

Charles Meador

From: James Lerch <jamesclerch@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 05, 2019 4:42 PM
To: Charles Meador
Subject: Re: Proposed Vacation
Attachments: Re County property on 25th St. E, Parrish.eml

Importance: High

Hi Charles,

While I will appear as a greedy opportunistic jerk that is just being difficult, I would be opposed to the county vacating the parcel if it results in an equal division of the land between myself and the adjacent owner.

Here's why I'm opposed to such a division:

The parcel to be vacated was made public when our subdivision was created in 1958. The plat record designates the parcel as a "Street R.W." between my property and the adjacent Lot #21 to the east.

My home was the first residence of the subdivision to be built along 25th Street East and finished construction in 1960. The house was designed and built on what was then (and still to some extent is) considered a corner lot. As a result the driveway, garage, and carport were placed on the north side of the property facing east. Vehicular access uses the parcel to the east as the only means of conveyance.

I purchased the property in 2002 and my family and I have used the public parcel daily to access our driveway and as virtual extension of our side yard. Myself and the prior owners of this residence have been solely responsible for the maintenance and up keep of the public parcel, which seems reasonable since we are the only persons using the public parcel.

During the rainy season only the center 12 feet of the parcel from 25th Street on the south to my driveway on the north can support vehicle traffic. The land to either side of this center section is used for drainage and is impassable after heavy rains.

If the county were to vacate this parcel and ownership of the land divided equally then my family and I would lose access to the only drivable component needed to access our driveway, garage, or carport. In addition the 25 foot width that would remain is too narrow to safely back my boat and trailer into either my garage or carport. While these issues can be resolved with time, money, and engineering it would be at a considerable expense. An expense I would only incur if the county vacates the property and a 50/50 disbursement is the only viable result.

In Summary, I am opposed to the county vacating the parcel if a 50/50 disbursement is the only possible result. Such a property disbursement would mean I would incur a considerable financial expense as well as a loss to the the ease and the level of access we currently enjoy to our property.

I've attached the most recent email I sent to Joy back in November of 2018 regarding this same topic.

Regarding the contact information for Susan Stinton, I've left voice mails and emailed her for permission to share the information I have. I haven't heard back from her yet, as soon as I do I'll send you an update.