= CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS ==

680 680

MINUTES OF THE CITY COUNCIL

CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS

Regular Meeting

August 26, 1954 10:00 A.M.

Council Chamber, City Hall

The meeting was called to order with Mayor McAden presiding.

Roll Call:

Rresent: Councilmen Long, Pearson, White, Mayor McAden Absent: Councilman Thompson

Present also: W. E. Seaholm, City Manager; W. T. Williams, Jr., City Attorney; C. G. Levander, Director of Public Works.

Invocation was delivered by REV. SCOTT FIELD BAILEY-All Saints Episcopal Church.

Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Councilman White moved that the Minutes of August 5th, 12th and 19th be approved. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Long, Pearson, White, Mayor McAden Noes: None Absent: Councilman Thompson

MR. R. F. SIDDONS, JR., President Highland Park Civic Club, presented the following:

"<u>HIGHLAND PARK CIVIC CLUB</u> <u>ON</u> THE DEVELOPMENT OF NORTH AUSTIN PARK AREAS

WHEREAS, there has been an unprecedented development and extension of North Austin within the last ten years and a large percentage of the residents of the newly developed areas do not have convenient access to existing park developments; and WHEREAS, the City of Austin has available adequate park sites at the Hancock Park location and the Kohn Park location (supplemented by adjoining city owned land) for general park developments including major swimming pools, and at the undeveloped Northeast Austin location for a golf course development, and these locations would, if feveloped, serve North Austin from East to West. Now, therefore Be it Resolved by the Highland Park Civic Club, in meeting duly assembled;

(a) That the Recreation Department, Parks Board and City Council of the City of Austin be urged to take the earliest possible action to develop the above sites and make them available for public use;

(b) That if it becomes necessary or advisable for the City to sell the East 40 acres of Hancock Park, that the City be urged that the funds realized from this source be ear-marked for development of recreational facilities in the City of Austin;

(c) That it is the sense of these assemblies that this action should be taken to provide comparative facilities in North Austin to theDeep Eddy and Zilker Park Projects and that the future growth and needs of North Austin require immediate development of the sites described above;

(d) That the Recreation Department, Parks Board and City Council be commended for their sincere and continuing interest in the recreational facilities of Austin Citizens.

We certify that the above resolution was passed by our organization on the 14th day of August, 1954, by Highland Park Civic Club.

> (Sgd) R. F. Siddons, Jr. R. F. Siddons, Jr. Pres. Highland Park Civic Club"

Councilman Pearson asked the City Attorney if it would be necessary to submit the sale of this Hancock tract to the vote of the people. The City Attorney stated it would not, as it had never been dedicated and was not purchased to be used for a park, and it was paid for out of the general fund. Councilman Long felt that it was purchased with a park in mind, as it was already a golf course. The City Attorney explained the transaction with the membership of the Country Club, stating it was made plain that it was not necessarily to be a park. The City Manager stated the thinking of the Council at that time was for a possible expansion of the University. Councilman Pearson suggested if the Council should get a concrete offer, that it should discuss this and consider it at every angle what the property could be used for, and decide what a fair value would be, and then put it out for public bids. Councilman Long said she was not in favor of selling it, and endorsed Councilman Pearson's suggestion of putting it to a vote of the people. Councilman White suggested having a public meeting before it was ever acted on by the Council. The Mayor said the Council did have the authority to sell this property if it received an acceptable offer. He thanked Mr. Siddons and the Club for their interest.

Councilman Pearson offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, C. H. Richey, DVM, had made application in writing for permission to operate a veterinary hospital for the treatment of small domestic animals on the 50° x 100° unplatted lot out of the J. C. Powell 2.75 acre tract, the same being on the East side of Lamar Boulevard and is locally known as 211 South Lamar Boulevard and is located in a "C" Commercial District, which under Section 6, Item 33 of the Zoning Ordinance, requires a special permit from the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the applicant further agrees to sound proof and aircondition the building, that no kennels, runs, or other housing of animals outside of the main building will be erected or used and that no animals will be boarded or bred or confined longer than is necessary for the proper treatment of diseases, and

WHEREAS, this application has been considered and approved by the City Council of the City of Austin, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:

THAT permission for the use and maintenance of a building for the treatment of small domestic animals be granted to C. H. Richey, DVM, and to be operated as a Veterinary Clinic.

The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Long, Pearson, White, Mayor McAden Noes: None Absent: Councilman Thompson

Councilman White offered the following resolution and moved its adop-

(RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, H. P. Ross is the Contractor for the alteration of a building located at 2420 Guadalupe Street and desires a portion of the sidewalk and street space abutting part of Lot 5, Outlot 49, Division D, of the City of Austin, Travis County, Texas, during the alteration of the building, such space to be used in the work and for the storage of materials therefor; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:

1. THAT space for the uses hereinabove enumerated be granted to said H. P. Ross, the boundary of which is described as follows:

Sidewalk and Street Working Space

Beginning at the south east corner of the above described property; thence in an easterly direction and at right angles to the center line of Guadalupe Street five feet to a point; thence in a northerly direction and parallel with the center line of Guadalupe Street approximately fourteen feet to a point; thence in a westerly direction and at right angles to the center line of Guadalupe Street to the east line of the above described property.

2. THAT the above privileges and allotment of space are granted to the said **H P**:Ross, hereinafter termed "Contractor", upon the following express terms and conditions:

(1) That the Contractor shall erect within the above described working space a solid fence built of not less than one-inch material and at least 8 feet in height (or extending from the sidewalk to the underside of the present awning) substantially braced and anchored and to maintain same in goodcondition at all times while the work is in progress. The Contractor will be permitted to put a door in the barricade that will either open in or slide parallel to the barricades, and at all times that material is being delivered or taken away from the building, a watchman shall be provided to warn pedestrians of approaching danger. (The Contractor will also be permitted to use one parking meter space immediately in front of the entrance in the barricade for the delivery or removal of materials during construction work.)

(2) That the Contractor shall in no way obstruct any fireplugs or other public utilities in the construction of such barricades.

(3) That provisions shall be made for the normal flow of all storm waters in the gutter and the Contractor will be responsible for any damage done due to obstruction of any such storm water.

(4) That the Contractor shall place on the outside corners of any walkway, barricades or obstructions, red lights during all periodsof darkness and provide lighting system for all tunnels.

(5) That the Contractor shall remove all fences, barricades, loose materials and other obstructions on the sidewalk and street immediately after the necessity for their existence on said sidewalk or street has ceased, such time to be determined by theCity Manager, and in any event all such sidewalk, barricades, materials, equipment and other obstructions shall be removed not later than September 15, 1954.

(6) That the City reserves the right to revoke at any time any and all the privileges herein granted or to require the erection or installation of additional barriers or safeguards if the conditions demand it.

(7) That the use and enjoyment of the spaces herein granted shall not be exclusive as against public needs, and the City, in making such grant reserves the right to enter and occupy any part or all ofsaid spaces any time with its public utilities, or for other necessary public purposes.

(5) That any public utility, or public or private property disturbed or injured as a result of any of the activities necessary for the completion of the construction work for said building projects, whether done by the Contractor, City forces, or public utilities, shall be replacedor repaired at the Contractors expense.

(9) That the Contractor shall furnish the City of Austin a surety bond in the sum of Five Thousand Dollars (\$5,000.00), which shall protect.

= CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS -

684

indemnify and hold harmless the City of Austin from any claims or damages to any person or property that may accrue to or be brought by any person by reason of the exercise or abuse of the privileges granted the Contractor by the City of Austin and shall guarantee the replacement of all sidewalks, pavement and all other public property and public utilities disturbed or removed during the construction work and shall further guarantee the construction of a walkway and other safeguards during the occupancy of the space.

The motion, seconded by Councilman Pearson, carried by the following

vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Long, Pearson, White, Mayor McAden Noes: None Absent: Councilmen Thompson

Councilman Long offered the following resolution and moved its adop-

tion:

(RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, bids were received by the City of Austin on August 20, 1954, for the paving of Guadalupe Street, from Koenig Lane to Denson Drive; and,

WHEREAS, the bid of Raymond Canion in the sum of\$9,863.85 was the lowest and best bid therefor, and the acceptance of such bid has been recommended by the Director of Public Works of the City of Austin, and by the City Manager; Now, Therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:

That the bid of Raymond Canion in the sum of \$9,863.85 be and the same is hereby accepted, and W. E. Seaholm, City Manager of the City of Austin is hereby authorized and directed to execute a contract on behalf of the City of Austin with Raymond Canion.

The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following

vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Long, Pearson, White, Mayor McAden Noes: None Absent: Councilman Thompson

Councilman Long offered the following resolution and moved its adop-

tion:

(RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, bids were received by the City of Austin on August 20, 1954, for the relocation of East Bouldin Creek Channel (South Congress Avenue Easement, Colorado River to Riverside Drive); and,

WHEREAS, the bid of Raymond Canion in the sum of \$2,791,80 was the lowest and best bid therefor, and the acceptance of such bid has been recommended by the Director of Public Works of the City of Austin, and by the City Manager; Now, Therefore,

\$\$ 68**5**

----- CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:

That the bid of Raymond Canion in the sum of \$2,791.80 be and the same is hereby accepted, and W. E. Seaholm, City Manager of the City of Austin is hereby authorized and directed to execute a contract on behalf of the City of Austin with Raymond Canion.

The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilman Long, Pearson, White, Mayor McAden Noes: None Absent: Councilman Thompson

Councilman White offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, heretofore, the City Council of the City of Austin found and determined that public necessity required the opening, widening, relocation and maintenance of East 7th Street in the City of Austin from Chicon Street eastward as an integral segment of routing of U. S. Highway No. 183 and State Highway No. 71 through the City of Austin; and,

WHEREAS, certain properties, including the parcels hereinafter described, were acquired for such right-of-way purposes; and,

WHEREAS, the relocation and construction of such street or highway has been completed for several years; and,

WHEREAS, the City Council has found and determined that the hereinafter described property is no longer needed for such right-of-way purposes; and,

WHEREAS, the O. R. Lott, Sr. Estate has paid the City of Austin Twelve Hundred Dollars (\$1200.00) as consideration for the conveyance of such property to it; Now, Therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:

That W. E. Seaholm, City Manager, be and he is hereby authorized and directed to execute a deed on behalf of the City of Austin, conveying to O. R. Lott, Sr. Estate, for and in consideration of the payment by said O. R. Lott, Sr. Estate to the City of Austin of the \$12,000.00 consideration, 2437 square feet of land, same being out of and a part of Lots 4, 5, 6, and 7, of Block 12, Lincoln Place, a subdivision of Outlots 23 and 23-1/2 of Division "A" of the Government Outlots adjoining the Original City of Austin, Travis County, Texas, which 2437 square feet of land is that portion of said Lots 4, 5, 6 and 7 lying south of the present right-of-way line of said East 7th Street.

The motion, seconded by Councilmen Pearson, carried by the following

vote

Ayes: Councilmen Long, Pearson, White, Mayor McAden Noes: None Absent: Councilman Thompson

The Mayor introduced the following ordinance:

= CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS ==

AN ORDINANCE VACATING AND PERPETUALLY CLOSING 3055 SQUARE FEET OF THAT CERTAIN ALLEY LYING BETWEEN BLOCKS 12 AND 13, OF LINCOLN PLACE, A SUBDIVISION IN THE CITY OF AUSTIN, TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; RETAINING AN EASEMENT FOR A STORM SEWER LINE IN THE CITY OF AUSTIN; AND SUSPENDING THE RULE RE-QUIRING THE READING OF AN ORDINANCE ON THREE SEPA-RATE DAYS.

The ordinance was read the first time and Councilman White moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its second reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman Pearson, carried by the following vote:

> Ayes: Councilmen Long, Pearson, White, Mayor McAden Noes: None Absent: Councilman Thompson

The ordinance was read the second time and Councilman White moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its third reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman Pearson, carried by the following vote:

> Ayes: Councilmen Long, Pearson, White, Mayor McAden Noes: None Absent: Councilman Thompson

The ordinance was read the third time and Councilman White moved that the ordinance be finally passed. The motion, seconded by Councilman Pearson, carried by the following vote:

> Ayes: Councilmen Long, Pearson, White, Mayor McAden Noes: None Absent: Councilmen Thompson

Mayor McAden announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

The Mayor introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE VACATING AND PERPETUALLY CLOSING THE NORTH SIX (6) FEET OF THE 739 FEET OF BANYON STREET LYING WEST OF LAMAR BOULEVARD; AND SUS-PENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF AN ORDINANCE ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS.

The ordinance was read the first time and Councilman White moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its second reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman Pearson, carried by the following vote:

> Ayes: Councilmen Long, Pearson, White, Mayor McAden Noes: None Absent: Councilman Thompson

The ordinance was read the second time and Councilman White moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its third reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman Pearson, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Long, Pearson, White, Mayor McAden

Noes: None Absent: Councilmen Thompson

The ordinance was read the third time and Councilman Whitemoved that the ordinance be finally passed. The motion, seconded by Councilman Pearson, carried by the following vote:

> Ayes: Councilmen Long, Pearson, White, Mayor McAden Noes: None Absent: Councilman Thompson

Mayor McAden announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

The Mayor introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO ENTER INTO A CERTAIN CONTRACT WITH PARKINSON ESTATES, INCORPORATED PROVIDING FOR THE APPROPRIATION OF MONEY PAID TO THE CITY OF AUSTIN UNDER SUCH CONTRACT AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

The ordinance was read the first time and Councilman White moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its second reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman Pearson, carried by the following vote:

> Ayes: Councilmen Long, Pearson, White, Mayor M cAden Noes: None Absent: Councilman Thompson

The ordinance was read the second time and Councilman White moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its third reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman Pearson, carried by the following vote:

> Ayes: Councilmen Long, Pearson, White, Mayor M cAden Nees: None Absent: Councilman Thompson

The ordinance was read the third time and Councilman White moved that the ordinance finally be passed. The motion, seconded by Councilman Pearson, carried by the following vote:

> Ayes: Councilmen Long, Pearson, White, Mayor McAden Noes: None Absent: Councilman Thompson

The Mayor introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THAT CERTAIN ORDINANCE ENTITLED: "AN ORDINANCE REGULATING TRAFFIC UPON THE PUBLIC STREETS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN; PRESCRIBING PENALTIES FOR THE VIOLATION OF SAME; REPEALING ALL ORDINANCES OR PARTS OF ORDINANCES IN CONFLICT HEREWITH; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY, ", WHICH ORDINANCE WAS PASSED - CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS ----

BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN MAY 6, 1937, AND IS RECORDED IN BOOK "K", PAGES 1599179, INCLUSIVE, OF THE ORDINANCE RECORDS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN, BY AMENDING SUBSECTION (d) OF SECTION 23 OF ARTICLE IV RELATING TO LOADING ZONE LOCATIONS; REPEALING ALL ORDINANCES OR PARTS OF ORDINANCES IN CONFLICT HEREWITH; DECLARING AN EMERGENCY AND SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF: ORDINANCES ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS.

The ordinance was read the first time and Councilman Pearson moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its second reading. The motion seconded by Councilman White carried by the following vote:

> Ayes: Councilmen Pearson, White, Mayor McAden Noes: None Sestimate voting: Councilman Long Absent: Councilman Thompson

Councilmen White moved that the following ordinance be introduced and published as provided by Article I, Section 6, of the Charter:

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN ADDL. TIONAL TERRITORY CONSISTING OF 27.10 ACRES OF LAND, MORE OR LESS, SAME BEING PORTIONS OF WALNUT HILLS, SECTION 4, AND WALNUT HILLS, SECTION 5, SUBDIVISIONS OF PORTIONS OF THE THOMAS ELDRIDGE SURVEY, THE J.A.G. BHOOKS SURVEY, AND THE PATRICK LASK SURVEY, IN TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS, WHICH SAID ADDITIONAL TERRITORYLIES ADJACENT TO AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUS-TIN, IN THE PARTICULARS STATED IN THE ORDINANCE.

The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following

Ayes; Councilmen Long, Pearson, White, Mayor McAden Noes: None Absent: Councilman Thompson

The City Manager presented the following on the Taxi cab operations.

"August 25, 1954

"Hon. Mayor and City Council Municipal Building Austin, Texas

"Gentlemen:

vote:

"The attached report is a consolidation of their report of all assets, receipts, disbursements, and gains or losses of all taxicab companies operating in Austin, under Franchise, in the period October 1, 1953, to June 30, 1954. Also number of miles traveled, earnings per miles, and costs per mile.

"A casual examination of these figures would very likely leave the impression there is a wide discrepancy, between the various companies, in the cost of operation. However, the difference shown in the cost of operation per mile, as taken from their monthly reports, is brought about through the various methods of reporting their costs to this office. A brief explanation of the differences in items included in the operational costs for the various companies follows:

"The Airline and Shugarts Taxicab Companies show a much lower cost per mile than do the other Taxicab Companies. This is due to the fact that each of them is a one man operation. Included in their report are all the items allowed under direct expenses with the exception of Drivers commissions, or salary for themselves. However under general expense they show no items other than for professional services, (making up monthly reports) gross receipts tax paid to the city, and miscellaneous items. No telephone, utility, rent, Federal and State Tax, etc.

"Roy's Taxi Company reports all cost items allowed under direct expense, including drivers commissions paid to hired Drivers, however, he and his brother drive daily, without including forty per cent of their receipts in Drivers commission item. Most items included in general expense are charged outbby this company, except salaries for dispatchers, managerial services, etc.

"The Owl, De Luxe and Harlem Taxicab Companies, operate on a part company owned, and part lease cab basis. That is each cab company owns part of the cabs bearing their name, and some of the cabs are owned and driven by persons who have leased their cabs to the company for all practical control purposes.

"Under this arrangement the company received reports of all earnings by all cabs under their control, reports all receipts and pays tax on full amount of receipts to the city. In listing items of direct expense they include depreciation on company owned equipment only, lists drivers commissions only on company owned cabs, after receiving payment of agreed terminal fee, cost of insurance, etc. from individual cab owners lists the balance of receipts from leased cabs, as cost of lease on equipment. Under general expense all usual items are included.

"The Checker Cab and Red Ball Taxicab Companies operate on a lease equipment basis. That is all cabs, radios, meters, and other rolling stock equipment, including shop tools are owned by Mr. K. M. Fisher, holder of the franchises, or by Mr. J. P. Fisher, Jr., and are leased to the Taxicab Companies for operational purposes. Approximately 2 per cent of total income is charged off as payment for use of cabs and other equipment. The Red Ball Taxi Company has been sold to the Checker Cab Company and all permits held by Red Ball are now a part of the Checker Cab Company.

"The Yeldow Cab Company is the only company in Austin operating under a full cab and equipment ownership basis. Their depreciation of equipment charges against total income amount to about nine tenths of one per cent, which is much lower than other companies. However, while their earnings per mile are higher than other companies their overall costs are also higher, with a resultant loss over the period covered.

"In my opinion, the figures shown in the accompanying report justify a request for some change in the taxicab rates for the city of Austin. However, I do not agree with the change proposed in the application now pending before your body, for the following reasons.

"1. The presently effective rate of \$.45 for the first one and one half miles is too low in cost, and far is distance, as compared to rates now effective in other cities. The average rate for the first drop now effective in eleven cities including Austin, of over 100,000 population in New Mexico, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas is \$.41 for 7/10 of one mile. In 90 cities of over 100,000 population in the United States the average rate for the first drop is \$.37.5 cents for 55/100 of one mile.

"2. The proposed rate of \$.30 per mile after the first drop is out of line with currently effective rates in other cities. The average rate for miles traveled after the first drop in eleven cities of over 100,000 population in New Mexico, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas is approximately \$.20 cents per mile. In 90 cities of over 100,000 population in the United States average rate is approximately \$.25 cents per mile.

"3. The proposed rate makes no provision for reducing the rate per mile after the first drop. Passengers riding long distances would pay the same rate of \$.30 per mile for the last mile as is charged for the first one. This would mean the passengers riding over one and one half miles would pay the entire increased fare.

"The average distance traveled by passengers is now approximately two and one half miles per trip. Under the present rate, the fare is \$.65 or with tolerance \$.70. Under the proposed rate the fare for two and one half miles would be \$.75 or \$.85 depending on how close to the full two and one half miles were traveled. Trips for longer distances would mean a greater increase percentage wise for the passengers. For example a trip from down town Austin to the Airport, a distance of 4 miles, now costing from \$.95 to \$1.00 under the proposed rate would cost from \$1.20 to \$1.30.

"A trip from downtown Austin to Bergstrom Field, a distance of 7 mides, now costing \$1.55 to \$1.60, under the proposed rate would cost from \$2.10 to \$2.20.

"4. Most of the persons operating "boot leg Cabs" in the past have carried their passengers over long distances. Any increase in fares for long distance riders might create a demand for a cheaper method of transportation and danger of "boot leg Cab" operation increasing. Particularly would this hold true if all the increase granted is to be charged to the long distance rider.

"For these and other reasons, I am of the opinion that the cost of such increases as is needed to keep the cab industry on a sound basis, should be distributed among all taxicab patrons, and not among just a part of them.

> "Respectfully submitted, "Signed: "J. E. McClain, Chief Auditor, Inspector Taxicabs

"JEM/jh

CC: All Councilmen Walter E. Seaholm Joe D. Huffman W. T. Williams"

Pursuant to published notice thereof the following zoning applications were publicly heard:

H. J. PEIMECKY

1208-28 & 1217-1315 South Lamar Boulevard From "A" Residence lst Height & Area To "C" Commercial 6th Height & Area RECOMMENDED by the Planning Commission

Mr. R. A. Hodges presented petition opposing zoning any further than 430 feet; The Planning Engineer explained the recommendation of the Planning Commission. The Mayor asked that those who favored upholding the recommendation of the Planning Commission and granting the change to vote "aye"; those opposed to vote "no". Roll call showed the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Long, Pearson, White, Mayor McAden Noes: None Absent: Councilman Thompson

The Mayor announced the recommendation of the Planning Commission had been upheld and the change granted; and the City Attorney was instructed to draw the necessary ordinance.

HOME SAVINGS LIFE INS. 402-08 & 407-09 East CO., J. O. ANDREWARTHA llth Street & ED F. HEMME

From "B" Residence To "C" Commercial RECOMMENDED plus one lot by the Planning Commission

Mr. O. P. Lockhart appeared in the interest of this application. No opposition. The Mayor asked that those who favored upholding the recommendation of the Planning Commission and granting the change to vote "aye"; those opposed to vote "no". Roll Call showed the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Long, Pearson, White, Mayor McAden Noes: None Absent: Councilman Thompson

The Mayor announced the recommendation of the Planning Commission had been upheld and the change granted, and the City Attorney was instructed to draw the necessary ordinance.

.

DELIA ANDERSON

Ð

4307-09 Bellvue Avenue

٨

From "A" Residence To "B" Residence RECOMMENDED by the Pdanning Commission - CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS

Ayes: Councilmen Hong, Pearson, White, Mayor McAden Noes: None Absent: Councilman Thompson

The Mayor announced the recommendation of the Planning Commission had been upheld and the change granted, and the City Attorney was instructed to draw the necessary ordinance.

- - - - - - - - -

400 Alpine Road

FRANK DARLINGTON

From "A" Residence lst Height & Are To "C" Commercial

lst Height & Area To "C" Commercial 6th Height & Area RECOMMENDED by the Planning Commission

Mrs. Frank Darlington appeared in her own behalf. No opposition appeared. The Mayor asked that those who favored upholding the recommendation of the Planning Commission and granting the change to vote "aye"; those opposed to vote "no". Roll call showed the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Long, Pearson, White, Mayor McAden Noes: None Absent: Councilman Thompson

The Mayor announced the recommendation of the Planning Commission had been upheld and the change granted, and the City Attorney was instructed to draw the necessary ordinance.

.

M. L. LILES

5413-17 Interregional Highway & 5406-5508 Cameron Road From "A" Residence lst Height & Area To "C" Commercial 6th Height & Area NOT Recommended by the Planning Commission

Mr. Liles appeared in his own behalf stating he was surrounded by commercial tracts or proposed commercial tracts. His development depended on a commercial zone. Councilman Pearson asked about this location with reference to future runways of the Airport. It was pointed out that this property is about 2000 feet from the location. The Mayor asked that those who favored upholding the recommendation of the Planning Commission and denying; the change to vote "aye"; those opposed to vote "no". Roll call showed the following vote:

Ayes: None Noes: Councilmen Long, Pearson, White, Mayor ^McAden Absent: Councilman Thompson

The Mayor announced the recommendation of the Planning Commission had

been overruled and the change granted; and the City Attorney was instructed to draw the necessary ordinance.

.

FORREST PEARSON

2611-2619 & 2701-11 South 1st Street From "A" Residence lst Height & Area To "C" Commercial 6th Height & Area NOT Recommended by the Planning Commission

Mr. Pearson appeared in his own behalf stating this subdivision was laid out in 1947 and the property was intended for commercial. Since then the City annexed the territory. He stated the property was not anything but Commercial in nature. All lots were under one ownership and the 6th Height and Area would apply nicely now as development could be planned with 6th Height and Area. He planned the development on the corner in order to have parking on both sides. No opposition appeared. The Mayor asked that those who favored upholding the recommendation of the Planning Commission and Edenying the change to vote "aye"; those opposed to vote "no". Roll call showed the following vote:

Ayes: None Noes: Councilmen Long, Pearson, White, Mayor McAden Absent: Councilmen Thompson

The Mayor announced the recommendation of the Planning Commission had been overruled and the change granted; and the City Attorney was instructed to draw the necessary ordinance.

.

H. A. SCHUYLER

6007-21 & 6101-05 Brooks

From "A" Residence lst Height & Area To "C" Commercial 6th Height & Area NOT Recommended by the Planning Commission

Mrs. Schuyler appeared in her own behalf. The Planning Engineer explained the recommendation. Mrs. F. F. Lambeck, 824 Tirado and Mrs. E. W. Humphreys, 6008 Brooks, opposed on grounds of lack of fire protection in the area. The Council postponed action on this in order to inspect the property personally.

VEE P. JERNIGAN

3505 Neal Street

From "A" Residence To "C" Commercial NOT Recommended by the Planning Commission

Mr. Dudley Fowler represented Miss Jernigan and asked that the hearing be postponed a week. Opposition to the change of zone was expressed by Mrs. R. F. Wilson, 3507 Govalle, Mrs. J. C. Caffey, 1104 Gunter and Mrs. Alexander, 3501 Govalle. Miss.Jernigan, a member of the Church of Christ, wanted her

E CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS

property zoned so that the Church could use it in the publication of a paper. Mr. Fowler stated the property owners had signed a petition favoring their request. The ladies opposing stated they did not realize it would mean a change of zoning and were opposed to the change. The Council postponed this until September 9, 1954, when there would be a full Council present.

The Council set the following application for change of zoning for public hearing, September 16, 1954:

MARK EURNETT, et al 0.822 of one acre of land From "A" Residence same being out of and a part of the Military Heights Addition, a subdivision of a portion of the George W. Spear NOT Recommended by League in the City of Austin, the Planning Com-Travis County, Texas, locally mission known as 3606-12 Bull Creek Road and 3602-04 Jefferson Street.

lst Height and Area To "C" Commercial 6th Height and Area

Councilman long asked that the maps for these zoning files be as they used to be sent out at the time Mr. Mahoney came to the Planning Department, as those maps, with the addresses rather than the numbers, and colored, were much more convenient for the Council members.

There being no further business the Council adjourned at 12:35 P.M., subject to the call of the Mayor.

APPROVED:

Camaday

ATTEST: