

Torrance, California.
February 18th, 1922.

An adjourned regular meeting of the Board of Trustees of the City of Torrance was held at the City Hall at 8 o'clock P.M., Saturday, February 18th, 1922.

The following Trustees were present: Messrs Proctor, Stone and Gilbert. Absent Trustees Fitzhugh and Smith.

Upon motion duly made, seconded and carried, the reading of the minutes was suspended until the next regular meeting.

Mr. H.F. Beckwith presented the following petition to the Board of Trustees, signed by 19 property owners of the City of Torrance;

"To the Honorable Board of Trustees,
City of Torrance,
Torrance, Calif.

We, the undersigned, all residents of the City of Torrance, and not residing within the proposed assessed limits of Carson Street, do hereby petition you to reconsider the proposed plan of repaving Carson Street from curb to curb only, the cost of which you propose to assess against the property adjoining Carson Street to the amount of fifty per cent. In our opinion this is unfair as we think this should be borne by a bond issue of the City."

Mr. Beckwith brought up the question of the up-keep of the road after the new pavement was laid, and wanted to know who would have to pay for this up-keep. The Board advised him that it was the usual procedure for the City to pay for the up-keep of the roads from a general fund for that purpose, but that in case there was no money in that fund the Board had the right to assess the cost of maintenance to the property owners. Mr. Beckwith stated that the property owners objected to this feature as they did not feel they should have to pay for the up-keep of the road, and wanted the assurance of the Board that the property owners would not be assessed for the maintenance of the roadway after the new pavement was put in. The Board stated that they were unable to give the property owners any definite assurance in this regard, but that it was the general custom of all cities to pay for such up-keep from the general fund for that purpose.

It seemed to be the general opinion of the property owners that they should not be assessed for one-half of the cost of paving Carson Street; stating that Carson Street was a main thoroughfare and that the City as a whole should stand the expense of paving same. The Board assured them that it was the general custom when paving streets to assess the property owners on that street for the entire cost of the paving; but that the Board of Trustees had taken into consideration the fact that Carson Street was a main thoroughfare, and in justice to the property owners on that Street, had decided that the City should stand one-half of the expense. Mr. Gilbert addressed the property owners, in behalf of the Board, stating that the property owners on Carson Street were being given a square deal in the matter of said paving. Mr. Beckwith replied, in behalf of the property owners, that all they wanted was the assurance that they would be given a square deal and that they were willing to accept whatever was customary in such matters.

The matter of paving the ten-foot strips on each side of the proposed asphaltic pavement to be laid on Carson Street, was next discussed. Mr. Gilbert inquired of the City Engineer, Mr. Postle, if the proposed manner in which the 10-foot strips were to be paved with rock and oil was up to the County specifications. Mr. Postle replied that the specifications for this proposed work was a little better than the County specifications for similar work. Mr. Young stated that he would like to see the City lay a permanent asphaltic pavement the entire width of Carson Street as the gravel and oil on the sides would soon wear away and it would mean another assessment against the property owners for more paving. The Board assured him that the pavement as contemplated was to be high-class in every respect and that it should wear for many years.

Mr. Beckwith brought up the question of increased taxation and wanted to know if their taxes would be increased by reason of the proposed paving of Carson Street. Attorney Briney replied for the Board, stating that the additional tax would average approximately 2½ mills each year for twenty years.

Mr. Beckwith inquired as to how far out it was proposed to grade Carson Street. City Engineer Postle replied for the Board, stating that the plan was to grade the street to the road just this side of the tree row. Mr. Beckwith suggested that the grading be carried through to the hollow in order that the cost of grading might be spread out and thus lighten the burden of each individual property owner. Mr. Postle stated that while it was true that this would make the expense less for each individual property owner, there was no necessity for grading any further than as planned.

Inquiry was made as to whether the 20-foot strip of asphaltic pavement was to be laid right on top of the present pavement, or whether it was to be torn up. City Engineer Postle stated that as far as possible it would be laid right on top of the present pavement, but that in some places it would be necessary to tear up the old pavement and regrade the street. In such cases the decomposed granite now used would be put back as a foundation for the new pavement.

The delegation of property owners retired, after an expression of thanks from President Proctor for presenting their views before the Board of Trustees.

A short discussion followed regarding the specifications for the proposed gravel and oil paving to be laid on the 10-foot strips on each of the asphaltic pavement on Carson Street, and it seemed to be the general opinion of the Board that this should be made as good as possible in order to sustain the asphaltic pavement.

There being no further business a motion was duly made, seconded and carried, that the meeting adjourn.


 City Clerk of the City of Torrance.

Approved


 President of the Board of Trustees
 of the City of Torrance.