3 2 /

MINUTES OF THE CITY COUNCIL

CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS

Recessed Meeting

April 29, 1948 2:00 P.M.

Council Meeting, City Hall

The meeting was called to order, with Mayor Miller presiding.

Roll Call

Present: Councilmen Bartholomew, Glass, Johnson, Thornberry, Mayor Miller;

Absent : None

Present also: W. T. Williams, Jr., Tax Assessor and Collector; Howard Bull, L. Theo Bellmont, Rickey Key, members of Tax Board of Equalization.

James Lederer - N 8' of Lot 2, and S 47' of Lot 3, Block 6, Map 61, Item 184, Bryker Woods B. 3005 Genview.

Mr. Lederer feels the whole valuation is unfair; that there was 400% increse. The explanation of the value was the lot 55 x 113' valued at \$15.00 per front foot; the building 1060 square feet plus porch and garage at \$3.75 per square foot on the house. 15% allowed for 10 years depreciation on house. The Council is to look over the records again.

Jay Brown - for F. F. Knight and J. M. Odom - 9th and Lavaca. Lots 4, 5, and 6, Block 108

Mr. Brown stated Mr. Knight and Mr. Odom bought this property in 1946 for \$65,000 and they are willing to pay on 2/3 basis of what they paid for it. The Board reduced it to \$47,450. The new building was not there January 1, 1947. The house was built in 1870 and started off with 40% depreciation. The value should not exceed \$42,000 if it is going to be on a fair basis. Mr. Brown stated they were willing to pay on 2/3 basis of what they actually paid for it on an inflated market. The Council stated they would make a complete investigation and let him know.

320

Mr. B. F. Leonard Southland Corporation -

Lots 1, 2,3,4, Block 115, 901 Red River Improvements on Lot 12, Block 20.

Mr. Leonard stated the value on the property in 1946 was \$4,975, and this year \$12,240. It was stated by Mr. Williams that the Board had changed the unit in the last days of the appraisal, and did not get to make the correction, and that the present assessed value should be \$10,530. Records to be corrected on the property.

On the Machinery and Equipment, Mr. Leonard thought it should be assessed on a tenage basis. The assessed valuation is \$19,140. He figured \$239.00 per ton, and they ran 60 tons, and Mr. Leonard stated that figure would be around \$14,000, or a decrease of \$5,000 approximately on the machinery and equipment.

Mr. Leonard is agreeable to the valuation of \$19,900 on buildings; and \$10.530 on the land, but is not agreeable to the assessed value of the machinery. He wants it assessed at \$15,000 based on tanage value at somewhere around \$250.00 per ton. He still thought \$19,140 was too much. The Council said they would look into the value of the machinery and let him know.

Mrs. D. M. Railey - Lots 5 and 6, Block 16, 310 East 2nd Mr. R. W. Kirshner 309 East 2nd.

Mrs. Railey believed the land to be valued too high. She stated they were in the industrial property and the line between the Commercial and Industrial zones is in the middle of their block. They are not using their property for industrial or commercial purposes, but as their home, and it is assessed for \$9,850 against \$2,740 last year, and she feels it is too much.

Mr. Kirshner stated the City Engineer had made a survey and had taken off 5¹4" of his property. He had been paying on 90¹, but now he has 86¹, due to the City's widening the street.

The Mayor stated that Mrs Railey's property was probably worth \$25,000, and her total valuation is in for \$13,000. He stated if the City took any from their lot, they would be allowed that much back; but it was probably taken from the sidewalk and curb line. He stated that all property had to be revalued to take care of the higher costs of government, and that she could raise her rent to offset the taxes if she did not have a contract.

Roswell Miller

Property on Northumberland, Lots 5^x and 6, Block C; Lots 4 & 5, Block E; Lots 9,10,11,11,12,13,14, Block E; Highland Park; Lot 8, Block 2, Lot 9, Block 2, E. 55¹ lot 10, Westfield; Lot 11, Block 2; Lot 6, Block 6, Lots 8, Block 8.

32%

Mr. Miller stated that the assessed values that were placed on the land were not equal with the improvements and not uniform. He felt that all of his lots were assessed too high.

Property on Northumberland. - Had been calculated at \$40.00. The Tax Department found an error, in that it should be calculated at \$30.00. This error to be corrected.

10 Lots in Little Highland Park. - He felt they were assessed too high.

Westfield Lot 8,9, and 55' Lot. Block 2. - Lots are low rugged land with creeks running through them.

Lot 11. Block 2, - Sloping Lot and has drainage in front of it.

Lot 6, Block 6. - Key lot. Every acre there backs up on three sides and the front has a creek running through it. The City was supposed to make a 30 foot street, but left it at 25 feet and that left the creek that has to be crossed to get to the lot.

Lot 8, Block 5. - Slopes off to the West (Corner of Elton). City has cut part of his property off and made a street there. Creek running in the northwest and makes this property less desirable than the adjoining piece of property.

Mr. Miller stated that the rest of his property that he protested was assessed as the adjoining property, but that he objected to the land values carrying too great a load of the residential property. He stated that where there were improvements, that the same type of value had not been given. Mr. Miller pointed out lots in the Starr Tract—lots that cost \$7000 to \$7500, but assessed at \$930.00 and \$1,030.00. Two pieces on top of the hill that cost \$9,500 on the City rolls for \$2,010 in 1947. He was making comparisons to this property and asking why it is on so low. The Council stated they would look at his property agains, and adjust it on front foot basis to see that he was not assessed higher than his neighbor and consider everything—utilities that were not in—and everything pertaining to its value.

H. J. H. Melin - 914 acres - Lot 1, Outlot 47, Div.

E, Map 2, Item 125. 1509 Congress Ave.

Mr. Melin stated that the property across the street is assessed on the basis of \$650 and his property was assessed at \$5.00 a front foot. He stated that he sold at \$4.00 in 1945 which he thought was an inflationary price. No sewers, two inch water line. He owns part of the street. The street has not been dedicated. His assessment was \$960. He feels it should \$595, on the basis of \$650, or on a \$4.00 foot. Council took this under advisement.

Improvements assessed \$2.65, less 15% depreciation. He stated that was all right, but on \$4.00 square foot less 30% depreciation, he could not understand. He was asking about the two screened porches, there being a question of being a shed roof or all under one roof. Council to send someone to look at it, and make a new appraisal.

Mr. Melin wanted consideration on the apartment house at 1509 Congress, which he bought in 1944 for \$15,000. He is satisfied with the appraisal of the land, but wants the building and improvements and remodeling rechecked. At the time of the appraisal, he was remodeling and it was not completed, and he was allowed 10%, but he would like to see it rechecked. The Council to look it over again. He has already paid his taxes.

John C. Palm

Lot 27, Block 4, 1930 San Antonio

Mr. Palm is objecting to the land value placed on the property. He stated it was a long block from 19th to 21st, and is as it was for many years with no changes--nothing commercial. He was not objecting to the improvements, but was raised from \$2.135 to \$5,290, which he thought was too much. The Council said they would make a study of it, saying if it is changed, the whole block will have to be changed. Eight percent had been added to his lot because it is over 100 feet deep---120 feet deep, with alley influence.

Shelton C. Adrian - 4

409 East Monroe and 16002 Newning

\$530 for the lot and \$8,290 for improvements. Mr. Adrian is satisfied with the lot value, but not the improvements. The building was built in 1912, and made improvements in 1929. 3303 square feet, full valuation at \$9,987 before 25% allowed for depreciation. Assessed value of \$5,000. Mr. Adrian thought the house being 35 years old should have more depreciation. Improvements include residence, one unit down stairs, two apartments up and garage apartment. The garage apartment is assessed at \$3,290. The question is the depreciation on the main house. To be rechecked for depreciation. Refigure the garage apartment, on the same lot with the house.

Lomis Slaughter

Waterson Estate. 240'x121' Spear League Unplatted Map 90-C, Item 43-5

140'x117' Spear League Unplatted, Map 90-C, Item 43-3, 3rd and Brazos Streets.

Mr. Slaughter stated he bought this property 10 years ago for \$3,500; gave part to the church and part to his son. He is now assessed

\$5,040, on what he has left, which is not even half of the original purchase. Across the street is negro property. He stated it was listed 140x117, but according to Doake Rainey's survey, he has 138'x117'. He stated he is in forthe same as the other property owners, but it is just too high, and he asks for a correction to be made.

Mr. Slaughter stated that the property on 3rd and Brazos Streets was assessed at \$35,160, against the cost of \$26,000 10 or 12 years ago. The improvements were in the refrigeration rooms. The building is 30 years old or more. 16,146 square feet above the floor, 5,520 in the basement, 1,000 canape at 15ϕ a foot, and the main building was assessed at \$2.50 per square foot. He asked that it be reconsidered.

Annie T. Giles

2824 Manor Road, Plat 240, Item 121.

Miss Giles stated this property represented \$5,000 inheritance, and it is valued for City purposes at \$7,800. Built in 1912. \$\frac{1}{2}\$ of the house is porches. Most of this land is hillside, and would cost more to develop than it is worth. Couldn't build a foundation for another house. Southeast part has the railroad running through it with 13 different curves. She said Manor Road is all run down, full of chug holes. She stated they gave the city sewer line easements. She thinks the assessment should not be in for more than \$5,000. The house is not suitable for rental. The Council directed to have it reappraised.

Mr. John Miller Buda, Texas 1511 Riverside Drive, Map 140, Item 11

The house was built In 1915 and bought for \$3,800. It is assessed at \$5,140, which is a raise from \$2,100. Mr. Miller stated it was listed as a two-story house, but does not have as much space upstairs as the ground floor. The garage on back of the lot facing on Summit has been converted to living quarters. The council said it would be rechecked and report sent to him at Buda, Texas.

Gustave Johnson

Lots 8 & 9, Block 3, Map 150, Item 106. Lot 10, Block 4, Map 150, Item 119.

Mr. Johnson is satisfied with the value on the house, which was built 44 years ago, but his lots were set too high in his opinion. They run down the hill. It was explained to him that the Board of Equalization reduced the value on his lots, but he was protesting Lot 10, and the two under the hill. The Council stated they would look at them again and let him know.

35%

Arthur Bagby, for - Mrs. Margaret B. Walne

Lots 1 & 2, Block 6, Lots 3 & 4, Block 33

WITHDRAWN

Arthur Bagby, for Gugenheim Goldsmith.

The question was the tax on the Tax with the Federal Government charged on Whiskey. The Mayor thought what had been paid the Government or State should be taken off the inventory, and it was discussed that the Manufacturer was taxed and passed on down to the purchaser, and the distributor was repaid, and it was taxable. It was stated the City Attorney wouldhand down an opinion.

Upon motion, seconded and carried, the meeting was then recessed, subject to call of the Mayor.

Approved: Donnilla.

Attest:

CITY CLERK

EVENING SESSION OF THE CITY COUNCIL:

Austin, Texas April 29, 1948

تحسرت مخسب

The City Council reconvened at 8:00 P.M. with Mayor Miller presiding and all members present.

Present also: Mr. W. T. Williams, Tax Assessor and Collector,; Howard Bull, Rickey Key, and L. Theo Bellmont, members of the Tax Board of Equalization.

J. W. Prtichard

Lot 13, Pease Estates (Represented also by Attorney, George E. Shelley)

Mr. Shelley stated that his client had protested the valuation of \$1,430 on the land, and the Board not only did not reduce the assessment, but raised it to \$1,530. He declared that the valuation of \$1,430 was unjust and inequitable and out of line with other property more favorable situated in the immediate neighborhood.

Mr. Shelley stated further that the Board did give him a reduction on the improvements from \$9,970 to \$7,900, but that this figure was within \$100 of what the house cost before his client added \$1,000 worth of improvements. The house was built about eight years ago. He declared that a valuation of \$7,900 on the improvements was entirely too high and he should be allowed some depreciation, and that it was out of line with other property around it. Mr. Pritchard stated that he had spent considerable money improving the place and does not feel that he should be assessed on improvements that he has spent money on to keep up.

The City Council directed that a recheck be made of the property to see how it compares with surrounding property. The Tax Office was to send a man out at 10:00 A.M. next morning for the recheck. The Mayor stated that the recheck would apply to the improvements only, and that the land would have to take the established unit per square foot.

George E. Shelley, Individually

His residence at the corner of 17th Street and West Avenue 211-213 Congress Avenue

Mr. Shelley stated that the land was formerly assessed at \$1,380 and was raised to \$4,070 and the improvements were raised from \$5,005 to \$10,540, or a total of \$14,640, and that this is within three or four hundred dollars of what he paid for the property 25 years ago. He stated that about six years ago he spent from \$3,000 to \$4,000 on improvements, but has had no depreciation allowed for twenty-five years. House is located on a fault, which caused it to crack. He thinks the raise is too much.

Mr. Shelley stated that practically the same situation applies to two other pieces of property- 211-213 Congress Avenue - which he bought just about a year prior to January 1, 1947, for \$23,500. The Board placed a

334

valuation of \$18,730 for purposes of taxation. He considers he paid a good price for the property, which he bought from E. G. Kingsbury.

3rd and Colorado Streets

Mr. Shelley stated that he paid \$30,000 for this property; that it is assessed on a basis now of \$48,000, which is \$18,000 more than he paid for it 18 years ago. He is protesting on both land and buildings.

It was agreed that a recheck would be made of the properties.

Mrs. Seth Mills

Property at 600-602 Nueces St.

Mrs. Mills stated that this property consists of an apartment house and residence. The land is assessed for \$11,260 and the buildings for \$7,810. The apartment house is 35 years old, and the residence is about 50 years old. She thinks the valuation is too high. It was agreed that a recheck would be made of the property to see if any relief can be granted.

George S. Nalle (Represented also by attorney
A. J. Wirtz)

All of Block 129; Lot 6, Block 70; S½ Lot 3, Block 110; N½ Lot 2; Block 110; Lot 3, Block 53; Lots 11 and 12, Block 19; S 107 of Lot 1, Block 131; Lots land 2, Block 143.

Mr. Nalle stated that he appreciated the little relief the Board of Equalization gave him, but that it was not enough. He stated that he was making no protest on Lot 8, but that the assessment on his home place at 1003 Rio Grande Street is beyond all comprehension. The land alone is assessed at \$86,576. This block is assessed for \$10,000 more than the Slaughter block, and more than the Court House block. The Board of Equalization explained this by saying that the Nalle block is not for sale, but is for homestead purposes, and pointed out that the block just east of the Nalle block is zoned one-half as commercial, and the whole block is assessed for only \$49,000. Mr. Nalle stated that he thought the land value on his block would be right at \$50,000, and that it would be more valuable without improvements on it. It was agreed that a recheck would have to be made of this property.

Lot 3. Block 129 - Mr. Nalle stated that on March 12, after a hearing before the Board of Equalization, they sent him a notice saying that the improvements had been changed from \$2,010 to \$1,840, and that later he was went another notice saying that the improvements on this lot had been raised from \$2,010 to \$2,160. His big house was originally valued at \$16,000 and the Board reduced it to \$11,400. He is makeing no protest on that.

Lot 2, Block 129- George S. Nalle, Jr - This property is located at 604 West 10th Street. The improvements were assessed at \$2,110 and reduced by the Board to \$1,850, but later were increased. He also protested

the separate assessment placed on the garage, which is an old stable building, and belongs with the house. It was agreed that a recheck would be made of this property.

Lots 11 and 12, Block 19, Original City - Mr. Nalle stated that they bought this property at auction for \$42,300, containing about 15,000 square feet. The City has placed a 2/3 value on it of \$34,650. Attorney Wirtz declared that the question of values is a question of opinion, and that he knows of no better way to establish the market value of a piece of property than for it to be offered for public sale and get a public bid. He declared further that he wanted to make this point for the record, that the market value of property is determined by what the willing purchaser will pay to the willing seller, and he does not think anybody's opinion is worth more than that.

Lot 3, Block 53, Original City - This property, located at 308 West 5th Street, had an old house on it, the assessment of which was raised to \$5,060. He read a letter sent some time previously to the Tax Department saying that the old house had been demolished by him. He stated further that his rent was forzen at \$30.00 per month under the OPA. He also protested the valuation on the land of \$9,002, which he paid \$15,000 for about ten years ago. He thinks he is entitled to some relief.

It was agreed that a recheck would be made of this property.

Lots 1 and 2, Block 143, located at northeast corner of 12th and RedRiver Streets - Mr. Nalle stated that there was no protest on Lot 2.

On Lot 3, Mr. Nalle stated that the land is very hilly, has a creek running through it, and that he had to put in a storm sewer there at his own expense. He thinks the assessment of \$3,410 is too high. No protest on the improvements.

It was agreed that a recheck would be made of this property.

Lot 6, Block 70, Original City - located at 7th Street and Congress Avenue--Mr. Nalle stated that this property is assessed at \$29,560 for the building, and \$142,000 for the land. The building is about 75 years old. He declared that the valuation is twice as high as the property across the street. It was agreed that a recheck would be made of this property to see if Mr. Nalle is treated fairly with all others in that block.

Joseph Lucas

Block 189, less SE 113'x140, Map 13, Item 27.

This property is located at 511 East 1st Street. Mr. Lucas stated that he was not protesting the valuation on the improvements, but only on the land. He thinks the valuation of \$6,840 placed on the land is too high, in view of triangular shape of the land caused by the cutting of Waller Creek through there. It was agreed that a recheck would be made of this property.

Beth Lucas, represented by Joseph Lucas Christian & Fellman Addition Lot 1, Block 19, Outlot 25, Division "C", Map 44, Item 13.

This property is located at 704 East $20\frac{1}{2}$ Street. Mr. Lucas stated that hiw wife, Mrs. Beth Lucas, paid \$675 for the lot in 1938, and that it has a tax valuation now of \$1,310. It is garage property. The improvements thereon are assessed at \$34,090, with a tax valuation of \$3,690. It was agreed that a recheck would be made of this property, both land and improvements, at the same time the property of Joseph Lucas is rechecked.

Arthur P. Watson, for Watson Properties
- Lot 1, Block 68, Map 8, Item 56.

Mr. Watson stated that his protest was on the land value only, which was placed at \$25,490 for tax purposes. His protest was based mainly on two things—(1) that, by reason of the high elevation of the rear of the property, it is impossible to get sewerage on the ground floor of the building; and (2) that the property is assessed the same as the property on the south side of East 6th Street, particularly that of Lot 12, Block 57, just across the street on the south from his property, which according to the opinion of most of the real estate men and other people who are familiar with the actual sale and rental value of property, on East 6th Street, is not worth as much as the property on the south side, and that the Citizens Committee placed a lower valuation on his lot than on that of the lot across the street above described. It was agreed that a recheck would be made of this property.

East 13' of Lot 2, and W 52' of Lot 3, Block 150, Map 6, Item 87.

This property is located at 402 West 12th Street. Mr. Watson stated that he was protesting the valuation of \$6,180 fixed by the Board for tax purposes. He stated that this property is split by zoning and his protest is based upon the valuation of most of this lot on a commercial basis of \$125 per front foot, plus depth factors, whereas the west part of this lot and the lot adjoining it are based on \$80.00 per front foot. He says that the commercial zone which extends from Guadalupe Street over a part of this lot does not increase the value of any part of this lot, since it is impossible to face any portion of this lot on Guadalupe Street. It was agreed that a recheck would be made of this property.

A. J. Kissman

Property at 6100 East Avenue

Mr. Rissman stated that the improvements on this property were not even started on January 1, 1947, and that he thought the valuation too high because there is no bus service, sewerage, or gas there. It was agreed that a recheck would be made of this property.

Mrs. Clara Louise Dittman -

Map 162, Item 176, located at 2505 Exposition Blvd.

331

Mrs. Dittman stated the improvements are assessed at \$3,510 and the lot, which is 75'x130' at \$1,120. She stated that she was not protesting the valuation of the land, but thinks the valuation on the improvements is too high. She says her neighbor on the north has a better house than hers, but is assessed for less. It was agreed that a recheck would be made of the property.

Mrs. J. W. Bradfield

910 West 22 Street, East 50 9' of Lot 19, Block 32, Division D. Map 46.

Mrs. Bradfield stated that this property is assessed at a valuation of \$9,430 and it cost her \$8,000. She said that the rent on this property had been frozen for siz years and she cannot get it increased. Her insurance ansState and County taxes have been increased, and the City valuation is too high. She said the land valuation is also too high. It was agreed that a recheck would be made of the property.

2103 Nueces Street, Lot 17, Horst Addition, Outlot 232, Division D, Map 46

Mrs. Bradfield stated that the valuation of \$12,120. on this property is too high. She stated that the house is 50 to 60 years old; that it needs repairs; and being a University house, she can only rent it for about nine months of the year. It was agreed that a recheck would be made of the property.

111 East 19th Street, NE 55x85' of Lot 7, Outlot 50, Division E, Map 2

Mrs. Bradfield stated that this property is assessed at a valuation of \$7,510 and that it cost her \$7,600 in 1943. The Council agreed to have a recheck made of this property.

911 West 19th Street, 113x130' E Block 15, Division E, Map 89.

Mrs. Bradfield stated that this property is assessed at \$5,829 and that it cost her \$9,000. The Council agreed to have a recheck made of this property.

Mrs. Bradfield in protesting the valuations on all of the above properties, declared that the rent from these properties was her only means of livelihood and that she considered the increase in valuations on same was out of line with the income received after deducting the cost of insurance, maintenance and repairs, and taxes.

Jake Hirshfeld, for Hirshfeld Estate Property located at 301-305 West 9th Street

321

Mr. Hirshfeld stated that this property, consisting of their home place and a rent house, was assessed at \$4,339 for the land, and \$21,780 for the improvements. He said that the Board reduced the improvements from \$21,780 to \$17,010, but that it considered this too small a reduction. He Stated that the assessment on the home place was too high for a residence, but that it would be all right for business property. The Council agreed to have a recheck made of the property.

W.C. Schulle

3 acres out of Daniel J. Gilbert Survey, Map 166, Item 10.

Mr. Schulle stated that this is his home place and that he was not protesting the valuation on the improvements, but only on the land, which he did not consider an equitable appraisal according to his neighbors assessments. He pointed out that on the north side of him, the property is assessed at \$2,000 per acre, or \$3,415 full valuation; and farther west of him the property is assessed at \$1,685 per acre, or \$3,415 full valuation, and that they all consider their properties are better than his. To the west of him is a dead-end street. He stated further that he has no utilities, except water and light - no sewerage and does not want any. He stated that his property is assessed 2½ times as high as one of his neighbor's. Council agreed to have a recheck made of the property.

Propertylocated at 312 West 5th Street, Lot 2, Block 53, Map 7, Item 34.

Mr. Schulle stated that the land is assessed for \$9,400 and the building at \$12.860, which he considers too high, as the alley is 8 feet above the building and he has no back entrance. The Council agreed to have a recheck made of the property.

T. J. Butler

Lots 5 and 6, Original City, Block 51, at 501-507 West 6th.

Mr. Butler stated that this property consists of a garage building on the corner of 6th and San Antonio Streets and the Butler Flats next door. He stated that he is makeing no protest on the assessment on the Butler Flats, but is protesting the assessment on the garage building and on all the land. He pointed out that the valuation of \$74,746 on this property for the year 1947 is \$34,101 greater than for the year 1946, or nearly 85% increase, with no additional improvements in the meantime; and that the rear of his property has a dead-end alley, which lessens the value of the moperty. He stated further that this was the first time he had ever paid all or any part of his taxes under protest, but was asking that the property protested be reduced

to a reasonable valuation in order that the taxes for the year 1947 and subsequent years may be equitable and fair. Council agreed that a recheck be made of the property.

R. C. Ammann, - Property located at 1904 San representing Mrs. John H. Chiles, Antonio Street.
Jr.

Mr. Ammann said that the landis assessed at \$5,290 and the improvements at \$3,810, or a total of \$9,100, and that he paid \$8,000 for the property, and the house is old. Council agreed that a recheck be made of the property.

Clarence Hyde

Improvements only, located at 2903 Lake Austin Boulevard

Mr. Hyde stated that the improvements are located on University property; that he paid \$200.00 for the house about 14 years ago and spent \$120.00 on it; that it has been raised to \$560.00. He thinks the assessment is too high in view of the fact that he has no sewerage, inadequate fire protection, and high rate of insurance. Does not think it should be assessed for over \$300.00. Council agreed to make a recheck of the property.

H. M. Oetting

Lots 5 and 6. Block 157. Map 60165, located at Lavaca and 13th Streets.

Mr. Oetting stated that he was protesting the valuation on the land only, which is placed at \$19,630, and which he considers too high. It was pointed out to Mr. Oetting that the unit value on this property is in line with that of surrounding property.

D. H. Hart, Jr. representing Mrs. Lucile S. Hart -

Property in Beausite Addition

Mr. Hart stated that his protest was on the land, and that he considers the valuation on all the lots too high, as there are deed restrictions for residential use only, which makes it hard to get rid of and reduces the value to some extent. He pointed out that the land value on his home place had been more than doubled. Council agreed that a recheck be made of the property.

Upon motion, seconded and carried, the meeting was then recessed, subject to call of the Mayor.

Approved:

MAY

Attestin mi rheen_