

MINUTES OF THE CITY COUNCIL

CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS

Regular Meeting

August 7, 1952
10:00 A.M.

Council Chamber, City Hall

The meeting was called to order with Mayor Drake presiding.

Roll Call:

Present: Councilmen Johnson, Long, MacCorkle, White, Mayor Drake
Absent: None

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

Councilman White moved that the Minutes of the previous meeting be approved. The motion, seconded by Councilman Johnson, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Johnson, Long, MacCorkle, White, Mayor Drake
Noes: None

DR. V. T. HAMMOND, 1191 San Bernard, stated that he and other law abiding citizens would give Patrolman WARREN JONES the best recommendation of any officer that has ever been out on the East 11th Street area; and he should be commended, and Dr. Hammond asked that some of the shackles be taken off, so he could do even more. He said he had prevented lots of killings; that he was polite and courteous and helpful to everyone; that he does not ease in every back door and drink liquor nor take any money and let the people do as they please. He submitted a petition in WARREN JONES'S behalf. The Mayor asked him to present the petition to the Chief of Police, and asked the group to go with the Chief to his office and talk with him about this matter. MRS. U. V. CHRISTIAN stated the neighborhood in the East 11th vicinity had improved since Warren Jones had been placed overthere, and they did not know of the first petition being circulated last week, but this was a petition in his behalf.

Councilman Johnson offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, J. M. Odom is the Contractor for the addition to a building located at 818 Brazos Street and desires a portion of the sidewalk and street space abutting Lot 9, Block 97, of the Original City of Austin, Travis County, Texas, during the addition to a 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 J. M. Odom, the boundary of which is described as follows:

Sidewalk and Street Working Space

Beginning at the northeast corner of the above described property; thence in a n easterly direction and at right angles to the centerline of Brazos Street to a point 12 feet east of the west curb line; thence in a southerly direction and parallel with the centerline of Brazos Street approximately 33 feet to a point; thence in a westerly direction and at right angles to the centerline of Brazos Street to the east line of the above described property.

2. THAT the above privileges and allotment of space are granted to the said J. M. Odom, hereinafter termed "Contractor", upon the following express terms and conditions:

(1). That the Contractor shall construct a four-foot walkway within the outer boundaries of the above described working space, such walkway to be protected on each side by a guard rail at least four feet high and substantially braced and anchored and without wood strips or obstructions of any kind along the pavement within the walkway, and at any time in the opinion of the City officials it becomes necessary for any reason to install a board floor within the walkway, the Contractor shall upon notice from the Building Inspector immediately place such a wood floor and substantially support same to prevent sagging under load.

(2). That the Contractor shall in no way obstruct any fire plugs 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 periods of 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 the City Manager and in any event all such sidewalk, barricades, materials, equipment and other obstructions shall be removed not later than January 1, 1953.

(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 of said space any time with its public utilities, or for other necessary public purposes.

(8). 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 replaced or repaired at the Contractor's 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, 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 MacCorkle, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Johnson, Long, MacCorkle, White, Mayor Drake

Noes: None

Councilman Long offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, Southern Union Gas Company has presented to the City Council tentative maps or plans showing the proposed construction of its gas mains in the streets in the City of Austin hereafter named, and said maps or plans have been considered by the City Council; therefore

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

THAT Southern Union Gas Company be and the same is hereby permitted to lay and construct its gas mains in and upon the following streets:

(1) A gas main in PRUETT STREET, from a point 270 feet west of Hearn Street easterly 85 feet, the centerline of which gas main shall be 7.5 feet south of and parallel to the north property line of said PRUETT STREET.

Said gas main described above shall have a cover of not less than $2\frac{1}{2}$ feet.

(2) A gas main in SPEEDWAY, from a point 28 feet west of east property line of Speedway and on north property line of East 19th Street northwesterly to a point 18 feet east of west property line of Speedway and 62 feet north of

north property line of East 19th Street.

Said gas main described above shall have a cover of not less than $2\frac{1}{2}$ feet.

(3) A gas main in SPEEDWAY, from a point 62 feet north of north property line of East 19th Street northerly to point 32 feet north of south property line of East 21st Street, the centerline of which gas main shall be 18 feet east of and parallel to the west property line of said SPEEDWAY.

Said gas main described above shall have a cover of not less than $2\frac{1}{2}$ feet.

(4) A gas main in EAST 2nd STREET, from a point 80 feet east of Pleasant Valley Road easterly 41 feet, the centerline of which gas main shall be 19 feet south of and parallel to the north property line of said EAST 2nd STREET.

Said gas main described above shall have a cover of not less than $2\frac{1}{2}$ feet.

The Southern Union Gas Company is hereby put upon notice that the City of Austin does not guarantee that the space assigned above is clean from other underground utilities, but is based upon the best records we have at hand, and that the minimum depth stated does not have any reference to the fact that greater depths may not be required at special points. When the Southern Union Gas Company requires definite information upon the ground as to elevations or working points from which to base the location of their assignments, they shall apply to the Department of Public Works not less than three (3) days before such information is required. The Southern Union Gas Company is further put upon notice that they will be required to bear the expense of repairs or replacement of any underground utility damaged during the construction of lines named in this resolution.

AND THAT whenever pavement is cut in the vicinity of a fire plug, water must be used at intervals during the course of backfilling of the ditches.

THAT the work and laying of said gas mains, including the excavation in the streets, and the restoration and maintenance of said streets after said mains have been laid shall be under the supervision and direction of the City Manager, and under all the pertinent terms and conditions of the certain franchises granted to said company by the City of Austin.

The motion, seconded by Councilman Johnson, carried by the following vote:
Ayes: Councilmen Johnson, Long, MacCorkle, White, Mayor Drake
Noes: None

Councilman Long offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

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

THAT the City Council of the City of Austin hereby approves the addition

to a boat dock on the property leased by W. W. Bennett, described as being located downstream from the westerly extension of the south line of Windsor Road and listed in the Travis County Deed Records, and hereby authorizes the said W. W. Bennett to construct and maintain an addition to this boat dock subject to the same being constructed in compliance with all the ordinances relating thereto and further subject to the foregoing attached recommendations; and the Building Inspector is hereby authorized to issue an occupancy permit for the addition to this boat dock after full compliance with all the provisions of this resolution. Said permission shall be held to be granted and accepted subject to all necessary, reasonable and proper, present and future regulations and ordinances of the City of Austin, Texas, in the enforcement of the proper police, fire and health regulations and the right of revocation is retained if, after hearing, it is found by the City Council that the said W. W. Bennett has failed and refused and will continue to fail and refuse to perform any such conditions, regulations and ordinances.

(Recommendations attached)

"August 7, 1952

"Memo to Mr. Walter E. Seaholm
City Manager
Austin, Texas

"Dear Sir:

"I, the undersigned, have reviewed the plans and have considered the application of W. W. Bennett, lessee of a piece of property located downstream from the westerly extension of the south line of Windsor Road and listed in the Travis County Deed Records, for permission to construct and maintain an addition to a boat dock projecting out into the lake approximately 90 feet. The construction details meeting all requirements and the Lake Austin Navigation Board having considered and approved this project, and this dock does not extend out as far as the one immediately to the north of it, I therefore recommend that if W. W. Bennett is granted his request by the City Council, that it be subject to the following conditions:

(1). That nothing but creosoted piles, cedar piles or concrete piles, substantially braced to withstand wind and water pressure, be used in the construction and that no structure shall be nearer than ten feet to any side property line of the owner or applicant.

(2). That no business, such as a restaurant, dance hall, concession stand, or any other enterprise for the sale of goods, wares and merchandise, except marine supplies and tackle, and no living quarters of any character, shall be erected on any pier, dock, wharf, float, island, piling or other structure extending into or above Lake Austin.

(3). That every structure shall be equipped with proper lights which show all around the horizon for night use and shall be equipped with flags or other warnings for daylight use.

(4). That all structures extending out into the Lake be constantly kept in a state of good repair and that the premises be kept reasonable clean at all times.

"Respectfully submitted,
(Sgd) J. C. Eckert
Building Inspector"

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

Ayes: Councilmen Johnson, Long, MacCorkle, White, Mayor Drake

Noes: None

Mayor Drake introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL TERRITORY CONSISTING OF A TRACT OF LAND OUT OF THE GEORGE W. DAVIS SURVEY, IN TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS, WHICH SAID ADDITIONAL TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN, IN THE PARTICULARS STATED IN THE ORDINANCE.

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

Ayes: Councilmen Johnson, Long, MacCorkle, White, Mayor Drake

Noes: None

Mayor Drake introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THAT CERTAIN ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING PARKING METER ZONES IN THE CITY OF AUSTIN; AND PROVIDING FOR THE REGULATION OF TRAFFIC THEREBY, WHICH ORDINANCE WAS PASSED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN AUGUST 19, 1937, AND IS RECORDED IN BOOK "K", PAGES 281-286, INCLUSIVE, OF THE ORDINANCE RECORDS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN, BY AMENDING SECTIONS 8(a) AND 2, RELATING TO PARKING METER ZONES; 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 MacCorkle moved that the ordinance be passed to its second reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman Johnson, carried by the following votes:

Ayes: Councilmen Johnson, MacCorkle, Mayor Drake

Noes: Councilmen Long, White

Councilman Long offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

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

That the final plat of the subdivision known as "Allen Oaks", approved by the City Plan Commission of the City of Austin on May 8, 1952, be and the same is hereby accepted and authorized to be filed of record in the office of

the County Clerk of Travis County, Texas, in accordance with the provisions of the laws of the State of Texas, and the ordinances of the City of Austin, and that this action of the City Council be indicated by appropriate notation, signed by the Mayor, on the original plat of said subdivision prior to its recording in the Plat Records of Travis County, Texas.

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

Ayes: Councilmen Johnson, Long, MacCorkle, White, Mayor Drake

Noes: None

Councilman Long offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

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

That the final plat of the subdivision known as "Resubdivision of Owens Subdivision No. 1, Section 1", approved by the City Plan Commission of the City of Austin on July 24, 1952, be and the same is hereby accepted and authorized to be filed of record in the office of the County Clerk of Travis County, Texas, in accordance with the provisions of the laws of the State of Texas, and the ordinances of the City of Austin, and that this action of the City Council be indicated by appropriate notation, signed by the Mayor, on the original plat of said subdivision prior to its recording in the Plat Records of Travis County, Texas.

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

Ayes: Councilmen Johnson, Long, MacCorkle, White, Mayor Drake

Noes: None

The City Manager submitted the following certificate from the City Tax Assessor and Collector:

"August 6, 1952

"TO THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL:

"I certify that the tax assessments for the property hereinafter described, assessed in the name of Dr. A. Nanney, are incorrect because of erroneous information as follows:

"The assessments involved were based upon the information that the plane was in flying condition, which would have been the true value at the time of the assessments. According to information submitted by Dr. A. Nanney the plane was purchased second hand in 1946 for the sum of \$325.00 and mechanics were employed to repair the plane, but this plan was finally abandoned in 1948 and the plane was also abandoned as junk in 1948.

"Dr. Nanney stated that he had never received a bill for this tax. This is entirely possible for the reason that at the time of the assessment this plane was at Haile Airport and for a very short time thereafter. The bills were mailed to Dr. Nanney at Haile Airport and apparently were never forwarded to him.

"According to information obtained from mechanics at Ragsdale Flying Service at 1801 East 51st Street, this plane was both stored and worked on by mechanics in the employ of Ragsdale Flying Service, and these mechanics

stated that in the year of 1948 the reasonable cash market value of this plane was not more than \$400.00.

"I recommend that I be authorized to reduce the assessed valuation on such property as follows:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Description of Property</u>	<u>Original Assessed Value</u>	<u>Recommended Value</u>
1947	1 Fairchild Airplane NC65214	670	210
1948	1 Fairchild Airplane NC65214	670	160

"(Sgd) T. B. Marshall
City Tax Assessor & Collector"

Councilman Johnson then offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, the City Tax Assessor and Collector has made a special investigation of the tax assessments hereinafter set forth and has found the same to be incorrect for the reasons stated in his certificate delivered to the City Council and filed with the City Clerk; and

WHEREAS, in such certificate the City Tax Assessor and Collector has recommended the adjustments, Now Therefore,

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

That the following tax assessments for the year shown be and the same are hereby adjusted and corrected to fix the assessed values therein as indicated:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Description of Property</u>	<u>Original Assessed Value</u>	<u>Recommended Value</u>
1947	1 Fairchild Airplane NC65214	670	210
1948	1 Fairchild Airplane NC65214	670	160

The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:
Ayes: Councilmen Johnson, Long, MacCorkle, White, Mayor Drake
Noes: None

Councilman White offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

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

THAT the City Manager is hereby authorized and directed, in behalf of the City of Austin, to execute a release to Sam T. Scott, his heirs and assigns,

any and all liens heretofore existing or now existing by reason of the herein-after mentioned judgment on Blocks 12, 13, 14, Division "E", of the outlots adjoining the original City of Austin, in the City of Austin, Travis County, Texas, in consideration of the payment of all taxes and court costs involved in tax suit NO. 10,938, City of Austin vs. Sam T. Scott, in the District Court of Travis County, Texas, in which judgment was rendered in favor of the City of Austin on the 19th day of April, 1893, and is recorded in Book X, page 290, of the District Court Minutes of Travis County, Texas.

The motion, seconded by Councilman Johnson, carried by the following vote:
Ayes: Councilmen Johnson, Long, MacCorkle, White, Mayor Drake
Noes: None

MR. S. W. FREESE, FREESE & NICHOLS, appeared before the Council to answer questions regarding the bids for the Water Plant. MR. FREESE explained there would be the conventional type of plant, and three up-flow types of units, and alternate bids were being taken on those up-flow units with the hope of saving some money. He expressed preference to the conventional type. Councilman MacCorkle asked if it would make any difference as to the type of excavation on the different types. Mr. Freese answered there would be four different types of excavation. Councilman Long asked if four sets of plans had to be drawn, and what was the cost. Mr. Freese stated there were four sets of plans, and he had no idea of the cost--that his estimate might be around \$3,000. Councilman MacCorkle asked if it would be possible to let a separate contract on the excavation when it was not known what type of plan would be used. MR. Freese said it would be impossible; that it was hoped to save \$100,000 on the upflow--if it were only \$50,000, he would recommend the conventional type; but it would be impossible to let a separate excavation contract, and the General Contractor would have to give an overall bid. Councilman White asked if an excavation contractor couldn't bid on all three proposals. Mr. Freese said that would cost the city so much money; otherwise the city would get cheaper bids from these contractors, and that it was necessary to have one person responsible for the whole job. The excavation was a minor part of it; and when there were several contractors working on one job, and not having the responsibility under one head, there was an impossible situation. Councilman White stated it was his understanding that Mr. Raymond Canion or any other excavation engineer would have an opportunity to bid on that excavation. Mr. Freese said the general contractors would be glad to get a proposal from Mr. Canion or any other reputable contractor. Mr. Freese stated he and Mr. Nichols had given a lot of thought for a separate contract. (The Council was given copies of Mr. Nichols' letter) He did not believe that some contractors would bid unless they had everything under their control, as to excavation, back-fill, clearing the material yard, and other various factors. Councilman Long inquired if bids were being called on four different sets, and were the specifications for excavation different in each case. The City Manager stated bids would be received tomorrow, and they were not calling for any bids in the excavation, but the excavation would be different in each case. He said there would be no economy, and would probably cost the city considerably more money; otherwise. Mr. Freese pointed out the advantage of having full responsibility under one contractor and he would know when to cut the ditch, back-fill, and where to put the dirt; if there was a separate contract, then the City had to stand between those two; and if Mr. Canion got the contract and did not get out of the way and interfered with the schedule, then the General contractor would have a claim against the City.

Councilman Long compared this to the Power Plant which had separate bids, and Mr. Freese explained that this was a different type of structure. Councilman White wanted to know if most of the excavation wouldn't have to be done before the contractor could do anything. Mr. Freese said it would be carried along as the contractor went from structure to structure, and that the plant would be well along before the excavation and back-fill was completed, and it would take about a year or year and one-half. Councilman MacCorkle recalled the difficulties at the Power plant with separate bids. The Mayor stated the trend was to have one contractor only, and that the other contractors would bid through the General contractor. Councilman Long inquired about \$16,000 claim on the Power Plant job, as there were some questions raised on the excavation there. The City Manager stated this was exactly what they were trying to avoid here; that there was a misinterpretation of the specifications. Mr. Freese stated he was acquainted with every big filter plant job in the State, and there had never been a separate bid for excavation. This was also true of every big filter plant in the Country. Councilman Long asked Mr. Freese if the up-flow type was not any good, and did he think the City was taking a chance. He stated "no". The City was not taking a chance, and it would work in Austin--that he personally preferred the conventional type. Councilman White was not in favor of having separate bids on all of the construction, but he thought on a big job like this it would be all right to have a separate bid on excavation, and the Council had agreed if Mr. Canion or any other excavator desired to bid, that they be given an opportunity to bid on this job separately, and he felt that the Council should back that up. Councilman White moved that the Council delay opening these bids and arrange to give all the excavating contractors a chance to bid on this particular job. The City Manager stated the Minutes of the Council did not show that; and that he had taken it up with the engineers, and they had recommended against it. Councilman MacCorkle was absent at the time this was discussed, and he said if the Council promised such, he would live up to it; but the minutes did not show it. Councilman Long stated it was agreed upon that the excavation contractor would be given an opportunity to bid. Councilman White's motion that the Council delay opening these bids and arrange to give all the excavating contractors a chance to bid on this particular job, seconded by Councilman Long, failed to carry by the following votes:

Ayes: Councilmen Long, White

Noes: Councilmen Johnson, MacCorkle, Mayor Drake

MR. FREESE promised to furnish the Council a breakdown from the contractor's figures what the excavation will cost.

Public hearing on the Thoroughfare Paving was held at 10:30 A.M. The City Attorney announced this hearing was called to consider the proposed assessment against the abutting property owners and streets listed. Notice of the hearing was published in the American-Statesman on the 27th, 28th, and 29th of July. The City Attorney stated that Mr. Latson of the Engineering Department was present and would explain the nature of the improvements as proposed and outline the method of assessment and plan for pavement. MR. LATSON stated that this contract

was known as Contract 4, coming under the thoroughfare and business class of pavement, strictly a permanent type of pavement. There will be 10" structural depth composed of 4" compacted flexible base and 6" hot mix asphaltic concrete, backed up in all instances by curbs and gutters. The property owners pay 80% of the total cost of a 30' street, and the City pays 20% plus any additional width, which in this case is 10'. This is payable in eight payments; one after the acceptance of the job by the Council and the other is one year from the date of completion, and seven years to pay the balance at 5%. These are on-or-before notes and can be paid off at any time.

MR. EDGAR BURKHART, 3717 East Avenue, on the corner of 38th and East Avenue, stated his property at the present time had no residential value, and he did not feel he could pay for any pavement for 110' of a street. He stated if his property were commercially zoned it might have some value; the Expressway cut off 20' of his frontage, and he had less than 10' front yard. As far as residential value was concerned, it would not increase it any by having this pavement. He stated he not only could not afford it, but he did not feel it was his right to have to do it.

MR. L. R. BARTON, owning property on the corner of Robinson and East 38½, stated that Bascom Giles' representative signed the property owners on that street up, stating if they got the Community Center, they would give the land and take over the paving. He stated his son-in-law signed under that condition. He stated they needed the pavement since the Community Center was put in, but that Bascom Giles should pay for it.

MRS. HERMAN KOCH, 3300 Cherrywood Road, favored the paving, but not the sidewalks. She stated 99% of the people were against the sidewalk, for the simple reason it just did not serve the purpose, and would cost them a lot more money. The Mayor asked others if they favored the paving, but were against the sidewalks, and the group indicated it did favor the paving, but not the sidewalk.

MR. JOE GONZALES (Unit 9, Waller Street) stated they did not need any sidewalk on Waller, because it did not lead to any school; and they could get by with just the paving, as it was going to cost them a whole lot.

MR. WINSTON CURRIE, 1100 Koenig Lane, was interested in the paving, but did not feel they could afford the sidewalks, and the City did not own the right-of-way easements. He inquired if the Gas Company put in mains and tore up this pavement, would he have to pay for cutting the pavement, after having paid for having the street paved.

MR. JACK TAYLOR, Business Manager, University of Texas, stated that the Board of Regents and the Administration of the University were delighted that 21st from Guadalupe to Speedway, and Speedway from 19th to 21st were going to be paved, widened, and that sidewalks were going to be installed.

The City Attorney stated if all property owners had been heard, the hearing could be recessed; and Councilman MacCorkle moved that this hearing be recessed. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Johnson, Long, MacCorkle, White, Mayor Drake
Noes: None

The Council took a five minute recess.

During a recess of the Council, MRS. DOYLE R. SMITH, 3716 Werner, asked that she dictate the statement that she bought her house from MR. R. L. SMITH who told them that Mr. Giles sent a petition around to make the property commercial, and he said if people who owned property would not fight the petition to make it commercial that he would pave the street. They heard no more about it until Brown & Root Contractors came out to see them and said that Mr. Giles had offered to put some paving in, but it was too cheap for the City to accept, and they were letting it go for a while until they read the paper Saturday that this hearing was being held today.

The Council resumed its business.

MR. PERRY LEIGON, Austin Labor Temple Association, asked that since parking meters on the Avenue would be replaced by 30-60 minute meters, that when the hour meters were replaced that they be installed in the area of Brazos and 10th. He explained the parking troubles in that neighborhood, and that set-back parking spaces had been provided for people who needed a short time to park; but that this space was taken up by State workers and down-town workers who parked all day. Councilman Long moved that the City Manager be asked to draw an ordinance to place meters in that area when they are available. The motion, seconded by Councilman Johnson, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Johnson, Long, MacCorkle, White, Mayor Drake
Noes: None

MR. PERRY LEIGON mentioned the alley in this same neighborhood was blocked by four state cars and a Houston truck, and he asked a policeman in back of the bus station to see if he could clear the alley, but he told him it was off his beat; that he patrolled up to Brazos. He asked the policeman if this wasn't a violation of the law, and he said it was not, that the alley belonged to the City.

The Mayor stated in his efforts to help the Schools in the interim financing, he was now recommending as the best solution to their problem that the City sell Two Million Dollars School Bonds on November 6; that by pushing very hard and getting the tax roll by December, the bonds could be delivered in the early part of December. He felt this was the best we could do under the present circumstances, and he had spent a tremendous amount of time looking into all angles. Councilman Long asked if the Recreation Bonds could be included in this sale. The City Manager recommended the sale of only the School Bonds at this time and then sell the Recreation Bonds next spring, as that would not hold up the recreation program. Councilman MacCorkle moved that the City Attorney be instructed to prepare an ordinance for the issuance of the \$2,000,000 School Bonds bearing the date of December 1st, 1952. The motion, seconded by Councilman Johnson, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Johnson, Long, MacCorkle, White, Mayor Drake
Noes: None

Councilman MacCorkle inquired if there was any money in the budget for additional lighting for Rosewood at the Softball Park. The City Manager stated at this time it was not included in the budget, as in the early part of the year, it was impossible to get an allocation for wire necessary for that type of lighting; however, this was possible now, and he would include it in the budget.

Councilman MacCorkle stated that some of the people on the Drag were interested in getting 30-60 minute parking on the West side of Guadalupe. The City Manager stated he would make a survey of the merchants and see what developed.

Councilman Johnson inquired about the Hospital. The City Manager stated everything was going along very nicely, and they were trying to schedule the work and keep the hospital going; that the Architect was through with the general plan, and they were now waiting on the mechanical part; that Mr. Smith, the consultant, was down here making final plans.

The Council received notice that the following applications for change of zoning had been referred to the Zoning Commission:

JACK H. KEY	2006 South Lamar Blvd.	From "C" Commercial To "C-1" Commercial
BEN H. POWELL	914 Lamar Boulevard	From "C" Commercial To "C-1" Commercial

The Council set the following applications for change of zoning for public hearing at 11:00 A.M., August 28, 1952:

D. A. SHIPWASH	The east 35' of Lots 14, 15, and 16, Block 14, Hyde Park No. 1 Subdivision. 108 West 43rd	From "A" Residence To "C" Commercial RECOMMENDED by the Zoning Commission 7-30-52
H. H. ADKINS By F. E. Brisbon	East 41.71' of the H.H. Adkins tract fronting 41.71' on St. Johns Ave., 710 St. Johns Street	From "A" Residence To "C" Commercial RECOMMENDED by the Zoning Commission. 7-30-52
S. N. EKDAHL	Lot 7, Block 176, Original City; 405-09 W. 15th St.	From "B" Residence To "C" Commercial RECOMMENDED By the Zoning Commission 7-30-52

J. A. BIRDWELL

.36 acre, George W. Spear League, fronting 99.66' on Burnet Rd., 163.85 deep along Anderson Lane, & a depth of 150.75' along the south property line, and a width of 98.9' along the east property line. 7800 Blk. Burnet Road

From "A" Residence To "C" Commercial RECOMMENDED "C" COMMERCIAL, 5th HEIGHT & AREA DISTRICT by Zoning Commission.

W. P. GOODWIN
GEORGE JOHNS
FRANK EIDELBACH

1110-1128 Airport Blvd. and 1110-1114 Kirk Avenue. A triangular tract of land fronting 456' on east line of Airport Blvd., and 372' on the west line of Springdale Road, and

A triangular tract bounded by Airport Blvd. on the east; on the west by Kirk Avenue and on the south by Blk. 2, E.C. Goodwin Subdivision.

A pentagonal tract fronting 25' on the south line of Goodwin Ave., bounded on the ne by Airport Blvd; on the east by Kirk Ave., on the south by Blk. 3, E.C. Goodwin Subd., and on the west by a line 220.7' west of an parallel to the west line of Kirk Avenue.

From "A" Residence To "C" Commercial NOT RECOMMENDED by the Zoning Commission-- Zoning Commission recommended only three lots in triangle on Kirk Avenue and Airport Blvd. to "C" Commercial. (7-30-52)

MRS. DOYLE SMITH, 38 $\frac{1}{2}$ and Werner, made inquiry about people living on a street, being assessed for paving and not being asked anything about it. The Mayor explained this was a thoroughfare program, and the Council designated several thoroughfares; that people in residential paving programs petitioned for the paving, but the thoroughfare program was a little different. MR. EDGAR BURKHART who lived on the corner stated his property was less valuable as residential and he was not able to get any encouragement from the Zoning Department, as they would not accept his application until October. He did not want to pay \$600 when it would not help his property. MR. LATSON explained he came in on the corner lot arrangement, and he would be assessed for only 73', and his total cost would be \$438.72.

There being no further business, the Council adjourned subject to the call of the Mayor.

APPROVED: _____

W. S. Driskell

Mayor

ATTEST:

Elzie Woosley

City Clerk