Mr. Mike Amyx Mayor, City of Lawrence PO Box 708 Lawrence, KS 66044

RE: Resolution No. 6634

Dear Mr. Amyx;

The purpose of this letter is to outline my opposition to Resolution No. 6634 creating a special assessment benefit district for the construction of Stoneridge Drive south from W. 6<sup>th</sup> Street. Apparently there was a public hearing held on April 4, 2006 concerning this Resolution. I was not there to personally voice my opposition because I did not receive the letter notifying me of the meeting until April 6, 2006. Since this Resolution significantly affects me in a number of ways, it is almost unimaginable that the City of Lawrence did not make certain that I knew beforehand about the hearing. Frankly, it makes me wonder if the failure to notify me was an intentional act on someone's part. Phone service between Lawrence and Des Moines is pretty good and a number of people associated with this project have my contact information. A quick and simple phone call from someone, anyone, was in order to be sure I knew about the public hearing.

I am opposed to several aspects of this special assessment benefit district as outlined in the letter I received. First, Tract 1 and Tract 2 are significantly different in size. Tract 1 (me) is the smaller of the two yet I am being asked to foot half the cost for a road that I don't need or want. That simply is neither fair nor equitable. No discussion has taken place to date about how the city proposes to provide me access to my property during the construction of this proposed road. The city was no where to be seen (in fact, had no idea what I was talking about) last spring when I was forced to work out on my own the details of providing myself access to my own property when the state closed my driveway entrance to the property. Having done that and having had a driveway put in once, I'm not doing it again. It is now the city's problem to provide me whatever access I need to get onto my property and adequately take care of my animals.

Second, the city is the one that has allowed the development of more than 120 acres and the building of hundreds of homes to the south of my property with only one way (15<sup>th</sup> Street) in or out of the area until the opening of George Williams Way last fall. Every one of those homes will benefit from the completion of Stoneridge Drive and those folks should be paying a significant portion of the cost to provide them this access. It is patently unfair to require me to pay half the cost

Mr. Amyx April 19, 2006 Page 2

of the city's poor planning and failure to provide the newcomers to the area adequate access in and out of the development area. All of this seems to be occurring simply because my land, which has been my family's home for the last 37 years, happens to be smack dab in the middle of someone else's project. I have not asked for any of this, but I sure have gotten it.

Lawrence is a wonderful city. I grew up there, have spent most of my life there and have been planning on returning when I quit working in Iowa. While in Iowa I have frequently returned to Lawrence and have kept track of what goes on there. Frankly, the treatment I have received from the city related to my property along W. 6<sup>th</sup> over the last 3 years has me wondering if I really want to return to a city where the city leaders treat the citizens of the community for whom they work with such an uncaring, unsympathetic, unfair and arrogant attitude. The treatment I have received from the city related to the public hearing discussed earlier in this letter is not an isolated incident. I am in the process of preparing a detailed list of events that have occurred and the resulting damages to myself and my property by the activities around my property. That list should be in your hands within the next week or 10 days.

Should you have any questions or desire additional information, feel free to contact me. I have enclosed my business card which lists both my phone number and fax number at work during the day.

Thank you for listening to my concerns.

Sincerely,

Christine A. Collister

cc: Dave Corliss
R. Scott Wagner
Chuck Soules

May 2, 2006

Mr. Mike Amyx Mayor, City of Lawrence P.O. Box 708 Lawrence, Kansas 66044

RE: Resolution 6634

Dear Mr. Amyx;

As I indicated in my letter of April 19, 2006, this letter contains a list of events that have occurred and problems I have had to deal with since my property on W 6<sup>th</sup> Street was annexed by the City of Lawrence. In that letter I stated there have been numerous instances in addition to the City's failure to notify me in a timely fashion of the April 4, 2006 meeting to discuss Resolution 6634, in which I have been treated as though I were an invisible, irrelevant, and non-existent landowner. At the time my property was annexed into the City I was assured that being brought into the city would result in no additional costs to me ... wrong. Since then we have endured many instances of additional cost in terms of time, inconvenience, and aggravation. The following are examples of types of things we have had to endure.

George Williams Way benefit district. When the George Williams Way benefit district was created that was also dropped on me like a bombshell. Just as in the instance of Resolution 6634 my only notice that anything official had been filed and was before the Commission was a letter from the city telling me about the public hearing... that letter at least arrived in time for me to make arrangements to appear at the hearing. My "proportionate share" of the cost of George Williams Way via the benefit district on my west boundary have been and is currently providing access to all those who live and work in the 120 acres of land south of my property. Even if you argue that I needed access to the west and should have been included in the George Williams benefit district ... a benefit district and access on one side is plenty, two benefits districts, one on either side of my property is unnecessary and not needed for access to my property.

It simply amazes me that no one bothers to inform the people they include in these benefit districts and that the benefit districts have been officially filed. I do not need the roads I am being asked to pay for and no one asked me if I wanted to be included in any benefit district. This is the second street I am being asked to pay a significant portion of and it will also be a major city collector street for the 120 acres behind me. Yet it does not appear any of those folks are being asked to pay anything to connect themselves to W 6<sup>th</sup> Street. I do not believe for a minute that landowners who owe land adjacent to every collector street that is built in the city of Lawrence are required to pay the costs to put those streets in.

Mr. Amyx May 2, 2006 Page 2

<u>Utilities cut off.</u> There have been numerous times when either the water, telephone or electric lines were cut and there was, without any warning, no water, no telephone service or no electricity to the house. Each of these instances required that we take the time to physically go find someone on the construction crew who could figure out what had happened and see that the problem was corrected. It then often took hours to get the problem corrected.

West fence. One evening at the beginning of the construction of George Williams Way, I was awakened by the police pounding on my door at midnight. They said there were some horses in the subdivision behind the house and wondered if they were mine. I got dressed, grabbed some halters and followed them to the Long Leaf subdivision east of the new elementary school at the south end of George Williams Way. The horses did, in fact, belong on my property. After learning that the police promptly left, leaving me alone in the dark to move 6 horses at least 1 mile back home when I had no idea how or where they got out. I had to call friends at that hour, wake them and ask them to come help me, however, the horses took off before they got there, ran north back toward home and the highway. We spent hours tramping around in the dark looking for them and finally gave up at 4:00 am after looking everywhere we could think of. We discovered that they got out because a construction crew had taken out about 100 feet of my west fence, and no one had bothered to put it back or let me know. The posts were broken off and the wire was broken and wadded up in balls. I spent the rest of that night, sitting in a chair in my living room, waiting to hear squealing brakes and a loud thud signaling that someone had found at least one of the horses. When the sun finally came up we found the horses and got them corralled in the lot behind the barn. It was extremely fortunate that no people and no horses were killed on the road that night. I spent much of the next day making phone calls to figure out who was responsible and getting someone to repair the damage they had

Southwest corner of fence. When the west fence was put in along George Williams Way, it was not connected to the fence that runs across the south edge of the property. We were told by the construction crew that the old west fence was going to be bulldozed down the next day. As a result we had to spend a significant amount of time completing the fencing job - connecting the two fences together and bracing the post that was to serve as the corner post.

Trash pick-up. Soon after the road was started I received a letter from the city welcoming me and stating that in several months they were going to start

**DCA** 

Mr. Amyx May 2, 2006 Page 3

charging me for garbage pick-up and I was to leave my trash by the curb. There was no curb and it would have been impossible for a garbage truck to stop on the road and pick anything up. I called, explained the situation to several people before I found the correct person, and was told it would be taken care of. Several months later when my utility bill came it included trash pick-up. So again, I had to make a long distance phone call to resolve the problem. The problem was ultimately taken care of, but only after at least three long distance phone calls.

Driveway. On May 26, 2005, without any warning or explanation, I received a letter from KDOT telling me that my driveway access to W 6th St would be closed on June 1, 2005 and I was to access W 6th via Fenceline Rd (now called Stoneridge Drive). This letter gave me five days, including a long holiday weekend, to find a contractor, have a driveway built and access a road that did not exist. When I asked the gentleman who wrote me the letter how he expected me to do that, he had nothing to say except that I had been paid for putting in a driveway. I agreed with him but had no idea what I was expected to do when there was nothing to connect the driveway to. When I then called City Hall, I found no one who even knew what I was talking about or seemed to understand the problem. So, on my own, I had to work out an arrangement with the highway contractor and the KDOT on-site person about how I was going to get in and out of my property during the road construction. Someone finally called me from city hall the next Tuesday, the day before my June 1 deadline but she did not seem to understand what the problem was. The contractor built a "driveway" of sorts along the edge of the cast bound lancs of W 6th to use to access my old driveway while those lanes were being constructed. After the east bound lanes were done but not open for traffic, we were allowed to use those lanes and they built a ramp over the curb so we could continue to use the old driveway. After the road was completed and my driveway was built, they extended the stub they constructed at the intersection of Stoneridge and W 6th so I could get to my new driveway at the required distance from W 6th. While I can't say enough about the cooperativeness and willingness of the contractor to help ensure we had access to the property at all times, there were numerous difficulties and challenges throughout the construction even with his help. These difficulties include but were not limited to the following: driving through sometimes impassible mud; having to park on the east bound lanes and walk back and forth to the house in the rain or dark because there was a trench across the driveway or large equipment was parked there; having to carefully weave our way alongside a large ditch in which water lines were being installed right next to our temporary "driveway" (so as not to fall in ); having to wait significant amounts of time to enter or leave the property because

Mr. Amyx May 2, 2006 Page 4

of equipment or trenches or large piles of rocks blocking the exit routes in all directions from the property; having to explain to the police on more than one occasion why we were driving on a road that was not open; at times needing 4 wheel drive to get up and down the access I was left with from my new driveway to W 6<sup>th</sup> because the grade is so steep.

Southeast corner of fence. Already this spring there has been another instance of someone taking down a section of pasture fence and leaving it down. The fence in the southeast corner of the pasture was for some reason taken down and left down. I don't know why the fence was taken down since no one bothered to ask permission or let me know they were going to be on my property. This thoughtlessness on someone's part required significant time to round up the horses and put the fence back up.

As you can see, we have been treated over the last few years in a less than conscientious and caring manner by the city and projects surrounding our long time family home. The lack of timely notification for the April 4 public hearing concerning Resolution 6634 is just another item in a long list.

Sincerely, Clurus Colloster

Christine A. Collister

Cc: Dave Corliss
R. Scott Wagner
Chuck Soules

Sent via e-mail May 2, 2006 and US Mail