

Speaker 1 ([00:05:19](#)):

Good evening everybody. Welcome to the April 8th, 2025 Lawrence City Commission meeting. Welcome here. This evening I'm going to go ahead and ask Sherry to read you the rules of the meeting.

Speaker 2 ([00:05:33](#)):

Thank you Mayor and good evening everyone. Please silence your cell phones to minimize distractions during the meeting. The primary format for accessing or participating in this meeting is in person at City Hall. Virtual access to view or participate in the meeting cannot be guaranteed. The chat function will not be monitored. If you have any trouble, the meeting can be viewed on the city's YouTube channel and cable channel five. When the mayor calls for public comment, please approach the podium to indicate you wish to speak. Virtual participants should use the raise hand function. When prompted, select Join us panelists. There will be a brief delay as your role changes. Once your name is called, please unmute and turn on your camera to provide your comments. All comments will be limited to three minutes. Please state your name and zip code before speaking. The city reserves the right to turn videos off or mute participants. Thank you Mayor.

Speaker 1 ([00:06:33](#)):

Alright, thank you very much. First item on the agenda is item A is to approve the agenda. The city commission reserves the right to amend, supplement or reorder the agenda during the meeting. Is there a motion to approve the agenda as is

Speaker 3 ([00:06:44](#)):

Move to approve the agenda. Second.

Speaker 1 ([00:06:46](#)):

Motion by dye second by Larson. All in favor say aye.

Speaker 3 ([00:06:51](#)):

A.

Speaker 4 ([00:06:51](#)):

Aye.

Speaker 1 ([00:06:53](#)):

Those opposed? Motion passes 5 0 4 4 0. I didn't know if she was on or not, but Okay, great. Okay. The next part of the meeting is going to be, we have four proclamations this evening. The first one is to proclaim the month of April, 2025 as national limb loss and limb difference awareness month. And this evening we have Rex Eller Brock here to speak to this proclamation.

Speaker 5 ([00:07:25](#)):

Good evening, mayor. Good evening Commissioners. I'd like to take this time to appreciate how much the limb loss community appreciates you recognizing us as members of this community. I've been a member here in Lawrence of 30 years. I've been a double amputee for two years and a single amputee for 13 years. This past May, the group of us started a limb loss support group here at Lawrence Memorial Hospital and it's really made the awareness of people with limb loss in our community. I'm happy to see that there's former current members of the city that work for that also have limb gloss. Evan is also a member of our

group. He's also our A compliance officer. I'm very glad to see that as progressive as we're trying to be. So I thank you for the time and I'd also like to have some other members speak. Thank you for your time.

Speaker 1 ([00:08:25](#)):

Sure thing. Thank you Rex.

Speaker 6 ([00:08:37](#)):

Thank you mayor and city council for recognizing our group. We've only been in operation approximately 15 months through Lawrence Memorial, but I think our voices are being heard as we're making an impact with the city and some of the concerns that we find limiting as we carry on our daily lives. Thank you again for your proclamation and we look for continued support. Thank you. Thank

Speaker 1 ([00:09:02](#)):

You for your words. Anybody else? I think that's it. You got some shy folks in here, but we appreciate you being here and undertaking this awareness and also helping a group who probably needs it more than we know. And so thank you and I'm going to go ahead and read the proclamation. Whereas there are approximately 2.1 million Americans living with limb loss and limb difference, and whereas diabetes, peripheral vascular disease and trauma are cited as the leading causes of amputation with approximately 99% of cases being contributed to them, studies have shown that behaviors such as diabetes management are properly treating wounds and observing safety practices can be effective in preventing amputations. And whereas the number of Americans living with limb loss differences will rise to over 3.6 million by 2050 unless a major public awareness campaign is launched and key prevention initiatives put in place. And whereas access to appropriate prosthetic care for people living with limb loss is vital to enable individuals to reach their full potential live independently and live well.

([00:10:11](#)):

And whereas the Amputee Coalition offers education support and advocacy through the National Limb Loss Resource Center for individuals with limb loss difference, their families and healthcare providers across the us. And whereas April is an appropriate month to designate as limb loss and limb difference awareness month as spring is a time of renewal and inspiration Now therefore, I'm Mike Dever, mayor of the city of Lawrence, Kansas, to hereby proclaim April, 2025 as national limb loss and Limb Difference Awareness month and encourage citizens to recognize the significance of this month by celebrating those with limb loss and limb difference, learning about relevant issues, expressing gratitude to supportive family and caregivers, and honoring veterans who have lost limbs in service to our country. Thank you very much. Okay, the next proclamation is to proclaim the month of April, 2025 as Child Abuse Prevention month. And I believe we have Bev Turner here to speak to that matter. Thank you Bev. Sure.

Speaker 7 ([00:11:32](#)):

Thank you.

Speaker 8 ([00:11:41](#)):

Good evening, mayor and city commissioners. My name is Bev Turner and I serve as the executive director of the Children's Advocacy Center of Douglas County. I'd like to also introduce our board members in attendance. Paula Martin, board chair and retired district court judge. Devin Kim, our board vice chair and the CEO of Hasi and executive director of a Compass Project. Thank you for coming. April is National Child Abuse Prevention Month when we recognize the importance of families and communities working together to prevent child abuse and neglect. The Children's advocacy Center of Douglas County coordinates the multidisciplinary team that responds to child abuse reports. Our multidisciplinary team includes law enforcement department for children and families, district attorney's,

office mental and medical services, victim advocates, all working together to support and improve the journey for a family and child when there's a disclosure of child abuse, these professionals work together in a collaborative approach that results in effective, efficient and improved child-centered outcomes.

(00:12:45):

The CAC provides a safe and child-friendly environment for the forensic interview and connects the family with specialized medical and mental health services. We work to ensure families have access to these tools on their path to healing while removing the financial and transportation barriers. Thank you to the city of Lawrence for the past financial support that contributed to the opening of the CAC in 2021 as the only child advocacy center serving children in Lawrence and the surrounding communities. Today we are here as a community to honor the courage of the children we serve and encourage all caring adults to report concerns of child maltreatment. Thank you. Thank you

Speaker 1 (00:13:22):

Very much. Appreciate the pamphlets. We'll meet up on this. Alright, I'm go ahead and read the proclamation. Whereas children are our nation's most vulnerable members as well as our nation's most valuable resources helping to shape the future of Lawrence Kansas. And whereas childhood trauma can have long-term physiological, emotional and physical effects through an individual's lifetime and impact future generations of their family. And whereas childhood trauma, including abuse and neglect, is a serious problem affecting every community in the US. And finding solutions requires input and action from everyone. And whereas protective factors are conditioned that reduces or eliminates risks and promote the social, emotional and developmental wellbeing of children. And whereas effective child abuse prevention activities succeeded because of the partnerships created between child welfare professionals, education, health, community, and faith-based organizations, businesses, law enforcement agencies and families. And whereas children who live in families with access to concrete, economic and social support are less likely to experience abuse and neglect. And whereas we acknowledge that to solve the public health issues of abuse and neglect, we must work together to change hearts and mindsets through storytelling and sharing center the needs of families, break down biases and barriers, and inspire actions from expected and unexpected partners in prevention. Prevention remains the best defense for our children and families Now, therefore, I, Mike Dever, mayor of the city of Lawrence, Kansas due hereby proclaim the month of April, 2025 as Child abuse prevention month. Thank you.

(00:15:05):

Okay. And our next proclamation is to proclaim, I guess it would be, let's see, the week of April 7th, 2025 as the National Public Health Week. And I have Jonathan Smith I think here today. Yes sir. How are you? Come on over, speak to our proclamation. Appreciate it.

Speaker 9 (00:15:22):

Before I get started, national Public Health Week is a party, so I brought some party favors. These are hot off the press copies of our community health improvement plan. I the first to receive these. They got more. More. I got a couple more. Thanks. Thank you. Thank you Sherry for distributing those. Good evening, mayor. Good evening commissioners. And then the entire city of Lawrence. Thank you for this proclamation and for your continued support of Lawrence Douglas County Public Health and National Public Health Week. My name is Jonathan Smith. I'm the executive director of Lawrence Douglas County Public Health. And this year's theme for National Public Health Week is, it starts here, which reminds us that health begins in our homes, in our communities, the work we all do and the policies that shape our lives. When we talk about health, we often think about doctor visits or prescriptions, but health is also about so much more.

(00:16:18):

It's about wellbeing. It's about whether people have safe and affordable housing, access to nutritious food, mental health support, and the ability to raise children in a vibrant community like Lawrence. That broader view of health is at the center of your community health improvement plan, which you all just got copies of and it's where real change begins. Our team at Lawrence Douglas County Public Health works every single day to support the vision for leading change to advance health for all. That includes the work you may not always see. So for example, right now we're taking proactive steps in the response to the measles outbreak that's happening in southwest Kansas. Staying ahead of the situation, making sure that our community is informed, protected, and prepared. National Public Health Week is also a celebration of community resilience. So during the COVID-19 pandemic, Lawrence came together, neighbors supporting Neighbors Partners stepping up in big ways that resilience still drives this community Today.

(00:17:15):

This week we celebrate public health, we celebrate science, the systems and the people behind those advancements. Public health is not just the work of our department, it's the result of shared effort from policymakers like you all up there. Healthcare providers, schools, businesses, nonprofits and residents of Lawrence, every contribution to public health matters. Lastly, I especially want to thank the incredible team that I get to work with at Lawrence Douglas County Public Health, their dedication and passion for this community makes a huge difference in people's lives. And just wanted to say thank you all for being part of this vital work and to helping make Lawrence a place where health truly starts. Thank you.

Speaker 1 (00:17:54):

Thank you. Thank you Jonathan. Well said. I appreciate all the work you all do for the community in keeping us safe and healthy. I'm going to go ahead and read the proclamation, whereas the week of April 7th, 2025 is National Public Health Week. And the theme is it starts here highlighting the important role that we all share in contributing to the health of our communities, our homes, our state, our country, and the rest of the world. Whereas this marks the 30th anniversary of celebrating National Public Health Week. Significant strides have been made in public health including disease prevention, pandemic preparedness, enhanced maternal and child health programs, and countless community health initiatives that enable communities like Lawrence to thrive. And whereas public health professionals foster collaboration with the city and county staff, community partners, education officials, healthcare providers, and several stakeholders to create abundant and equitable opportunities for all Lawrence residents to live a healthy life.

(00:18:46):

And whereas efforts to support public health will continue to transform systems to ensure that everyone has fair and just opportunities to be as healthy as possible regardless of their social status. And whereas National Public Health Week acknowledges the contributions and successes of the public health system and serves as a time to appreciate the hard work and dedication of the public health professionals. Now, therefore, I'm Mike Dever, mayor of the city of Lawrence, Kansas. Do hereby proclaim the week of April 7th, 2025 as National Public Health Week. And I encourage all Lawrence residents to take part in the weekly, excuse me, take part in this week by supporting Lawrence Douglas County public health and public health professionals and the communities that they serve. Thank you, Jonathan.

Speaker 7 (00:19:38):

There we go. How many, you can just take the rest. Perfect. Thank you.

Speaker 1 (00:19:48):

Alright, our last proclamation is to declare April is Fair Housing month and I think we have Kim Bratz here from the Deputy Director of Lawrence Community Shelter.

Speaker 10 ([00:19:57](#)):

Hello.

Speaker 1 ([00:19:58](#)):

Hey Kim.

Speaker 10 ([00:19:59](#)):

I'm Kim Rabbits from Lawrence Community Shelter. It's truly an honor to stand before you today to celebrate and recognize an issue that has been a passion of mine for a very long time. And that's the importance of fair housing. This stay serves as a moment to reflect on the progress that we have made and equally as important to acknowledge the work that still lies ahead to ensure that every individual, regardless of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, gender, or disability, has access to fair and equal housing opportunities. Fair housing is not just a basic right, it is the foundation of our community where everyone can thrive, feel secure, and live with dignity. As we honor this commitment, let us remember that the fight for equality is ongoing. By working together, raising awareness and upholding principles of fairness, we can continue to break down barriers and create neighborhoods that reflect the diversity and the strength of our communities. Thank you for all of you who have dedicated their time and energy and passion to this cause.

([00:21:17](#)):

Your efforts to ensure that fair housing is not just an idea but a reality for many. Let us continue to move forward together, build a future where everyone has the basic right to feel safe and have affordable housing. If you can't hear it in my voice, I'm a Texas gal. So in Texas we like to keep things friendly and fair. And when it comes to housing, it's important to make sure everyone has the same shot no matter where we are from or how we talk. So let's play it fair and by the same rules, y'all keep it fair, keep it equitable, and keep it affordable. Thank you so much. Thank

Speaker 1 ([00:22:01](#)):

You. Camel are good words. I appreciate it. Thank you. Whereas April 20, 25 marks the 57th anniversary of the passage of the Fair Housing Act, which provides in Lawrence equal opportunity for all residents in the sale, rental and financing of housing and prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, age, marital status, disability, familial status, color, religion, sex or national origin, sexual orientation and gender identity. And whereas the City of Lawrence supports efforts to eliminate discrimination in housing by working to educate all of its citizens on fair housing rights and responsibilities, and through enforcement of fair housing laws, including Chapter 10 of the code of the city of Lawrence. And whereas the mission of the city of Lawrence to create a community where all enjoy life and feel at home and to utilize effective strategies with a commitment to equity and inclusion in all aspects of our daily life for our citizens.

([00:22:54](#)):

And whereas the city of Lawrence Human Relations Commission has been in existence for over 60 years and continues its goal to embrace inclusion and promote goodwill and collaboration across the spectrum of all people of Lawrence. And whereas the month of April is officially set aside as fair housing month throughout this nation. Now therefore, I Mike Dever, mayor of the city of Lawrence, Kansas, in conjunction with the annual national commemoration do hereby proclaim the month of April, 2025 to be fair housing month in Lawrence and ask the people of Lawrence to join me in reaffirming our obligation to fair and equal housing for every person who resides or wishes to reside in our city. Thank you.

Speaker 7 ([00:23:41](#)):

Okay,

Speaker 1 ([00:23:47](#)):

Next item is the consent agenda. And items on the consent agenda are considered under one motion and approved by one motion. Members of the governing body may remove items for separate discussion if desired, members of the public may remove items identified as quasi-judicial for separate discussion if desired, members of the public will be limited to three minutes for comments. Okay. Do we have anybody who would like to remove anything for separate discussion on the consent agenda? No. Okay. Seeing there's no quasi-judicial items, is there a motion to approve?

Speaker 3 ([00:24:23](#)):

Move to approve the consent agenda. Second.

Speaker 1 ([00:24:25](#)):

Motion by Fin Dice, second by Larson. All in favor say aye. Aye.

Speaker 11 ([00:24:30](#)):

Aye. Aye.

Speaker 1 ([00:24:31](#)):

Motion passes. Five zero. Okay. The first item on our agenda is a regular agenda item, which is to consider the landmark nomination for the first Presbyterian church structure only located at 2415 Clinton Parkway to Lawrence Register of Historic Places.

Speaker 12 ([00:24:54](#)):

Good evening, mayor, vice Mayor Commissioners, Lynn Bradick, Zulner, historic resources administrator for this city. And I have been asked by the city attorney's office if you would please disclose any parte communication you've had on this item this evening.

Speaker 1 ([00:25:10](#)):

Excellent. Commissioners, do you have any parte communications to report?

Speaker 12 ([00:25:13](#)):

I

Speaker 11 ([00:25:14](#)):

Don't have any.

Speaker 1 ([00:25:15](#)):

I don't have any commers. None. I don't have any.

Speaker 13 ([00:25:17](#)):

Don't have any other than the emails. I think we've all received.

Speaker 1 ([00:25:21](#)):

Thank you. I don't think we have anything to report.

Speaker 14 ([00:25:24](#)):

Wonderful.

Speaker 1 ([00:25:25](#)):

Yes,

Speaker 14 ([00:25:25](#)):

That will make Mayor you have commissioner I. I'm sorry,

Speaker 1 ([00:25:29](#)):

I totally missed that. I apologize. Yes. Commissioner Sellers, do you have anything? Do

Speaker 14 ([00:25:34](#)):

I don't. Thank

Speaker 1 ([00:25:35](#)):

You. Thank you.

Speaker 12 ([00:25:39](#)):

So this is the public hearing for the landmark nomination of the First Presbyterian Church. The structure only if you recall earlier in the year we had a nomination for the entire site and the city commission found that the site itself was not meeting the criteria of chapter 22. So we went back to work with the applicant and they have nominated just the structure, not the entire parcel for nomination as a landmark structure on the Lawrence Register of Historic Places. This is showing the entire property at 24 15 Clinton Parkway. And this long piece right here that you can see the rooftop is the structure itself, but none of the parking area or the green space is included in this nomination proposal.

([00:26:43](#)):

And there's just a closeup of the site showing you what that outline looks like for the building. Just a couple of quick photographs of the structure. It is architect designed structure by a nationally known company that deals with church structures. And wanted to point out that even though in the nomination, you know how historians get sometime in architectural historians are worse when they start throwing language around. But even though it says that it's no significant architectural style, that just means that it's not queen in and it's not craftsmen and it's all those styles that are ground into the historic fabric of architectural history. Rather with the ecclesiastical structures built during this time period, specifically if they're designed by an architect, which this one was, they didn't tend to pull from gothic revival like other early churches did. They really looked at modernism. And so the style is actually considered modern. It's not that it doesn't have a style, but it doesn't reflect one of those historically categorized styles. So this is the front of the structure that faces the parking lot and then a closeup of the entrance into the structure.

([00:28:20](#)):

And this is the front that actually faces Clinton Parkway. And if you'll notice it's all brick work and rounded edges with a cornice line and the windows are arched with brick detailing. And this is showing that west side where the garden is. It's a little hard to see the structure here, but it also has some of that nice architectural detailing. And then on the right you'll see the larger piece again with the rounded corners to emphasize that modern style. And this is looking at the back and here in the nomination you

heard mention of the 12 apostles windows and that is these windows here that go into the sanctuary of the church and that's a better view of those windows.

(00:29:24):

This is the rear of the structure that's used as a handicap entrance and also an entrance when you're going into do things other than go into the primary sanctuary and then just going around the rest of the building back to that parking lot that's on the east side of the structure. So this is what the context area of this building would look like if only the structure were listed and not the parcel. So it does reduce quite a bit the number of properties that are impacted by the context area. And to just say a couple of things about the context area, I went ahead and included some information that's going to the HRC for the first time next Thursday. They are looking at amendments to chapter 22 similar to how we're doing the land development code. We've used it for a year now. We found things that aren't working like we hoped they were or they're not as clear as they were and needed further clarification.

(00:30:42):

And so we're taking those back for the first time to the HRC next Thursday and they will have an opportunity to hold a public hearing, discuss those amongst themselves and then direct staff as to what the next step is. That document hasn't been through legal yet. It hasn't had a public meeting where other people can chime in. It is certainly based on a lot of the public comment we've gotten over the past year and we tried to incorporate those changes. The other thing to talk about with context area is prior to the adoption of the new chapter 22, we did environs definitions for every single property that was listed in the Lawrence Register. And as part of that we analyzed almost building by building half block by half block this needs review that doesn't need review. This kind of review applies here, it doesn't apply here.

(00:31:51):

And what we heard when we were going through rewriting the chapter is that that was extremely confusing for the public because they never knew what projects had to get reviewed, they never knew what standards they were going to get reviewed by and it was just very confusing. And so throughout that process, one of the goals of the HRC was to make that review very standard so that everybody knew across the board it's 250 feet, these are the projects that get reviewed, these are the standards and they're listed. So hopefully that's taken away some of the confusion in the public about not knowing if their project needed review. And I think it's been very successful in that way. We've had a lot of good response, particularly from contractors who do a lot of work in the historic areas knowing exactly what they need to plan for. So just wanted to mention that. And then this structure is being nominated for its architecture. It is architect designed and it is a pretty unique structure in the way it's designed and some of the design elements and there have been architectural historians at the state level and then also at the national level who have supported that this is an architecturally significant building so it would qualify staff and the historic resources believe under criteria for architecture for listing in the Lawrence Register.

(00:33:39):

And so staff is recommending that you adopt on first reading ordinance 10064 that would landmark the first Presbyterian church, the structure only to the Lawrence Register of Historic Places as a landmark. And I'd be happy to stand for any questions that you might have.

Speaker 1 (00:34:03):

Great, thanks Lynn. I was reviewing the documents and I just have a question about the criterion. They mentioned being nationally considered under criterion A at the federal I presume, and then criterion C being architecture. Is that based on the construction date of between 67 and 68? Is that the unique thing under Criterion C for the architecture,

Speaker 12 (00:34:28):

One of the things with the national register is you have to be at least 50 years old,

Speaker 1 ([00:34:33](#)):

Right?

Speaker 12 ([00:34:34](#)):

And that would be it or if there's a criteria and exception, but the architecture piece is more and the wording is very similar for the National register nomination as this that we have in chapter 22 talking about if it's the work of a master builder or a master architect or has distinguishing characteristics.

Speaker 1 ([00:34:58](#)):

Very good. Alright, cool. I just wanted to make sure I understand that so it's strictly the date and then to your point about an architect design building and then the date, the age, and then of course his other historic work and his famous contributions elsewhere I guess.

Speaker 4 ([00:35:13](#)):

Yes,

Speaker 1 ([00:35:13](#)):

Combined. Okay, thank you.

Speaker 3 ([00:35:18](#)):

Manual question, but just so we have it right, the agenda says approve ordinance number 1 0 0 6 4, but the ordinance that's in the packet is 1 0 1 1 7. It's old one. I think

Speaker 12 ([00:35:33](#)):

I will double check which one is the correct ordinance number and it also has the, I talked to Randy today. It has the old codified code number. It still has 2018 in it, so if you adopt it tonight before it comes back for second reading, that codification date will change to the 2024 code and this is not pulling up. I can check on that while you do public comment so we can make sure we get the right number.

Speaker 1 ([00:36:22](#)):

And then I have another question for you if I can. It's about the context area specifically the impact on those parcels that are effectively in what's left of the context area on the building only. Can you talk about what limitations will be placed on vacant land that it currently, even though there's no building in that area, but there's land that's developable, how will that impact, even if part of the parcel touches the context area, will the rest of the parcel be impacted by that context area? If I'm reading this correctly,

Speaker 12 ([00:36:53](#)):

The way the definition of context area is written in chapter 22, if the circle or area touches any structure, then that entire parcel is considered part of the context area. If

Speaker 1 ([00:37:10](#)):

There's no structure

Speaker 12 ([00:37:11](#)):

So it could to make it land and it's not touching anything, then it would not be part of the context area.

Speaker 1 ([00:37:16](#)):

Okay, so I saw the structure, that's why I was asking, so if there's no structure in that radius in the context area and it's undeveloped land, then that this context area won't affect the implementation or design of those areas at all?

Speaker 2 ([00:37:30](#)):

Correct.

Speaker 1 ([00:37:31](#)):

Okay, thank you.

Speaker 2 ([00:37:34](#)):

The ordinance number that was assigned is the 1 1 7, so that's the correct number. 1 0 1 1 7. Okay, thank you.

Speaker 1 ([00:37:39](#)):

Commissioner Sellers, do you have anything to ask?

Speaker 14 ([00:37:45](#)):

Not at the current time. Mayor.

Speaker 3 ([00:37:47](#)):

Thank you. Thank you.

Speaker 1 ([00:37:47](#)):

You're welcome. Anybody

Speaker 3 ([00:37:48](#)):

Else? Sherry? I did not hear what you said.

Speaker 2 ([00:37:51](#)):

The ordinance number that was assigned is the 1 0 1 1 7. That's

Speaker 3 ([00:37:56](#)):

Okay,

Speaker 1 ([00:37:56](#)):

Just want to get that right. 1 0 1 1 7.

Speaker 2 ([00:37:59](#)):

Yes. So that's what you'll want to include in your motion you,

Speaker 11 ([00:38:03](#)):

So I want to just if you could provide me a little bit better clarification. So any buildings that it touch in adjoining properties, just those buildings would be impacted, not the ones outside.

Speaker 12 (00:38:14):

Once that area touches structure on the parcel, then the whole parcel becomes part of the context area and that is a change that is being proposed to the historic resources commission next month because the definition of included things like fences and pergolas and things like that, and that's not the intent when you're doing historic review, it's for primary structures or significant accessory structures. So that definition is being proposed to change.

Speaker 11 (00:38:55):

So when we're looking at this property, it's directly west, there's a childcare center there right now there is a structure, so even though that's around, it's undeveloped be in a structure there. Would that impact them if they went and tore that structure down and wanted to build something else there?

Speaker 12 (00:39:18):

Yes. If they wanted to do something on this parcel then it would be under the review. If this large area that is undergoing a large development has no structure on it so that development would not get reviewed.

Speaker 13 (00:39:37):

Okay. Thank you Mayor. If I would, I noticed it. How much many less reviewable properties will there be in comparison to what it was before? I believe since it went from the site itself, the context area, and now it's shrunk to the structure. How many adjacent properties will it now affect?

Speaker 12 (00:40:04):

It will affect the properties that you see on your screen here, the daycare center and then park 25 and then this is also a structure for an apartment complex. If the city commission adopts what staff's recommendation is to take the word fence out of the definition of structure, then this property here on the east side would not be in the context area because the building doesn't start. But there is a fence there currently I believe, and then with the housing authority, there is nothing in this area right now, so it would not be included. Also previously all the way across Clinton Parkway was included, the university land and so with this revised context area, none of that land is included.

Speaker 1 (00:41:02):

Good. I think we're getting it. Any other questions for Lynn before we go to public comment?

Speaker 4 (00:41:10):

No.

Speaker 1 (00:41:10):

Okay, thanks. We may have some more public comment on this or something. Does anybody else want to do a presentation? Is there any other,

Speaker 12 (00:41:19):

The applicant is here if you would like to hear

Speaker 1 ([00:41:22](#)):

Words. Okay. I don't know if it's required or needed, but I certainly would like to hear from 'em. Yes.

Speaker 12 ([00:41:27](#)):

Okay, thanks.

Speaker 1 ([00:41:28](#)):

Thank you.

Speaker 15 ([00:41:34](#)):

Good evening. I am Jeff Southard. I'm appearing on behalf of First Presbyterian Church in support of its nomination to the Lawrence Register of Historic places earlier the state of Kansas, the interior department, the Lawrence City staff and the City of Historic Commission all approved the historic designation for both the church building and the site. As you heard, this commission declined to do so although there was some support for designating the building alone. So we appear before you now to seek designation for the building alone. In this effort, we have once again been supported by the staff and the historic commission. You've also heard the revised designation reduces the number of adjoining properties affected by the context area from seven to four, and that was an issue that was of concern to some of you earlier as well. There can be no question in commissioners that the First Presbyterian church is an historic structure completed in 1968. It was designed by Edward Soic, a nationally known church architect. The entire building is all his design and nothing has been changed on the exterior since then. Dr. Jay Price, a professor of architecture at Wichita State mentions Mr so prominently in his book, temples for a Modern God talks about modern mid-century church architecture.

([00:42:56](#)):

In your packet you have some of the accomplishments of Mr. Sobek background and so forth. He was famous for his concept of churches that don't look like churches from the outside. If you were to put a label on it, that's the best I can do. FPC is an outstanding example of this. In fact, it's the only soic design church in the state of Kansas. The church building has many unique features as shown in the photographs. You saw the outline of the church, it is very asymmetrical now. There isn't probably more than 30 feet that are all in one straight line. FPC is truly unlike any other church in Lawrence. Again, I can't stress enough that no individual part of the building can be separated from the rest. As some might suggest all or integral parts of one unique structure, there is no memorable one structure at part of the building.

([00:43:44](#)):

If you go to Notre Dame for example in Paris, and you're going to remember the rose window that everybody that goes there remembers the rose window. We have no rose window and nobody ever goes to discharge and comes away thinking, boy, those three front doors, aren't they something? Nobody ever said that ever. The hole is one structure taken as a whole. Now some may pose this designation on the grounds that would be harmful to development in the area. Nothing could be further from the truth. I give you example, a downtown Lawrence, you can't throw a rock in downtown Lawrence without hitting historic structure. And yet downtown Lawrence seems to be developing quite nicely. So don't be misled by that argument. In conclusion, the only question before you tonight is whether the First Presbyterian church building meets the criteria for landmark designation due to its architectural uniqueness. Since the answer to the question is clearly yes, the church is entitled to this designation. Commissioners, we met you halfway by designating just the building. Please meet us the other half. Thank you. I'll take any questions you may have. Thank you very much.

Speaker 1 ([00:44:44](#)):

I don't think I have any right now. Thank you I

Speaker 16 (00:44:57):

Good evening. I'm Marisa Peterson, a family business owner of Park 25 apartments and we are on the south edge of FPCs property. After the last HRC meeting in December, I asked Mr. Suther what additional benefit FPC will receive by getting the city of Lawrence historical designation when they already have the national and state historical designations that give FPC full access to all of the advantages these designations provide. And his answer in December literally was we just want the plaque. Over the course of the last year, though we have made significant good faith efforts to participate in FPC, getting the city historical designation by suggesting ways to comply with existing city code while still protecting ourselves from adverse business consequences, including suppression of our property value and increased regulatory burdens associated with Park 25 being trapped in a context area. Ironically, the city has already carefully and specifically determined in their findings of fact and conclusions of law that there is actually no historical context for the surrounding area of FPC, which includes Park 25.

(00:46:10):

In light of this reality, we have repeatedly adjusted a way for FPC to receive historic designation by marking the 250 foot radius that defines the context area from the Trinity doorway of the church protecting the building. And this suggestion fully complies with existing city code. However, in the time since the February, this City Commission meeting was rescheduled to be this evening due to adverse weather, the agenda item report now suggests a highly unusual procedural circumstance where First City staff has unilaterally drafted changes to existing city code without opportunity for public comment or input. Although Park 25 apartments has repeatedly asked for the opportunity to participate in code revision discussions at HRC meetings and via written request, we have been excluded for participation in this recent coder vision process. Second city staff has put their draft redlines to chapter 22 out publicly on the internet in tonight's agenda item report packet.

(00:47:15):

But finally, while code changes are still in draft form and unapproved city staff is suggesting that tonight the governing body approve Ordinance ten one seventeen based on these draft changes to chapter twenty two one ten one seventeen does not comply with the existing chapter 22 ordinance. And we suggest that as long as chapter 22 is being fixed, to please include the option to approve historical designation for a structure or even a site without a context area for situations like ours when the city in their own findings of fact and conclusions of law has already determined that there is in fact actually no cohesive context to the area around FPC. Thank you. Thank

Speaker 1 (00:48:01):

You.

Speaker 17 (00:48:16):

My name is James Peterson and I'm the president of Park 25 Inc. The apartment community southwest of the First Presbyterian Church. When I downloaded the agenda item report for this meeting, I was surprised to find that staff had included a revised historic resources code that will be presented at the Historic Resources Commission meeting later this month. If you compare my February 17 email, that was for the meeting that was supposed to come up at that email to the city commission with the Red Line code revisions by staff, you'll see that the issues that we raised are being addressed, but they are being addressed in a way that affects us asymmetrically, allowing certain properties to be excluded from a context area for FPC while continuing to include our property in a context area. Most importantly in the suggested revisions, the staff has not provided the city commission with explicit flexibility to reduce or eliminate the creation of a context area even if the commission makes a finding as it has in this case that

the building has no specific historic architectural style influence and there's no cohesive building pattern to the context area surrounding the site.

(00:49:32):

And this commission also said there's no identifiable character to the area in the findings of fact. At a minimum, any revision to chapter 22 should provide the city commission with flexibility to waive the creation of a context area when there's just no good reason to establish one. I watched the April one City Commission meeting with interest and I appreciate the difficulty of the balancing act that this commission is involved in with budget cuts to important city priorities. This creation of this context area will suppress property values by limiting the number of investors. These people aren't buying, buying the property to live there. They're buying the property to run a business there. So these investors come and they're willing to purchase apartments but they don't like being under the additional regulation of a historic review. And this will suppress property tax growth in the coming 10 years. At current property tax levels FPC will pay \$0 in city taxes and that's zero for the Unified School District 4 97. In addition, they've filed a lawsuit against the city consuming valuable resources, but over the same period, park 25 will contribute over \$1.8 million to the city in property taxes. 622,000 of that to the school district 4 97 and that's an increase of 7.6% over the prior year. We ask the city commission to balance the needs of FPC and Park 25 by providing the historic recognition just with a smaller context area. Thank you. Appreciate you.

Speaker 18 (00:51:29):

Good evening. I'm not as tall as Mr. Peterson

Speaker 3 (00:51:32):

Is. We'll put it down.

Speaker 18 (00:51:35):

So my name is James Kessinger. I am the attorney for the Park 25 apartments. For your context, the park 25 apartments are at 24 0 1 West 25th Street. Also to familiarize yourself with our campus, the park 25 apartments consists of 27 buildings. There are 253 apartments plus staff on any given day. There's three to 500 people, a lot of them voters that live in our apartments and it is the park 25 apartments. Two of the resolutions that you pass tonight are in support of what Park 25 apartments does. They are intending to provide safe and affordable housing, not to really, really rich people, but to students and working class people. There are two KU bus stops at Park 25 and Mr. Peterson told me that tonight they drove by. There was actually a student there at the bus stop waiting for a bus ride. We're asking you to balance the needs and the expenses for all the people involved, but it's not new. I mean they didn't get to hit the reset button. This commission already entered findings of fact and conclusions of law in September and those still apply. This commission found that the church, the church is a modern style building with no specific historic architectural style or influence. You already found that. You already found that there's no cohesive building pattern to the context area surrounding the site. Similarly, there's no identifiable character to the area.

(00:53:22):

The site is 6.5 acres, but building, you'll have a hard time, but you need to reconcile the findings that you already made in the context of the building. You already went down the list of ordinance factors and found not only that the site but the building was part of it. The building doesn't meet those criteria either. So how do you reconcile that if you pass what's requested of you tonight? There's nothing different. Nothing has changed. And from our perspective, the context area still meets. It still pulls in two of our buildings. So unless you want, I mean according to Ms. SOL's interpretation to you, you suck in our campus. That is too much. That's too much expense for the benefit that's going to be achieved for this. Now the proposed amendments tonight, I will complain. We weren't involved at all, although we

requested to be and what was represented to you as being a lot of community involvement, they knew we wanted to be involved in that and we weren't asked to be involved at all, but the proposed amendments. Thanks Mr. Thank you.

Speaker 1 ([00:54:40](#)):

Any other public comment? How about online Sherry?

Speaker 2 ([00:54:47](#)):

Yeah, we do have a few and I'll just apologize in advance. It's moving. Team Zoom is moving slow, but I'll get folks moved over as soon as I can. Greg Musel,

Speaker 19 ([00:55:08](#)):

Members of the commission, thank you for the opportunity. Greg Musel on behalf of the vacant property to the West, I find that ironic that we're still in this situation where you are supporting all the right principles for fair and inclusive and accessible housing and four years after you approve this project, housing project to the west of the church, we're still in litigation where the church has sued the city to stop it for the avowed reason that it might include university students that they don't want next to them. Setting that aside. Our concern from the start has been the process and the timing because this has all the attributes of leverage in litigation where the church has sued the city. That's what's been objectionable. What I heard tonight from Ms. Zulner is completely different than what we've heard in the past because we are vacant. If we decide to build a building within the context area, that building would be required to go through HRC approval either administratively or through the HRC commission and the city commission.

([00:56:16](#)):

So the thought that just because it's vacant now, it is never subject to the review of the HRC. I'd like to have Ms. Zollner clarify that after my remarks because if that were the case, it would've been a completely different issue for the last year and a half that we've been talking about this application. I agree with Mr. Kessinger that you have made certain findings of fact and if you decide to consider approval tonight, please include the finding of fact that there is no cohesive building character or historical context within the context area so that Mr. Peterson and Mr. Mrs. Peterson on their property, the daycare center and the housing project that I represent don't have to worry about future objections from the church. And the city doesn't have to worry about future litigation from the church if the HRC and the commission find approval. But simply put, the only way to do this in a credible, transparent and fair manner is to delay consideration until the litigation filed by the church against the city and against the housing project is concluded. Then let them bring this back when it's not part of the litigation process, I do ask that Ms. Zollner clarify on vacant property whether a future building that fits within the context area would or would not then pull the entire parcel into the review process. Because what I heard tonight is different than what I've heard from her and Mr. Larkin in the past. Thank you again for your service. These are never easy.

Speaker 7 ([00:57:58](#)):

Thank you.

Speaker 2 ([00:58:13](#)):

Chris Flowers. Chris Flowers.

Speaker 20 ([00:58:27](#)):

Hi, this is Chris Flowers and just some thoughts. If the church wants they're building and windows preserved, can they just not tear their building down? No one's proposing doing anything to the church. Only the area around it. So I think this ordinance, this proposal, it places limits on what others can do with their property. Why should park 25 be limited from making changes to their own property? This doesn't protect the church and that building and it doesn't protect the windows. It protects the area from development Park 25. Putting up a structure on their property isn't going to damage the church's building or the church's windows.

(00:59:19):

Also, if this is a good thing for Lawrence, where's the Lawrence citizens saying, Hey, we need to preserve this church. Why is it only the church that's speaking up that's saying, Hey, our building's historically significant to the rest of Lawrence. Why isn't the rest of Lawrence agreeing with 'em? Let's see. And also, what if the childcare wants to sell and be replaced with housing that supports our housing goals? Why are we going to stop, potentially stop that before it even starts by designating some historical thing that no one's asking for except the church which has the ability to preserve their own building by not doing anything to it. So I just want to throw that out there. And also when you all vote to bill at the wetlands, just remember part of that's going to be because of decisions like tonight where you make it harder to build housing inside of the city. Thank you.

Speaker 1 (01:00:27):

Thanks Chris.

Speaker 2 (01:00:41):

Jeffrey Heppler.

Speaker 21 (01:00:49):

Hey y'all. Good evening. Thank you for your time. I just want to say here to what I've been hearing, I feel like I don't want to say this, I feel like this is going against any potentialities for infill in a place that's already a heavy housing area. And I've been to this church, it is gorgeous. I do love this church, but that poor little childcare center to the west, that thing is on its last leg. Y'all maybe not the business but the building and that's a big parcel. Someone's going to want do something with that and that, I don't know, I heard something about eliminating the context area. I feel like that might be something worth exploring to create exceptions for instances like this. That's all I have. Thank you.

Speaker 2 (01:02:00):

That's all the comments.

Speaker 1 (01:02:01):

Alright, great. Thank you very much. Okay, Lynn, can you speak to the questions we've already asked? Clarify the issue related to a vacant piece of land, if it's within the context area, whether or not you build on it in the future, you have to go through the review process on design, et cetera. And two, if you have an existing building, if you demolish it, then if that parcel is part of a bigger parcel, does that then become the whole parcel is under review because they acquired the parcel that's currently, say a daycare facility as he suggested and say somebody wanted to tear that down and reuse the land, would now that huge parcel be covered by the context area as well? So that's my question.

Speaker 12 (01:02:43):

Okay. So the way it stands right now, if someone wanted to build structure on that large vacant land, that's too the west of the church, it would not go through any historic review because there is no structure that would incorporate it into the environment 10 years from now, if they have structure on that property and they submit for a permit, there would be structure within that 250 feet. So that would require review. So it's all about timing and whether there's structure within that 250 feet or not. I want to make clear that context area and landmarking have nothing to do with use. They don't change the zoning, they don't change the use. If you want to tear down the childcare center and put up affordable housing, that's great. That's not something the HRC would look at the design of the building, but not the use.

(01:03:54):

And I did a lot of research in preparation for this and I have not found a study that shows that designation with design guidelines decreases property values. There's a place called Place Economics with a man named Don Brima and he's done studies from New Orleans to LA to small towns in Kentucky. And what they found is in historic districts that have design review, the properties at worst value out stay the same, but most often they increase. And it's because it's giving that even playing field for everybody in that area to know exactly what's expected of them. And that's also one of the reasons the HRC changed from evaluating each context review to just the broad chapter 22 so that everybody knows, oh, it's in a context area, we look at section 22 5 0 7 and that's what we got to meet. And so that was the reason for that.

Speaker 1 (01:05:14):

Okay, very. So if I wanted to build on that parcel of land that's in question to the west, not the daycare separate parcel, and I built a four story apartment complex, you would not have any historical review for the initial development of that facility, correct?

Speaker 12 (01:05:34):

That's correct.

Speaker 1 (01:05:35):

However, if I went to renovate that property in the future or I needed to do some sort of renovation or addition, then any work I do under that is now governed by this context area. And thus the HRC regulations, correct?

Speaker 12 (01:05:49):

Correct.

Speaker 1 (01:05:50):

Okay. I want to make

Speaker 12 (01:05:51):

Sure that the way chapter 22 is written only projects that are exterior and visible from the public right of way. So nothing behind house or any of those types of things. There's clarification in what staff is presenting that it doesn't include electrical or mechanical or any of those kind of permits. And I would like to say we're at the very beginning of that request for revisions. We haven't started the public comment period yet. We just wanted to provide you with that so that that's something we're working on. The HRC will take public comment, we'll likely have public meetings and then bring it back to the HRC before they make a recommendation to you, which would also be a public hearing.

Speaker 11 (01:06:43):

What's the timeline for that?

Speaker 12 (01:06:45):

Well, we'd like to move it along quickly so that we can clear up some of the confusing language in there, like the word radius that you've all talked about a lot. And so hopefully the HRC will give direction to staff next Thursday. And then we would work with our communications department to get the word out and to set up a public meeting and then it would go back to the HRC for them to make a recommendation to you.

Speaker 13 (01:07:21):

I'm just, excuse me, a mayor, I'm just kind of curious why now, why not wait until that went to HRC and then bring it back to us afterwards

Speaker 12 (01:07:32):

For the application for landmark?

Speaker 13 (01:07:35):

Yeah. Yeah, I mean especially if this addendum is going to be considered and these changes are going to be made to it, why not just go through that and then bring it back to us with that incorporated?

Speaker 12 (01:07:48):

That's certainly something the city commission can consider as a motion. When you file an application for a landmark, there is a determined date that it has to be considered so that you don't have landmarks lingering for five or six months. So in the code it says it has to be heard within so many days.

Speaker 1 (01:08:12):

Got it. Excellent. Commissioner sellers, can I let you chime in?

Speaker 14 (01:08:17):

Yes. And I do appreciate one's additional comments and I can discuss that in final deliberation, but I guess I wanted to hear from Mr. Kessinger or the attorney for part 25. I guess there was just something that he said that's kind of sticking in my craw and it's in relation to some of the clarifying language that he wanted from Lynn. And I want to be as plain as possible on this. I guess my question is to Mr. Kessinger, and if I'm saying your name wrong, please, I apologize. It's a little difficult to hear virtually folks inside the chambers, but you had mentioned you put a lot of emphasis on bringing up a couple of the resolutions we passed today in regards to fair housing and identifying the makeup of individuals that live within part 25. So I guess my question is to you, sir, in speaking of fair and affordable housing in context to this particular design application for designation, what is it that you're thinking that this designation is going to do to the complex? I mean, I've read the same articles that Lynn read in regards to the impact of historical designation and property values. So I guess I want to know specifically what have you researched or what anecdotal knowledge do you have that apparently US commissioners don't have that you can point to that says that this historical designation is going to change this apartment complex ability to provide housing to students. And apparently those who are not rich, but I guess who are hard blue collar workers,

Speaker 18 (01:10:06):

Of course I can easily do that. So Park 25, it is owned by a holding company that actually owns quite a few properties and we do this all the time. It is not our common practice to hire an architect for regular renovations. So the Peterson companies, which owns Park 25 and a lot of other properties, it engages in exterior renovations regularly, constantly. They don't normally hire an architect. They have a regular construction crew and regular relationships that they use and the contractors know what they're doing. If you adopt this and we're involved, we have to hire an architect, meet it within your requirements, and that adds to our expense. Now we don't, there's no margin here for absorption. We're not a high-end apartment. This is not apartments for professionals who make hundreds of thousands of dollars. These are lower middle class work a day apartments, students that live there, this expense gets passed on bottom line, whatever expense for administrative cost adds onto the operations gets passed along as rent.

(01:11:26):

So it's an easy translation. I can also tell you that this company sells and in the past buys a lot of property. We know how properties are valued. I've sold several of these in the past five years. The properties are valued on revenue, commercial properties are valued on revenue. And if the buyer anticipates higher operating costs because they're within these districts, then they factor that into their pro forma. It's factored into what they can borrow and it affects the purchase price. Now, I don't know what studies they're talking about in Kentucky. I've done this six times in the last five years, seven times in the last five years. And it makes a difference. So

Speaker 1 (01:12:11):

Thank you. Thank you, Lynn. I saw you shaking your head. Is that incorrect? About

Speaker 12 (01:12:17):

You do not have to have architectural drawings for submission for design review and for some building permit reviews. Licensed contractor in the city of Lawrence can submit. We even have in our residential districts, the homeowners themselves submit for the design review. So it doesn't require stamped architectural drawings unless that's part of the building permit requirement, which it often is if it's a multifamily commercial use. And then the other thing I'd like to point out is we have, I don't know how many of you know about the Joseph Savage house. It's over off of 19th Street and there's a huge apartment complex just behind it. And they have worked with us for the last 10 years. They've never had to go to HRC. They've done all kinds of redevelopment on the property. So I just don't think it's going to be as horrible as what we're hearing because everything is administrative except for new construction additions, over 20% of the footprint and demolition.

Speaker 1 (01:13:39):

Okay, thank you Mr. Sellers. Did you have another question on that?

Speaker 14 (01:13:45):

I did, but it became a comment and I'm just going to wait. So thank you Mayor.

Speaker 1 (01:13:49):

Thank you. We ready for comments? I think we're ready for comments then. Yes, please. I Anybody want to ask any questions further or kind follow up on these?

Speaker 13 (01:14:08):

I did for land and not any, what historic property was that again? And where was it located?

Speaker 12 ([01:14:15](#)):

The Joseph Savage house. And I can pull up a map. I should be able to find

Speaker 7 ([01:14:20](#)):

It real quick.

Speaker 12 ([01:15:06](#)):

I always forget exactly where it's, here we go.

Speaker 10 ([01:15:16](#)):

It's around Kent Terrace, doesn't it?

Speaker 12 ([01:15:19](#)):

Yes. It's 24th. It's on Kent Terrace. And let me see if I can share this.

([01:15:50](#)):

So this is the house here and then this is the apartment complex. And then also there's some other smaller rental units back here behind the structure. And so we've been working with them for years. I'd have to go back and check and see when the Savage House was nominated, but that is one instance. And also with affordable housing, we've worked with Tony I think on almost all of his projects except for one at ninth and Delaware. We're actually working with him on one at ninth and Delaware right now. We did the one down on New Hampshire, which was low income housing tax credits for people over 65. So the use, like I said, doesn't really affect it. And as far as the design goes, when we're working with those projects that have that sensitivity, there are oftentimes when the historic resources looks at the entire picture and says, okay, maybe this isn't financially feasible for this project and for that reason we think it meets chapter 22.

Speaker 13 ([01:17:13](#)):

Okay, thank you.

Speaker 7 ([01:17:24](#)):

Well, anybody want to start

Speaker 3 ([01:17:36](#)):

Muted?

Speaker 14 ([01:17:38](#)):

Oh, I came off mute because I was just wanting to see who was going to perhaps offer to defer this. I feel like that's somewhere in the air. It's not me, but I did want to share, I did want to say thank you, Lynn, for the presentation. I think one of the sticky points is I know we've heard that this commission agreed, this commission agreed. I do remember, I didn't agree on a lot what this project, this project predates my time on the commission and I had some concerns when it first came to the commission. And as we continue to work through these in a way that hopefully find we could finally get to a resolution prior to any decision, any decision made in court. I don't know if that's the will of this commission tonight, but I will share that one of the sticking points I continue to hear from those with part 25 was this perception of the, pardon me of loss of value.

([01:18:43](#)):

And I did my own research and took time to even reach out to a couple of city planners who have done work in this area and one particular in LA County who's been doing this work for over 20 years and where of time if there is a loss of value, it's to the actual historic site, not necessarily to the properties around that said site that's been designated. So I do feel like that's a little bit of a boogeyman in this conversation. I also felt like it was a little bit of a boogeyman in this conversation to talk about the perception of if this happens then we have to pass it on to those poor hardworking people and students. And so I think a lot of play on words and things and because of this issue coming to us, maybe it's a little bit of boredom or just folks are just tired and ready for the courts to make a decision in this piece. But we've asked staff to come back to us with this. We've looked at the context area. I was one of the ones that felt that the context area should be relegated only to the building and not necessarily to the parcel that has come back to us. We've heard from staff the process, they've gave us anecdotal stories of how they've moved through this process with other applicants.

(01:20:13):

Not to say that this is making a mountain out of a molehill. I don't want to reduce it to that, but I think there's a lot of would it could have, should have that are presented in this argument that doesn't change. The fact of this was brought to us as it relates to the designation and it's gone through that process. It's been presented to us as such. I don't have any objections to designating the designating the structure in itself. My concern is in hearing all of this, is this idea of calling out processes within a way that seems to be that someone's trying to circumvent some things. I think it was called out that folks were not engaged in a process which the process is just getting going, which one has nothing to do with. I think it's a little bit more indirect and not directly related to what we're voting on tonight.

(01:21:16):

But I think for me, I don't have a problem with giving the church the designation. I never have. And I think it kind of hurts me a bit to hear as a commissioner, those involved essentially say that doing something like this is going to impact our ability to continue doing the things that as a commission we are committed to. And I think it's done in kind of a disingenuous way and the fact that we're throwing, again, students under the bus and poor people to say that. And so yeah, we've kind of had these conversations before with other things that have come before us on our agenda and I don't appreciate it. I really don't like us weaponizing maybe some of the most vulnerable people in our community at expense of trying to make a hypothetical point or creating a boogeyman that doesn't exist. So as it relates to giving the designation to the church, I am in support of that and appreciate Lynn taking the time to share with us some of the upcoming changes that are being proposed or are in process as well as explaining to us and giving us a better understanding of how working with applicants and working with those and what this is going to look like moving forward so that we don't have to create these boogeyman that don't exist.

(01:22:43):

So thank you.

Speaker 13 (01:22:45):

Thank you. I'll jump in. Thank you Lynn. And thank you everybody for coming to speak to this. Actually, it helped a lot of your supplemental information kind of add to the discussion of other areas where this is present and it's being dealt with and things of that sort and the vacant area. But to actually speak to what Commissioner Seller said, the only thing I have holding me back a little bit, I'm almost there is just the process itself is we're approving it and then it's going back for a change next week at HRC where I'm not sure exactly what could be at, I mean you haven't run it past the attorneys yet. And then after that it's coming back to us. So that's kind where I'm drawing a line a little bit. So my preference would be to go ahead and see the baked item and come before us so we can just go ahead and get it sorted. But just,

Speaker 1 (01:23:57):

Yeah. Sounds good. Sounds good. Yeah. The red lines specifically I think is what you're talking about, the changes in our code. Did you have anything?

Speaker 3 ([01:24:05](#)):

Well, I'm very interested in seeing what the changes are

([01:24:10](#)):

And seeing how we talk about that. I would say it's probably going to take a while to get back to us and then who knows, we might send it back again where there might be a long process there I guess. But I am interested in those changes and obviously we have a concern about the context area and I think there'll be a lot talk about that. Again, the answers tonight make me feel better about that. That being said, given the code as it exists today, and we have an applicant who's applied under the code and we sent them back to say, you go apply just for the building at least, and we denied the larger context area, I would support approving what it was today. I mean, if this would've come up on February 17th, we might not even known there would've been how close we were to any changes. So I hear what you're saying. I'm not necessarily opposed to it, but I guess, and maybe I should ask this question, if later we change the definition of a context area, it would affect every property that's designated correct. So it would change how it affects this property and it change how it affects the Savage House and it would change how it affects the rest of them. So I hear what you're saying. I guess I would support this, but know that I'll probably support changes to the context area when it comes forward.

Speaker 4 ([01:25:50](#)):

Yeah,

Speaker 11 ([01:25:53](#)):

The church has done what we had asked the last time we handled this project, went with the building and I support that. And after hearing Lynn's definitions or explanations of some of the changes that could be coming down the pike made me feel more comfortable of continuing to support what the church has done based on our last meeting regarding this issue. So I'm in support of it.

Speaker 13 ([01:26:23](#)):

Okay. Thank you. Go ahead. Is the context area part of these later discussions or is it

Speaker 12 ([01:26:33](#)):

Staff did not bring it up as part of the later discussions, but that is something that if you wish the HRC to have a discussion about, you can certainly direct them to have that discussion and they can have it and we can incorporate that into the public meeting as well. We did talk a lot about context areas when we rewrote this chapter over a year. And I will say, I can't remember, I think we had eight public hearings with public participating and where it is now is the outcome of all of that participation.

Speaker 3 ([01:27:15](#)):

But the definitions you're talking about though, definitions that implicate the context area.

Speaker 12 ([01:27:21](#)):

Yes. So

Speaker 3 ([01:27:23](#)):

When I say, I mean you are going to talk about,

Speaker 12 (01:27:25):

Right, if you want them to talk about not having a context area for certain properties or going back to do the context definitions for each property. If you want them to have that discussion, then you can certainly ask them to.

Speaker 11 (01:27:45):

Yeah. Yeah. Well, I would appreciate a discussion about the context area and whether it needs to reach beyond the property boundaries.

Speaker 13 (01:27:51):

Yeah,

Speaker 11 (01:27:53):

That's where I would like to see a discussion

Speaker 13 (01:27:55):

Just because this is such, I mean, the only reason that this is, I feel like this has been in such deep discussion is because of how unusual this project is and where it is and the age of the properties around it, they all came up together. So that's what kind of makes it, which kind of lends credence that it might not be pervasive. And this just might be just a

Speaker 1 (01:28:21):

Circumstance

Speaker 13 (01:28:23):

For this area.

Speaker 1 (01:28:24):

Yeah, I looked up a lot of this architect's work in other states, Wisconsin, Minnesota, do my research. I don't like to come in here ignorant. And I think many of his structures are considered historical, but they're not designated on either a federal or state registration. So people consider it important and valuable, but it isn't provided any protections by the law. And I think what our rules do is give this third level of protection to the property, but then it also starts affecting adjacent landowners in a way that is unfair to land ownership in general. Because what you have done is impacted the ability for these adjoining landowners to change or alter their properties in some way, or at least an extra layer of review on how they might use their property. So this whole context area, the environments, those are kind of protections that don't really exist, again, aren't increase the level we have here.

(01:29:20):

So I'm really concerned about drawing big borders on these big urban, rural, ex-urban areas, especially because we're impacting large areas. And I really appreciate the redraw and building. I still think it's such an odd shape. We're creating a, we'll call it a geo, I don't know what you call that shape, but some sort of shape vial that I don't know what to call it, but it's impactful to everybody. And I think that's not like most places in this country. So we are special and we need to be careful what designations we give because those come with encumbrances on the adjacent landowner as well. So I'm really interested in changing the

way we regulate if we can, to minimize the impact on adjacent landowners and the cost associated with owning these properties and maintaining them. Because what happens in these historical areas is people don't touch their properties because they're afraid of what it's going to cost to reassemble it in a way that is acceptable.

(01:30:18):

And I'm not saying it's true, but these are these fears and there's consequences of having these rules. And so for me, that's something I want to get on the table tonight. And we need to take a deep hard look at those things. This is a perfect example of why we need to take a deep hard look at it because there's going to be others just like this. And the fact that I looked up many of this gentleman's churches and only a few of them are on the historic and he's done many, I couldn't find the exact number, but they're beautiful and important. But to start impacting other people's rights, we need to be serious about this and we need to consider the landowner and their rights. And we also need to consider everybody adjoining. So for me, I think they have met all the obligations, but I also really have a problem with how these zones, specifically the impact on the adjoining property on a property that's shaped like this, that's located in an open field that's surrounded by many undeveloped parcels. So this is going to be hard for us to control in the future if we don't have some restrictions on the area of influence of this kind of designation. And for me, you're protecting the thing, but you're also manifesting control over other people's property. And for me, that's a hard part when we're talking about a building that's younger than I am. So anyway, no comment.

Speaker 12 (01:31:38):

We can get you a national register

Speaker 1 (01:31:40):

Combination. Would you to register me anyway, this is kind of where I really want to make sure you are clear and we're all clear that those, that's the only problem I have with this is it's extra judicial rights that are given to people once they get this designation. And for me, that's hard because we created this and now we have to follow these rules. And what we need to do is maybe fix these rules in a way that we're not having these conversations for weeks at a time over something as simple as a landmark designation, which is already at the federal state level. So it's our overburdensome rules that are causing some of these concerns. And I think that's what we need to talk about tonight. So

Speaker 3 (01:32:19):

I would just jump in and I definitely agree we need a discussion on the context area in general, but also I think the Polk 25 folks have a suggestion about at least having an option

Speaker 4 (01:32:34):

To

Speaker 3 (01:32:35):

How to apply it. And I think that should be talked about. And so to the extent we need to put that as part of the motion, I'll do that if I make a motion here in a second.

Speaker 1 (01:32:45):

Yeah. So it sounds like we have enough

Speaker 13 (01:32:46):

To Yeah, I'd be fine with it. That's a part of the motion. Yep. We can go. That's something we can go back and look at. Okay.

Speaker 3 ([01:32:54](#)):

Yep. Well, I'll try it then. I'd move to adopt on first reading ordinance number 1 0 1 1 7, designating the first Presbyterian church structure only located at 24 15 Clinton Parkway to the Lawrence Register of Historic Places, and to direct staff in the HRC to look at the context area as they consider the changes in their upcoming meeting.

Speaker 1 ([01:33:19](#)):

We have a motion,

Speaker 11 ([01:33:21](#)):

Second

Speaker 1 ([01:33:22](#)):

Motion by Finkle Dye, second by Larson. All in favor say aye.

Speaker 11 ([01:33:26](#)):

Aye.

Speaker 1 ([01:33:27](#)):

Those

Speaker 11 ([01:33:27](#)):

Opposed?

Speaker 1 ([01:33:29](#)):

Motion passes. Five zero. Thank you very much.

Speaker 12 ([01:33:32](#)):

Thank you.

Speaker 1 ([01:33:34](#)):

Okay. The next item on our agenda is to go into an executive session and we need to consider a motion to recess into such.

Speaker 3 ([01:33:44](#)):

I move to recess an executive session for approximately 20 minutes to discuss the possibility of acquiring real property in the city pursuant to the exception under KSA 75 dash 43 19 b6. For the preliminary discussion of acquisition of real property, the justification for the executive session is to keep the possible terms and conditions of the property acquisition confidential. At this time, the C Commission will resume its regular meeting in the C commission room at approximately 7:34 PM after the executive session is concluded.

Speaker 1 ([01:34:14](#)):

Second motion by Finkle Dye, seconded by Larson. All in favor say aye. Aye.

Speaker 4 ([01:34:20](#)):

Aye.

Speaker 1 ([01:34:21](#)):

Motion passes five zero I. Okay. We're going to gavel back in just getting back from the executive session and we have nothing to report from that session. And we're going to wait a minute for the other commissioners to get back in here and start with commission items. Okay. We'll go ahead and start with item G, which is the commission items. Do any commissioners have any items to discuss or bring up at this time?

Speaker 3 ([01:55:52](#)):

I might've mentioned this a couple of weeks ago, but if not, I had a CJC meeting today, so it reminded me that we do have a new strategic plan. It's been out, so I encourage all the commissions to check out the strategic plan and what the CJC will be working on in the next three years. And so anyway, I just want to point that out. And new website, new strategic plan. It's on the county's website, but just Google, CJCC in Lawrence and you'll see that.

Speaker 1 ([01:56:24](#)):

Awesome. Thank you. Commissioner Sellers, anything Okay else? Good? Nope, I'm good. Alright, let's go ahead and look at our future agenda items

Speaker 3 ([01:56:40](#)):

I had, I don't see it on here. Have we set, someone suggested me, we had maybe, do we set a hearing date for the KU project? That's May 6th. Okay. So we might want to put that on there.

Speaker 1 ([01:56:57](#)):

Yeah, May 6th is,

Speaker 3 ([01:57:00](#)):

But related to that, I had a president ask about the third Michigan project that had gone to Planning commission, got a split vote, and he was thinking it might be set on May 6th as well. And he was curious if it might be on a different date then, but I don't know if the developers or, anyway, I think I just look at that of balancing those out. But he was worried that he thinks they'll be based upon the planning commission. Again, I've not watched that yet. I will, but there's a lot of neighbors, they were concerned about that and didn't want to put 'em all on one night was his concern. I see. I know this other, so I just point that out.

Speaker 1 ([01:57:48](#)):

Okay. Anything else you want to talk about on the agenda coming? All right. Let's see. Commissioner Sullivan. Right, so we'll go ahead and move on to the city manager's report.

Speaker 19 ([01:58:05](#)):

The only item on there is your upcoming ex parte disclosures.

Speaker 1 ([01:58:11](#)):

Roger that. Okay. Any questions for the city manager? Public comment on the city manager's report. Any online? Yes. Ooh, we're getting shrunk.

Speaker 7 ([01:58:26](#)):

Wow.

Speaker 2 ([01:58:37](#)):

Steven Watts.

Speaker 22 ([01:58:43](#)):

Thank you. You know the city manager report in the February 11th, 2025 Town Commission meeting found the police chief stating via a written memo quote, the department received a report from the DOJ in December. We will be working with our committee that helped plan the initial event to draft an implementation plan. Upon completion, the committee will release the entire DOJ report and implementation plan to the community. Hopefully this will be complete by the end of March. Well, March has come and gone. That PR event took place in August, 2024, and here it is seven plus months later in nothing. That event promised that there would also be community members from each of the groups at the event who would be assisting in writing police policy. Who are these people? How are they? And were they selected? When has the group met? What is the meeting schedule? The city manager needs to report on this.

([01:59:53](#)):

The Lawrence Times August 3rd, 2024 stated, Lawrence Police Chief Rich Lockhart said at the end of the meeting that he wanted the community to hold him accountable for the department to accomplish some of these tasks over the next six months. And if they don't, to reach out to local news reporters. And he said, we're going to implement ideas from this and I don't want you to feel like your time was wasted. I feel like my time was wasted. He said as an example, that he loved the idea for the community to be involved in department policymaking. Let's see how that works. Treat people as people. Lawrence Community members suggest solutions to barriers with the police is what the Lawrence Times article was all about. Where is the implementation plan promised by Mr. Lockhart? And for that matter, where is the 2024 annual report for our Town Police Department? It's nowhere to be found on the Town Police website. And where is the 2023 use of Force report for that matter? Where is the 2024 use of Force report? A Freedom of Information Act. Found that Ferris Muhammad, Lynn Herod, the Barry Johnson, Doris Ricks, Melissa Patterson, Yolanda Franklin, Sue Hack, Nicole Ryles, Kelly Hams, chief Lockhart, and Lieutenant Myron Grady were the people on the committee. They wouldn't answer the question. It took a Freedom of Information Act to get it.

([02:01:40](#)):

Can we have a city manager report on that please? Thank you.

Speaker 1 ([02:01:44](#)):

Thank you. Thank you, Steve.

Speaker 2 ([02:01:49](#)):

That's all the comments.

Speaker 1 ([02:01:51](#)):

Okay. Alright, we'll go ahead and look at our calendar here. We've got a meeting next week and then nothing on the 22nd. Anybody have any questions on ribbon cuttings or any of the activities? Nope. Okay. All right. Commissioner Sellers, any questions on the calendar? Okay, thanks. Alright, we'll go ahead and end our live broadcast and let anyone who needs to leave the room until we start up with our open public comment. Any public comment?

Speaker 13 ([02:02:50](#)):

Oh, you probably want to read the thing. Sorry. You probably want to read the thing.

Speaker 1 ([02:02:54](#)):

Oh yeah, that's right. Sorry.