

**NEIGHBORHOOD AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES
Monday, December 4, 2023**

The meeting of the Neighborhood and Community Development Standing Committee was held on Monday, December 4, 2023, at 6:36p.m., remotely via Zoom and on-site. The following members were present: Acting Chairman Burroughs; Stites, Davis, Stites, Bynum, McKiernan. Commissioner Townsend was absent. The following officials were also in attendance: Jud Knapp, Land Bank Manager; and Monica Sparks, Deputy UG Clerk.

Commissioner McKiernan said I'd like to announce that due to continuing COVID-19, some committee members, staff, and the public are attending remotely via Zoom as well as those of us who are on-site. All participants who are joining by phone or by Zoom should mute their devices when not speaking to avoid background noise.

During the meeting, please make sure you announce yourself by name and title when you speak so that the public that is observing knows who is speaking. This is critical given the number of remote participants and is still the current guidance from the Kansas Attorney General.

The public is allowed to participate by Zoom. They're also allowed to submit comments by email prior to the meeting. Those comments will be included in the record of the meeting. The public also has an opportunity to provide comments via Zoom and from here in the 5th floor conference room at the Municipal Office Building.

Commissioner McKiernan called the meeting to order. Roll call was taken, and all members were present as shown above.

Commissioner McKiernan said to the best of my knowledge there were no revisions to this agenda as initially published. **Monica Sparks, Deputy County Clerk**, said that is correct.

Commissioner McKiernan said we have no previous minutes to approve this evening, so we'll get right into the committee agenda item number one, the only item with multiple sub items is Land Bank Options and I'll turn this over to our Land Bank Manager, Mr. Jud Knapp.

Committee Agenda

Item No. 1 - 212871...LAND BANK OPTIONS

Synopsis: The Land Bank Manager respectfully requests that the Neighborhood and Community Development Committee review the proposed item and forward it to the Land Bank Board of Trustees for final consideration, submitted by Jud Knapp, Land Bank Manager.

Please visit the new site to review the applications below.

<https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/b63e9cb3cca44be59f458765dbeddc8/>

9 Single Family Homes

14 Multifamily Units

Jud Knapp, Land Bank Manager, said for tonight we have eight homes and fourteen multi-family units that we're going to go through. I think we can lump A1 through A8 together as one and then go to B1 and B2 and then B3 and B4. I think that's what I'm going to try to do but always if you have questions, you can stop me. Alright, the first one, A1, is at 3427 North 71st Street. I believe this is the third time we've seen this lot here, and all times it's been cancelled but then I have another applicant that is coming right behind it. So last month it got cancelled because the applicant found out how expensive it was to build so that's why that one got removed. This one became available, and it got taken very quickly. Staff didn't have any comments, the neighborhood groups didn't have any comments.

Items A2 through A5 are the same person. They are requesting to build five homes on six lots. They do have 20 years of building experience, so they are experienced builders. Staff comments with these next five were they need a design change due to the narrow lot design guidelines because it's going to be more of a bungalow type of house with like a raised front porch. Staff wants to try to maintain the 25-foot lots in this neighborhood and that will support density and to match the neighborhood. So, the first one's at 907 Tenny. There's actually three lots under this so this is where the 25-foot lot comment comes from. Staff would like to see those split up into three and build three homes on that lot because that's a 75-foot lot.

A3 is at 263 North 9th Street so it's just north of the last address and there's three lots there. The applicant wants to build two homes there, but staff said they would love three. A4 is 253 North 9th Street and then A5 has a little different narrow lot design guidelines do not apply to this lot because all the lots around it are all different sizes and a home built here would match the

neighborhood on whatever size lot that is. Next is A6, is a continuation from the last meeting we had with Mount Carmel. They initially requested 15 lots that we approved last month, but we missed these four parcels in there. They're planning to replat into a cul-de-sac and they need those four lots to make that cul-de-sac work. This would bring their total up to 19 lots to build ten homes.

A7 and A8 were held from last month's meeting. I do have comments for A7 through A8 and they're both the same for both houses. A7 is here, A8 is right across the street. They are not the same person but it's kind of like the same. They aren't the same names, but they aren't the same person but this just like the same group. It's just like another person's doing it. That's why the homes look the same but the comments that we received from the Oak Grove Neighborhood Group was that the Oak Grove supports A7 and A8 on a conditional basis. I want to read this note to you, both received a unanimous vote and to answer the question, would you like to see this in your neighborhood? Would you like to see a single-family home in your neighborhood? The neighborhood group said yes. They also had some conditions with it, they said while both projects have look appeal in an area that has been dormant for several years, many of these voters saw the lack of African ethnicity as a serious drawback, internship, training as well as job employment activities were absent. Oak Grove wants more homeowners; it was not determined how much time the developer would give to the seeking owners before seeking renters. With the existing sizable population of renters in the neighborhood goods and services are virtually absent. Oak Grove believes that it is not solely the number of rooftops, it's also the number of disposable income that reside in these homes, that was their comment, so that concludes items A1 through A8. **Commissioner McKiernan** said thank you Mr. Knapp, in a moment I'll ask if there are any comments or questions, but I'm just going to share something and this is my last meeting so you won't have to put up with this from me from now on, but at first I was wondering why are A2, three, four, and five all split up? It's the same applicant, why isn't it all just lumped together? Now, I see why, because at A2, no split that. I, personally, do not see that a 25-foot lot—let me rephrase that. I, personally, believe that if an applicant wants to take two 25-foot lots and combine them into a 50 or wants to take three and make them into 37 and a half's or whatever they are, I do not have a problem with that. I mean we're sitting here saying no, you have to build on a 25-foot front lot, but go back to the ones on North Hallock, would you please? The last ones you presented. Like 2529 North Hallock, that's a 75-foot front. So, why aren't we telling that applicant split that into three 25's? I think there is an inequity in how we're proceeding here that and frankly, this North

Hallock property is only a few miles due north of the North 9th Street properties that the previous applicant wants that we're kind of messing with. So, I 'm fine if we say do it, but I just think that there is inequity in this process and I think that a firm commitment to force 25-foot front construction is misguided and will ultimately result in fewer homes being constructed in our downtown area, that's just my opinion. Any other members of the committee have comments or questions? **Chairman Burroughs** said thank you, I don't disagree with those statements. My concern would be if we have a whole block of 25-foot lots, what do we plat them to be moving forward? I'm with you, a 25-foot lot if it's going to build narrow shotgun homes that aren't connected, that with some of the past practices that have been done with demolition, makes it even more difficult in which to deal with these lots, so I don't disagree with you. I would hope that whoever's working on Land Bank policies would be thinking about this, taking this into consideration that as we discuss these, that we may want to look at combining a minimum of two, no more than three. There may be a way to do that, there's nothing wrong with building a larger home in a community because if we're going to build shotgun homes, it's going to take the quality of home that I see there, is not conducive what I would consider to a neighborhood of a block full of 25-foot lots. I would just assume if we're going to invest in our neighborhoods and reinvest in our neighborhoods that we see housing stock that comes back that could be there for a couple of generations. **Commissioner McKiernan** said I would agree with that and I would also speculate—I don't know because I don't build houses ,but I would guess that people who build houses, would have a sense for what size lot, what size house is going to be marketable and that my opinion again, is we should not stand in the way of that effectively free market. **Commissioner Stites** said that's where I was going. We can't have cookie cutter houses, and the market is telling us what we need. One of them said and I can't remember what it was, they're targeting under \$300,000 houses. Well, you know what, if those aren't going to sell, I'm not saying the \$300,000, I'm saying if a house that is built this size is not going to sell, we aren't in that business. Our job is to get those out of Land Bank and get them back on the tax roll. That's our job, not to say that we know better because heaven knows that we do enough of that, thinking that we know better than some of the professionals but I 100% agree that having that ability and like Commissioner Burroughs says the 25 maybe up to. But I still don't want to make that policy. If one comes in and it's whatever the distance maybe have that ability to put one off, so I agree.

Commissioner McKiernan said thank you, any other comments or questions?

Commissioner Davis said I will say as you all can guess; I've been working on a lot of things. The Land Bank stuff was still being worked on with the Mayor's Office and the hope as I know, Commissioner McKiernan, you won't be with us, but the hope is in 2024, we will have something that has kind of the Mayor's blessing for this group to consider. Thank you. **Commissioner McKiernan** said now I will say, despite my biases, I'm not going to stand in the way of any of these applications. If these applicants know our restrictions and chose to still go forward then I wish them godspeed and good luck, but I would hope that we would have a more coherent and more uniform and potentially more equitable Land Bank policy moving forward. Any other comments or questions. And Monica, I do not have my—did not get Zoom window up here so I'll be asking you if we have anybody online so first of all, in terms of public comment, did we receive any written comment regarding any one of the items A1 through A8? **Ms. Sparks** said no comments were received. **Commissioner McKiernan** said thank you, is there anyone online who would like to comment on applications A1 through A8? **Ms. Sparks** said no hands are raised. **Commissioner McKiernan** said thank you very much, is there anyone here present with us who'd like to comment on A1 through A8. I see no one coming forward, so these items are available for motion.

Action: **Chairman Burroughs made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Davis, to approve as submitted.** Roll call was taken and there were five "Ayes," Bynum, Stites, McKiernan, Townsend, and Burroughs.

Mr. Knapp said that brings us to Item A9. A9 was also in last month's Standing Committee Meeting but it was sent back with the stipulation that they need to have a public meeting about the transitional houses. That meeting has not happened, so I am requesting that this item be hold until that meeting takes place. **Commissioner McKiernan** said was this the item Mr. Knapp, where the group that the developer was supposed to meet with is going to meet like the next day and there was no time to coordinate a meeting. Something like that? **Mr. Knapp** said no, that was the last two applications. **Commissioner McKiernan** said that was the other and they have done that. **Mr. Knapp** said yes, they have. **Commissioner McKiernan** said but this applicant did promise that

there would be such a meeting, that has not yet happened. **Mr. Knapp** said yes Commissioner. **Commissioner McKiernan** said what I'm going to do is I'm going to ask for any public comment, but Mr. Knapp is suggesting that we hold these three, this one item, these three properties over until such time as the meeting has been held. Monica, did we receive any written communication regarding A9? **Ms. Sparks** said no comments were received.

Commissioner McKiernan said I'd ask if there's anybody joining us online who has their hand raised to make comment on A9. **Ms. Sparks** said no hands are raised. **Commissioner McKiernan** said Committee, A9, is before us with a recommendation that we hold it over until such time as a public meeting has been held.

Commissioner Stites said I just have a question (Inaudible) hold it over until, how long is that? I mean, is it 30 days? Are we going to see this again in 30 days, if they don't have the meeting and then we have to say this same thing again, and we just kick the can down again. Hey, you know what They didn't do what they said they were going to do last meeting. I'm okay with this application being thrown away and they can reapply. **Mr. Knapp** said have to have these items in like—is it four or five weeks in advance. So, when that last meeting happened, there wasn't much time to have that meeting, and I think it was a shorter meeting month. I think it happened—so I will not put it back on the agenda until that public meeting has happened.

Commissioner McKiernan said that is a great point because we were second Monday last month, we're first Monday this month, and so we did have a compressed time in between meetings. **Commissioner Stites** said what I want to make sure of is that might not happen this month, it might not happen next month and then it's kind of off the books for anybody else to put in a request for that property because it's tied up and another application can't come forward because it's property down the road. I'm okay with doing it—I mean I—but you're saying come back before us until they have this meeting. We don't know when that meeting is. I want to say that if they don't have the meeting within two more months, 60 days, then that application is null and void. **Mr. Knapp** said that sounds great to me. **Commissioner McKiernan** said so we have a motion that this item be held over for a maximum of 60 days and that—I'm reading body language here and facial expressions, and I think we're going to get a little bit of clarification from Legal in just a second. It's just a hunch, and so basically what we're asking is a maximum of 60 days and if that public meeting has not yet occurred by that time, that this be denied.

Wendy Green, Deputy Chief Counsel, said the only thing is for our own ordinances, item can only be held over a maximum of 30 days. So, it can only be held over to the next Standing Committee meeting unless maybe somebody would want to suspend a rule. **Commissioner McKiernan** said Monica, could you tell us or do you have the next meeting. When is our next meeting? When is our January meeting? Is it the second Monday, in which case we'd have five weeks. **Ms. Sparks** said I can tell you and it will be January 8th. **Commissioner McKiernan** said it will be the second Monday, although jammed right up against the holiday. So, Mr. Murray, I'll recognize you for any clarifying comments.

Commissioner Bynum said my question is going to Commissioner Stites. What precedent, what policy exists around making a statement that if we hold it 30 days and they don't have the meeting as requested, then we can trash can it. I mean how does that comport with the way that we've handled other applications. I just—all I'm asking is for consistency, and what the policy currently might be. **Ms. Green** said so technically, it's still a motion to hold it over though. So, if—**Commissioner Bynum** said but he made a—he added a stipulation to his motion, he added a condition. **Ms. Green** said he did but—**Commissioner Bynum** said I'm asking how that creates consistency? **Ms. Green** said so if he—the motion itself though is to hold it over, and then if they don't do what they're supposed to do then it's just denied in essence, and we won't hear it again. So, the initial motion though is that it be held over, and then if they don't do what they do, then it gets denied. So, you have to deal with that initial part of the motion, which is to hold it over. And our rules say that it can only be held over 30 days. **Commissioner Bynum** said I just want to make one more comment to this point. Again, I'm looking for policy and secondarily, it's December, it's Christmas, the next meeting is the 8th. It's—I think going to be difficult at this time of year for them to have a community meeting between now and January 8th, just an opinion. The second part of that question is we're we asking them to meet with a specific Neighborhood Group or were we asking them to hold some sort of public meeting. Those aren't the same thing. **Commissioner McKiernan** said I would—just to be contrarian here, I would say that we don't necessarily have to mandate a meeting or any application. We certainly don't mandate meetings—I mean there is in policy but, Mr. Knapp who was the meeting to be with? **Mr. Knapp** said it was with the neighborhood and surrounding areas was I heard they—the Village Initiative did have this meeting for their last approval. They had a community meeting at an area church, so I assumed it was going to be the exact same meeting again. **Commissioner McKiernan** said so then the request for the

meeting here is because it's Village Initiative, not because it's a Land Bank application. Would that interpretation be correct? **Ms. Green** said correct, it seems like that's what it is if you ask me Commissioner.

Commissioner McKiernan said Mr. Murray I'll go ahead, and Commissioner Stites I will be back with you in a second, but I'll recognize Mr. Murray for some clarification.

Lavert Murray, Economic Development Advisor to the Mayor, said this is pretty much in line with the concern cited by Commissioner Bynum. I think we all know that the Village Initiative is already under construction just around the corner from them with housing similar to what is proposed. So I just met with Randy George a week or so ago, and I would suggest that maybe he didn't understand that we're wait—and no offense, yet that we're waiting on him to have this meeting before this matter comes back and so, I think in the meantime, you'll certainly get his attention, and be it the concerned citizens of Quindaro or the Quindaro Initiative. He'll meet with the surrounding groups, but I guarantee you he's not one to want these properties to go away because he had to seek funding for this, and I think it was just some oversight on his part. I know for the development, that he's pursuing as we speak, that he's under construction with it was suggested to him to meet with the neighbors at that time, and the community groups and he did. I don't know what he might be confused by, but I can assure you that he will respond if given adequate time. **Commissioner Stites** said what I will say though is I'll withdraw the motion, but I want to be clear about something also, is we have to suspend the rules because you've already—you've said that we've can only send it back once? **Ms. Green** said no, you can send it back multiple times, you can only send it—you can only hold it over for 30 days at a time. But you could do it multiple times. **Commissioner McKiernan** said with all that clarified, is there a motion on Item A9?

Commissioner Davis said just let me—sorry, let me put two and two together. Village Initiative, they're the applicant, they do have a history within this community and a connection within this community, so I want to be very mindful of that. Not to play favorites here, but there's a difference, this is a local organization. Mr. Knapp, if you can help me, it was a Village Initiative that said they would have the meeting. **Mr. Knapp** said yes. **Commissioner Davis** said okay and they just weren't able to do it. Granted, holidays schedule's crazy. I think even 30 days, that gives January 4th—that's wild. I'll move to approve. **Commissioner Stites** said with that being said, I'll agree, and I'll second that. **Commissioner McKiernan** said so we have a motion and a second to

approve A9 as submitted. And I cannot remember have I asked for public comment on this? I have not. Alright. Monica, did we receive any correspondence related to A9? **Ms. Sparks** said no comments received. **Commissioner McKiernan** said is there anyone joining us online who'd like to comment on item A9? **Ms. Sparks** said no hands are raised. **Commissioner McKiernan** said and there's no one here in the room or should I say is there anyone here in the room who would like to offer comment on A9? I see no one coming forward. There has been a motion and a second to approve as submitted. Roll call please.

Action: **Commissioner Stites made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Davis, to approve as submitted.** Roll call was taken and there were five "Ayes," Bynum, Stites, Davis, Burroughs, and McKiernan.

Commissioner McKiernan said Mr. Knapp we're now into the B group. **Mr. Knapp** said yes, we're in the multi-family area now. B1 is at 1600 Rosedale Drive. This is for a duplex; it does match the zoning of R2 here. This item received no comments from staff, and no neighborhood group comments. B2 is at 1929 Stewart Avenue. This is zoned R2, so it meets the zoning of a duplex. A little bit about the applicant, they are in the construction trade and they're looking to build a house that will suit their needs and they're also going to live in one side of it and rent out the other side of the duplex. B3 was held over from last month, they did have a public—they did have a Neighborhood Group meeting. I do have the Neighborhood Group comments right here. It says Oak Grove Executive Committee opposes this application. There's a high concentration approximately 15 apartments and four rental houses in this block area. The number of single-family homes is considerably less, the Neighborhood Group doubts that more of the same will attract goods and services that the area badly needs. Random shootings are the norm, much of the infrastructure sidewalks and curbs is absent, either it never existed, or it was uprooted or removed by companies and entities doing work in the right-of-ways. The nearest transportation is five blocks away, great consideration and components of the Equitable Development Reference the Anti-Displacement strategy in the northeast area, KCK. The Heritage Trail plan should be given not only to increased density but to equally in part, improve this area's quality of life and attractiveness to those with disposable income and those with investment dollars. So, that was the comments I received from the Neighborhood Group here they are against the application.

B4 was also held and it's also in the Oak Grove Neighborhood Group and I got comments for them. Oak Grove Executive Committee support this application with conditions. I have to remind you that this is a multi-family, four unit build that the applicant is requesting the conditions for being supported by the Neighborhood Group was no four-plexes or multi-family units. The neighborhood wants more owner-occupied single-family structures. I take this as it means that they don't want multi-family they want single-family homes, and I do have to say this area is already zoned RP5, so it would match the zoning of this area. A developer would actively seek and include workers and trainees of ethnicities that represent the demographic that are most negatively affected by red lining and other adverse Government actions in Legislation. The developer would partner with the Neighborhood Group and MBR to work within the framework of the Anti-Displacement strategy. That concludes my items, Commissioners.

Commissioner McKiernan said comments or questions from the Committee on these applications? **Commissioner Bynum** said RSP 4 being 630 Quindaro, I appreciate the Neighborhood Group actively looking at these applications, the question really is though the conditions are not really part of this stage of the process correct. It's currently zoned now as we move through we might reach a point where this were to be in front of Planning although possibly not, I'm a little confused on the ability of Neighborhood and Community Development Standing Committee to place these kinds of conditions on a Land Bank transfer. I'm just a little confused and I keep looking straight at Legal, and is our Planning staff online? Okay, so whoever wants to take it. **Ms. Green** said that's normally not what this Standing Committee does at all with an option agreement. Normally, an option agreement is granted and then it is determined whether or not anything further is needed. So, just from a Legal perspective, no that's not what we do at this point.

Ms. Sparks said we do have Kallie McLaughlin online. **Commissioner McKiernan** said Ms. McLaughlin if you have any information for Commissioner Bynum, so ahead. **Kallie McLaughlin, Planning Department**, said so if they decide to do just a single-family then they would have to go through the narrow lot design guidelines as part of that process, but if they do want to do anything that's three units or more, So I guess single-family, and duplex is narrow lot. Three units or more would fall into the commercial category, so we would require a Final Development Plan to be presented before the Planning Commission, in which point they would have to or they would be open for public comment, which seems to be—the maybe a better spot to put those neighborhood opinions and commentary. **Commissioner McKiernan** said any other

comments or questions from the Committee? **Ms. Green** said I do remember there was a question the last month—they had a question about the TIF for the Paragon Falcon and when it was going to expire, and I did have an answer for that, it should expire in July of 2025. **Commissioner McKiernan** said that doesn't apply to any of these does it? I thought it would apply to A7 and A8.

Ms. McLaughlin said no actually it would apply to B3 and B4 as well I thought, but possibly not, maybe I wrote my notes in the wrong place. But anyway, if anybody wanted to know, it expires in 2025. **Commissioner McKiernan** said it's perfectly possible. I could first time have been wrong today. **Ms. McLaughlin** said I did put my notes in the wrong place. **Commissioner McKiernan** said North Hallock properties were the ones that were in the Paragon Falcon, weren't they? So, Committee, getting whooped by a map here. Does the Committee have any comments, questions or a motion on any of these applications? **Mr. Murray** said I just wanted to clarify some things because I indicated to that the North Hallock property is in the Paragon Falcon area, but I believe if it is on the—and I should have looked at the map, if it's on the North side of Quindaro, the 630, 628, 626 Quindaro projects would be in the Paragon Falcon area as well.

Commissioner McKiernan said those are on the North side of Quindaro at roughly 7th. **Commissioner Davis** said just a question for Legal, and I don't know if we've had this conversation to this extent. Could we even mandate the—for example, could we mandate that a Land Bank application be only owner-occupied. Is that something we are even allowed to do? **Ms. Green** said Land Bank properties are ours to do with as what for whatever our policy says. So, if we want to make that part of our policy, that we can mandate, whoever purchases it make it owner-occupied, then we could do that, but we don't have anything in our policy as of right now that says that we can mandate that or that we can't mandate that, to tell you the honest truth. **Commissioner Davis** said and there's nothing in State Law that would prohibit us from doing so? **Ms. Green** said no, not necessarily because the Land Bank, when it—even though it's quasi-Governmental it's its own entity. So, it's almost acting in a quasi-Governmental function. Although, I can't think of anything—I mean as long as we're not violating Fair Housing Laws, I don't know that there's any reason that we couldn't. I mean, I don't know that saying something has to be owner-occupied necessarily, I would have to look into that, but I don't—any off the top of my head. I can't think of say—why saying something has to be owner-occupied would necessarily violate a Fair Housing Law, but that's what we need to make sure that we don't run afoul of are the Fair Housing Laws.

Commissioner Burroughs said you have Home Rule Authority to do these types of things, granted by law, you're that you did state Federal Housing Authority. That would be the only thing I think that we would have to run through. Other than that, whatever decisions we need to do under the Home Rule works. **Commissioner McKiernan** said as attractive as that might be, I would caution us that I think that's a slippery slope, that we would potentially down the road be at cross purposes with previous decisions that this body has made. But I won't be making them. **Commissioner Stites** said how long has this property been in the Land Bank? **Mr. Knapp** said I don't have a good answer for that one. **Commissioner McKiernan** said would it be safe to say it's been more than a few years? **Mr. Knapp** said definitely, yeah. (Inaudible) **Commissioner Stites** said how many single-family housing applications have we had in that last couple—**Mr. Knapp** said we have like 450 total. **Commissioner Stites** said no, no, no. **Mr. Knapp** said Oh, none. This is the first time this property has come. **Commissioner Stites** said there's a lot of opportunity for anybody that wanted to build a single-family house in there. They could have come forward and built one. **Mr. Knapp** said yes, Commissioner.

Action: **Commissioner Stites made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Davis, to approve as submitted.** Roll call was taken and there were five "Ayes," Bynum, Stites, McKiernan, Townsend, and Burroughs.

Commissioner McKiernan said Monica, you'll have to check me again, I forgotten whether or not we checked to see if—we have not. Alright, was there any public comment, correspondence received related to items B1 through B4? **Ms. Sparks** said no comments received. **Commissioner McKiernan** said is there anyone joining us online who'd like to comment on B1 through B4? **Ms. Sparks** said Elnora Jefferson has her hand raised.

Elnora Jefferson, Kansas City, KS, said I'm part of the Oak Grove neighborhood, and I'd like to say that yes, that is correct. That TIF does extend to Quindaro Boulevard. The other question that I raised at the last month was the developer agreement that there is a developer agreement of record and we've not—I don't have any information, or maybe I should say I'd like to know where I could get the information as to whether or not the developer agreement is still active. Because one big thing was that the developer had the right of refusal in this particular area.

I'd like to say that we enjoyed our meeting with this particular applicant, he was willing to work with and enthusiastic and anxious to work with the neighborhood group, so I hope that this will, and it looks like it will go forward. The question I have is on the application over on Roland, will that to require a second meeting? **Commissioner McKiernan** said I think that question would best be answered by Ms. McLaughlin but based on my interoperation of her previous comments it sounds as if it might. Ms. McLaughlin, do you have any insight on B3, the properties on Roeland? **Ms. McLaughlin** said I'm sorry Jud, can you go back to that so I can take a look at that one more time?

Mr. Knapp said yes Kelly, I'm back on it right now. It's the three duplex location. **Ms. McLaughlin** said so those are zoned R2B, which means that they're allowed by right to have a duplex, the only difference is that they still have to go through the narrow lot design guidelines and there might be some changes to what you see in that picture. I also notice that the plat or that the lots they have are a little smaller, so if they want to change how their plats are done and they want to change the spacing on them so whether you know three even lots, that would require a planning entitlement. So that would be a subdivision replat in order to do so, which may result in the public hearing if they pursue that. If they don't pursue that avenue and they just want to do a building permit for three single family homes or three duplexes, I'm sorry they are allowed to do so by right.

Commissioner McKiernan said thank you so much appreciate that. Then Mr. Murray, do you have any additional insight on these properties? **Mr. Murray** said in fact, Ms. McLaughlin just covered that although, I was going to point out that with regard to the comments made earlier about reserving the Land Bank parcels for single family use only. That would have and I was going to point out that would have zoning implications that I agree with Legal Counsel that you can do that. Bu, just understand the impacts it would have to our zoning ordinance. **Commissioner McKiernan** said we have a motion and a second, but I'll recognize Commissioner Bynum and then Commissioner Stites. **Commissioner Bynum** said thank you, I'm just trying to get clarity and maybe you stay there too, Ms. Jefferson mentioned refusal in that TIF area, these are in the Land Bank, I mean how would there be a first RIT refusal on a property that's been foreclosed and placed in the Land Bank. **Mr. Murray** said can I address that? I don't want to front of anyone but—and Jud will recall conversations that he and I have had about some of the parcels in the Land Bank and what prompted some of those discussions was an application for property in the Mount

Carmel area. Many of these parcels in the Paragon Falcon and the Mount Carmel area and there other redevelopment areas that were approved and there were contracts with developers covering these areas. At that time and I'm talking more than 10 years ago, we placed a number of these parcels acquired for the developer in the Land Bank for what reason.

Well, number one they were not ready at the time to develop those specific parcels and thus we were trying to give them time to get their plans ready but avoid taxation on those parcels in the integral. Now as you know when there is land, you have to tax that land unless it's serving a government purpose and in this or public purpose. In this instance the purpose was for redevelopment and the fact that they were being held for redevelopment. The only way to escape taxation was to put them in the Land Bank and that's why you will find a number of parcels in redevelopment areas in the Land Bank. And so, they weren't acquired via tax foreclosure sale. They were acquired actually by—In the case of Mount Carmel there were a number of parcels that were condemned or not condemned but acquired via eminent domain and the same for Paragon Falcon, and then placed in the Land Bank hoping that the developer could live up with the terms of their redevelopment agreement and get them built out. As you know, I need not point out that there was a pandemic that slowed some things and then there was an economic turndown that hurt other things. But that's why you'll find a number of parcels in the Land Bank. **Commissioner McKiernan** said there is a motion and a second to approve as submitted. Any other comments from the Committee?

Action: **Commissioner Stites made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Davis, to approve as submitted.** Roll call was taken and there were five “Ayes,” Bynum, Stites, Davis, Burroughs, and McKiernan.

Commissioner McKiernan said that takes us to the end of our agenda, there are no more items. Is there a motion to adjourn? **Commissioner Burroughs** said Brian, my friend I just want to say it's been a pleasure serving with you on this Committee, you have served as this Chairman since I have been on this Committee and your wisdom and knowledge in reference to community housing is going to be sorely missed but I just wanted you to know that I've respect the work that you bring to the Committee in your thought process and how you conduct yourself as a member of this committee and I just want to say thank you and your professionalism will be missed.

Commissioner McKiernan said thank you Commissioner Burroughs, I appreciate that. I have no doubt that this Committee will carry on and do even better work moving forward. So, is there a motion to adjourn? **Commissioner Bynum** said no sir, I need to make a comment. Well, I can't let Commissioner Burroughs—It could because I have a very long speech I just want to echo Commissioner Burroughs comments and we'll have more time for this in the coming days but just in general this Committee and all the other work you've done is so appreciated dearly, and a lot of it is for just the way you think about things and analyze things. I like to call it McKiernaning and part of that references this spreadsheet creation and the pie chart creation and all the ways that you take the data and you've certainly helped me over these years understand that data better and it's so appreciated and it won't be replaced. We have fine people coming, but what you've done won't be replaced and it will be missed, and I thank you.

Commissioner Davis said I'll just add although I'll save the full length of my speech for Thursday. But no Commissioner McKiernan you've really modeled Public Service very very well and it is always refreshing to hear you speak and hear you analyze issues and problems. I think you've brought a level of clarity to a lot of really hard to understand topics and things and so I appreciate your candor, appreciate your wisdom, and I appreciate your sacrifice. I know there's a lot of other things on your plate and things that this community has—we have little to no idea and so thank you for your service to this community. **Commissioner McKiernan** said let's not overlook the value and the power of all the other members of the Committee here—**Commissioner Davis** said this is your time to receive appreciation Chair. **Commissioner McKiernan** said—Are doing great work and that will continue. Okay, now is there a motion? **Commissioner Stites** said I knew this was going to happen tonight, so I prepared notes that I 'd like to go over and thank you about. I've worked with you now for two years, I've known you for many years prior to this and it does not surprise me at all as I was your Community Policing Officer, you conduct yourself the same exact way as you did as a member of my district that I represented. You are going to be missed, and I echo exactly what everyone has said here. I can't add anything to that other than I'm going to miss you—**Commissioner McKiernan** said I'm still going to be around, don't worry. **Commissioner Stites** said we'll make a motion to adjourn. **Commissioner McKiernan** said there is a motion to adjourn. **Commissioner Davis** said there is a second. **Commissioner McKiernan** said there is a motion and a second to adjourn. Roll call please.

PUBLIC AGENDA

No items for discussion.

ADJOURN

Action: Commissioner Stites made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Davis, to **adjourn**. Roll call was taken and there were five “Ayes,” Bynum, Stites, Davis, Burroughs, and McKiernan.

Acting Chairman Davis adjourned the meeting at 7:25p.m.

JG