to become more difficult during peak hours as the traffic backs at the intersections. Medical Parkway at West 38th Street will most likely have to be signalized in the near future. Wabash Avenue does provide public circulation to and from the businesses that are located along Lamar Boulevard. Left turn movement of traffic off of Lamar Boulevard to businesses on the west side of the street is quite difficult because of the heavy traffic. In general, Wabash Avenue, from an overall area planning standpoint, is not properly located. It does provide a level of service for the businesses along the west side of Lamar Boulevard but is not the best location to serve the remaining area. If the street is vacated, there would probably have to be some other alternative for circulation, i.e., north-south alleyway or minor street approximately halfway between Wabash Avenue and Lamar Boulevard. This would serve almost exclusively the businesses along Lamar Boulevard.

Mr. Sam Perry, attorney for Seton Hospital, presented maps of the area showing the existing and proposed development, the existing street system and the streets which are requested to be vacated. One of the parking areas is for people that will be using the hospital complex, and another will be used for employee parking. This proposal has been discussed with several adjacent property owners and it was felt that the proposal will help solve some of the traffic problems because of the location of driveways. Even though it is requested that the streets be vacated, they will serve the area as part of the overall parking system.

Mr. Moten Crockett, property owner adjacent to Wabash Avenue appeared at the hearing and strongly objected to the closing of Wabash Avenue because of the impact it would have on the existing heavy traffic along Lamar Boulevard. Wabash Avenue is a street with 60 feet of right-of-way which is at the present time used for ingress and egress to the existing businesses along Lamar Boulevard. If the street is closed, vehicles will be forced to use Lamar Boulevard and be required to make a left turn movement off of Lamar Boulevard into the existing businesses. The street should not be closed until there is further study concerning the amount of traffic that is in the area with the possibility of the relocation of the street to align with Medical Parkway. There have been several streets already closed in the area and there is need for access to the area.

Mr. Pearce Johnson advised the Commission that there is a severe problem on Lamar Boulevard particularly at various hours of the day. Cars have to make a left turn movement in order to get to the businesses creating a dangerous situation. Any vehicles taken off of Wabash Avenue and added to Lamar Boulevard would compound a bad situation.

C10-69-1(h) STREET AND ALLEY VACATION--contd.

Mr. Bert Maloney, representing Seton Hospital explained that the City has had knowledge of the development planned for this area and it is felt that the overall total complex should be considered rather than one segment. Seton Hospital is not requesting anything they did not present to the City previously.

Mr. Perry advised the Commission that he has discussed the proposal with the architect and he is authorized, on behalf of Seton Hospital, to dedicate a 25 foot street, alleyway or public easement which would be the most easterly 25 feet of the Seton property and which would abut property belonging to Mr. Johnson and Mrs. Shelly. This would provide for circulation and access to property fronting on Lamar Boulevard as well as the Hospital. Seton Hospital will also dedicate 15 feet of right-of-way for the widening of West 38th Street to the property at the corner of West 38th and Lamar Boulevard. The present plans are that there would be some manner of access into the parking area from West 38th Street. It would not be a public thoroughfare or perpetual easement but would only be a parking lot entry.

There was considerable discussion by the Commission with regard to the existing and proposed circulation. They were of the opinion that the request is reasonable, provided a 30 foot dedicated street or easement, to be paved, curbed and guttered if so desired by the City, is required along the most easterly portion of the Seton Hospital property and subject to 15 feet of right-of-way being provided for the future widening of West 38th Street to the tract of land located at the corner of West 38th Street and Lamar Boulevard.

After further discussion, the Commission unanimously

VOTED: To recommend that Wabash Avenue from West 35th Street north to West 38th Street, approximately 150 feet of West 37th Street from Wabash east toward Lamar Boulevard and the alley extending 62.5 feet east from Wabash Avenue between West 37th Street and West 38th Street and the alley extending 108 feet east from Wabash Avenue between West 35th and West 37th Streets be VACATED subject to the provision of a 30 foot dedicated street or easement, to be paved, curbed and guttered if so desired by the City, 15 feet of right-of-way for West 38th Street and subject to the retention of the necessary easements.

R520 RENEWAL AND REDEVELOPMENT

Mr. Richard Lillie, Assistant Director of Planning, advised the Commission that the Community Design Center (C.D.C.) from the University of Texas and Blackshear Citizens Organization have been working for the past few months on developing an alternate land use and street system plan for the Blackshear Urban Renewal Project, with the hope of decreasing the relocation workload through increased rehabilitation of housing. The proposal is based primarily on the retention of lots within the project area which are substandard under existing ordinances. The existing ordinance requires legal lots to have 50 feet of frontage and 5,7 square feet of area and a 25 foot building setback line. Mr. Lillie presented

R520 RENEWAL AND REDEVELOPMENT--contd.

the compromise land use and street plan of the area which is the result of adjusting the Urban Renewal Agency's second plan and the plan presented by the Community Design Center. He explained that this compromise was reached between representatives of the Community Design Center, the Urban Renewal Agency and the City Planning staff.

Mr. Lillie further advised the Commission that for the purpose of this meeting he is confining discussion to the issue of substandard lots and substandard setbacks. Within an Urban Renewal project there should be concern about the continuation of a substantial number of substandard conditions, specifically structures, lot area, lot frontage, building setback lines and street rights-of-way.

Mr. Lillie stated that the information to be presented is based on the proposed land use and street plan. The figures are not exact and are presented only as an indication of the extent of the problem of substandard lots and includes only existing lots and not lots that would be created under the Urban Renewal Plan. The key issue is substandard lots and building setbacks. The Zoning Ordinance in effect prior to 1946 required a minimum lot width of 33 feet and a minimum lot area of 4,000 square feet. On March 14, 1946, the City adopted the standards which are now used which is a minimum lot width of 50 feet and a minimum lot area of 5,750 square feet and a 25 foot building setback line. The lots which were subdivided prior to 1946 and have been retained in the existing shape and size during the intervening years are legal lots under the Ordinance. It is estimated that there are approximately 135 residential lots located within the proposed plan; of this number, approximately 60 are standard to the existing codes and ordinances. The remaining 74 are substandard. Of the 74 substandard lots, 21 are substandard in width and 17 of the 21 lots are legal lots under the Ordinance. There are 13 lots which are substandard in area only and of this number, 11 are legal lots. There are 40 lots substandard in width and area under the existing ordinance and 32 are legal lots. This means that of the 75 substandard lots, 60 are legal lots and building permits could be issued if requested. This also means that if a house was on one of the lots and the owner wanted to add to the house or demolish it and rebuild, a permit would be issued as it is a legal lot of record. There are approximately 10 lots subdivided prior to 1946 that have less than 33 feet of frontage and less than 4,000 square feet of area. If an owner decides to develop these lots, Board of Adjustment action for a variance would be required before a building permit could be issued. There are over 50 existing structures in the project area that are located less than 25 feet from the property line. Retention of these structures is proposed in the plan. The new structures that might be developed onto the lots would assume required setbacks under existing ordinances.

The issue of the continuation of substandard lots in urban renewal areas does not end with Blackshear Project as there are other areas in East Austin, including the area within the Model Cities Program, which have identical problems. The statistics have been presented in the hope that the Commission might state their intent as to whether or not substandard lots could be acceptable in the Blackshear Project area.

R520 RENEWAL AND REDEVELOPMENT--contd.

Mr. Dunnam stated that one of the things the Commission will want to consider is how to deal with the substandard lots, whether by a new zoning district or by variance and the other issue is establishing a criteria for acceptable substandardness. He said that he first heard of this proposal some time ago and asked the staff why the problem has taken so long to come before the Commission.

Mr. Lillie stated that last fall, the Urban Renewal Agency, in conformance with the 1968 Federal Housing Act which proposed more citizen participation in urban renewal projects, began a restudy of the Blackshear area. The restudy resulted in a second plan in which the Agency and the City, through the Planning Department staff, tried to leave as many lots as possible and redesignate as many commercial areas as possible to residential. This work was done in the hope of reducing the relocation workload leaving as many families in the project as possible. The Community Design Center of the University became involved in the Project through a contract with the Blackshear Citizens Organization and to come up with another alternative to the Urban Renewal Plan. They worked on the project until approximately one month ago at which time they met with the Planning staff and the Urban Renewal Agency and gave a presentation of the proposals with the hopes that they could work out an acceptable alternate plan. Approximately two weeks ago, the staff received a copy of the proposed plan for review and again met with representatives of the Community Design Center and the Agency in order to work out some problems so that the Community Design Center could take back an acceptable plan to the Blackshear Organization for their approval. It was hoped that by April 15 the Community Design Center and the Blackshear Residents Organization would have some indication of the feeling of the Planning Commission with respect to substandard lot size.

Mrs. Lillian MacDonald, Chairman of the Blackshear Organization, advised the Commission that the group was organized in the latter part of the summer of 1968 when it was learned that the citizens participation was encouraged in the area and could make suggestions to the Agency so that so many people would not be displaced. When the Community Design Center came into being at the University they were requested to assist the Blackshear Organization in making suggestions for changes to the plan. The Blackshear Organization is composed of people who live and have property in the project area.

Mr. Robert Mather, School of Architecture of the University of Texas, informed the Commission that the Community Design Center has a meeting with the Blackshear residents on April 16 at which time the plan will be discussed. The pros and cons of the plan will be presented as they are understood and the positive and negative implications to property owners will also be presented so that the residents will be able to make there own decisions as to whether they will recommend the plan.

Mr. Dunnam stated that he is concerned about why the Commission is faced with the major policy issue of resolving the question of variances and substandard lots on such short notice. The planning procedure involving the residents in

R520 RENEWAL AND REDEVELOPMENT--contd.

this neighborhood started last fall but until recently there has been little or no contact with the Urban Renewal Agency, the Planning Department and the Planning Commission on the issues that are involved which are major policy issues. He stated that he is and has been very sympathetic of the need for variances in order to keep clearance to a minimum since he first heard the proposal last summer; however, months have past and now the Commission is being requested to make a policy decision so the plan can be submitted in order to meet a June 1 deadline. There should have been a closer relationship with the Planning Department and the Commission so that the problems could have been worked out before this time.

Mr. J. A. Mosley appeared at the hearing and stated that the Urban Renewal Agency would be taking the residences in the area and they do not want to give anything in return. He said that his home is paid for and there is no place else in Austin he can locate for the same amount of money. There is no reason a standard house should be taken just because it is on a substandard lot. If the lots are required to be standard, the structures will have to be removed and the people will have no place to go, and will not have enough money to purchase more property.

Mr. Taniguchi advised the members that this is the first experience with Urban Renewal for many of the people now involved. The delay in bringing this matter before the Commission or to anyone has been the result of the difficulties created by the nature of Urban Renewal in Austin. There have been a variety of people working on the project and the citizens, students and faculty have different opinions and different ideas that makes for an awkward situation to resolve or work smoothly. He stated that the status of the Planning for this project would depend a great deal on the community organization and their decision at their meeting. To get the project into a proposal form by June 1 is almost impossible but there are several alternatives. One alternative would be the extension of time. A second, suggested by Mr. Lurie, is an amendatory route where the existing urban renewal plan number 2 is submitted with assurances and guarantees that a further amendment will be submitted later. The third alternative, if there is no other way to resolve this, is to indicate that the plan is not accepted and this should be stated as soon as possible. Mr. Dunnam asked if the staff has any recommendations to make on this problem. Mr. Lillie suggested the recognition of the legal lot as it effects this Project, those lots which were subdivided prior to 1946, and the possible drafting of a new zoning residential district recognizing small lot sizes.

Mr. Osborne stated that many Zoning Ordinances state an intent for each zoning district, but Austin's does not. A new zoning district permitting smaller lot sizes does not keep the Planning Commission or the City Council from applying it indiscriminately. He said that in his opinion the Commission could not limit the location of such a district only to renewal areas. There are some differences in circumstances in various areas but a more detailed legal opinion would be needed. There will be a combination of renewal, intensive code enforcement and general code enforcement in the East Austin area. The

R520

RENEWAL AND REDEVELOPMENT--contd.

Commission will be setting a precedent regardless of the particular action if it is their intent to permit this type of lot. Previous Planning Commissions have said, and this was carried out in the Kealing Project, that the resulting actions of renewal should result in standard conditions. This is the policy the staff has been working on. In the case of the Kealing Project, the standard conditions were carried out but there are differences in circumstances in the Blackshear area. The Commission would have to justify, once a plan comes before the Commission as a formal plan, that the acceptance of certain substandard lots is sound in terms of certain conditions.

Mr. Dunnam stated that if this is a condition that will come up again and again, his inclination would be to deal with it in a policy way and not leave it to consideration of variances on each individual lot. There are certain conditions that are probably not acceptable under any circumstances but there are others where some kind of zoning district would be acceptable.

Mr. Osborne stated that the key issue is for the Commission to state their intent at the present time as to what would be acceptable. It appears that there are two ways in which the Commission can meet most of the problems, either through the present provisions in the Ordinance, allowing for existing lots subdivided prior to March, 1946, which covers a great majority of the cases, or zoning amendment which would cover a majority of the cases. There will still be some substandard lots.

Mr. Dunnam stated that this would be the purpose of designing criteria and to exclude certain zoning districts.

Dr. Hazard asked about the reason for not going the variance route. Mr. Osborne stated that there is no problem with the variances in the interim period although it is an added burden in a sense for the Planning Commission and the Board of Adjustment. The Commission should decide on a general policy that would be permissible. The legal test of variance to the Zoning Ordinance is hardship and not economic hardship.

Mr. Taniguchi stated that he wonders if the Commission is looking for an interim statement for the Blackshear area. We could say that in the case of Blackshear we look with favor, or our intent is to recognize substandard lots as acceptable in the Urban Renewal Plan.

Mrs. Ball stated that the existing lots have been in this area so long there is no reason why the citizens should have to go to the expense of enlarging them if it has been the City's policy of recognizing legal lots since 1946, and there is no reason why they should not remain as standard lots.

Mr. Dunnam stated that the Commission is attempting to find a way to recognize them as standard and expressing our intent to deal with them in a policy way.

One of the property owners in the area stated that most of the time and delay before approaching the Commission has been in trying to get people with

R520 RENEWAL AND REDEVELOPMENT--contd.

substandard lots to sell to other people with substandard lots but in cases where both property owners would like to stay, this should be allowed. Houses are already on the lots and are standard but the lots are not standard. It is requested that the Commission approve this type of lot as the people in the area want to stay.

Mr. Osborne commented that the issue comes down to two alternatives in his opinion, either endorsing current renewal practice to create lots that meet current standards of minimum size, width, etc. or the Commission can accept lots within the renewal area that meet the minimum provision standard for legal lots created prior to 1946, in the Zoning Ordinance which is the 4,000 square feet of area and a minimum of 33 feet of width.

Mr. Dunnam stated that the Commission needs to express the intent and direct the staff to make an analysis to research a new zoning district without deciding which method will be just. Mr. Smith said that his thought is that this will come before the Commission again and again with the Model Cities Program and there should be a general policy.

Mr. Osborne said that the idea of a set of criteria is the key but the question now is the Blackshear area. A great majority of the lots are substandard to existing requirements but have more than 4,000 feet of area and 33 feet of width. Should this be a basic standard with respect to the Blackshear Project in trying to wrap up this plan. Prior Commissions have said that the renewal areas should meet the existing standards. We are suggesting that on this project you broaden the applicability, in turn we will try to work out how this can become more wide spread and effectively used. After further discussion, the Commission

VOTED: To express the intent to accept lots on the basis of 33 feet of width and 4,000 square feet of area as specified in the Zoning Ordinance plus consideration of variances for those lots that are substandard to those requirements, provided that there are existing structures on the lots, on the value of their merits and that the lots cannot be further subdivided.

It was further

VOTED: To instruct the staff to investigate other policies to handle small lot problems for future situations, perhaps by considering special zoning districts.

AYE: Messrs. Dunnam, Brown, Taniguchi, Hazard and Smith

NAY: Mr. Hanks

ABSENT: Messrs. Kinnan, McNeil and Milstead

Hoyle M. Osborne
Executive Secretary

ADJOURNMENT: 11:50 p.m.