

In addition to the property that the city has proposed to take into its limits, I own some additional acreage, being the South 600 feet of the tract, the front of which is owned by Mr. Drake.

Under the circumstances, it seems to me an imposition to include my property within the city limits. The supposition raised by Hare and Hare that it was desirable for the city to own 200 feet on the outside of public streets for the purpose of protecting property owners, has no effect, in my case, because I own the property and am interested in protecting its value.

As I have for a good many years, been one of the larger taxpayers of the city, I feel that I have been doing my full part toward the support of the city, and I vigorously protest against the inclusion of the fifteen acres South of Mr. Underwood's property, which includes two vacant five-acre tracts and the improved five-acre tract occupied by my home. One interesting feature is that the five-acres occupied by my house fronts on Haskell property and all of the lots to the North fronting the other ten acres are owned by my daughter, Mrs. Dolph Simons, and are already in the city limits. No improvements whatever, occupy these lots at this time.

I trust that you will recommend that my property be excluded from the proposed action by the city, and thereby, save me and the city the expense of litigation.

I am sending this letter by messenger, that it may reach your hands without delay. Trusting that you and the city will see the justice of my stand, I remain,

Respectfully yours,

W. C. Simons