



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
November 17, 2014
Meeting Minutes

November 17, 2014 – 6:30 p.m.

Commissioners present: Britton, Culver, Denney, Josserand, Kelly, Liese, Struckhoff, von Achen

Staff present: McCullough, Stogsdill, Day, Larkin, Ewert

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Receive and amend or approve the minutes from the Planning Commission meeting of October 20, 2014.

Motioned by Commissioner Kelly, seconded by Commissioner Britton, to approve the October 20, 2014 Planning Commission minutes.

Unanimously approved 8-0.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Receive reports from any committees that met over the past month.

Commissioner Britton said that there had been two Horizon 2020 public forums to get public perspectives. He said they were still in the fact finding phase but that they would move into more deliberations for a new plan or revised plan in the near future.

EX PARTE / ABSTENTIONS / DEFERRAL REQUEST

- Ex parte:
Commissioner Culver received an email from Mr. Robert Baker from Tenants to Homeowners after cutoff for communications.
- No abstentions.

PC Minutes 11/17/14

ITEM NO. 1 CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR VERIZON WIRELESS; 1287 E 1200 RD (SLD)

CUP-14-00298: Consider a Conditional Use Permit for a new 195' Verizon Wireless communications tower located north of the Westar Substation at 1287 E 1200 Rd. Submitted by PAMCORP LLC for Verizon Wireless LLC on behalf of The Kansas District of the Wesleyan Church Inc, property owner of record.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Ms. Sandra Day presented the item.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Mr. Scott Goble, representing Verizon Wireless, showed a search area map on the overhead. He said the goal was to find a site as close to the center of that site as possible.

PUBLIC HEARING

Mr. Russell Livingston asked about the height of the tower and stacking leased space above that.

Commissioner Liese said the tower could not go above 199'.

Mr. McCullough said that was correct.

APPLICANT CLOSING COMMENT

Mr. Goble said it would be a 199' tower and that Verizon would occupy the top of the tower. He stated leased space would be below that.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Culver asked about the following paragraph in the staff report:

Recent changes to federal laws allow some future modifications to approved and existing communication towers, base stations, co-location equipment and other features. The full scope of these changes has not been assessed by staff. Changes can include expanding the tower by up to an additional 20' and increasing the base station (enclosure area) by up to 10%.

Ms. Day said at this point she did not know the full implication of what the changes in the federal regulations would mean. She said co-location changes were primarily focused on federal law as it related to historic preservation and for the environmental review that goes with these types of applications. She said according to the release that she read it may have some implications for the local governing body. She said ultimately they needed to review the communication tower regulations for the city and county. She said there could be some requirements that an application could be expanded.

Commissioner Liese asked if there was any reason why they couldn't insert a height maximum in the motion.

Mr. McCullough said the height maximum was understood in the application. He said the federal preemption may allow tower companies to expand to a certain degree administratively. He said staff was not sure of what the implications were at this point. He said an applicant would still need to go through the local process of zoning but it may make it so the applicant could get a 10% increase perhaps without going back through the process.

Ms. Day said staff did not know at this point because it is a recent determination at the federal level.

Commissioner Struckhoff asked if the proposed allowable increase trigger lighting requirements.

Ms. Day said her understanding was that towers under 200' were not automatically required to be lit by FAA requirements.

Commissioner von Achen asked if there would be room for three additional carriers on the tower.

Mr. Goble said yes, there would be room for three additional carriers on the tower. He said he had sharing agreements with other carriers.

Commissioner von Achen asked if towers in the area had co-location spaces.

Mr. Goble said each tower had a certain amount of structural integrity.

Commissioner von Achen asked if Verizon anticipated the co-locations to fill up quickly.

Mr. Goble said he couldn't speculate at this time. He said the 10% height was a federal regulatory requirement and that any co-locator would need to show federal compliance that they would not be increasing the tower height by more than 10%. He said nothing in the federal requirement would supersede the local jurisdiction.

Commissioner Denney asked if this was in the floodplain.

Ms. Day nodded her head yes.

Commissioner Denney asked if the control building would be susceptible to flooding.

Ms. Day said it would need to meet minimum elevation requirements.

Commissioner Liese asked how deep the tower would go into the ground.

Mr. Goble said they would do a geotechnical investigation of the subsurface soils. He said in this part of the country they were used to going 35' with the tower foundation. He said the compound would be built up above the floodplain.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Commissioner von Achen, seconded by Commissioner Britton, to approve the Conditional Use Permit for a communication tower located at 1287 E 1200 Road and forwarding it to the County Commission for a recommendation of approval subject to the following condition(s):

- 1) Provision of a revised site plan to include the following changes:
 - a) Revise the landscape plan to show five (5) street trees along E 1200 Road/Kasold Drive located 8' from west side of pedestrian pathway.
 - b) Revise the site plan to show a city approved access driveway apron and a paved access drive from the apron to 6' west of the recreation path.

Unanimously approved 8-0.

PC Minutes 11/17/14

ITEM NO. 2 SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR VERIZON WIRELESS; 1725 BULLENE AVE (SLD)

SUP-14-00312: Consider a Special Use Permit for a new 120' Verizon Wireless communications tower located at 1725 Bullene Ave. Submitted by PAMCORP LLC for Verizon Wireless LLC on behalf of Steven L. Eudaly, property owner of record.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Ms. Sandra Day presented the item.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Mr. Scott Goble, Verizon Wireless, said there were challenges in finding the location. He showed the search area map on the overhead. He said they were trying to improve service to people who live and use the area. He said a third party review confirmed that there were no current co-locations available.

PUBLIC HEARING

Ms. Andrea Repinsky said the neighborhood was opposed to construction of the tower. She expressed concern about it being a visual intrusion and the potential health effects.

Mr. Michael Almon, Brookcreek Neighborhood Association, said the surrounding area was primarily residential with commercial uses in the area, not industrial. He felt the tower was an accessory use to an existing business on site. He said the equipment cabinets were larger than the primary structure and expressed concern about the fall zone.

Ms. Martha Chapin, Woods on 19th Homeowners Association, said she did not receive notice of the item. She said there was no photo simulation from her neighborhood. She stated there were lots of families and children living in the area. She expressed concern about property values and the impact of lost taxes over time on the city.

Ms. Day showed the notification area on the overhead, which included two property owners inside The Woods neighborhood. She said there was no specific study done regarding tax issues.

Mr. Russell Livingston, 1712 Learnard Ave, said he did not want a cell tower in his backyard. He wondered what other locations the tower could be located on, such as the grain elevators.

Mr. Byron Wiley asked why a cellular antenna could not go on the existing grain elevator nearby. He said the burden of proof to show there was not another good location was on the applicant.

Ms. Bonnie Efman said she lives in the Barker neighborhood and that she was not notified and that it was not appropriate for the neighborhood. She said she was a Verizon user and she has no issues. She expressed concern about potential health issues.

Commissioner Liese asked staff to discuss accessory use and address the health effects of radio towers.

Mr. McCullough said it was a Special Use Permit, not an accessory use. He said no tower would be an accessory use because it was a primary use when introduced onto a property. He said they were accessory on a few districts, such as the Hospital District and the GPI District.

Commissioner Liese asked if a cell tower would be an accessory use if it was being used for that business.

Mr. McCullough said yes. He said the 1996 Telecommunications Act specifically prohibited jurisdictions from looking at health impacts that may or may not be caused by cellular antennas. He said by Federal Law Planning Commission was not to take that into consideration.

Mr. Randy Larkin, staff attorney, said if the radio emissions at the site were within the federal guidelines then the local jurisdiction was prohibited from looking at health impacts.

Mr. McCullough said it was the first set of new towers for the community in several years. He said the City hired a third party review, with the applicant's funds, to justify and confirm building a new tower versus co-locating. He said the Code required that a tower be able to carry at least two providers to allow for co-location. He said it was allowed in residential districts with a Special Use Permit but staff encourages applicants to locate within non-residential districts.

Commissioner Liese asked staff to address co-location on the grain tower.

Ms. Day said part of the third party review was to look at other structures. She said it was evaluated by Burns & McDonnell and they concluded that the applicant provided reasonable burden of proof that the structure would not support the Verizon plan. She said moving farther outside of the search ring would involve installing another antenna to sync up with it.

APPLICANT CLOSING COMMENTS

Mr. Goble said this location was chosen because the property was zoned industrial and that it was the closest industrially zoned land to the center of the target. He said he had conversations with the people who own the grain elevator and the site did not work because there were environmental impact concerns. He said it was also too far away for it to work. He said they exhausted all other possible options.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner von Achen asked how wide the tower was.

Mr. Goble said at the base of the 120' tower it was roughly 3' diameter and tapers as it nears the top. He said the top was approximately 1' in diameter.

Commissioner Britton asked why the tower was only 120' high.

Mr. Goble said they did not need the more height for their coverage objective.

Commissioner Britton asked how many co-locations could be on the antenna.

Mr. Goble said the antenna was designed for three carriers. He said Verizon would be at the top and two co-locaters could be below.

Commissioner Kelly asked if a 120' tower was needed based on other towers in the area.

Mr. Goble said coverage was always based on where other towers were and the topography of the ground, density of buildings, number of users, population, etc.

Commissioner Kelly said the maps the applicant showed tonight were different than what Verizon shows as their coverage on their website.

Mr. Goble said he was not a marketing person and he could not speak to what the map was showing.

Commissioner Denney said a statement was made by the public regarding the change in the character of the neighborhood. He asked if a tower could be built like this in a commercial area with a Special Use Permit.

Ms. Day said yes. She said the Special Use Permit would not alter the base zoning district, that was a separate action.

Commissioner Denney said a tower could still be built if the property was zoned commercial with a Special Use Permit.

Ms. Day said that was correct.

Commissioner Culver asked about co-location of equipment for other carriers and if that would be considered a Special Use, not an accessory use.

Ms. Day said the ground equipment was included.

Commissioner Britton asked if a small, but just as tall, grain elevator could be built at the site.

Ms. Day said potentially yes. She said there were some height limitations of the district. She said there were some exemptions from communications from the overall height of the base district.

Commissioner Britton asked what the height restriction was for the industrial district.

Mr. McCullough said 75'.

Commissioner Liese asked how the community should treat aesthetic issues.

Mr. McCullough said that screening of the base was possible. He said in urbanized areas these were some of the supporting uses that were needed for the life the community leads. He said there was no way to hide a tower but that a monopole design could be encouraged versus the lattice design, which was a little less visible over time.

Commissioner Britton said he was dissatisfied with the federal law that said they could not consider factors related to health or safety. He said it boiled down to aesthetics and the classic "not in my backyard" problem. He said he was trying to picture where other cell towers were located around town but he couldn't although he would probably notice it in his backyard. He said it was unfortunate that some have to bear the burden of others but he did not think it was a reason to deny the request. He said the land was zoned industrial and had been zoned for a more intense use for a long time. He said it was aesthetics versus utility and that it should probably be approved. He said over time it would become part of the landscape the way the grain elevator or campus buildings had become.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Commissioner Britton, seconded by Commissioner Culver, to approve the Special Use Permit, SUP-14-00312, for a communication tower located at 1725 Bullene Ave and forwarding the request to the City Commission with a recommendation of approval, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to release of the site plan for issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall provide the following changes and documentation:
 - a. Submission of documentation to demonstrate the tower fall zone will be maintained within the proposed enclosure area.
 - b. Submission of lighting details to show the fixture type, lamp type and size not to exceed 150 watt incandescent lighting, and cut-off feature to shield and direct light downward.
2. Provision of a revised site plan to include a landscape plan per City Staff approval that shows additional landscape to include evergreen shrubs planted 5' on center along the west half of the north property line to provide screening between the proposed tower and the abutting residential zoning to the north.

Commissioner Denney agreed with Commissioner Britton. He said aesthetics was a hard one to deal with. He said aesthetics was a hard issue and that many communities had built into their regulations "stealth" antennas. He said a monopole was a vast improvement over the old cell towers. He said with the advancement of LTE systems they would probably see more of these towers. He said it might be worth Planning Commission's time to have staff look at an addition to the Code for aesthetic improvements that "stealth" antennas could provide.

Commissioner Kelly said the information regarding the grain tower was helpful. He said he liked this area of town and that it had exciting character with industry next to residential. He struggled with the zone of notification for something so tall. He felt that it made more sense to include a larger area of notification due to the extreme height of the use. He said he supported this because it was consistent with the use. He said it was the balance of the community needs versus the abutting use of residential to industrial.

Commissioner Josserand said he was disappointed with the 200' property owner notification on such a tall tower. He felt the notification range was too narrow. He said he was a believer in telecommunications and that a resident in the Barker neighborhood had complained to him about Verizon's service.

Mr. McCullough said public notice was sent to the Brookcreek Neighborhood and The Woods on 19th Homeowner Association (Tyler Edwards).

Commissioner Struckhoff said he was a member of the Burroughs Corridor Plan Committee. He wished they could have used the grain elevator and he would like to see Code changes to improve aesthetics for the future.

Commissioner Liese said he was in favor of increased public notification but he did not see any evidence that they would have gotten different information if more people were at the meeting. He said if he thought there was more to learn he might have requested a delay but there did not seem to be more information to obtain from the public. He said they needed utilities to live the life they want to live. He said it was part of life to support that.

Commissioner von Achen said she would support the motion. She said she lived in the country and she would not want it in her backyard. She said if she lived adjacent to industrially zoned property this was one of the least objectionable possibilities that could be there.

Unanimously approved 8-0.

PC Minutes 11/17/14

ITEM NO. 3 TEXT AMENDMENT FOR PARKING & ACCESS STANDARDS (SMS)

TA-13-00235: Consider proposed Text Amendments to the City of Lawrence Land Development Code, Article 9 and related sections of Chapter 20, for comprehensive revisions to parking and access standards.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Ms. Sheila Stogsdill presented the item. Said she would like general agreement by Planning Commission on direction for staff. She said staff could then take those changes and have other departments look at it for further discussion.

Commissioner Liese said he would like to limit what could be stored in a yard to one recreational vehicle/RV and one boat, with neither being allowed in the front yard. He said there was no reason to have two campers in a yard. He felt that one boat and one camper was fine.

Commissioner Josserand said that would exclude a particular house in west Lawrence that had a sail boat and motor boat.

Commissioner Denney wondered about a house within the city limits on an acre lot.

Commissioner Liese said it would start to look like a boat shop or RV lot once there were multiple of each.

Commissioner Denny wondered if it would still matter if it was screened by trees and could not be seen from the street.

Commissioner Liese said it was not fair for neighbors to look at multiple boats on a lot.

Commissioner Kelly said they discussed at their Mid-Month about how people who own RV's and boats should consider the cost of owning and storing them. He said he was leaning more toward allowing storage in the backyard versus front or side yard.

Commissioner Britton said he generally agreed with Commissioner Kelly regarding owners thinking about storage when purchasing an RV or boat. He said he would not like seeing that in his neighborhood and liked the idea of restricting storage to the side or backyard.

Commissioner Denney wondered about driveways that go all the way to the back of a property.

Commissioner Liese said it could be parked beyond the face of the house.

Commissioner Von Achen asked if two or three boats/RV's could be parked inside a garage.

Ms. Stogsdill said that was correct.

Commissioner Britton said he would be interested in knowing an advocates position for wanting the ability to park in a front yard.

Ms. Stogsdill said if a home was built to the setbacks there would not be enough physical space to park on the side or to get access to the backyard.

Commissioner Liese said if a yard was that small then it shouldn't have a boat or RV in it.

Mr. McCullough said the survey that was conducted provided an overwhelming response to have the ability to park an RV or boat in the driveway in the front yard. He said staff's suggestion at the Mid-Month was to allow at least one in the driveway and then get a safe distance back from the street and/or sidewalk so there was site distance ability. He said if everything was behind the front building it would be contradictory to what the unscientific study reflected.

Commissioner Liese asked the audience to provide their thoughts.

PUBLIC HEARING

Ms. Candice Davis said she liked the idea of no parking in the front yard. She said she liked the idea of backyard and side yard better. She said there would people who could not afford storage and would like to store it in the driveway. She said in the Oread neighborhood it would be a problem to park RV's and boats.

Ms. Cille King, League of Women Voters, said the letter they sent addressed most of their concerns. She said maybe a canoe could be in the side yard but not bigger boats. She said people on the committee did not want to see storage in the front or side yard.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Kelly said having nothing in the front yard went against what the survey showed. He liked the idea of high profile versus low profile.

Commissioner Denney asked if RV/boats had to be parked on an improved surface, not gravel.

Ms. Stogsdill said Section 908 stated some form of pavement or alternate paving blocks. She said there was allowance for gravel on lots in the floodplain.

Commissioner Denney said he liked the idea of separating low profile versus high profile. He did not feel they should start legislating what looked good. He felt they should base this on safety issues. He said the issue of screening was appropriate but he was opposed to saying 'if you live in Lawrence you can only own one of these and one of these at your house, regardless of its shape.'

Commissioner Liese said if he did not think they should talk about aesthetics then he shouldn't talk about screening. He asked Commissioner Denney if he supported the requirement of keeping the lawn mown versus growing to chest height.

Commissioner Denney he felt there was a difference between the two. He said there was a community hazard in terms of mosquitos, snakes, and critters that crawl around in overgrown grass.

Commissioner Britton said the Code did deal with aesthetics to a certain degree and he did not think it was outside of their purview but felt safety was more of a concern. He said aesthetics was one of the most important things to homeowner enjoyment and where people choose to live.

Commissioner Liese said he ran some other numbers on the survey. He said the sampling was pretty random and nothing was done to determine the interest in the survey. He said the survey neglected to ask whether people owned an RV or boat. He said in all likelihood everyone who owns an RV or boat and knew about the survey probably responded.

Commissioner Britton inquired about public notice for the Text Amendment.

Ms. Stogsdill said the item was published in the legal notice section of the newspaper and also sent out to the normal list serve that receive Planning Commission agendas. She said she also had contact from a local architect about a specific section so some adjustments were made based on those comments. She said it was sent out to the typical design professionals that submit most of the site plan work to the Planning office.

Commissioner Britton asked how the web survey was distributed.

Ms. Stogsdill said it was on the City's website and was distributed to multiple list serves. She said the City's Communication Manager also did a press release as well as it being included in the Journal World's Town Talk article.

Commissioner Denney said they should not put too much stock in the survey. He felt most of the issues could be addressed in an objective manor based on safety. He felt 18' from the curb was reasonable.

Commissioner Liese wondered if they could place the item on multiple agendas to discuss over several months before voting on everything.

Mr. McCullough said this was the type of item that would get legs once it hit City Commission so it could come back to Planning Commission at that point.

Commissioner Liese suggested they discuss the topic until 10:00pm and then table to the next meeting.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Commissioner Denney, seconded by Commissioner Culver, that they accept standard number 1 as written by staff:

1. *RV-type items should be parked (on improved surface) in the front and exterior side yards. Proposed text permits with distance requirement of 18 feet (car length) from back of curb or edge of street pavement. (See map attached illustrating street improvements, sidewalk, and property line in typical 60' right-of-way.)*

Ms. Stogsdill reviewed the diagram with them.

Commissioner Culver said the 18' was self-limiting. He said he had hard time penalizing those that only had the option of front yard parking with no side or backyard.

Commissioner Kelly said he saw question 1 as more than two questions. He said they have to first decide 18' and then decide if they were allowed in the side yard.

Commissioner Struckhoff said it would be self-limiting and perspective RV owners would be advised to heed that. He said existing RV owners would have to move their RV.

Commissioner Struckhoff said the setback would govern other issues. He appreciated the high profile versus low profile designations.

Commissioner Liese said he would vote against the motion because RV and boat owners should include appropriate parking in their expenses. He said he would approve side or backyard parking but not front yard.

Commissioner Britton asked if they could deal differently with people who already had an RV and parked them in front versus those who purchase an RV.

Mr. McCullough said no, this type of Code would not receive grandfathering non-conforming rights. He said people could seek a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Commissioner Josserand said they could amortize current owners out over time before they have to follow the rule.

Motion failed 3-5, with Commissioners Culver, Denney, and Struckhoff voting in favor of the motion. Commissioners Britton, Josserand, Kelly, Liese, and von Achen voted against the motion.

Commissioner Britton said he would feel more comfortable allowing current RV owners a certain amount of time until new regulations would take effect.

Mr. McCullough said there could be a delayed effective date.

Commissioner Liese said he would be in favor of waiting a year or two to allow people time.

Commissioner Kelly said they needed to start with the idea of if they think 18' is the right distance for safety reasons with 2 year amortization. He said while the average setback was there if an RV was longer than that there could be multiple.

Commissioner Liese said one potential motion was to allow RV's to be parked on exterior side yards on improved surfaces so there wouldn't be the 18' issue.

Motioned by Commissioner Liese, seconded by Commissioner von Achen, to allow RV items to be parked on improved surfaces on exterior side yards with a distance of 18' from the curb or edge of street pavement.

Motion carried 8-0.

Motioned by Commissioner Culver, seconded by Commissioner Denney, to allow RV type items to be parked on improved surfaces in the front of a property with a distance of 18' from the curb or edge of street pavement.

Commissioner von Achen asked if it was possible to make a stipulation that parking was not allowed in the front of the property unless there was no way to park on the side or back due to size.

Mr. McCullough said it was a possibility but it may require driveway extensions that people may not want.

Commissioner Britton said he did not want to create something that would be difficult to enforce. He said part of the cost of owning an RV was being able to store it in a way that was appropriate for the

neighborhood. He said there was nothing unfair with recognizing that it was part of the cost of owning that type of equipment.

Commissioner Britton said he would oppose the motion as is because he would support allowing continued parking in the front for another year or two.

Commissioner Liese said he agreed with Commissioner Britton.

Motion failed 3-5, with Commissioners Culver, Denney, and Struckhoff voting in favor of the motion. Commissioners Britton, Josserand, Kelly, Liese, and von Achen voted against the motion.

Motioned by Commissioner Liese, seconded by Commissioner Struckhoff, to allow RV type items to be parked on improved surfaces in the backyard with a buffer of 2' all around.

Motion carried 8-0.

Commissioner Kelly wondered if they voted against the front yard parking in order to allow residents time.

Commissioner Liese said he would support a motion to prohibit parking in the front yard that didn't go into effect for 1-2 years.

Commissioner Denney said he would be comfortable with 18' distance and a 2 year amortization.

Commissioner Kelly said the 18' distance would self-regulate.

Motioned by Commissioner von Achen, seconded by Commissioner Struckhoff, to allow RV type items to be parked on improved surfaces on interior side yards with a buffer of 2'.

Motion carried 8-0.

Planning Commission will continue discussion on the topic at their December 2014 meeting.

PC Minutes 11/17/14

**ITEM NO. 4 INITIATE TEXT AMENDMENT FOR INCUBATOR SPACE FOR
BUSINESS/ENTREPRENEURIAL COLLABORATION & PROTOTYPING**

Consider initiation of a Text Amendment to the City of Lawrence Land Development Code to add a *Use* that provides incubator space for business/entrepreneurial collaboration and prototyping. Staff will provide a memo for the commission consideration regarding options and articles within the Development Code that would need to be amended.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mr. McCullough said the staff memo spoke for itself and staff was supportive of initiating the Text Amendment.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Commissioner Kelly, seconded by Commissioner Britton, to initiate the Text Amendment and consider the item at a future Planning Commission meeting.

Motion carried 8-0.

PC Minutes 11/17/14

**ITEM NO. 5 INITIATE TEXT AMENDMENT FOR SHORT-TERM LOAN OR CAR TITLE
LOAN (MKM)**

Consider Initiation of a Text Amendment to the City of Lawrence Land Development Code to create a use group for short-term loan or car title loan business, or similar business, and establish standards.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Britton said he liked the idea behind this Text Amendment.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Commissioner Britton, seconded by Commissioner von Achen, to initiate the Text Amendment and consider the item at a future Planning Commission meeting.

Motion carried 8-0.

PC Minutes 11/17/14

ITEM NO. 6 LONG-RANGE PLANNING WORK PROGRAM UPDATE

Long-Range Planning Work Program Update.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mr. McCullough said all staff resources would be going into the Comprehensive Plan in the coming year.

NO ACTION TAKEN

PC Minutes 11/17/14

MISCELLANEOUS NEW OR OLD BUSINESS

Consideration of any other business to come before the Commission.

MISC NO. 1 DISCUSS APPOINTMENT OF PC MEMBER TO LAWRENCE ARTS COMMISSION AS EX OFFICIO MEMBER

Discuss appointment of PC member to Lawrence Arts Commission as ex officio member.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Commissioner Liese said Planning Commission was invited to officially designate a member to the Lawrence Arts Commission. He said having a permanent appointment could be time consuming and wasn't necessarily directly related to Planning Commission items. He suggested a volunteer be involved but not a permanent position.

Commissioner Josserand said the ordinance was so old that it no longer had meaning. He said he was not sure how the Lawrence Arts Commission could profit from having a Planning Commission member on it. He felt someone like Commissioner Kelly should do it because he had served on the Lawrence Arts Commission. He suggested the ordinance be changed.

Commissioner Kelly said the issue came up with the 9th Street Corridor Plan and having a Planning Commissioner involved provided a planning perspective. He said he currently served on the Lawrence Arts Commission and felt the ordinance should not be changed.

Commissioner Liese asked how often the Lawrence Arts Commission met.

Commissioner Kelly said once a month.

Commissioner Liese asked Commissioner Kelly to start reporting monthly to Planning Commission about the meeting since he serves on the Lawrence Arts Commission.

Commissioner Kelly said the ordinance could be amended to say that if a Planning Commission member was already on the Lawrence Arts Commission then that would fill that requirement.

General Public Comment

Ms. Candice Davis, Oread Residents Association & Lawrence Association of Neighborhoods, expressed concern about parking with duplexes. She asked that they no longer allow stacked parking for duplexes.

Mr. McCullough said it would be one of the questions of the Article 9 amendment process.