

City avoiding 'costly' paving

Written by Mark Peyton, Gothenburg
Wednesday, 26 May 2010 21:51 -

"Council to Open Street" In rereading the May 12 edition of The Times I noticed something I hadn't seen earlier.

On the lower half of the front page was a gray insert that I skipped over. The insert pertained to the City Council discussing the opening of Avenue J from 25th through 27th streets. Probably a good idea.

However, I had to laugh when I read the following: "...the council decided to gravel it for now because paving is costly." City policy is that land owners on either side of a street are responsible for the cost of paving that street. The land on one side of this street is owned by the Redevelopment Authority.

The Redevelopment Authority is nothing more than a sub-committee of the City Council itself. Thus, the City Council, when faced with the cost of paving admits that paving is costly, and in this case, so costly it is not warranted.

Two years ago I made this same argument to the same City Council members when they decided to pave 22nd and 23rd streets between Avenue G and Avenue H. When I pointed out that their estimate of \$1.40/linear foot translated to a \$28,000 paving bill for me alone the Council Members said they understood, however, paving would never get any cheaper and besides, the paving would be for the benefit of the city.

Now, when the City Council is faced with the full cost of a "benefit" they decide that paving is too costly.