



**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**September 21, 2015**  
**Meeting Minutes**

---

September 21, 2015 – 6:30 p.m.

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

Staff present: McCullough, Crick, Day, Larkin, M. Miller, Ewert

---

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

Receive and amend or approve the minutes from the Planning Commission meeting of August 24, 2015.

Motioned by Commissioner Kelly, seconded by Commissioner Culver, to approve the August 24, 2015 Planning Commission minutes.

Approved 9-0.

**COMMITTEE REPORTS**

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

Commissioner Britton said the Horizon 2020 Steering Committee met and that Planning Commission would have a discussion about that later tonight.

**EX PARTE / ABSTENTIONS / DEFERRAL REQUEST**

- No ex parte.
- No abstentions.

PC Minutes 9/21/15

**ITEM NO. 1 SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR ROCK CHALK PARK; 6100 ROCK CHALK DR  
(MKM)**

**SUP-15-00334:** Consider a Special Use Permit for an *Active Recreation* use, an indoor/outdoor KU Tennis Facility, at Rock Chalk Park, located at 6100 Rock Chalk Drive (associated with 100 Rock Chalk Lane). Submitted by Paul Werner Architects, for RCP LLC (City of Lawrence equitable owner, IRB), property owner of record.

**STAFF PRESENTATION**

Ms. Mary Miller presented the item.

**APPLICANT PRESENTATION**

Mr. Paul Werner, Paul Werner Architects, agreed with the staff report conditions.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

Mr. Rick Hird, Petefish, Immel, & Heeb Law Firm, representing Mr. Jack Graham. He said when the Special Use Permit (SUP) for Rock Chalk Park was approved by City Commission there was an issue with the lighting. He said the lighting was installed with poles that were higher than allowed by Code, without filing a photometric plan, and in violation of the terms of the SUP. He said the City Commission granted the SUP, approved the photometric plan, and by the time it got to City Commission the lights had been up for a long time. He said he asked City Commission to require the most effective glare control for the lights. He stated Commissioner Farmer said he was tired of the nit picking and whining. He said his client was not objecting to Rock Chalk Park because it was a done deal. He felt Planning Commission had an obligation under the ordinance that says the lighting shall be designed to the maximum extent feasible to minimize adverse impacts on traffic safety and nuisance impacts. He referenced an email sent on April 21, 2014 from Mr. Stephen McDowell to the City Commissioners, which talked about the glare and light trespass being unacceptable. He felt it was important to mitigate the impact to the maximum extent feasible. He wondered if there were potentially better shields available. He said the photometric plan did not measure glare, only the footprint on the ground below. He said his client appreciated the building location but it did not block the glare. He asked Planning Commission to make sure that the inquiry and research had been done that these were the best possible fixtures. He said additional shields could be installed to not adversely impact neighbors. He showed a shield example on the overhead.

**APPLICANT CLOSING COMMENTS**

Mr. Werner said Mr. Hird's assessment that this was discussed at City Commission was right. He said a special consultant reviewed the photometric plan. He said the lights needed to work for Rock Chalk Park to work. He said the Sports Pavilion tennis court lights impacted Mr. Graham the most. He said the lights for this tennis facility were ½ mile away and the tennis court lights were only 50' tall. He stated the time would be limited for use. He said tennis was not really a winter sport so when the trees have lost their leaves it would probably not be in use.

**COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Liese said the lighting in the past had not been reviewed as much as he would have liked. He felt the request was a reasonable one but he was not sure how to achieve it. He felt they should figure out the very best way that all parties could get what they wanted and the community could get what they need.

*Complete audio & video from this meeting can be found online:*  
<http://www.lawrenceks.org/boards/planning-commission/agendas>

Commissioner Butler asked if the design that Mr. Hird showed on the overhead was available now.

Mr. Hird said it was his understanding that the shield was available now.

Mr. Werner said that information was not shared with him. He said the photometric plans did not show glare. He said even with a shield the lamp would still be seen from certain angles. He stated shields might require more lights to be installed. He stated the consultant could look at it again. He said these lights were the farthest away and not as tall.

Commissioner Butler asked if the lighting had been designed to the maximum extent possible.

Mr. Werner said it was a reasonable solution and the City Commission made that call when they approved the plans. He said Free State High did not have shields at all. He said glare was hard to measure and putting something on the lamps would probably require more lights.

Commissioner Liese asked staff about each party paying for half of the fees for an expert and have that expert be the deciding factor.

Mr. McCullough said the glare was a biggest concern with the lights. He said there were houses much closer to the west, for example, that shared the full brunt of some of the lights that faced west. He said the impact depended on the location of where you were compared to the light fixture and topography. He said when they looked at this the first time they had the benefit of different types of lights in a brochure. He said the way they approached this then and now is looking at the location of the tennis facility building with the light poles themselves, knowing the building would shield most of the glare from the lights. He said the conditions dictate cut off times and light levels. He could not say whether this was the best of the best in terms of cutoff fixtures. He said staff recommended feasible conditions to mitigate the impact.

Commissioner Liese asked what would protect Mr. Graham from choosing a consultant that would be paid by someone with a stake in it.

Mr. McCullough said there was a consultant the first time and the outcome of that was mixed. He said there was a recommendation from Mr. Graham to employ better shields. He said the lights were already up so staff employed cutoff times as well. He said it was impossible to screen field lights but they could be mitigated in a feasible way.

Commissioner Liese asked Mr. Hird about the essence of his client's request.

Mr. Hird said the essence of the request was that his client wanted to know that this was the best possible alternative shield. He said the lights at Rock Chalk Park on the 100' poles created intrusive glare into his home. He said his client wanted the lights to mitigate the glare to the maximum extent possible.

Commissioner Liese suggested a consultant agreed upon by all parties that would be neutral.

## **ACTION TAKEN**

*Complete audio & video from this meeting can be found online:*  
<http://www.lawrenceks.org/boards/planning-commission/agendas>

Motioned by Commissioner Liese, seconded by Commissioner Struckhoff, to approve the Special Use Permit, SUP-15-00334, for the additional *Active Recreation* use at Rock Chalk Park subject to the following conditions:

1. Provision of an executed Site Plan Performance Agreement.
2. Dedication of utility easement by separate instrument for the sanitary sewer main.
3. Prior to the item being considered by the City Commission, Staff will review, in consultation with lighting designers, the shielding specifications proposed for the tennis court lights to insure that the lighting has been designed, to the maximum extent feasible, to minimize nuisance impacts (glare) on residential property.
4. Provision of a revised plan with the following changes:
  - a. Addition of the following note: *"The KU tennis court lights shall be shut off no later than 10:30 PM Sunday through Thursday and no later than 11:00 PM on Friday and Saturday nights; unless there is a tournament that runs past that time."*
  - b. The plan should note the type of screening to be used for the trash receptacles/dumpsters and mechanical equipment.
  - c. Revised water and sanitary sewer lines per the City Utility Department's approval.
  - d. Show and label the 20 ft Landscape Easement on the south side of Rock Chalk Drive right-of-way.
  - e. Show the easement for the sanitary sewer main and note the Recording Information (Book and Page Number).

Commissioner von Achen asked Mr. Hird to put the shield picture back on the overhead. She asked if they were clip on and would be added to the existing lights.

Mr. Hird said he did not know.

Mr. McCullough said he thought they were designed as a series of light fixtures that were attachments to the bare fixture.

Mr. Werner said shields would require adding more lamps. He stated the lighting consultant that Gould Evans used found it met the Code. He said separate photometric plans were submitted for each field individually. He said the Sports Pavilion lights were the closest to Mr. Graham's house.

Commissioner von Achen asked if the lights could be directed more downward.

Mr. McCullough said the taller the lights were the more direct downward they could be pointed, but would depend on the topography. He said there were a lot of variables with light design.

Commissioner Culver asked staff to elaborate more on process regarding a consultant providing info to City Commission.

Mr. McCullough preferred not putting the applicant and neighbor in the position of agreeing on an outcome. He said staff would be more comfortable with looking into better shielding options to present to the City Commission. He said that could have additional impacts, such as more fixtures.

Commissioner Sands asked if the lighting on T3 was the concern (referring to plan that Mr. Werner had on the overhead).

Mr. Werner said T3 was the lighting Mr. Graham was concerned about. He said T5 and T6 would not impact Mr. Graham.

Commissioner Kelly asked about the brightness of a foot candle.

Mr. McCullough said a foot candle was pretty dim..

Commissioner Kelly asked how often KU televised tennis matches.

Mr. Werner said their existing facility was not lit so it was not an option currently.

Commissioner Kelly asked how often the high lighting would be used.

Mr. Werner said rarely and that they would not be on when not needed since they would be paying the electric bill.

Commissioner Kelly asked how often a game might go past the amount of time listed.

Mr. Werner said very rarely.

Commissioner Liese asked if the applicant would be comfortable with a consultant taking another look at the lights.

Mr. Werner said yes. He said he preferred the word 'appropriate' for lighting, versus 'best.'

Commissioner Denney asked if these were the same lights used elsewhere in Rock Chalk Park.

Mr. Werner said yes, but on much lower poles.

Commissioner Denney said he was not sure about the difference between brightness and glare. He asked if they were really talking about glare or about where the lights were aimed. He wondered if it was really a shielding issue they were talking about.

Mr. Werner said he was comfortable with how low the lights were and where the building was.

Commissioner Culver said there may not be full agreement on both sides for what was the best possible lighting.

Mr. Hird said he was in favor of having an independent consultant look at this. He stated the ordinance said to the maximum extent feasible.

Commissioner Culver said he would like to see the language maximum extent feasible in the motion.

Commissioners Liese and Struckhoff were comfortable with that language as part of the motion.

Commissioner Struckhoff asked if any consideration had been given to a remedy such as a tree line between Mr. Graham's property and Rock Chalk Park.

Mr. McCullough said essentially there were trees between the two properties. He said his assumption was that the fixtures could not be seen when the trees had leaves. He said at certain angles the lights could be seen because the trees were not dense enough.

Commissioner Britton said he was having trouble with the idea of a consultant instead of trusting staff to look at it. He said it seemed like this could be one of those things that staff can determine and he would rely on their expertise. He trusted staff and he felt they had done a good job. He did not want to set a precedent for a second lighting study.

Mr. McCullough said Mr. Hird was asking for an exercise in reviewing options to see if a longer shield would help. He said originally the City paid for the consultant to look at the design. He said if the issue was Mr. Graham seeing a lightbulb a ½ mile away then staff would concentrate on the T3 area and eastern poles to see if longer shields could be installed.

Commissioner Britton asked who would be deciding the best feasible option.

Mr. McCullough said staff had employed full cutoff fixtures, time limits, and a ½ mile distance between the concerned property and the lighted site. He said staff did not pursue all the different detailed options by all the different manufacturers. He said the City did have some expertise with the topic, especially Parks & Rec, with all the different courts and fields the City lights. He said he was not sure a third party would be as helpful. He said what would be helpful was to document the facts of the proposed lights, fixtures available, and why they could or could not be employed.

Commissioner Britton asked if the motion was to have consultant decided whether lighting design would mitigate the adverse effects to the maximum feasible extent. He said he was concerned about giving the consultant the job of deciding that instead of staff. He said he would be more comfortable if a consultant advised and allowed staff to actually determine it.

Commissioner Kelly said he did not want to lose context of all the things that had been done to mitigate the glare. He stated this project had history and the City was the applicant. He said he was more comfortable with a consultant providing input.

Mr. McCullough clarified the City was not the applicant and it was not a City driven project. He said the City was an owner listed because of the industrial revenue bonds associated with it. He said KU was the owner.

Commissioner Denney asked if staff felt like they had looked at this to the degree that they could say the maximum feasible system was being recommended.

Mr. McCullough said staff felt it was a reasonable package of mitigation applied but that they could provide additional information and options to present to the City Commission.

Commissioner von Achen asked if the lights would be on when the courts were not in use.

Mr. McCullough said it was his understanding no since it would cost money to run the lights.

Commissioner von Achen noted the staff report recommendation of 5,300 parking spaces but the applicant had another parking study which reduced it to less than half of that to 2,100 parking spaces.

Ms. Miller said the 5,300 was the amount of parking for a bigger event, such as relays. She said the bigger events would not all be accommodated by parking on site and would include a shuttle. She said there were 2,500 parking spots on site. She stated there would never be an activity in all the facilities at one time, they would be staggered.

Unanimously approved 9-0.

PC Minutes 9/21/15

**ITEM NO. 2A PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR 6<sup>th</sup> & MONTEREY WAY PCD  
MORGAN ADDITION; 800 MONTEREY WAY (MKM)**

**PDP-15-00378:** Consider a revised Preliminary Development Plan for a multi-use development consisting of multi-dwelling structures, a detached dwelling, and construction sales and services and associated variance from building setback requirement. 6<sup>th</sup> & Monterey Way PCD Morgan Addition, located on approximately 2.5 acres at 800 Monterey Way. Submitted by Allen Belot Architect, for Robert J. and Beverly G. Morgan, property owners of record.

**ITEM NO. 2B FINAL PLAT FOR MORGAN ADDITION; 800 MONTEREY WAY (MKM)**

**PF-15-00380:** Consider a Final Plat for Morgan Addition, a 2 lot subdivision on approximately 2.5 acres located at 800 Monterey Way. Submitted by Landplan Engineering, for Robert J. and Beverly G. Morgan, property owners of record.

**STAFF PRESENTATION**

Ms. Mary Miller presented Items 2A & 2B together.

**APPLICANT PRESENTATION**

Mr. Allen Belot, Allen Belot Architect, agreed with the staff report. He said there was a preservation plan to save as many trees as possible. He said he did not have any problem with evergreen trees, as discussed in the communication letter that was included in the packet. He said regarding the connection there were five different property owners and his clients did not want to play referee to getting the others to agree.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

Mr. Don Dhans said he lived south of the proposed building and he liked the greenspace near his property. He expressed concern about keeping some of the greenspace as a buffer. He liked that the apartments would be two story instead of three story. He also said he would like a privacy fence. He also expressed concern about lighting and property values.

Mr. Chad Simpson said he liked the greenspace and wanted to maintain some of that. He expressed concern about property values going down. He said he would like a privacy fence. He stated he wanted access to Comet Lane opened up.

Ms. Judy Brynds said she liked the privacy that the greenspace provided. She expressed concern about property values.

**APPLICANT CLOSING COMMENTS**

Mr. Belot said the buffer zone on the south side would be preserved. He said he had no problem with evergreen trees as requested by the public. He stated the back of the building would have no different lighting than the patio lighting of the existing houses in that area. He did not see how a fence would add to the visual value of the tree line and felt it would be redundant. He said they would probably have to tear up trees to install a fence. He stated installing a fence instead of trees could potentially be an alternative.

**COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

*Complete audio & video from this meeting can be found online:  
<http://www.lawrenceks.org/boards/planning-commission/agendas>*



Commissioner Britton asked staff if the connection to Comet Lane was something City Commission would consider.

Mr. McCullough said it was a condition of approval and ultimately the decision of City Commission. He said staff was recommending that connection be made and other things would follow that connection.

Commissioner Kelly asked Mr. Belot about why the shop was designed where it was.

Mr. Belot said it was a neat little house with a rural feeling. He said the house had a neat scale and qualities to it. He felt that putting a two car garage in front of the house would be an insult to the house. He stated as a compromise the garage was pulled back so it wasn't the dominant architectural element when you look at the front of the house from the street. He said there was a fence and mature trees in the back. He stated the impact of the 9' was more of a benefit to the streetscape since more people would see it from the front than the back. He said nobody would see the back because there were 30' mature trees behind the garage.

Commissioner von Achen asked what the nature of the shop was. She asked if the shop was commercial.

Mr. Belot said Mr. Morgan had run a concrete business out of the shop for 35 years. He said the business had been reduced and had a significantly smaller imprint than 35 years ago. He said they need a place to park a few vehicles, especially in the winter time.

Commissioner von Achen asked Mr. Belot to discuss the west side of the plan (the area in blue).

Mr. Belot said it was the turf detention area. He said the size of it had been determined but not the material.

Commissioner Kelly struggled with the idea of moving the garage back to maintain the rural feel when it was next to apartment buildings. He said he would be more comfortable with moving the garage forward and maintain the space behind. He said the entire area still had nice stands of trees. He struggled with the variance of moving the garage back.

Mr. Dhans said his comment about installing a fence was to protect his property from people who might come on to his property.

Mr. David Roubison said he did not see how the trees could be kept. He was concerned about kids cutting through his yard. He said there was tons of room to put in a fence and keep the trees.

Ms. Miller said there was a utility easement on the property.

Mr. Belot said he thought by trying to preserve the trees it would provide a thick and adequate buffer. He said if a fence was installed he would want relief from tree replacement. He said a fence would block the view of the trees which would defeat the purpose of the trees.

Commissioner Sands said there was already an apartment complex to the north. He asked the neighbors if there had been any issues with kids or residents of those apartments encroaching.

Mr. Simpson said there have been several incidents in the years he had lived there. He said kids play in the greenspace and that his gate has been opened and things thrown into his yard. He said kids run back and forth quite a bit. He felt that retaining trees would no good because the greenspace was mostly thickets. He said there would be nothing dividing his property from apartments because the thick bushes would be ripped out and replaced with grass. He stated there was plenty of room for a fence.

Ms. Miller said the plan was to save as many trees as possible on the south side but that if any were destroyed during utilities or construction they would be replaced one for one. She said until a tree inventory was done they would not know exactly know how many trees there were.

Commissioner Britton said it sounded like if the trees worked out great but if they don't work out maybe there should be a fence.

Commissioner Sands pointed out this project was infill.

Commissioner von Achen asked Mr. Belot about the space between the neighbors and the tree line.

Mr. Belot used an aerial on the overhead to point out the tree line.

Commissioner von Achen asked if all the trees were on the Morgan property.

Mr. Belot said most of them. He said he would be happy to take out all the trees and put in a bufferyard as defined by Code. He wanted to preserve as many trees as possible.

Commissioner Denney asked how far it was from the nearest duplex to the back of the proposed apartment building.

Mr. Belot said about 60'-70' away from the apartment building.

Commissioner Denney said it looked like a narrow setback.

Mr. Belot said he was basing his figure on assumptions from the Code.

Commissioner Kelly said the fact was that someone else owned the greenspace. He said Mr. Belot was trying to work with the neighbors the best he could to preserve as much as he could. He said nothing was preventing the homeowners from installing a fence on their own property line to protect whatever they want to protect. He said it was tough because it was hard to make everyone happy.

#### **ACTION TAKEN on variance for Item 2A**

Motioned by Commissioner von Achen, seconded by Commissioner Butler, to approve the variance from the side setback and the rear and peripheral setback to allow the following to be located within the required setbacks:

1. The existing residence and proposed addition located within 12 ft 4 in of the east property line.
2. The proposed shop to be located within 21 ft of the south property line, subject to the following condition:

- a. Installation of a 6 ft privacy fence to the south of the shop and associated access drive to provide screening from the residential property to the south.

Commissioner Britton said he would support the motion because he put a lot of stock into staff's recommendation.

Commissioner Sands inquired about the setback.

Ms. Miller said it was a 20' setback.

Motion carried 8-1, with Commissioner Kelly voting in opposition.

### **ACTION TAKEN on 2A Preliminary Development Plan**

Motioned by Commissioner von Achen, seconded by Commissioner Butler, to approve the Preliminary Development Plan based upon the findings of fact presented in the body of the staff report and subject to the following conditions:

1. If the City Commission approves the connection of the shared access drive to Comet Lane, the sidewalk along the shared access drive will be extended to Comet Lane, the shared access drive shall be named, and the shared drive will be constructed to connect with Comet Lane.
2. Provision of a revised Preliminary Development Plan with the following changes:
  - a. Include a listing of the uses which are permitted in the PDP with the revised uses in the A-2 Phase: *Detached Dwelling* and *Construction Sales and Services*.
  - b. Show the complete PCD in the Preliminary Development Plan or provide a copy of the most recently approved PDP along with the revised PDP for this property.
  - c. If the City Commission approves the connection to Comet Lane, list the name of the shared access (private street) and show the shared access/private street and sidewalk being extended to connect to Comet Lane.
  - d. Revise the Interior Parking Lot Landscaping requirement.
  - e. Make revisions to the sanitary sewer and water lines/easements per the City Utilities Department's approval.
  - f. Note the amount of Common Open Space that is being provided and the percentage of the total site area that it includes and revise the pervious surface figure in the site summary.
  - g. If the variance from the southern setback is approved, show and label a fence to the south of the shop and associated access drive.

Commissioner Britton said the applicant was doing what was reasonable to preserve the quality of life that the foliage provided.

Commissioner Culver said there had been some accommodations of impact and scope of the project in addition to the greenspace. He said the three story apartment complex had been reduced to a two story apartment complex as a compromise to make it a smoother transition into the neighborhood.

Unanimously approved 9-0.

**ACTION TAKEN on 2B PF**

Motioned by Commissioner von Achen, seconded by Commissioner Denney, to approve the Final Plat for the Morgan Addition and forwarding it to the City Commission for acceptance of easements and rights-of-way, subject to the following conditions:

1. Provision of revised, executed Master Street Tree Plan with revised species and minor technical changes for recording.
2. Pinning of lots in accordance with Section 20-811(k) of the Subdivision Regulations.
3. Provision of a revised Final Plat with the following change:
  - a. Endorsements revised to reflect that the Planning Commission approved the Final Plat and the signature blank revised to 'Clay Britton, Planning Chair'.
  - b. Signature blanks for mayor and city clerk updated.
  - c. Easements revised, if necessary, to reflect those shown on the approved Preliminary Development Plan.

Unanimously approved 9-0.

PC Minutes 9/21/15

**ITEM NO. 3 FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR BAUER FARM CREDIT UNION; 4851  
BAUER FARM DR (SLD)**

**FDP-15-00373:** Consider a Final Development Plan for Bauer Farm Credit Union, located at 4851 Bauer Farm Dr. Submitted by Landplan Engineering, for Free State Holdings, Inc., property owner of record.

**STAFF PRESENTATION**

Ms. Sandra Day presented the item.

**APPLICANT PRESENTATION**

Mr. Brian Sturm, Landplan Engineering, agreed with the staff report.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

No public comment.

**COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Culver said the second shared access with CVS made sense to include if possible because a car going through the teller drive-thru may be able to get out of that circular pattern without waiting for other cars.

Ms. Day said it provided a pass-thru escape route.

Commissioner Sands asked if the existing sidewalks would remain.

Ms. Day said yes.

**ACTION TAKEN**

Motioned by Commissioner Struckhoff, seconded by Commissioner Culver, to approve the Final Development Plan based upon the findings of fact presented in the body of the Staff Report, subject to the following conditions:

1. Applicant shall submit a photometric plan including a point by point illumination array to show the lighting levels and fixture type are compliant with the standards in Section 20-1103(d)(3) prior to release of the Final Development Plan for issuance of a building permit.
2. Applicant shall submit a copy of the written permission from the adjacent property owner for shared access along the south property line prior to the release of the Final Development Plan.

Unanimously approved 9-0.

PC Minutes 9/21/15

**ITEM NO. 4 PRELIMINARY PLAT FOR DREAM HAVEN; 2910 PETERSON RD (MKM)**

**PP-15-00067:** Consider a Preliminary Plat for Dream Haven, a 7 lot residential subdivision containing approximately 9.3 acres, located at 2910 Peterson Road and adjacent parcels, and associated variances from the lot design and right-of-way width requirements in Section 20-810 of the Subdivision Regulations. Submitted by Treanor Architects, for David A. and Anne K. Gnojek and Dream Haven II LLC, property owners of record.

**STAFF PRESENTATION**

Ms. Mary Miller presented the item.

**APPLICANT PRESENTATION**

Mr. Matt Murphy, Treanor Architects, was present for questioning.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

No public comment.

**COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Sands inquired about the cul-de-sac.

Ms. Miller said there would be one additional lot, two lots total, with one driveway.

Commissioner Denney asked about the public comment letter which referred to losing land.

Ms. Miller said she did not know what the letter was referring to and that no land was being taken away from anyone.

**ACTION TAKEN on Variances and Preliminary Plat**

Motioned by Commissioner Kelly, seconded by Commissioner Culver, to approve the following variances and Preliminary Plat:

**Variance From Right-Of-Way Width:**

Variance requested from Section 20-810(e)(5)(i) subject to the following condition:

The plat shall be revised to note that a variance from the right-of-way width required in Section 20-810(e)(5) of the Subdivision Regulations was granted by the Planning Commission to allow the right-of-way on the subject property side of the center line to remain at 50 ft and list the date of approval.

**Variance From Lot Design Requirement:**

Variance requested from Section 20-810(a)(2)(i) subject to the following condition:

The plat shall be revised to note that a variance from the Lot design requirement in Section 20-810(a)(2)(i) of the Subdivision Regulations was granted by the Planning Commission to allow the creation of 2 lots with 30 ft of frontage on Durham Court provided the lots utilize a shared access.

**Preliminary Plat**

Preliminary Plat of Dream Haven II subject to the following conditions:

*Complete audio & video from this meeting can be found online:  
<http://www.lawrenceks.org/boards/planning-commission/agendas>*

1. Provision of a drainage study/dam rehab plan and Downstream Sanitary Sewer Analysis per City approval.
2. Applicant shall provide a revised preliminary plat with the following changes:
  - a. Addition of notes reflecting any variances that are approved.
  - b. Addition of a note designating maintenance responsibility for the prairie grass reserve area.

Unanimously approved 9-0.

PC Minutes 9/21/15

**ITEM NO. 5      ISSUE ACTION REPORT FROM H2020/COMP PLAN UPDATE STEERING COMMITTEE (JSC)**

Consider accepting the Issue Action Report from the Horizon 2020/Comprehensive Plan Update Steering Committee to provide the base for completing a new comprehensive plan. Adopt PC Resolution PCR-15-00414, and initiate Comprehensive Plan Amendment to make changes per Issue Action Report's direction if appropriate.

**STAFF PRESENTATION**

Mr. Jeff Crick presented the item.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

No public comment.

**COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Britton thanked staff for their work.

Commissioner Culver thanked Planning Commission members that helped with the steering committee. He said Planning Commission talked about creating a vision statement for the updated plan about a year ago and he liked seeing it implemented. He looked forward to seeing what staff did with this. He fully supported accepting the issue action report.

Commissioner Kelly said there were some themes that came out in the issue action report, such as a focus on neighborhoods. He felt they should pay attention to the use of outside advisory group's plans within the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Sands felt this was something they had needed for a long time. He said he was jealous he didn't get to participate in the steering committee.

Commissioner Denney appreciated all the work that went into this. He appreciated it was being put together by people who live in Lawrence, not an outside group.

Commissioner Kelly said the purpose and mission statement was developed by KU students and it was a great project for them since they were the generation that would benefit from the plan.

Commissioner von Achen asked if this would come back to Planning Commission after written.

Mr. Crick said yes.

**ACTION TAKEN**

Motioned by Commissioner Denney, seconded by Commissioner Sands, to adopt the issue action report and sign Planning Commission Resolution PCR-15-00414, forwarding the issue action report to the County Commissioners and City Commission.

Motion carried 9-0.





PC Minutes 9/21/15

### **MISCELLANEOUS NEW OR OLD BUSINESS**

Consideration of any other business to come before the Commission.

#### **MISC NO. 1 PC INVOLVEMENT WITH OTHER POLICY BOARDS**

Discussion about Planning Commission involvement with other policy boards.

Mr. McCullough said Commissioner von Achen requested to attend the Sustainability Advisory Committee.

Commissioner von Achen said one of the Sustainability Advisory Committee's goals this year was land use planning.

Commissioner Britton said if another board thinks having a Planning Commission member would be beneficial they could do that through their by-laws but he did not want it to be a requirement for Planning Commission. He didn't want to be in a position where Planning Commission members were attending too many meetings.

Mr. McCullough said there were a lot of other boards that make recommendations to City Commission that intertwine with each other, such as Board of Zoning Appeals and Historic Resources Commission. He said as issues come up it makes sense to look at those issue by issue and not mix boards too much because each one has a specific charge. He said they have had joint meetings with Historic Resources as issues have come up but do not sit on their board regularly because of the time and energy it would take.

Commissioner Culver said there was nothing in the Code that had to pass through the Sustainability Advisory Board since they were more initiative based. He said with Historic Resources Commission there may be issues triggered for a collaborative effort.

Mr. McCullough said Planning Commission could appoint a liaison to other advisory boards.

Commissioner Kelly said as the issues come forward they could consider them as a Commission, based on interest.

---

**ADJOURN 9:56pm**