

the plat by virtue of Section 3600 of the General Code, irrespective of where the plat was located. As I have before pointed out, by subsequent enactment a city from which the plat was distant less than three miles, became an interested party to the extent that the consent of its planning commission was made a condition precedent to action in either dedicating or amending a plat. This was in effect a limitation upon the prior absolute authority of the interested property owners to change the plat at will. The third interested party is the county which, in this respect, acts in most cases in behalf of the township, the latter having originally been vested with authority to vacate township roads, this jurisdiction having been taken away from the township and given to the county commissioners.

These streets and alleys being as they are township roads in most cases, impose an obligation upon the township to keep them in repair. This involves the expenditure of money, and, accordingly, the county commissioners are given the authority contained in Section 6860 of the General Code to make changes in the manner therein provided. In my opinion the authority in Section 6860 is not restricted by the provisions of Sections 4346, 4355 and 3586-1 of the General Code so as to require precedent consent by the planning commission to action by the county commissioners. In other words, I am of the opinion that Section 6860 of the General Code confers upon the county commissioners the authority to alter, widen, straighten, vacate or change the direction of streets and alleys in platted ground outside of the limits of a city, irrespective of the location of that ground and without securing the consent of the planning commission of any city, provided, of course, that the provisions governing the exercise of such power as found in the succeeding sections of the General Code be followed.

Respectfully,
EDWARD C. TURNER,
Attorney General.

1628.

APPROVAL, FINAL RESOLUTION ON ROAD IMPROVEMENTS IN
WASHINGTON COUNTY.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, January 27, 1928.

HON. GEORGE F. SCHLESINGER, *Director, Department of Highways and Public Works,*
Columbus, Ohio.

1629.

BONDS—SCHOOL DISTRICT—IMPROVEMENT RESTRAINED BY IN-
JUNCTION—NOTES DUE AND PAYABLE—PROCEDURE OF BOARD
OF EDUCATION DISCUSSED.

SYLLABUS:

1. *Where bonds have been authorized by the electors of a school district and where the board of education has borrowed money and issued notes in accordance with the provisions of Section 5654-1, General Code, and where an injunction proceeding has*