Neighborhood and Community Development Committee
Standing Committee Meeting Agenda
Monday, June 01, 2015
6:00 PM

Location:
Municipal Office Building
701 N 7th Street
Kansas City, Kansas 66101
5th Floor Conference Room (Suite 515)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Hal Walker, Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Gayle Townsend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Brian McKiernan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Ann Brandau-Murguia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner James Walters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Call to Order / Roll Call

II. Approval of standing committee minutes from March 9 and 30, 2015

III. Committee Agenda

Item No. 1 - RESOLUTION: SILVER CITY URBAN RENEWAL PLAN

Synopsis:
A resolution setting a public hearing date of June 25, 2015, to consider an amendment to the Silver City Urban Renewal Plan, submitted by Marlon Goff, Economic Development.

It is requested that this item be fast tracked to the June 4, 2015 full commission meeting due to it being time sensitive.

Tracking #: 150143
Item No. 2 - COMMUNICATION: LAND BANK APPLICATIONS

Synopsis:
Communication requesting consideration of the following Land Bank applications, submitted by Chris Slaughter, Land Bank Manager. The Land Bank Advisory Board has recommended approval.

Applications for yard extension unless noted otherwise
2748 S. 8th Pl. - Rex Davis
2024 N. 13th St. - Yuri Garcia
810 Quindaro Blvd. - Jacquetta Noble
3049 N. 27th St. - Guiding Star MBC
3053 N. 27th St. - Guiding Star MBC
3055 N. 27th St. - Guiding Star MBC
951 Ray Ave. - Gloria Chela
1511 N. 26th St. - Brenda Nunez-Baltazar
1913 N. Thompson St. - Mt. Zion Economic Foundation, for future development
144 N. 61st St. - Phillip Brown for single-family construction

Transfer to Land Bank
450 Walker Ave. from City of KCK, future development request from Mt. Zion Economic Foundation and Rev. C.L. Bachus

Best & Final
3530 N. 35th St. - Michael Jackson for yard extension, Maria Flores for yard extension
On April 27, 2015, the Neighborhood and Community Development Standing Committee voted unanimously to hold this item over to June 1, 2015, and that the two parties be contacted to attend the meeting to answer questions.

Discussion: Wells Fargo REO Donation Program
Tracking #: 150137

IV. Adjourn
The meeting of the Neighborhood and Community Development Standing Committee was held on Monday, March 9, 2015, at 5:00 p.m., in the 5th Floor Conference Room of the Municipal Office Building. The following members were present: Commissioner McKiernan, Chairman; Commissioners Townsend (via phone), Markley, Murguia and Walters. The following officials were also in attendance: Gordon Criswell, Assistant County Administrator; Ken Moore, Deputy Chief Counsel; Colin Welsh, Assistant Attorney; Greg Talkin, Neighborhood Resource Center Director; Wayne Wilson, Program Coordinator, Neighborhood Resource Center; and Brandelyn Brajkovic, Municipal Court Judge.

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

Approval of standing committee minutes for January 5, 2015. On motion of Commissioner Murguia, seconded by Commissioner Walters, the minutes were approved. Motion carried unanimously.

Committee Agenda:

Item No. 1 – 150038… DISCUSSION: CODE ENFORCEMENT

Synopsis: Discussion on more aggressive code enforcement efforts for repeat violators and to address perpetual violators, submitted by Wayne Wilson, NRC/Code Enforcement.

Wayne Wilson, Program Coordinator, Neighborhood Resource Center, said recently we had a discussion with a couple of commissioners and went to the agenda review on finding ways that we could be more effective against, enforcement efforts against repeat violators.
One of our things that we wanted to do is discuss an issue whereby if an individual has three code violations at a property, not necessarily similar code violations, but three code violations, that we would have the opportunity to address those with a summons if the case warranted it.

Additionally, we wanted to discuss those people who are perpetual violators, the people that we have to address year after year after year for the same violations that have multiple properties that we have to continuously deal with in our community. These people have caused great damage to our community. They eat up valuable resources and so we were looking for a way to make it more apparent to them that they were not welcome to conduct business as they had been in our community. We bring that to you for discussion looking for ideas.

On the second item we had actually hoped to be able to increase the $2,500 fine and/or time in jail. As the state law dictates, that’s a misdemeanor, and so the $2,500 and the year in jail is the maximum fine on that. We’re looking for other avenues, means to do so.

**Chairman McKiernan** asked this item is open for discussion, but basically we have the Uniform Building Code that we, as a community, have said we will maintain our collective properties according to this Code. Is that correct? **Mr. Wilson** said it’s an international--**Chairman McKiernan** said International Building Code. **Mr. Wilson** said international. What we use for code enforcement, International Property Maintenance Code. **Chairman McKiernan** said Property Maintenance Code. **Mr. Wilson** said yes, sir.
Chairman McKiernan said we have individuals in the community who do not maintain their properties up to that code that we have all agreed will be our standard. We have some of those individuals who don’t maintain their properties up to that standard even after being cited not once, but multiple times. Mr. Wilson said that’s correct.

Chairman McKiernan said so we are looking for some strategies that we can use because I think it’s safe to say that those people who let their properties deteriorate or accumulate multiple code violations certainly do have a negative impact on their neighborhood, in particular, but on the whole community in general. So we’re looking for some additional strategies.

At this point, we’re open for discussion. Any of the commissioners who’d like to ask questions, discuss, make a comment, give some direction.

Commissioner Murguia said I just have some things I’d personally like to see; it just comes from me.

I’d like to see us eliminate any language that references jail time only because I don’t know of that ever happening where anyone’s actually gone to jail for code violations. I hate to make threats to the public that are not really ever going to happen.

I’d like to see us shift cleanup and administrative fees to their property tax because from my understanding from meeting with you guys is that oftentimes when you try to get people to pay the ticket they don’t pay it, or many times, not often might be an extreme, that they don’t pay it. Ultimately, our goal is for the property to be cared for. I think, otherwise, that really the property shouldn’t be in their hands if they can’t take care of it. So I’d like to see the fines that are not paid put on their property taxes. At least that way we have a mechanism to eventually control the property if they don’t pay those fines or abide by our city code.

Commissioner Markley said I hate to ask this question because I don’t want to look at Colin because I know it will be more research for him, but I would love to know to what extent we can put property owners in sort of lockdown. Let me give you an example of what I mean.

For those of you who have been to college you know that the campus police can’t really do a lot to you, but if you have outstanding tickets, you can’t get your grade card. So I want to know to what extent if these guys have outstanding tickets, if they have code violations, are there
other things, other benefits of the Unified Government that we can withhold from them? As we know, it’s hard to collect money from them; it’s hard to force them to do anything. I mean, we all know the issues we have with enforcing codes, especially against owners who have obviously already proven themselves to be not interested in keeping up their homes. So if we have these repeat violators, is there anything else we can do?

We’ve talked about when it comes to rental licensing, obviously they shouldn’t be getting a rental license if they have repeat code violations, in my opinion, period. No renewal of any rental license for any of their houses if they have code violations in this frequency. That’s how I feel. But for the homeowner, is there anything else that we can do? I’d just be interested to know.

Commissioner Murguia said I would just echo the part about a business license. I don’t know how you deal with a business that has code violations. I don’t know how the business license piece of that works, but they shouldn’t be able to continue to operate a business if they’re violating codes in my mind. I don’t know how to resolve that, but it would make sense to me that that shouldn’t happen.

Greg Talkin, Neighborhood Resource Center Director, said, Commissioner, I’d like to address a couple of these. Chairman McKiernan said absolutely.

Mr. Talkin said on the issues with the property tax attachment, or the fine attachment, that’s the administrative process that you guys have approved and we’re currently trying to get things underway to get that implemented. I stated that was going to be about a nine month process, and it does require a little bit of budget to get that kicked off. We’ve got requests in to see how we can move that forward.

On the licensing issue, right now most of what we issue out of the Business License Office is an Occ. Tax. We wouldn’t want to refuse that because it’s just a tax. It’s just like we wouldn’t refuse taking somebody’s property tax if they have a code violation. We do license a few like liquor stores and things like that in working with the police and things along that line. Those we might be able to do something; however, states oversee a lot of that, too, on the liquor and some of the other licenses that we do issue.
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Licenses are only about 5% of what Business License actually issues, otherwise, it’s just a tax they’re collecting and a registration. You can’t take an action on it.

Chairman McKiernan asked is it possible to transfer these fines over to the property tax that’s associated with that property, whether it’s business or residential. Mr. Talkin said on the administrative process that we’re getting underway, those fines, if not paid, can go as a special on the property. The court process, the criminal process, no. They cannot be moved over to property tax from my understanding.

Commissioner Murguia said you choose your words very carefully when you say they can go on the property tax bill. I would just tell you I would want it so that they do go on their property tax if they don’t pay them, where it’s part of the process. Mr. Talkin said that’s the only reason I say they don’t.

There would be two reasons we wouldn’t place an administrative cost. First of all, it would go through an administrative hearing officer process. That officer has the final determination. It would be somebody outside of our office hearing those cases, if somebody appeals. The other reason it wouldn’t go on is if somebody did pay it. Otherwise, it’s our plans to put those costs on the property if not paid.

Commissioner Murguia said nine months, why is it taking nine months? Mr. Talkin said first of all, the administrative process is a completely different line of thinking. All of our database is not set up for the flow process for that. We need some help, a consultant to come in and help set up that database because we got one person on staff and her whole goal every day is to keep everybody up and operating on their current system, very little time for implementation to get something new done. That was part of the cost that was proposed.

Additionally, there will be a need for an additional staff member because our office will now start collecting revenue in this fashion because we will be asking for those citations to be mailed to us. We’ll have to track and keep all of those records. We haven’t done that in the past in the code enforcement side.

Commissioner Murguia asked why are we doing that. Why don’t they just go pay like everybody else goes and pays a speeding ticket? Mr. Talkin said because this is an administrative process. This isn't the criminal court process. Commissioner Murguia asked but
what does it matter. They’re already collecting money. Why can’t we let them continue to collect money and just modify their system? Why does it matter?

Mr. Talkin said we can look into that. Our thought is the whole penalty on this issue, at least for this part, is trying to penalize them through the monetary issue at first. We don’t want to waste anybody’s time. We’re asking for them to mail that in. Then, we go to the next step if it’s not complied. Then we increase that administrative citation. Mail it into us. I don’t think, well I guess Municipal Court does accept mail-ins.

Commissioner Murguia said that’s what I mean. If you get a speeding ticket, or a non-moving violation or whatever, you have a choice. You can appear in court or you can mail it in. Mr. Talkin said we can definitely look at that, Commissioner. Commissioner Murguia said, yeah, it’s already there.

Brandelyn Brajkovic, Municipal Court Judge, said I apologize for my dress. I was trying to hide so I didn’t mean to dress so casually.

The only thing I could see the issue with Municipal Court taking the money is right now we have one system that is a criminal justice type system. So bringing it into us, we would have to have access to the MAUWI system, which I know through budget process we’re asking for anyway.

The other issue may be union related depending on how you could get that through because we’re entirely union, too. We’d have to make sure it was part of the Municipal Court function, but other than that, yeah, we handle money. Those answers I can work with Moe to try to get to, but those will be the two major issues.

Commissioner Murguia said it just seems like it’s easier to set up a process. It’s easier to adjust the process we currently have that seems to be what we want to do than to create a new process. Judge Brajkovic said the issue is our computer system is based off of the LE-web, the KCMO/KCK Police Department criminal justice system. So it just matters how that interacts. It issues bench warrants automatically when you don’t make payments, those types of things. But there are things we could definitely explore. We have cashiers up there. They’re already making payments on it.

Commissioner Murguia said I won’t belabor this, I promise, but since you kind of led me down that path, I’m just curious. Are there municipalities that do not have a code enforcement department that just use their local law enforcement division to handle their code-
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like cases? Mr. Wilson said yes, there are. I’m associated with the Kansas Association of Code Enforcement and a lot of the very small municipalities throughout the State of Kansas, mostly on the western side of Kansas, they have like one or two police officers that also act as code enforcement officers, building inspectors, dog catchers. They take care of pretty much all of the city responsibilities.

Commissioner Murguia asked so is there a way to adjust our ticketing, our tickets that policemen write, to include code violations. Judge Brajkovic said they already do. They already write tickets under code violations. Commissioner Murguia asked on their tickets. Judge Brajkovic said yes, they do. They come in. We call them short tickets. They get put in through the docket, the docket gets set up by alphabetized and they’re just one group that gets put in there. We code them in there.

Commissioner Murguia said last week I had a 1.5 hour long conversation with Chief Ziegler. He was telling me about how he wants, eventually, for all of his police officers to become community police officer minded and he wants to see, this was all from him, not from me, he wants to see them more engaged in code violations and things like that. But there was an issue with the ticketing. I would just suggest, then, not for this meeting now, that you start moving forward including Chief Ziegler in your discussions about code enforcement and how you’re going to do that moving forward. I think you have a Chief that’s more than willing to help there.

Judge Brajkovic said some of the things that I would like to see, too, is I think with you guys’ conversation of ranking of codes and things that likely that could be split up in IMDS, plus it may make it easier. Right now they come in under two or three separate ordinance violations. That might be what he’s talking about.

Commissioner Murguia said I talked briefly with the Mayor about this ranking of code violations last week. Just for purposes of discussion of this committee, I would just tell you that my opinion, I really don’t care if it’s a house that isn’t painted or if the roof is falling in. Some people feel like one is worse than the other. I don’t think so. I think it all has the same impact on a neighborhood when people stack up trash in their yard or they don’t paint their house or their roof is falling in. All of that still impacts the neighborhood in the same way. Personally, my personal opinion is that I do not think that’s a good use of time. I think it’s a way overload on data that we don’t need. What I care about is that our officers, whether its code officers or
police officers, can use professional discretion to act very quickly. Since they’re in the field and they know who the repeat violators are, they should know whether they need to go directly to a ticket or whether they should be knocking on the door speaking to someone. They know that just like the officers on the street kind of know that.

Personally, I would like to see a faster moving system where it goes straight to a ticketing process that can be mailed in. If you don’t mail it in, I’d like to see it go directly to your property. At the end of the day, if you’re not going to take care of your property, then you probably shouldn’t be in that house.

**Commissioner Markley** said I was going to say on the collections piece before I forget and leaves my mind, we’ve been talking about how maybe we should be hiring a collections agency to work on our property tax collection. Maybe this is really for Gordon to take back to the Administrator’s Office, maybe we need to be talking about a collection agency to collect all the money owed to us, whether it’s code violations, tickets that haven’t been paid, or whether it, you know, if it gets put on the property tax bill then it all winds up in the same place. Maybe we should be looking at a broader -- there’s no reason a collection agency can’t handle all of that without specifying what particular item they should collect.

**Chairman McKiernan** said I love the idea of moving it over to the property tax, but we all know that there are -- it seems to me, just as many people who choose not to pay their property tax bill as choose not to correct their code violations. That would be the one thing we would need to address is that there would ultimately -- **Commissioner Markley** said that’s why I want to keep their grade card.

**Commissioner Murguia** said if we could come up with something like that that we can do that’s more immediate, but I guess right now we’re doing nothing. There are code violators that have been violators for twenty years. Had we the ability to put these fines on their property taxes, their property would have gone through tax sale and would have been out of their hands by now. So I’m saying, yeah, four years is a lot shorter than twenty years. I’m just trying to move us one step closer to shortening that period. It doesn’t mean in the meantime there aren’t little things that you can do, but in the long run, at the end of the day this is the deal. If you’re not
taking care of your property and you’re causing problems for your neighbors who are taking care of their property, then you should not own that property any longer.

I’m sure there are lots of people listening to me right now that are very angry saying I don’t know what I’m talking about, but I would just tell you that I’ve seen in my district, first-hand in Third District, what not painting your house and letting your roof fall in and stacking up junk in your yard has done to my neighborhood over time. I think people would take it a lot more seriously and they’d either pay those fines and/or pay their property taxes, which ultimately would pay these fines, or they lose their property. End of story. Blight and code violations kills neighborhoods; it kills it. The people that live there that want to live a decent, sanitary nice life end up moving to other neighborhoods.

Chairman McKiernan said Colin has furiously been scribbling notes so I assume that all of our ideas are being transcribed. Colin Welsh, Assistant Attorney, said it’s all the things you’ve asked that I don’t know tonight.

While I have the microphone, Commissioner Markley, you asked specifically about withholding certain other services or advantages based upon code violations, that would be another thing that I’m not fully prepared to address tonight. I guess off the top of my head, I’d feel more comfortable if there was some nexus between the violation and what was being withheld, but I guess not to put it back to you, but if you could come up with some ideas to get to me of like specific items, then I could look into whether that would work out or not. I’m sorry.

Judge Brajkovic said I know one thing that was just mentioned before I came up by one of the code enforcement supervisors is that not allowing them to bid in tax sale might be helpful. I didn’t think about, I don’t know off the top of my head how many do that, but it seemed like a good idea so I thought I would pass that forward.

Commissioner Murguia asked so people with code violations can bid on additional property. Chairman McKiernan said evidently. Commissioner Murguia said I could have been better off to not know that.

Chairman McKiernan said so it sounds like, to summarize so far, that we would suggest that the jail time not be considered as a lever for this, but that we examine all other possible levers in terms of privileges not granted or privileges that are taken away or moving this over to property tax where there might be additional leverage for it, and that we consider, or look at, the
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possibility of either blending our current Municipal Court ticketing system and the code ticketing system or somehow consolidating all of that into one system so that possibly we could use Municipal Court as a vehicle for collecting the money, collecting the fines, and not put that additional responsibility on your department or another unit that doesn’t currently do that. I think that’s what I’ve heard so far.

**Commissioner Markley** said all of that is right. I don’t really have an answer to this, but I’m just going to throw it out there. If we know the owner has multiple properties, another thing I’m wondering is whether there’s some way we can leverage that fact against them other than with the rental licensing. You’re not going to give them their license. I don’t know, like I said, I don’t have an answer to that question. I’m just asking myself.

The other thing I would say, I love everything Commissioner Murguia is saying about just eventually getting the property out of their hands, but as we all know, that can take fifty-two years or four, depending on the situation. The really hard spot that we get in, I think, as commissioners, is where the neighborhood has identified a house as a problem. There’s a codes’ case open. The owner is not responding and we’ve got three years to wait until it can go to tax sale because it’s taxes are up to date. What do we do for those three years? That’s what I really hope that we can brainstorm is what do we do during those three years when the owner is not responding and we can’t sell the house yet.

I’m in that situation with one in Argentine right now. You know, you go to these neighborhood group meetings and they say what’s going on with this house. I don’t have a good answer for them. The reality is we’ve done some upkeep on it and we’re just waiting. We’re waiting for those tax years to roll over and that’s three or four years of drain on that neighborhood. Again, I don’t have an answer to that question either. I’m just throwing it out there. That’s the worst time is during that waiting period where we can’t get the house even if we want to. We have nothing else we can do to that owner at this point.

**Chairman McKiernan** said that’s my big concern about -- it is a concern about rolling it over onto the tax bill. We, then, have to be diligent about pursuing those properties whose taxes are delinquent and finding those people who have 59 properties that are all delinquent, or finding that property that’s been delinquent 20+, 30+, 40+ years and actually moving on it and making
something happen, because otherwise, we’ve just shifted the fine over to another place that we won’t collect it.

I totally agree, but then that puts some back on us that we need to get better at our process so that it actually is a lever or a penalty and not just another postponement. I completely agree with Commissioner Markley. Anything we can do and I know I’ve had discussions with all of you about various properties that are exactly what she’s talking about where the neighborhood has identified them as a true blight. They’re abandoned. We end up doing specials in terms of cutting the grass and picking up the trash. They are causing people to talk seriously about moving out. We’re powerless, it seems, to do anything other than cut the grass and pick up the trash.

Mr. Talkin said, Commissioner, a lot of those properties you’re referring to, the industry is now calling them zombie properties, although it’s not all of those, but it’s those ones that are in the limbo of foreclosure and they’re not foreclosing on them. People have moved and left away. We have nobody to hold accountable in a lot of those instances. Therefore, Code Enforcement really can’t do anything else in a number of instances until we get some responsible owner or the way to get ownership or control of that property. Those are a big problem.

Chairman McKiernan said one thing I’d like for us to investigate, and I know that there’s various legislation that’s being talked about, but I believe the City of Baltimore uses a receivership process. Now there are a lot of barriers to that process, but that’s a process that can take place if a house has been identified as abandoned and causing blight, even if it’s not tax delinquent, and puts the power in the court, I believe, in the Municipal Court rather than in the Tax Court. If that would give us any leverage any earlier on some of these properties I’d love for us to also investigate that.

Mr. Talkin said Colin might be able to add to this, but Baltimore and the State of Missouri are two options that have state laws that are more favorable for that receivership process. What Representative Frownfelter was proposing was a similar ordinance, although it still probably doesn’t go as far as some of the other states’ ordinances, or other states’ statutes, that gives a little bit more leeway to those entities. But we have no state statute right now that really is favorable for us and that’s what they’re trying to do in the State of Kansas right now through what Frownfelter’s trying to do.
Mr. Welsh said that’s the Abandoned Housing Act which we do have. In Baltimore, it’s more synced in with their code enforcement process. There’s no reason that here if somebody wanted to go down the Abandoned Housing Act or the receivership avenue there that they would certainly be looking at code violations as indicative of the blight. That would be more applicable if Frownfelter’s change had gone through this go round because right now the blighting influence only applies to commercial properties whereas if it’s a residence, you’re only looking at whether it’s vacant and/or tax delinquent.

Chairman McKiernan said my understanding is that that legislation is not completely stopped for this legislative session, that there is still a chance that that legislation could move forward. Mr. Welsh said somebody told me that there had been a problem recently, but I’m sorry, I don’t know. Mr. Talkin said from my understanding, it got shot down in the Senate. Chairman McKiernan said correct. Mr. Talkin said but they were able to revive it somehow through a committee. Chairman McKiernan said I thought it was still open on the House side.

Mr. Talkin said well, it’s got to go back. I think it was approved in the House. Chairman McKiernan said okay. Mr. Talkin said now because of the Senate’s denial, I believe it’s still alive but it’s still got to go back to the House again and then back to the Senate if the House approves it. So it’s kind of starting over.

Commissioner Murguia said the Senate didn’t vote on it. I was there. The Senate didn’t vote on it, but they did -- Senator Melcher offered to be a chairman on the committee to help move it through. There were a couple of other tweaks they needed to work on. There is a representative or senator out of Wichita that’s having some issues. I don’t know who that is. If someone could find out who that is, I’ll go visit him or her. I’m serious. If someone could find out what’s going on. I go there once a month already for a couple of days, so I’d be glad to go visit whoever it is in Wichita, if you could just get me that information. Other than that, they still think, other than that one person, there shouldn’t be an issue.

Mr. Talkin said Mike Taylor should know the name. He’s been pretty close to everybody that’s been involved in that. Commissioner Murguia said my offer stands so if staff has Mike Taylor get with me, I’d be glad to do that.

I do have another question. To my knowledge we haven’t used this, what do you use condemnation for? What’s the purpose of condemnation besides I want to build a highway here? Is there another reason to use it? Ken Moore, Deputy Chief Counsel, said you can use
condemnation to acquire property for a public purpose and the recent, well not really recent, probably in the last ten years, the Kansas legislature has narrowed that purpose. Economic development purposes are no longer considered public purpose. So, really streets, highways, infrastructure improvements, those kinds of things, are the reason you can acquire land through condemnation.

Commissioner Murguia asked isn’t there a process to submit a list of properties that you wanted to condemn and then can’t you go through a state review process if it doesn’t fit the exact rules. Mr. Moore said yeah, I think the Secretary of Commerce can expand, I think it’s the Secretary of Commerce, they can expand that definition. You can apply to the State for special authority to condemn for different purposes, but to my knowledge, I don’t think anyone’s ever done that. I don’t think that process has been used yet.

Commissioner Murguia said if there is an exception process, so clearly we, in Wyandotte County, are not having a lot of influence over our State legislature about laws like condemnation that we would like to see changed. Instead of trying to change the law, why aren’t we taking up very specific properties of ours here in the county and looking for an exception? That way it doesn’t put elected officials for other areas of the State in the position to enact an ordinance that their constituents would be against. It would only be affecting our county. Do you see what I’m saying?

Why force someone to vote on a law that’s going to make them unpopular in their district when really, we don’t care if it happens in Wichita. I just want it to happen in Wyandotte County. So why would we not take a list of properties up to the State and try to go through condemnation with them? Mr. Moore said it would still have to be for, you have to have a public purpose. In the past, of course, we interpreted economic development to be a public purpose and that’s what they’ve narrowed and taken away. That’s no longer considered a public purpose. So you have to articulate that it is a public purpose, and you have to pay fair market value for the property that you’ve condemned.

Commissioner Murguia asked could you get me the broadest possible definition of public purpose. Mr. Moore said okay. Commissioner Murguia said because I think it’s got to be beyond economic development and roads and bridges, so could it be just it’s a good public purpose to have a blight removed. I mean, if it fits at all, I think we have to at least go down swinging. We got to be willing to take the property up to bat. Mr. Moore said I think we’re
looking into that now. There’s some proposed legislation that designates certain zip codes, Kansas City, Kansas, Wichita, Shawnee County, to expand that definition so you could do that. I’m not sure of the status of that though. Obviously, we’re supporting it. Commissioner Murguia said but you can find that out for us. Can you bring that information back to this committee? Mr. Moore said sure. Chairman McKiernan said excellent.

Chairman McKiernan said a great discussion. Appreciate staff bringing this forward and looking for additional ways to get leverage so that we can maintain or keep blight out of our neighborhoods because certainly we all know how negatively it affects neighborhoods where it is found.

Commissioner Townsend said, Chairman, before we leave this topic, I did have some questions for this discussion. The first one deals with who exactly are we targeting with the anticipated ordinance? How are we going to define perpetual violators?

I noticed in the summary they talk about possibly people with a third violation of any code issue within two years. We also talk about people having five or more similar violations within a two-year period. First of all, who are we targeting first?

Secondly, I’d like to know how the ordinance that we’re contemplating, or being asked to think about, would differentiate, or work in concert with, the code enforcement administrative fine process ordinance that this committee discussed and moved forward this past January and February. How will this be different? How what we’re talking about now be different than the process that we just discussed two months ago?

Mr. Talkin said, Commissioner, I can answer I believe a part of that. We brought this forward for the discussion to figure out what these thresholds would be to determine that perpetual violator or that habitual violator. As far as the administrative versus the criminal process, we believe that no matter which process they’re in, if we confirmed a violation then it would go towards that count. Depending on how many times we deal with somebody, our plans are to initially start off now with the administrative process once we get that underway. As discussed in the standing committee when it was approved, we’re going to apply that to a limited number of processes first, all of our abatement cases which are weeds, trash, inoperable vehicles,
and our structural cases. What we mean by structural is not necessarily the house is falling down, they need paint, roofs, things like that.

No matter what process we’re doing, we’re planning on starting off with the administrative process first, then using the court criminal process as a more aggressive nature because we believe through the administrative process, first of all, we might develop contacts that makes it easier to get a summons and get somebody served and in court. Not only that, at that point, it’s another option.

I’m kind of getting off target, but I would also bring up at this time that maybe we don’t get rid of the jail time because when we do the administrative and then to go the criminal, we do believe that jail might have a role in that purpose at that time because that will be the most aggressive we’ll be is in the court if at all possible if we can get somebody in there. We know that we need to limit. We have other criminals that need to be there that are probably way more severe crimes, but we would like it to still be a threat. We think, occasionally, it could be used especially in this scheme of administrative then to criminal.

Anyway, no matter administrative or criminal, each time we have a violation, that would be considered in the count and no matter what direction we are going. Once again, we’re here tonight to kind of discuss what we feel those thresholds should be.

Commissioner Townsend asked what will be the tipping point to move something from the administrative process to possibly this new ordinance that we’re contemplating that has jail time as one of the punitive measures. Mr. Talkin said we believe the first process would be the administrative. We think that we will be able to get and hold a few different, let’s say areas, more accountable. One of those would be corporations in the administrative process where people hide behind the corporations. They can hide behind the corporations, but if they don’t pay the bill, we’re going to put it on the property. That doesn’t stop us from doing that where an individual, it kind of helps in that area. It also helps for those property speculators that are just hanging out there, just out of town, out of sight, out of mind, thinking that we can’t do anything to them because they’re out of town. We have people tell us that all the time. Some of those properties are developed properties in residential neighborhoods that are getting very active again. They’re going to pay their taxes or lose it and they have a lot of value.

On the administrative side, we believe, that’s going to have a little bit more of a kick in the rear to people that we didn’t have before. You’re still going to have those that you place a
special and you aren’t going to get them paid just like we were talking a while ago, but we believe there’s a niche that will definitely help there.

Now, if in that process we have a tiered setup, $250, $500, $1,000--$100, $250 and $500 is the way we escalate that administrative fine. We believe when we get up to the $500 range, we can do that as many times as we see necessary. However, if we have that person, we know where they’re at, and we know that they have clear ownership, then we may be starting to inconvenience them with having to appear in court. We communicate to court that we’ve already done this administrative process and they’re still not listening, therefore, asking the court for more aggressive action up front instead of like we do now. The first time violator there gets a little bit more leeway because they’re the first-time violator. We’re asking to jump around a little bit of that because we’ve already went through a lot of issues with these individuals.

Commissioner Townsend said thank you. That helps put it in perspective because I was concerned that we may have addressed some of these issues, so I wasn’t sure what the goal of this particular new ordinance would be. So this is the next step after the administrative process has been exhausted. Would that be a fair statement? Mr. Talkin said that’s correct. Commissioner Townsend said thank you.

Chairman McKiernan said I think this has been a great discussion. Appreciate you bringing this forward. We’ll continue to work through this, and I would assume that we will be discussing this again in the future. I look forward to continuing this discussion.

Action: No action required.

Item No. 2 – 150043… COMMUNICATION: LAND BANK APPLICATIONS

Synopsis: Communication requesting consideration of the following applications, submitted by Chris Slaughter, Land Bank Manager. The Land Bank Board of Trustees has recommended approval of the applications.

95 Applications for yard expansion, unless noted otherwise
3304 N. 57th St. - LaVerta Hulse for a garden
235 S. 21st St. - Brenda Juardo for a garden
1007 Seminary St. - Pleasant Valley Baptist Church for parking
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1700 N. 7th St. - New Bethel Church, Inc. for parking
1702 N. 7th St. - New Bethel Church, Inc. for parking
1704 N. 7th St. - New Bethel Church, Inc. for parking
12204 Pebble Beach Dr. - Katherine Dodd for single-family construction
220 S. 8th St. - Joannie Hillesheim
3544 R N. 59th St. - Leonita Davis
2921 S. 53rd St. - Gary Eisele
2943 N. 27th St. - Doris Winston
1511 N. 18th St. - Ann Bridgewater
823 S. Mill St. - Alicia Hook
1705 Walker Ave. - Luis Amiel
4729 Farrow Ave. - Roy Perez
1970 Franklin Ave. - Inda Scheuler
2320 N. 9th St. - Aldama Socorro
13646 Martin Luther King Ave. - Jeffrey Barger
334 N. 40th St. - Ricardo Berumen
3530 N. 35th St. - Michael Jackson
1860 S. Pyle St. - Wilberto Linares
1231 S. 40th St. - Sergio Castillo
654 Rowland Ave. - Eugene Hall
1707 Waverly Ave. - Ernest Moore
1928 N. 26th St. - Roberto Maldonado
2930 N. 12th St. - Francisco Torres
27 S. Tremont St. - Olga Flores
2952 N. 35th St. - Jason Young
2115 Lombardy Dr. - Carl Campbell
3306 Freeman Ave. - Lidia Mejia
1432 S. 29th St. - Pedro Salazar
2912 Washington Ave. - Reyna Rodriguez
3036 N. 42nd St. - Ruben Weaver, Sr.
2905 N. 13th St. - Eh Tee Ta
2942 N. 43rd St. - Manuel Hernandez
812 Quindaro Blvd. - Jacquetta Noble
1934 N. 25th St. - Sam Soundara
342 N. 40th St. - Linda Clark
61 S. 26th St. - Felix Luque-Borquez
3015 N. 48th Terr. - Ubertino Contreras
318 N. 20th St. - Reynalda Morales
85 S. 19th St. - Jose Alfredo Soria
6838 Webster Ave. - Madella Henderson
2113 S. Ferree St. - Michael Mitchell
535 S. 71st St. - Jason Indorf
124 R N. 98th St. - Charles Stites
329 Walker Ave. - Warren Robinson
2315 N. 47th St. - Roxanne Robertson
403 Troup Ave. - Steven McCord
429 Quindaro Blvd. - Steven McCord
2218 Garfield Ave. - Talisha Robins
1532 Yecker Ave. - Kenneth Ellison
1955 Stewart Ave. - Maria Murillo
1739 Haskell Ave. - Marchita Butler
2204 N. 11th St. - Margaret Richardson
2430 Farrow Ave. - Shellaime Bradford
2312 N. 26th St. - James Wheeler
2519 N. 18th St. - Joseph Esry
1300 S. 36th St. - Alejandro Aguilar
2817 N. Tremont St. - Dorothy Youngblood
1115 S. 40th St. - Rosa Fisher
1905 Parallel Ave. - Francisco Ramirez
1923 Parallel Ave. - Francisco Ramirez
1506 Richmond Ave. - Tanya Bland
3608 Garfield Ave. - Peggy Graham
937 S. 135th St. - Kevin Cook
1603 W. 39th Ave. - Leslie Karnahan
1130 N. 32nd St. - Guillermo Medina
1513 N. 17th St. - Carol Evans
29 S. Tremont St. - Michael Valentine
3020 Parkwood Blvd. - Eric Jones, Sr.
2150 S. 38th St. - Adela Moreno
940 Kansas Ave. - Richard Sanchez
1607 N. 55th St. - David Stracke
430 Troup Ave. - Elsy Segovia
1917 N. 11th St. - Juan Martinez
3228 Brown Ave. - Juan Franco
3240 Cleveland Ave. - Truman Road Corridor Assoc., Inc.
650 N. 62nd Pl. - Tecumseh Long, Jr.
1707 N. 25th St. - SC & ND Real Estate Investment, LLC
2720 N. 20th St. - Eddie Williams/Doris Jones
219 N. 27th St. - Vickie Browning
2234 Richmond Ave. - Dennis Smith
940 Kansas Ave. - Rogaciano Meza
1981 Richmond Ave. - Marco Mendoza
2305 N. 11th St. - Fernando Apodaca
2416 N. 11th St. - Bryant Huskey
1333 Oakland Ave. - Eric Jenkins
2203 N. 45th St. - LaTuessa Halliburton
1354 Brown Ave. - Edward Taylor
1836 N. 18th St. - Steve Jaklevic
1846 N. 18th St. - Steve Jaklevic
228 S. 21st St. - Wade Lytch
2015 S. 51st St. - Argus Rothmeyer
3010 N. 32nd St. - Isabelle Riley
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Chris Slaughter, Land Bank Manager, said we have a couple of applications tonight. What happened is that we have identified some properties and we did a letter campaign letting the adjacent property owners know that there is Land Bank property next to them. It’s available for sale and we got pretty good response on it. That reflects in the number of applications tonight.

It, again, was very successful; however, it took a lot of time. I don’t know how often this is something we’ll repeat, but at least it’s something we’re looking at doing at least on an annual basis, maybe twice a year or something like that. Definitely as new property comes into the Land Bank per the current policy, we will continue to do that as well.

There are some that I want to point out. Also, with the system of getting this information so you guys have plenty of time to digest it a couple of weeks earlier, the last column that addresses the Advisory Board and their communication, there is one that has changed. Again, we met after this was submitted so that’s why it said approved on there, but we do have one property that the Advisory Board is recommending that we deny. I’ll give you reasons why I believe that that’s probably the proper course of action. There are a couple that I’ve been contacted that are no longer interested in the property, so I’m going to give you those addresses: 1970 Franklin - they have indicated that they are moving so they would not want the property. 2204 N. 11th St. – was indicated it’s an elderly person. She doesn’t believe she’ll be able to maintain the property and her family’s indicated to her that they will not be available to help her maintain the property, so she has decided at this point that now is probably not a good time.

We did have two for 940 Kansas Avenue. We did a best and final. The deadline was last Friday. I only received one recommendation, so the application from Mr. Meza we’re going to ask that that one be denied. He did not respond. I did not receive anything.

Commissioner Murguia asked what’s the address on that? Mr. Slaughter said 940 Kansas Avenue. Commissioner Murguia said I don’t show a Meza. Mr. Slaughter said there’s two. Mr. Sanchez did give me the proper documentation within the timeframe. Commissioner Murguia said oh, you’re just eliminating them both. Mr. Slaughter said just Mr. Meza. We’re going to ask that Mr. Sanchez be awarded the property.

The last one is 2921 S. 53rd. Again, in meeting with the Advisory Board, it was brought to my attention that there had been some code history. In doing my checks, where a lot of this history had happened, the applicant had no longer lived there or actually was renting the
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property. In the checks that I have to do to maintain whether they're a code violator or not or if they currently have anything, it never registered other than the current address that they have listed on their application. **Chairman McKiernan** asked which one was that. **Mr. Slaughter** said the name is, I believe it’s Eisele, 2921 S. 53rd. It should be about maybe 10 or 12 down. **Chairman McKiernan** said so that one’s coming off then. **Mr. Slaughter** said with a strong recommendation from the neighborhood groups, it was pretty much recommended that they don’t believe this individual would be a good steward of the property. We’re prepared, if you guys feel warranted, to deny that application and we’ll just keep the property in the Land Bank and try to come up with maybe another idea to use it.

For the record, if you want me to read off the other addresses, I’d be more than happy to do that. **Commissioner Murguia** said no, that’s okay. **Chairman McKiernan** said as much as we really would love to hear that, so we have taken four properties off of the list that you originally gave us. **Mr. Slaughter** said correct. **Chairman McKiernan** said one of which is one of two applications for 940 Kansas.

**Mr. Slaughter** said in a way I think what we need to do is take two off and then two would need a motion to be denied. Then I’ll send correspondence to them. **Chairman McKiernan** asked which are those two again. **Mr. Slaughter** said the 2921 S. 53rd and then the 940 Kansas Avenue application for Mr. Meza. **Commissioner Murguia** asked need to be what. **Mr. Slaughter** said denied. **Chairman McKiernan** said to deny those two. **Mr. Slaughter** said the other two, just we’re not going to consider those anymore.

**Chairman McKiernan** said we have then a total of three motions would be necessary to take this list. Before we get to the motions, are there any other questions or discussion about any of the remaining parcels on this list?

**Commissioner Murguia** asked Chris, to your knowledge, none of these people have had or currently have code violations. **Mr. Slaughter** said correct. They currently do not. **Commissioner Murguia** said they currently do not, but they could have in the past. **Mr. Slaughter** said they could in the past. Generally what I do is I’ll check anything maybe since we’re so early in 2015, if there’s some that shows up for 2014, I’ll look into it, see what it was. Generally, if the code officer indicates that it’s closed, or sometimes I’ll contact them and they’ll
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say you know they had some trash in the yard. We sent them a letter. They got it cleared up and everything’s fine, other than that they’re okay.

**Commissioner Murguia** asked so what happens if today we deed over this property to them and then they fill it up with a bunch of used cars. **Mr. Slaughter** said if it’s within the first year, we have the right to retain the property. **Commissioner Murguia** asked to take it back. **Mr. Slaughter** said yes.

**Action:** Commissioner Murguia made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Walters, to deny the applications for 2921 S. 53rd St., Gary Eisele, and 940 Kansas Avenue, Rogaciano Meza, and forward to Land Bank Board of Trustees. Roll call was taken and there were five “Ayes,” Walters, Murguia, Townsend, Markley, McKiernan.

**Commissioner Murguia** asked do I have to make a motion to remove 1970 Franklin Avenue and 2204 N. 11th? **Mr. Moore** said you could make a motion to approve all the ones except for those. **Commissioner Murguia** asked I can do that. So we only need two motions.

**Action:** Commissioner Murguia made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Walters, to approve the remaining on the list with the exception to 1970 Franklin Avenue and 2204 N. 11th Street and forward to Land Bank Board of Trustees. Roll call was taken and there were five “Ayes,” Walters, Murguia, Townsend, Markley, McKiernan.

**Chairman McKiernan** said we have additional applications at the end of that list, correct? **Mr. Slaughter** said yes. We have some transfers. These are City of KCK and Unified Government properties that we’re asking to be transferred into the Land Bank. I can give further information if needed.

7 Applications for transfers to Land Bank
5122 Crest Dr. from City of KCK
4821 Crest Dr. from City of KCK
4718 Crest Dr. from City of KCK
5127 Crest Dr. from City of KCK

March 9, 2015
Action: Commissioner Markley made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Murguia, to approve and forward to Land Bank Board of Trustees. Roll call was taken and there were five “Ayes,” Walters, Murguia, Townsend, Markley, McKiernan.

Item No. 3 – 150046… REQUEST: ADOPT REVISED LAND BANK POLICY

Synopsis: Request to approve a revised Land Bank policy, submitted by Chris Slaughter, Land Bank Manager.

Mr. Slaughter said the final item is we brought back the Land Bank policy from the last discussion. We were given some direction on some additional information that was needed to help you guys make the decision and hopefully we’ve provided that. Mr. Welsh from Legal, I thought, put together a very elaborate and eloquent summary. We can go back into the nuts and bolts if we want to or we’re here to entertain questions. I’ll just leave it at that.

Commissioner Murguia said, Chris, I was the one that actually asked you guys to provide, and you’re welcome to call me out on that, I was the one that asked you to bring me back the changes. What I didn’t understand at that time is that it was more just a more formalized version of the existing policy with some more detailed tweaks to it.

Believe it or not, you gave it to me and I went through it. Not my strong suit, but I went through it in detail and it was fantastic. You guys did a great job I thought. I just had two questions and they should be relatively painless.

First one, are we accepting structures into the Land Bank? Mr. Slaughter said correct. Commissioner Murguia said and I understand some of that will be strategic and won’t necessarily be all structures, but we do have the capability to do that, correct? Mr. Slaughter
said correct. We’ve technically always had the ability; we are just going after it with more gusto. Commissioner Murguia said yes. Mr. Slaughter said if that’s a proper adjective. Commissioner Murguia said that’s what I understood also.

Talk to us just a little bit about -- I have my own thoughts on this but before I just leap into it, I want my fellow commissioners to understand the role of the Land Bank Advisory Board. Mr. Slaughter said currently the Advisory Board, as the name describes, is to advise us. They’re generally made up of NBRs and the Livable Neighborhood Executive Board. They represent a wide portion of our county.

They’re very instrumental. I think what we just had the discussion earlier about the application from the one person, if I wouldn’t have gotten the input from them, we would have probably approved that tonight without being the wiser. Then down the road, the Land Bank would have probably been staring at some very upset neighbors and the process of going through to get that property back.

What we’re asking here in the future is to expand that Advisory Board to include some staff members, various departments that’s outlined in the new policy, to give us more of a broad approach, to not only is this the right applicant for this property, but also direction on where are our strategic target areas. How do we get the right type of developers and investors into our community? Who are our partners? How do we make some of our smaller partners into those better partners? That’s the direction we’d like to see the Advisory Board go to.

I will add, if I may, again, their role is to advise. They do not have the authority to approve an application. They don’t have the authority to deny as much as the earlier they made a recommendation to deny. You guys still had the authority to approve the application.

Commissioner Murguia said I guess I have another question then. In this group of staff people, well first of all, can somebody apply for a vacant lot out of the Land Bank and still get that vacant land and owe delinquent tax on another piece of property or do you check that? Mr. Slaughter said we do check. Actually that’s one of my easier checks to do based in our tax system. What I do based on their, what they call a name ID, their identifier, it brings up pretty much all the property registered. Now, if they’re John Doe as an owner and they’re John D. Doe as an owner and they’re J. Doe as an owner, that sometimes may take a little longer. If I’m not aware of that, I may miss that, but generally we have the ability to check that. If they’re
delinquent, then we’ll send them a letter or we’ll reach out to them asking them when can you get these taxes paid up. If not, we’re going to hold and not advance your application.

**Action:** Commissioner Murguia made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Walters, to approve and forward to Land Bank Board of Trustees.

**Commissioner Townsend** said I guess the simplest thing to do would be just to go through page 1 -- I’ve marked some of the questions that I have to put this into perspective.

In Conditions Set on Land Bank Properties, we talk about holds on different areas for development. Didn’t we have a discussion about limiting commercial holds for a certain period of time and wouldn’t this be the place where those changes or limitations would be incorporated? **Mr. Slaughter** said we did have a past discussion on that. I would imagine here in probably May, we will be bringing back our annual discussion on that. I was kind of holding until that discussion to really see what direction you guys wanted to take that, whether we needed to really be providing more specifics, keep it the way it is, adjust it, that kind of discussion. **Commissioner Townsend** said well, see, that’s what I thought we had had and that would have been what I expected to see in here. I’m not sure how beneficial it would be to keep going over and over the policy without incorporating what we’ve already discussed, unless there was no definite determination, but I’d thought we’d had a discussion about that and being able to go back to these developers and challenge them after a certain amount of time, what are they going to do and what are their intentions for certain areas. That was one thing that I noticed on page one.

Near the bottom of page one where there’s a strikethrough through the sentence “The Land Bank Board of Trustees reserves the right to accept or reject all proposals without cause.” What was the rationale for withdrawing that? Isn’t that something that we would want to retain, a power we would want to retain?

**Mr. Welsh** said I’m sorry, Commissioner. As far as, I think that you’re looking at the old policy. So as far as hold areas are concerned in the new policy, I guess first I would say that my understanding has been that the establishment of hold areas has been more the bailiwick of Economic Development; however, the new policy basically just provides that the Land Bank is going to work in concert with Economic Development, maybe concert is too strong of a word,

March 9, 2015
but they’re going to be aware of hold areas. As the Land Bank conducts its business, is going to support whatever hold areas are established by Economic Development and work with them in that capacity. So on the second part of your question, could you repeat that?

Commissioner Townsend said the second part of my question, would the other issue about not so much hold, but the right to reserve or right to accept or reject all proposals without cause, that was the bottom of page one. Mr. Welsh said and that is retained. Several places in the new policy it’s provided that the Board has complete discretion to approve or deny. The policy sets out lots of ideas about considerations that are going to be made when looking at a policy, but it’s made very clear that on a case-by-case basis the Board can approve or deny without cause. Commissioner Townsend said I apologize. Maybe I’m looking at the wrong thing; maybe it’s still the effect of anesthesia. Mr. Welsh said I’ve got some of that too. I was at the dentist.

Chairman McKiernan said, Colin, what you’re saying though is that even though on this red-lined, strikeout copy we have, that line is struck at the bottom of page one. That intent, the right to accept or reject without cause, is maintained in another section. Mr. Welsh said absolutely. Commissioner Townsend said okay, that’s my concern because that seemed to be a power that we would want to retain. Mr. Welsh said sure. Chris did the red-lining. It was very difficult for him to do that because the policy is completely different in structure. All the language is in different places. Again, red-lining is somewhat futile.

Commissioner Townsend said let me ask the remaining questions that I had, then, in light of that, because it may be addressed somewhere else. On page two of the copy that I have where they struck through Applicant’s Proposal to Forward to Unified Government Standing Committee for their Recommendations to the Land Bank. Is that power retained somewhere else, because I cannot imagine not going through what we just did for the 90 some properties. Is that right retained by the Standing Committee, particularly this one? Mr. Welsh said yes. We’re going to continue that same process. That’s correct, right, Chris? Mr. Slaughter said that’s correct.

Commissioner Townsend said on page three, in the two sections that are talking about Purchasing Land Bank side-lot Programs and Process for Purchasing Land Bank Properties, is the right or the option, let me use that word, to purchase properties from the Land Bank just as some of these 90 citizens just did, whether or not it’s a side-lot, maintained in the new
procedure? Mr. Welsh said yes. Side-lots are in the new policy. Regardless of it’s a side-lot or not, they will have—Commissioner Townsend said those were the main concerns that I had.

Chairman McKiernan asked any other questions or discussion about this particular policy revision. We’ve had a motion and a second to approve as submitted. Hearing no other discussion, roll call please.

Action: Roll call was taken and there were five “Ayes,” Walters, Murguia, Townsend, Markley, McKiernan.

Measurable Goals:
Item No. 1 – 150041… MEASURABLE GOALS: NEIGHBORHOOD RESOURCE CENTER

Synopsis: Measurable goals for the Neighborhood Resource Center, provided by Greg Talkin, Neighborhood Resource Center Director.

Greg Talkin, Neighborhood Resource Center Director, said under the Neighborhood Resource Center, there are five different divisions plus the Livable Neighborhood staff. Direction was, for the department, we were to give one goal for now that we already measure.

The one division that I have that seems to get the most attention from the governing body is Code Enforcement. Commissioner Murguia, part of this came from one of your requests, although it may not be the percentage you asked for, we’re proposing a five percent increase in our overall Codes cases for this year, for 2015, compared to the last two years’ average, which is a little bit higher than what last year’s cases were.
As you can see here on the chart, the number of cases in 2013 and 2014, our average, the two year average in the next column, we’re proposing a five percent increase on top of that 12,043 cases, resulting in 12,645 cases. This is something that we can easily track and already do.

**Chairman McKiernan** said I think it’s great. We’ve already had this discussion. I would like us to also consider some things, some metrics like percent of cases successfully resolved, decreasing time to resolution of those cases, but I think this would be a great starting place. **Mr. Talkin** said yes. We are going to work on the percentage of cases that resolve through the first notice of violation and so on. Don’t have a timeframe with a number of other technology things that we’re looking. We’ve got to figure out priorities on some of these things, including the administrative process has a lot of technology issues. We can hand calculate that right now, and that’s what we did in that one presentation; however, we want to get it to where the computer calculates it so we remove any variation that might be in that.

**Commissioner Murguia** said I was just going to make the comment that with our aging housing stock, especially in the urban core in Kansas City, Kansas, that increasing the number of code violations is great, and I think that’s great on that end, but the way to also begin to decrease the number of code violations is as our housing stock ages and becomes available, I want to continue to explore options with you and Commissioner Markley about acquisition and demolition dollars that allow us to eliminate potential blighted rental property. You know what I’m referring to. If
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we’re able to really shift some resources to addressing aging housing stock and eliminating the opportunity for someone to buy it at a low amount of money and rent it and have it just depreciate in value even more, if we’re allowed to get our hands on it, acquire it and demolish it, then we eliminate some of these future headaches through the Codes department.

I do recognize that a lot of this increase has to do with the housing stock is just getting older. If we, as a government, aren’t going to buy it and tear it down and find somebody to build new, then we really have no one to blame but ourselves for this. So great job.

Chairman McKiernan said again, just some further ideas as looking at how to resolve these. It’s great to write more tickets, but ultimately with the administrative fine, with what we talked about earlier tonight, we want to look not only at writing more tickets, but closing more tickets, successfully resolving more tickets. This is a great place to start so we have our documentation of what our body of tickets is and now we can look at how we can peel off bits and pieces and get greater resolution. I think this is a great place to start.

You will continue then the discussion about, because we’ve had this discussion before, about how some of the data that I’ve asked for is available, but only through basically a hand calculation as you mentioned. We will continue the discussion about what other technology might be needed to implement other reports and other calculations. Mr. Talkin said yes. Chairman McKiernan said perfect. I like it.

Action: No action taken.

Adjourn

Chairman McKiernan adjourned the meeting at 6:07 p.m.

mls
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The meeting of the Neighborhood and Community Development Standing Committee was held on Monday, March 30, 2015, at 5:00 p.m., in the 5th Floor Conference Room of the Municipal Office Building. The following members were present: Commissioner McKiernan, Chairman; Commissioners Walters, Murguia and Townsend (via phone). The following officials were also in attendance: Ken Moore, Deputy Chief Legal Counsel; Patrick Waters, Senior Attorney; Gordon Criswell, Assistant County Administrator, Melissa Mundt, Assistant County Administrator, Emerick Cross, Interim Commission Liaison; Maureen Mahoney, Assistant to the Mayor/Chief to Staff; and George Brajkovic, Economic Development Manager.

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

Approval of standing committee minutes for February 2, 2015. On motion of Commissioner Murguia, seconded by Commissioner Walters, the minutes were approved. Motion carried unanimously.

Committee Agenda:

Item No. 1 – 150064… COMMUNICATION: LAND BANK APPLICATIONS

Synopsis: Communication requesting consideration of the following Land Bank applications, submitted by Chris Slaughter, Land Bank Manager. The Land Bank Advisory Board has recommended approval.

Chris Slaughter, Land Bank Manager, said first off out of this list that we’ve given you, we do need to take one off. We’ll probably bring it back next month, but there was a request to have it removed for more information. The address is 2053 Springfield Blvd. We’ll ask that that address not be considered tonight.

Applications for yard extension unless noted otherwise
Chairman McKiernan said so any motion for approving properties as a bulk would not include that one—Commissioner Murguia said wait. Jody Boeding, Legal Counsel, said for the record is it 2503 Springfield. Commissioner Murguia said yes, because 2053 isn’t on here. You’re talking about 2503. Ms. Boeding said I think so. Commissioner Murguia asked is that right. Chairman McKiernan said second one, second page. Mr. Slaughter said I have 2053 on mine. Chairman McKiernan said mine said 2503. Mr. Slaughter said you’re just talking about the agenda form right, not what’s in your packet. Commissioner Murguia said well, we have the packet. Ms. Boeding said I think the attachment says 2051. Mr. Slaughter said is the applicant’s address but the Land Bank is—I believe it’s 2053. It’s the one for JaMia Development, LLC. Ms. Boeding said this is correct and not the agenda. Mr. Slaughter said I don’t put the agenda together. Chairman McKiernan said it is correct, so the attachment that is headed Wyandotte County Land Bank Applications list this property address as 2053 Springfield Blvd. so that is the one that’s removed and will not be included in any votes tonight. Mr. Slaughter said correct. Commissioner Townsend asked, Mr. Chairman, which is the correct address? I see both. Is the address actually 2503 or is it 2053? Chairman McKiernan said, no the actual address is 2053. Commissioner Townsend said okay, same on the application. I just had a question of something generally, if this would be appropriate to raise it, that has to do with all of these. I was just wondering, Mr. Slaughter, just as a matter of standard practice is there any verification done by us, meaning the UG; that any of these LLCs or other corporations that
may make applications are in good standing or even valid entities before the applications are passed on to the Land Bank Advisory Board. **Mr. Slaughter** asked can you explain what you mean by good standing. Are you inquiring about if they have a business license or are we talking about registered with the state? **Commissioner Townsend** said more with the state. That was the reference that I actually meant, that they are a corporation and currently in good standing or there is such a thing as the LLC that’s presented. **Mr. Slaughter** said generally, well, we don’t get a lot of LLCs that are applying for properties so probably moving forward you know I agree, that’s probably a good way to look. That’s part of the request of why we’re going to pull it off tonight is to vet it a little bit more. Again, a member of the Advisory Board thought there should be a little bit more vetting. That’s why we’re going to pull it off and we’ll bring it back probably at the next meeting, but I’ll look into that information. **Commissioner Townsend** said that would apply to any of the LLCs. That would be our practice. **Mr. Slaughter** said it should be, yes. **Commissioner Townsend** said okay, thank you.

**Commissioner Murguia** asked so then can I move for approval on everything but 2053. **Mr. Slaughter** said not yet. At the bottom we do have two properties that we’re doing a best and final on. As usual I will give a recommendation on both. Let’s go to the last one first, 235 S. 21st St. We have ZJ Enterprise, LLC for yard extension and Brenda Jurado for a garden.

Some history on this property, Ms. Jurado’s parents had applied for this property at one point. It’s right across the street from their house. At the time there were some substantial code violations in talking with the code officer in that area. There are still probably grounds for some current or future violations so I feel, or the Land Bank feels, that the best recommendation would be for ZJ Enterprises on this property.
The other one is 228 S. 21st St. If you look at the map that’s up on the screen, do we have a pointer? Chairman McKiernan asked can we have one click worth of zoom in. Mr. Slaughter said that’s perfect. I will say after I get done speaking both applicants are here and if you feel it’s necessary for additional questions or comments from them, I believe they’re available for comment. Chairman McKiernan said show us again the first one which was—Mr. Slaughter said the first one we just talked about, this is the property that’s being requested. 235. This is the Jurado residence and this is one of the properties zoned in the area by ZJ Enterprises. Our recommendation is for ZJ for the award.

The next property we’re talking about here is 228 S. 21st and we have the same applicant here at 1914 and we have 234. They’re requesting a yard extension. ZJ is requesting to hold it for a future development. The development, I’ve heard a lot about it. There have been discussions with other groups, departments within the UG, but I also think we’re still in some infancy stages that at this point I see more credence to turn around and make a recommendation to award this to the neighbor for yard extension. The neighbor, I believe it’s Lytch has no taxes.
that are owned, has no code violations that are outstanding. He wants to just expand his yard and I think that’s a stronger recommendation for—than a future development that just is still, in my opinion, in the infancy stages. Again, both applicants are here and if you want to get more additional information that’s up to you. My recommendation would be for Mr., Lytch for 228 and ZJ Enterprise for 235 S. 21st.

**Commissioner Walters** asked, Chris, did you say that 235 S. 21st was for a future development also. **Mr. Slaughter** said no. Being the proximity to the 1914 I’ve went ahead and listed that as a yard extension. A lot of this is, I mean, this road comes to about right here and that’s it, so a lot of this is just kind of rough terrain and being that he’s already the owner here, he’s applied also in the packet for 1910 which we wish to move forward on. We just felt that he would probably be a better steward of the property. Again, this house here, there’s been issues with codes. If you drive here off the highway, you’ll see what I’m talking about; various construction, equipment and supplies that are highly visible from the highway. Again, in speaking with the Code Enforcement Officer in that area, there has been issues in the past and again they are just wanting it for a garden. This is a pretty rocky, rough terrain. We’re just going to stand by our recommendation for ZJ. **Commissioner Walters** said thank you.

**Commissioner Murguia** asked does ZJ Enterprise still want 235 if they’re not going to get 228. **Mr. Slaughter** said I believe they—yes, they want all three. I just feel that the best suite for 228 is going to be the neighbor. **Commissioner Murguia** asked are you ready for a motion? **Chairman McKiernan** said at this point would we want to hear from either of the applicants who are here. Let’s do that. I believe we have two applicants who are here tonight and if I could ask each of you, one by one to come to the podium here in the middle of the room. If you’d just state your name and your city of residence for the record and then—before we get to that, might I suggest we can take the first block down to these two best and finals and we could approve those, get those out—we could have a motion on those, get those out of the way and then just focus on these two best and finals, then take each of them one by one, hear from whatever applicants are here and move on those. **Commissioner Murguia** said okay, this is the fourth time. Would you like me to make a motion? **Chairman McKiernan** said yes I would.
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**Action:** Commissioner Murguia made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Walters, to approve the applications minus 2053 Springfield and minus best and final. Roll call was taken and there were four “Ayes,” Walters, Murguia, Townsend, McKiernan.

**Chairman McKiernan** said then that brings us down on this list of Land Bank applications to 228 S. 21st and 235 as a best and final. On the property 228, which is the property on the west side of the street, correct, do we have—and you said this one was yard expansion from 234. Do we have the resident of 234 here? Sir, could you come on up to the podium and state your name and your city of residence for the record and then just give us a brief background on why you wish to acquire this property for a yard expansion.

**Wade Lytch, 234 S. 21st St.,** said I do have the property that would be to the south. That property would be to my north. I’ve been in the neighborhood quite some time. It’s actually been a grandmother’s house and then I got it from her so we’ve been kind of been maintaining the property for some time and we’d like to continue on with that and get the property awarded to us so we can—**Chairman McKiernan** said and so just a direct expansion of your yard northward on to the next lot. **Mr. Lytch** said yes, correct. I plan on retiring in the home so the taxes will be there every year until I—for the record. **Chairman McKiernan** said always a good thing. Thank you sir, appreciate it very much. Then we have the other applicant is here as well. If you again can state your name, city of residence for the record, and then just explain your application for 228.

**Dean Siggorts, 7425 Juniper, Prairie Village, KS,** said I’m one of the partners of ZJ Enterprises and we have already completed one redevelopment area next to City Park Drive so we office at 361 City Park Drive. Let me just say I think I have a few minutes. Let me just say something real quick. Number one, I’m a big fan of Mr. Lytch. If this is what he wants to do, that’s fine. If we purchase the property, I just want him to know we wouldn’t ask him to move. We wouldn’t ask him to take anything off of it; it’s just merely the start of the process for us. You know development starts with an acquisition, it’s a big leap of faith and we’re just trying to seize the moment. The delays that happened, they close the window of opportunity. I’ve met
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with David Haley, Pam Curtis, Mayor Holland is quite aware of what we’re doing, Joe Reardon, ex-mayor, Murray Rhodes, obviously not in order of importance right, Paul Soptic with WCAC, very close with Marty Finnes with CABA, he’s really kind of spearheading this whole thing and then I’ve been working with the Economic Development group of Greg Kindle and Jay Matlack.

We would not even be touching this if they hadn’t added a mixed zoning because we want to come in with some nice retail and some low rise buildings that will have retail as well as office, apartment and condo. Then we want to do a high density upscale apartment area combined with a regular workforce apartment area, kind of in the same area so they’re not set off. We’re very aware of being correct I think is the word.

You know we all know private land ownership is the biggest obstacle in planning implementation. Land assembly is seen as a tool and that’s to regulate prices and to implement the plan. The main advantage of the development actually takes place and with this group behind me, we’ve been so politically correct that it’s been very fun. We’ve gone through sewers. 60% of this group, this area does not even have infrastructure, it is a jungle. It’s an elevation of over 120 ft. difference.

We’re working on putting in the road and we want to put a nice face on this part of the county. This might not pertain to this piece but I had the feeling that I’m going to be in front of this group for quite some time and I just want you to know that our intent is sincere, okay.

The average house cost in this area is $40,000. There are 42 residences, there are 60 vacant lots. Again, the biggest problem we have is going to be the elevation differences, but we know how to handle that. The people from sewers have given me words that I’m so happy that the word horizontal boring has come into play that I can’t believe, but we’re going to go through this project and we look forward to it in the future.

Again, with Mr. Lytch, upstanding person, great guy, I know his lot. I know all these lots and if he wants to purchase it and use it for side storage or whatever, then I’ll withdraw. If you would like for me to purchase it and give him an agreement that until it comes time for this development to move, you know back into his neighborhood, then he is free to use it 100%. We won’t touch a thing.

Action: Commissioner Murguia made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Walters, to approve staff’s recommendation.
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Chairman McKiernan said staff’s recommendation is…restate that please. Mr. Slaughter said for 228, our recommendation is for the owner at 234 and for 235 we are recommending the owner at 1914 Vermont. Chairman McKiernan said which is the gentleman that just spoke. Mr. Slaughter said correct. I believe it would be—I picked the wrong time to break my reading glasses. For 228, we recommend for Mr. Lytch and for 235, ZJ Enterprises, LLC. Chairman McKiernan asked do you want one or two motions on that. Do you want to move to accept both of staff’s recommendations or simply one?

Action: Commissioner Murguia made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Walters, to approve both of staff’s recommendation on both best and finals. Roll call was taken and there were four “Ayes,” Walters, Murguia, Townsend, McKiernan.

Chairman McKiernan said now we’re into the next section which is measurable goals. Mr. Ken Moore is here to follow-up an item. We started some discussion last month about code violations and maybe looking at some renewed enforcement for serial or habitual violators. Mr. Moore had followed up on some of the items that we had discussed last month and just wanted to bring that information back to us. This is for information only, for the discussion.

Measurable Goals
Item No. 1 – 150038… RESPONSE/DISCUSSION: CODE ENFORCEMENT

Synopsis: Response and continuing discussion of code enforcement from the March 9, 2015 standing committee meeting.

Ken Moore, Deputy Chief Counsel, said at the last meeting there was a request to bring some additional information about eminent domain and the reasons that the city could exercise their authority. I thought it would be good to kind of give a background of how we got to the current state of the law.
That’s really been the state—that statute has been in existence in that form for probably fifty years.

In 2005 the Supreme Court had the Kelo case and that has been called one of the most despised Supreme Court cases ever. It was a five to four split decision and they—the reason it’s called that is because the city acquired property solely from one private landowner and gave it to another solely for economic development purposes. There really wasn’t a public purpose there except for economic development. Now, the thing about that case is as I showed you in that first statute, that’s really the status of the law from forever. It just kinds of made it very clear. It kind of resulted in a public uprising, if you will, so Kansas and 43 other states either adopted changes
to their laws or their constitutions to restrict how the government can acquire properties through eminent domain.

In that 26-501a is a new statute adopted in 2006 and it says that, and the key word there in that title is transfer to private entity. It prohibited the transfer from one private property owner to another private property owner and then in paragraph b it says the taking of private property by eminent domain for the purpose of selling, leasing or otherwise transferring is prohibited except and that it has some exceptions.

Now, when that statute came into effect on July 1, 2017, Commissioner Murguia, you might remember we had some action where we were just under the deadline and we acquired Indian Springs, Prescott Plaza and some other projects. There is an exception. There are six exceptions listed but I think the key one for the purpose of this group’s discussion is that the Unified Government can acquire property if it’s unsafe for occupation by humans under our building codes. Again, that is a situation where you can acquire from one property, from one property owner to transfer to another private property owner.
We’ve adopted the International Property Maintenance Code, Ordinance 8-24 and it really kind of defines and outlines what we consider unfit for human occupancy. It’s unsafe, it lacks maintenance, disrepair, infested, unsanitary, improper heating, ventilation or other equipment required by the code. Commissioner Murguia said so am I wrong, not to interrupt your presentation, and I’m really not trying to be a smart aleck here, but would I be right then to interpret it that we have a lot of property that fits that criteria in Wyandotte County. Mr. Moore said I would imagine so, yes. I think so. Commissioner Murguia said okay, I just want to make sure I wasn’t misinterpreting anything. Mr. Moore said now in our code we have an unfit process where it’s posted to have hearings. This is really the process used for demolition but it’s also a process used to get the property owner to make repairs to their property. This is separate from the Municipal Court prosecution. This is an administrator process to either get repairs or to give us authority to demolish the property. Commissioner Walters said, Ken, just for my understanding, so if a house is vacant and there is no electricity to it, that automatically fits that definition, does it not? Mr. Moore said it would. Commissioner Walters said thanks.

Chairman McKiernan said if I could kind of piggyback on that, if you could go back to the unfit process there. That process really is mainly to encourage the property owner to make whatever corrective action is necessary to bring it back from unfit status. Is that right? Mr. Moore said that’s correct. If they post it unfit, and Colin’s our resident expert, he handles that process; but if they post a property unfit they still set it for an administrative hearing before the
codes officer. That’s an opportunity to come in and really have explained all of the deficiencies in the property and then given a deadline to submit a plan as to how they’re going to remedy those things. It falls that administrative process.

If they fail to do so and the property meets certain criteria, which essentially is at the cost of the repairs exceeds the appraised value as shown in our tax records, if that’s the case then they’ll initiate the demolition process; which is really the same process but they do more of the publications and official notices. They notify mortgage companies and other parties of interest. Whereas, when they’re just trying to get a repair they just go through that process with the property owner itself. Chairman McKiernan said well, two things come to mind. First of all, if it’s posted unfit and the property owner acknowledges that the repairs need to be made but then simply doesn’t make them, then what recourse do we have other than ultimately to tear it down. I guess to back up from that would be what, if any, means do we have to try to arrest that slide toward demolition so that before it’s even posted unfit if a house is creating a blight in a neighborhood, there is a corrective action that can be taken earlier so it doesn’t just sit there and fester discouraging people from moving in and encouraging people to move out? Mr. Moore said well, the same authority we have to ultimately demolish we have the authority to go in and make the repairs. We can eliminate the blight or the unsafe condition but as a practical matter, I think it just gets to a point where it goes to demolition. Chairman McKiernan said wait a minute. We have the capacity, if we would choose to do it—Mr. Moore said we can issue an order to repair—Chairman McKiernan said to make the repairs. Mr. Moore said of course access those costs against the property. It’s always a fine line if you’re throwing good money after bad. Chairman McKiernan said well, but okay, so once we’ve made those repairs then what. Can we acquire the property having brought it from that status up? Mr. Moore said there are no provisions to transfer ownership in this process with it at all. Chairman McKiernan asked are there any other judicial or court processes that might transfer ownership at any point. Mr. Moore said well, as a demolition assessment it becomes a lien on the property and if it’s delinquent, then we can foreclose like it’s part of the tax foreclosure sale and acquire it in that fashion but that’s it, that’s, well, I don’t know. Is there—we might be able to do a private foreclosure that says any private debt if we didn’t want to acquire the property. Colin Welsh, Assistant Attorney; said I think that’s right. Mr. Moore said in my time here I’ve never, or I shouldn’t say never, because I think sometimes we’ll do that to a—it’s the same authority we use
to board structures up to secure them is pretty much under this authority.  **Chairman McKiernan** said okay. Thank you.

**Commissioner Murguia** said, Ken, can you give us—you don’t have a timeline associated with that process. Can you flip back real quick? So there are statutory timeframes. I know the next slide says in total but I’m not talking about in total. I’m talking about if I have a house in my district where I want to track it from beginning to end through this unfit structures process, once a notice is issued how long before it can go to demolition; 30 days, 60 days, 90 days? **Mr. Moore** said for demolition, well—**Commissioner Murguia** said once you notice it up, how many days do you have before I can tear it down? **Mr. Moore** said we use this process in two ways. One is to get the owner to repair and that is kind of more an abbreviated process because we don’t go through the title search, the publications and that part; to do a demolition though we go through the full-fledged process by getting a title report and doing the publication of the notices. Colin, can you answer that question, what is our timeframe for the demolition process. **Mr. Welsh** said I can’t give you an accurate idea about what our timeframe is on that depiction just because we have such a backlog of them that—**Commissioner Murguia** said doesn’t statute indicate that though. I’m not asking for our timeline personal. I’m asking isn’t there a statutory timeframe that’s required before we can—**Mr. Welsh** said I believe that it’s notices that the item that the statutes most concerned with. I don’t think there’s any specific set of days in which we have from noticing to tearing it down. It’s reasonable, I believe, but I can get back with you on that to be more specific. That’s just off the top of my head. **Commissioner Murguia** said because reasonable is relative. **Mr. Welsh** said it certainly is. **Commissioner Murguia** said so I would be curious that the statute would probably—if you could tell me. The statute should indicate or define reasonable if it’s 14 days or 30 days. I know it does with a lot of our other notices. **Mr. Welsh** said again, we’re going forward on projects that we’re certainly—we do have notice so as far as people that we can’t get a hold of, I think we’ve been, we have plenty of other ones to go out here I guess is what I’m saying.

**Commissioner Murguia** said in this process it looks all clean, neat and easy, the way you have it written up there. **Mr. Moore** said it’s the font. **Commissioner Murguia** said it’s got to be the font because it’s not the process. After you notice, when you say define notice, what constitutes
Mr. Welsh said hopefully they’ve been in for the unfit hearing so we have lots of documentation that they’re aware of the situation but then we make an order to them that they need to get it. I mean they have the opportunity to demo it on their own but if they don’t do so by a certain date, we’ll take that on and then of course then we’re communicating with the contractors and then we’re dealing with their schedule as far as when they can get it in. So, did that answer your question? Mr. Moore said the 8-451 on notice says that you provide them notice in writing by publication of a hearing not less than 10 days, no more than 30 days. So that’s of the initial hearing. Commissioner Murguia asked why not more than 30 because we go way longer than 30. Mr. Moore said I understand. I mean this is for the initial hearing. Commissioner Murguia said oh, they have to be heard in 30 days and that’s the ticket process. Mr. Moore said no. Commissioner Murguia said that’s the notice process. Mr. Moore said this is completely separate from Municipal Court. Commissioner Murguia said so when you send them notice you send them a court date to show in court to be heard about the unfit process or do we do that in a different system? Mr. Moore said this is done, it’s an administrative process at the NRC. Commissioner Murguia asked with the administrative judge. Mr. Moore said no, with the code inspector that issued the unfit citation, unfit notice or maybe a supervisor. Mr. Welsh said yes. A code officer working for the public officer is Mr. Talkin right now. Commissioner Murguia said so after they’ve been heard, after they’ve been noticed up, you have 30 days, you have to set a hearing date within 30 days, they go to the hearing, let’s say they comply and go to the hearing in 30 days and they say I’m not fixing it up and I’m not tearing it down. I don’t have any money to do either. So when can we demolish, the 31st day? Mr. Moore said well then—Mr. Welsh said the order would be given after that 30th day and again, if they don’t respond then we’re kind of in a lurch where we don’t have necessarily have notice. Now we can publish it and we can go forward and—although I have some reservations I suppose we could go forward pretty quickly but again, we don’t have any—we can’t be assured that we’ve properly notified them, then they’re going to come back and potentially have a cause of action against us. Mr. Moore said there is a 30 day appeal time also. So we will not take any action for that period of time.

Commissioner Walters said at the hearing isn’t a decision made and the owner notified of that decision at the hearing. Mr. Welsh said again, we’re working at it from here are the repairs you
need to have made unless, as Ken was saying, the cost for the repairs exceed 100% of the appraised value and then at that point then the officer or the demolition coordinator, I suppose, would be saying that’s it, we’re going to demo this. You need to have this demolished within this certain timeframe. If you don’t then we’re going to go forward. We also at that time often provide a form where they can kind of waive their rights, accept that we’re going to demolish it and access the value to the property. That happens fairly frequently.

**ARTICLE IX. - UNFIT STRUCTURES PROCESS**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 8-451. - Notice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 8-452. - Order to repair, remove or demolish.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 8-453. - Repair, removal or demolition by public officer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 8-454. - Emergency action and waivers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 8-455. - Service, posting and filing of complaints and orders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 8-456. - Appeals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 8-457. - Violation; penalty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commissioner Murguia** said sorry to belabor this, but for me this process is important and I did not get this presentation in my packet. Can I have this? **Mr. Moore** said sure. **Commissioner Murguia** said okay. **Chairman McKiernan** said all of us please. Thank you. **Commissioner Murguia** said I’m better with scenarios than just ambiguous process, okay. So you’ve sent me a notice. I’m the property owner. You sent me a notice. I got a letter in the mail and I’ve got a court—I’m sorry administrative hearing date, okay. I show up to that administration hearing, at that hearing it’s simply to provide me with an order to repair, remove or demolish my property. You’re ordering me to repair, remove or demolish one of those things, correct? That’s the order that you’re talking about. **Mr. Welsh** said right. **Commissioner Murguia** said so now I have my order and I have to do one of those things and that order, in that order it will specify how many days I have to do one of those three things, correct? **Mr. Welsh** said yes. **Commissioner Murguia** asked is there a statutory timeframe? **Mr. Welsh** said no. That’s really up to the Codes Officer determining on the representations of who they’re dealing with, when can you have this done by. **Commissioner Murguia** asked can we make—so in local government can
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we set a policy directing our administrative officer to give everyone the same amount of time. **Mr. Welsh** said I would suppose so. **Commissioner Murguia** asked do you think that would be helpful in lawsuits because I know we try to be really flexible and often time that works against us. Jim gets 60 days to fix up his property. I get 30 days so when it’s sort of just out there like that, it seems to bring out questions. **Mr. Welsh** said I think it cuts both ways. It’s nice to be able to tell the judge like you know, all we asked them to do was this and you know to think about it could practically should have only taken this period of time but we gave them this and this and this and finally we put the hammer down. I mean that looks good as far as the judge is concerned. **Commissioner Murguia** asked if it goes to court, what court does it go to. **Mr. Welsh** said it goes across the street. **Commissioner Murguia** said to our District Court in our county. Okay, so the notices to appear, the order is to do one of those things and you gave them 60 days and they don’t do it. So on the 61st day does section 8-453 allow you to demolish the structure, repair, remove or demolish the structure? **Mr. Welsh** said and they failed to file the appeal. **Commissioner Murguia** said yes. **Mr. Welsh** said then at that point, yes, I believe it would. Again, I’m sorry I haven’t really thought about it in these terms because of the stack of these that are on the Demolition Coordinators desk. **Commissioner Murguia** asked how much is the stack, how many. **Mr. Welsh** said I can’t answer that. I have no idea. I would feel safe saying it’s a stack. **Commissioner Murguia** said like a hundred or thousands. **Mr. Welsh** said I’m going to say hundreds, but a thousand I don’t know. I’m sorry.

**Chairman McKiernan** said but realistically and it’s not the focus of this particular presentation but realistically, any structure that gets to the unfit process has been in the system for a while and that kind of goes back to some of my continuing frustration is it’s not the first time we’ve ever seen a property when it shows up to this unfit hearing. There have undoubtedly been, or I would guess there have been, code violations, previous notices; previous attempts to have someone comply. That’s what I would really like is stop the slide toward unfit so that we arrest the process before it ever gets up to this notice but once it gets here, accelerate the process.

**Commissioner Murguia** asked can you explain to me what emergency action and waivers are. **Mr. Welsh** said that’s basically when time doesn’t allow notifying all the parties. There’s an eminent of danger—**Chairman McKiernan** said so would that be like when I had a building
burn in my district, that night there was an assessment made that it presented an eminent danger of collapse and we demolished it the next day and then assessed the demolition charge as a lien against that property. **Mr. Moore** said that’s correct. **Commissioner Murguia** said so that’s really—I’m reading it from top to bottom as in first step, second step but that’s not really the case. 453 and 454 really are parallel. **Mr. Moore** said they are. **Commissioner Murguia** said thanks. **Mr. Moore** said one is an emergency and one is not. **Commissioner Murguia** said service posting and filing of complaints in order. **Mr. Welsh** said that goes to notice and you’re posting it on the property, you’re sending it by registered or certified mail. **Commissioner Murguia** asked is that part of the notice. **Mr. Welsh** said yes. **Commissioner Murguia** said so that is parallel to notice. **Mr. Welsh** said right so that’d go back. **Commissioner Murguia** said that’s the definition of notice. **Mr. Welsh** said yes. **Commissioner Murguia** said and then appeals, can you appeal? You want to appeal after the order, correct? **Mr. Welsh** said yes. **Commissioner Walters** asked who do you appeal to. **Mr. Welsh** said to the District Court. **Commissioner Murguia** said right here in Wyandotte County. What is the violation or penalty? **Mr. Welsh** said penalty, well, technically we could be you know issuing a summons for violating these orders—**Commissioner Murguia** said for not demolishing, repairing or removing. **Mr. Welsh** said yes. **Ms. Boeding** said that would be Municipal Court. **Mr. Welsh** said yes, right. **Commissioner Murguia** said that’d be like a ticket to court where they’d have to pay a fine in addition. **Mr. Welsh** said correct. **Commissioner Murguia** said okay. That’s very good you guys. I’ve been here for a long time. That’s really good.

**Commissioner Walters** asked is this a Kansas City, Kansas program or policy or is it a county. **Ms. Boeding** said this is a Kansas City, Kansas ordinance. **Commissioner Walters** said thank you.
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Mr. Moore said and then that’s the eminent domain condemnation process and a lot of that is really governed by the notice periods you have to give before any of the court hearings and it has to be published and mailed so it’s hard to reduce it below that 5 month period. Ms. Boeding said this is all state law. Mr. Moore said yes, this is all state—those state statutes that I referenced earlier about the authority; this is the process that implements that authority.

Commissioner Murguia said this is a little harder because it’s a little more information at one time. So the second one adopting resolution declaring legal authority and purpose, what’s the legal authority and purpose? Mr. Moore said well, anything in that statute. I mean we have general authority for any public purpose. Later tonight on your next committee agenda you have one for a sewer repair and it’s you know for that public purpose and a—Commissioner Murguia asked do you have a legal definition for public purpose? Mr. Moore said it’s outlined in those statutes earlier. For a public purpose it could be, it is primarily used for as long as the government retains that interest in the property, it’s for any infrastructure improvement, things of that nature and then you have those six exceptions in the unsafe or unfit structure as one of those exceptions. Commissioner Murguia said a new retail shopping center. Mr. Moore said only if the property there that you’re condemning would meet one of those six exceptions. Commissioner Murguia said which is. Mr. Moore said other than that you cannot condemn for economic development purposes solely to get it taken from one property owner to give it to another. It has to be one of those six exceptions. Commissioner Murguia said and the six again are. Mr. Moore said I only showed you one. Commissioner Walters said the sixth exception is the one that probably has the most applicability. Commissioner Murguia said
public purpose you mean. **Commissioner Walters** said well, it defines a house that is in ill repair and doesn’t have proper ventilation, illumination, that sort of thing. It was on an earlier slide. This process on this slide, would this be a county or city program. **Mr. Moore** said it could be either way. The other way we exercise that power as a city because Bonner Springs and Edwardsville have their own authority to do the same thing.

**Commissioner Murguia** said so I’m a little confused because when Jim was using as example unfit, you would stamp a home unfit and resolve that through the three options repair, removal or demolition; but condemnation and unfit even after you do all that you don’t get ownership of the property in an unfit situation. Brian’s already asked that. In condemnation my understanding is you do get ownership. **Mr. Moore** said that’s correct. **Commissioner Murguia** said so there is a big difference. If the lights aren’t working and it’s boarded up, you can condemn it because it’s a public safety issue. **Mr. Moore** said because it’s unfit. **Commissioner Murguia** said oh good Lord. **Mr. Moore** said the six exceptions are, one is for KDOT, one is for utilities, the third is when the owner agrees in writing, the fourth is if there is a title defect that you have to clear the title defects so by condemning you eliminate other potential claimants from it. The fifth is when it’s unsafe for occupation by humans and the seventh is when the legislature specifically authorizes it. **Commissioner Murguia** asked so we can condemn property that’s unsafe for humans. **Commissioner Walters** said yes, exception number six. **Commissioner Murguia** said which is the one you were talking about and condemnation gets us ownership. **Mr. Moore** said yes, that’s exactly right.

**Commissioner Murguia** said so Commissioner McKiernan’s been asking this question for a long time. He just asked it again, unless I’m missing something, he just said we have lots of property, for example; in his district that’s boarded up, maybe it’s not too far gone but there’s a party that’s interested in it, why can’t we condemn that because it’s unsafe, fix it up and then give it to someone else? **Mr. Moore** said we can. That may be the key is that we essentially buy it from them because if you go back to the process, the court appoints three appraisers. They go in and inspect the property. They determine what the value of the property is, the fair market and they got a laundered list of factors that they use and in order to acquire the property we have to pay that to the owner including the appraiser’s fees and the court cost. **Commissioner Murguia**
said so you’ve condemned it now you own this property that you’ve condemned so you own it. Commissioner Walters said you had to pay for it. Commissioner Murguia said right, you pay for it. Now we want to give it to someone else or sell it to someone else. Can we do that? Mr. Moore said yes. The reason I put that Kelo case up there, kind of for a reason, is that I think it’s the same sentiment that if the person, the bottom point there, is that the owner if they don’t like what they get they can appeal and have a jury trial and a jury is going to determine how much their property’s worth. I think that you know their—I guess on one hand you have a property owner who says I didn’t take care of it, but on the other hand it’s the government taking property from one property owner to give it to another, which is not really—the course I think that the legislature’s on, aren’t very keen on that idea. Commissioner Murguia said so the same person, it’s really just a question, probably more your opinion. So the same person that doesn’t have the money to fix up their property, that it’s so bad that we have to board it up is going to have money to sue us and take us to court. Mr. Moore said well it depends on the award of course because the other thing is if they win, we pay their attorney’s fees. If they get more of them as a ward, it’s a one dollar or more thing, we pay their attorney’s fees. Mr. Welsh asked we’re filing the lawsuit of condemnation right. Mr. Moore said we file the condemnation and if they don’t like the award they file a separate appeal. They are entitled if they get more than the award, they are entitled to the attorney’s fees. Commissioner Murguia said but that’s no different than the process we’ve always followed with condemnation. Mr. Moore said correct. Commissioner Walters said but best if you can negotiate a price and get everybody in agreement rather than having conflict. Commissioner Murguia said well, that’s what we did in 2007 with Indian Springs and 18th & I-70 so nothing’s really different in my mind. Mr. Moore said no, well, right, the only difference, if you will, is I guess the money was budgeted for those purposes and we knew they were there. Commissioner Murguia said yes, but that’s, okay—Chairman McKiernan said but if we chose to budget money again for similar purposes it would seem that we still have the legal capacity under a certain set of circumstances to do what we’ve done before. Commissioner Murguia said we’ve just been asking that question—I’ve been asking that question for eight years and what I’ve been told since I came on in 2007 is that the action taken by the state legislature in 2007 prohibited us from doing condemnation, not that it’s a budgetary issue. It’s a condemnation issue and it really isn’t because exactly the definition that Brian has now been talking about for four years is the same issue that we have a public safety
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issue with blocks and blocks of blight and dilapidation, property that may be structurally unsound, at minimum vacant and boarded up. And we’ve been told repeatedly that we could not condemn because it didn’t meet the condemnation statute, but that’s not true. What really is the truth is we just have to make a good case in court during the condemnation hearing about why this property is a public safety issue. Mr. Moore said that is unfit.

Chairman McKiernan said wow! I really appreciate this discussion because now I’ve got a lot to think about because it would appear that we have a tool we may not have been leveraging as fully as we could have up to this point. May I muddy the water just a little more. Commissioner Murguia said oh please do. Chairman McKiernan said well, what I’d like for you to is, if you wouldn’t mind, I’d love to learn a little more about the process and I keep picking on Baltimore because I have read about their process of receivership that is a judicial decision to award control but at first not the deed and then later the deed to someone other than the owner because the property is abandoned and creating a blight in that neighborhood and they have definitions that go with those. Now it’s my understanding that a third party not-for-profit can make the petition to the court. Mr. Moore said in Kansas, correct. Chairman McKiernan said but the government cannot make petition to the court. Is that correct? Mr. Welsh said that’s correct as it stands now. Chairman McKiernan said I would love to learn a little bit more about the private third party not-for-profit versus the government in terms of what the procedures are and what the differences in the procedures are for the receivership process, which ultimately gets us to the same place which is a house that’s sliding toward demolition that gets stopped, rehabilitated and reinhabited. I would love to kind of get a little more about that as well because I think that’s another tool that we potentially have that we may not fully understand and be fully leveraging.

Commissioner Walters said well it certainly addresses the house that is abandoned but is in the process or the thinking that we have to wait three years to get it in the tax sale. Chairman McKiernan said if I so chose I could rattle off several addresses of houses that do not yet fit our eligibility for tax sale and yet—Commissioner Walters said are unfit. Chairman McKiernan said are unfit, well, yes, they’re posted, but they do not yet fit and that’s been part of my
frustration is what do you mean I have to wait another year to take action on this house which is a danger to the neighborhood and even then, who knows how that’s all going to turn out.

**Mr. Welsh** said you’re talking about the changes that Frownfelter has been trying to make essentially because right now you can’t do that receivership. The blight and the vacancy is not alone on a residence. It has to also be qualified. It has to qualify for the tax sale. Of course for local government the tax sale is the route to take because we do that already. **Commissioner Murguia** said not through condemnation. **Mr. Welsh** said right, but then we have to pay them for it. I guess the only other thing I’d say to that line is most of these properties that we might and, Ken’s the resident expert on condemnation, if we’re trying to go through condemnation with a property and it needs to be unfit for human habitation; by the time we get everything filed, if there were just minor problems with the house then they’re going to bring it up to code and then be able to come into court and say it’s not unfit so you can’t go this route. So we’re only going to be—ultimately we’re only going to get the properties that are big problems, right. Now if we have other ideas for them that’s fine. **Chairman McKiernan** said but you know if somebody brought it up to code, I’d be happy. That’s irrespective of paying the taxes. That’s a whole different issue, but if we simply have code violations that are longstanding and are remedied, I think that’s a win. **Mr. Welsh** said I agree with you.

**Commissioner Murguia** said this is the concern I have again, which is the concern I have with Land Bank and then I’ll obviously let you finish. This has been very educational. I’ve been here a long time and I did not know this. I just think it’s really interesting, especially when I’ve specifically been told we cannot condemn property unless it’s a public purpose and was led to believe that was for sewer line, road or a bridge. That’s very enlightening.

The concern I have is what you said about, and I’m really not holding you to this, I don’t care if it’s a hundred. I don’t really care if it’s ten, but you said there are probably hundreds of these. Were you talking about unfit or condemnation? **Mr. Welsh** said no, I’m talking about properties that are in the demo queue and I haven’t gotten a number for a long time on that so please take that with a grain of salt. **Commissioner Murguia** said yeah, and that’s okay. I guess what I’m saying is we already are paying hundreds of thousands of dollars a year in
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demolition, we already are paying thousands of dollars, at least tens of thousands of dollars to take properties through the tax sale.

I think the concern you’ve heard from Commissioner McKiernan, myself and Commissioner Markley is that we have a lot of tools available to use to take back control of our city and we’re not being strategic in the way that we’re using them. So we do have money to condemn property and take it. We could take it from demolition and we could not demolish some that we don’t care about and acquire and demolish the ones we care about and be much more strategic about it. That’s what concerns me is that yes we have a list of property on the demolition but does the city, collectively does our community really care if half of those get demolished or would their priorities be in another area of demolition.

It just doesn’t seem to be—it seems like everybody is working within their department. I’m here to demolish houses. I’m going to do it and I don’t care how it affects the rest of the city. I’m here to stamp houses on foot and it doesn’t matter to me how that happens and then the repeat thing I continue to hear from our Administrator is that we’re short on staff, their overworked and they don’t have enough time to get their job done, just a comment. Anyway, you go ahead.

Mr. Moore said okay, if you want to talk about this. Commissioner Murguia said I’d just like a copy of it in writing and all the detail, all the extra definitions that you gave me. It doesn’t have to be neat or anything, if you could just send it to me, even highlighting what you read. That’ll be great. I’d just love to have it in a file.

Chairman McKiernan said you know and to go back to the structures for demolition, in the last four years there’s been 51 structures demolished just in my district. Let’s say that’s 12 a year and it was told to me one time that any moment in time we have enough money to tear down about a fourth of the structures that are eligible or posted for demolition. That would make it roughly 50 a year and if we take that times the number of districts that would suggest that there could be in the low hundreds of numbers of properties that are currently eligible for demolition. I agree with Commissioner Murguia, this has been a really, very eye-opening discussion. I appreciate the information. If we could talk about receivership a little bit, I would appreciate that and we will just continue the discussion of using all of our tools.
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Commissioner Murguia said I know this is not meant for us to take action but I would like to request that you bring something back for us for consideration. I know you already turned that off, but in the process of the unfit process when you stamp the home unfit, I would no longer—I would like to set a timeframe for each. So like when you notice the person you’ve already said you got to give them more than 14 days. Mr. Moore said more than 10 less than 30. Commissioner Murguia said more than 10 less than 30. You have a very specific timeframe and then when you give the order there is no timeframe. I would like us to establish a timeframe because I’m assuming that if they want to appeal that timeframe, they can appeal that through the appeal process. Mr. Moore said yes, when the order is entered that’s when their 30 day clock to appeal starts. Commissioner Murguia asked but do you see what I’m saying. Right now it’s just arbitrary. I give Jim 60 days and myself 30 days. Why wouldn’t we just eliminate that option and say everybody gets 30 days to repair, remove or demolish and if they need longer than that, they need to go through the appeal process. That way there’s no favoritism. Mr. Moore said I understand. Commissioner Murguia said there’s no hey, this guy got 60 days and I only got 30 and plus staff can just move them through faster. Mr. Moore said I think, at least back in the days when I used to be more involved in this, the length of time, the orders are very incremental. You have to do these things by this date and if you do that you were given more things to do as the time went on. It was also kind of somewhat coinciding because they didn’t give them like a year to fix everything. You have used a certain amount by this time, if you did that then you get an additional period of time. One of the problems is you don’t want, again, the homeowner to throw good money after bad thinking they can do it and then they don’t really—the bottom line is we’re going to demolish it anyway.

Commissioner Walters said it seems to me that one of the things we should think about is a strategy. If we really think this condemnation is a tool that it sounds like it is, at the same time I don’t think we want to condemn hundreds and hundreds of houses either. As you said, the idea is to try to figure out a way to get them repaired, stabilized and improved but there might be a reason for us to condemn some. So how we come up with that strategy would be very helpful. Is it neighborhood based, is it value based, whatever that strategy might be. Chairman McKiernan said I absolutely agree and look forward to continuing this discussion.
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Action: For information only.

Adjourn

Chairman McKiernan adjourned the meeting at 6:05 p.m.
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**Proposed for the following Full Commission Meeting Date:**  
6/25/2015  
**Confirmed Date:** 6/25/2015

□ Changes Recommended By Standing Committee (New Action Form required with signatures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contact Name</th>
<th>Contact Phone</th>
<th>Contact Email</th>
<th>Ref</th>
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</tr>
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<tr>
<td>5/20/2015</td>
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<td>Economic Development</td>
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</table>

**Item Description:**
Silver City Park has been closed for public use and access since prior to Unified Government consolidation in 1997. The park grounds were acquired by the City of Kansas City, KS from the Urban Renewal Agency of Kansas City Kansas in May of 1975. The location and restrictions for the park are outlined in the land use plan exhibits of the Silver City Urban Renewal Plan approved in 1963.

The UG Parks & Rec Department has no current or future plans to purchase equipment or make improvements to the park for public use. The department has continued to mow and treat the grounds for noxious weeds.

UG development staff is proposing to amend the Silver City Urban Renewal Plan and solicit redevelopment proposals for this underutilized tract of land.

**Action Requested:**
A resolution setting a public hearing on June 25, 2015 to consider an amendment to the Silver City Urban Renewal Plan

**Budget Impact:** (if applicable)

- **Amount:** $  
- **Source:**  
  - [ ] Included In Budget  
  - [✓] Other (explain) Policy action by Commission.

**Publication Required**

**File Attachment**

**File Attachment**

**File Attachment**

**File Attachment**
RESOLUTION NO. R-____-15

A RESOLUTION CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR NOTICE OF A PUBLIC HEARING ON THE ADVISABILITY OF AMENDING THE SILVER CITY URBAN RENEWAL PLAN.

WHEREAS, K.S.A. 17-4742 et. seq. (the “Act”) authorizes the governing body of any municipality to create urban renewal areas in which to utilize private and public resources to eliminate and prevent development or spread of slums and urban blight, to encourage needed urban rehabilitation, to provide for redevelopment of slums and blighted areas, and to undertake any feasible municipal activities as may be suitable to achieve these objectives; and

WHEREAS, the Urban Renewal Agency of Kansas City, Kansas (“Urban Renewal Agency”), on or about September 16, 1963, by resolution created the Silver City Urban Renewal Area under the Act and approved the Silver City Urban Renewal Plan (“Plan”); and

WHEREAS, the Plan proposed clearance of blighted conditions in the northeast section of the project with subsequent redevelopment into a multi-family and public use area, and comprehensive rehabilitation and conservation in other sections of the project, including a system of minor park or greenbelt areas together with a neighborhood park and recreational area; and

WHEREAS, the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas (“Unified Government”), as successor to the City of Kansas City, Kansas, and the Urban Renewal Agency, acquired Silver City Park for park uses as designated by the Plan; and

WHEREAS, Silver City Park has been underutilized and the Unified Government now desires to sell the property for residential development or other uses authorized by the Act; and

WHEREAS, K.S.A. 17-4747 provides for modification of an urban renewal plan upon notice of a public hearing; and

WHEREAS, the Unified Government hereby finds and determines it to be necessary to direct and order a public hearing on the advisability of amending the Plan to change the proposed designated use of Silver City Park from park uses to residential and other uses, pursuant to the authority of the Act; and further to provide for the giving of notice of said hearing in the manner required by the Act.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE UNIFIED GOVERNMENT:

SECTION 1. Public Hearing. It is hereby authorized, ordered and directed that the Board of Commissioners shall hold a public hearing, in accordance with the provisions of the Act, on the advisability of amending the Plan to change the proposed designated use of Silver City Park from park uses to residential and other uses, on June 25, 2015 at 7:00 p.m. in the Commission Chambers, lobby level of the Municipal Office Building, 701 North 7th Street, Kansas City, Kansas, under the authority of the Act.

SECTION 2. Proposed Plan Modification. The general nature of the proposed amendment to the Plan is to change the designated use for Silver City Park from park uses to residential and other uses in order to allow the Unified Government to sell the property for development.
SECTION 3. Map and Legal Description of Silver City Park. The legal description of the property to be affected by the proposed amendment to the Plan is set forth on Exhibit A attached hereto and incorporated by reference herein. A map generally outlining the boundaries of the property is attached as Exhibit B hereto, and incorporated by reference herein.

SECTION 4. Notice of Hearing. The Unified Government Clerk is hereby authorized, ordered and directed to give notice of public hearing by publication of this Resolution in the official newspaper. Publication shall be at least once each week for two (2) consecutive weeks. The second publication shall be at least seven (7) days prior to the date of the hearing.

SECTION 5. Effective Date. This Resolution shall be effective upon adoption by the Unified Government Board of Commissioners.

ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE UNIFIED GOVERNMENT THIS ___TH DAY OF __________________, 2015.

______________________________
Mayor/CEO

______________________________
Unified Government Clerk

CERTIFICATE

I, hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of Resolution No. R-_____15 of the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas adopted by the Board of Commissioners on ______________, 2015 as the same appears of record in my office.

DATED: _____________ __, 2015.

______________________________
Unified Government Clerk
EXHIBIT A

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF SILVER CITY PARK

The following property located in Wyandotte County, Kansas City, Kansas:

Parcel 1, SILVER CITY PARK SUBDIVISION, a proposed subdivision in the North one-half of Section 29, Township 11, Range 25, in Kansas City, Wyandotte County, Kansas, being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the Northeast corner of Lot 12, Block 32, in MULVANE'S ADDITION, said point being on the South line of Ruby Avenue (as now exists); thence South 77° 31' 14" East, along the North line of said Block 32, 549.34 feet, to the Northwest corner of Lot 1, Block 31, MULVANE'S ADDITION; thence South 00° 25' 38" East, 29.00 feet, to the Northwest corner of Lot 35, COBURN'S 2nd ADDITION, thence South 89° 27' 15" East along the North line of COBURN'S 2nd ADDITION, 252.00 feet, to the Northeast corner of Lot 26, on said subdivision; thence South 00° 25' 38" East, 891.40 feet; thence South 65° 46' 06" East, 219.00 feet; thence South 89° 47' 14" East, 125.00 feet; thence North 39° 59' 02" East, 439.63 feet, to a point on the West line of BARBER COURT SUBDIVISION; thence North 00° 17' 49" West along the West line of said subdivision, 639.85 feet to the Northeast corner of Lot 2, BARBER COURT SUBDIVISION, thence North 89° 45' 01" West, along the North line of Lots 1 and 2 of said subdivision, 163.50 feet, to the Northwest corner of Lot 1, BARBER COURT SUBDIVISION; thence South 00° 17' 45" West, along the West line of said Lot 1, 127.64 feet to the Southwest corner of Lot 1, BARBER COURT SUBDIVISION, also being a point on the North line of Lawrence Avenue; thence North 89° 45' 00" West, along the North line of said Lawrence Avenue, 117.15 feet; thence Northwesterly, continuing along the Northeast line of Lawrence Avenue, on a curve to the right, having a radius of 1402.40 feet, and being tangent to the last described course, 497.69 feet; thence North 52° 32' 23" West, along the northerly line of said Lawrence Avenue, 217.63 feet; thence South 37° 07' 27" West, 112.90 feet; thence South 62° 07' 59" West, 408.60 feet; to a point on the Northeasterly line of Hans Drive; thence Northeast through a curve to the left, having a radius of 1001.32 feet, a distance of 829.98 feet; thence North 58° 11' 33" West, along the Northeasterly line of Hans Drive, 116.30 feet; thence North 00° 06' 33" East, 25.14 feet; thence South 89° 53' 27" East, 135.30 feet; thence North 00° 06' 33" East, along the West line of Lot 28, Block 18, ARGENTINE HEIGHTS, and its Southerly prolongation, 157.50 feet, to the centerline of an alley in Block 18, ARGENTINE HEIGHTS; thence North 89° 53' 27" West, 75.00 feet along the centerline of said alley; thence North 00° 06' 33" East, along the West line of Lot 18, ARGENTINE HEIGHTS, 137.80 feet to a point on the South line of MULVANE'S ADDITION; thence South 89° 53' 27" East, along the South line of MULVANE'S ADDITION, 115.50 feet to the Southwest corner of Lot 12, Block 35, MULVANE'S ADDITION; thence North 00° 06' 33" East, along the West line of Lot 12, Block 35, and the West line of Lot 19, Block 36, MULVANE'S ADDITION, 332.50 feet to the centerline of an alley in Block 36, MULVANE'S ADDITION; thence North 89° 53' 27" West, 100.00 feet along the centerline of alley in Block 36, MULVANE'S ADDITION; thence North 00° 06' 33" East, along the West line of Lot 12, Block 36, MULVANE'S ADDITION, 132.50 feet to a point on the South line of Elmwood Avenue, said point being the Northwest corner of Lot 12, Block 36, MULVANE'S ADDITION; thence South 89° 53' 27" East, along the South line of Elmwood Avenue, 215.00 feet; thence North 00° 06' 33" East, along the East line of 28th Street, 348.70 feet to the Northwest corner of Lot 12, Block 33, MULVANE'S ADDITION; thence South 89° 53' 27" East, along the North line of said Lot 12, 125.00 feet to the point of beginning, Subject to easements and restrictions of record.
EXHIBIT B

MAP OF SILVER CITY PARK
Staff Request for Commission Action

Tracking No. 150137

Type: Standard
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Changes Recommended by Standing Committee (New Action Form required with signatures)

Date: 5/19/2015
Contact Name: Chris Slaughter
Contact Phone: 8977
Contact Email: cslaughter@wycokck.org
Ref: Department / Division: Economic Development/Lan...

Item Description:
The Land Bank Manager respectfully requests that the Neighborhood & Community Development Committee review the proposed packets and forward them to the Land Bank Board of Trustees for final consideration.

Item (1) - Applications (10)
Item (2) - Transfers to Land Bank (1)
Item (3) - Best and Finals (1)
Item (4) - Discussion Wells Fargo REO Donation Program

Action Requested:
The Land Bank Manager respectfully requests that the Neighborhood & Community Development Committee approve the above requests and forward them to the Land Bank Board of Trustees for final approval.

Publication Required

Budget Impact: (if applicable)

Amount: $
Source:

☑ Included In Budget  Land bank revenues are projected in the budget.
☐ Other (explain)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>APPLICANT ADDRESS</th>
<th>LAND BANK ADDRESS</th>
<th>PROPOSED USE</th>
<th>STANDING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rex Davis</td>
<td>2738 S 8th Pl</td>
<td>2748 S 8th Pl</td>
<td>Yard Extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuri Garcia</td>
<td>2026 N 13th St</td>
<td>2024 N 13th St</td>
<td>Yard Extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacquetta Noble</td>
<td>812 Quindaro Blvd</td>
<td>810 Quindaro Blvd</td>
<td>Yard Extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiding Star MBC</td>
<td>3035 N 27th St</td>
<td>3049 N 27th St</td>
<td>Yard Extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiding Star MBC</td>
<td>3035 N 27th St</td>
<td>3053 N 27th St</td>
<td>Yard Extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiding Star MBC</td>
<td>3035 N 27th St</td>
<td>3055 N 27th St</td>
<td>Yard Extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria Chela</td>
<td>953 Ray Ave</td>
<td>951 Ray Ave</td>
<td>Yard Extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Nunez-Baltazar</td>
<td>1517 N 26th St</td>
<td>1511 N 26th St</td>
<td>Yard Extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Zion Economic Foundation</td>
<td>417 Richmond Ave</td>
<td>1913 N Thompson St</td>
<td>Future Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip Brown</td>
<td>2503 N 43rd St</td>
<td>144 N 61st St</td>
<td>Single Family Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 1: Personal Information.

1. Applicant's Name: Rex Davis
   Spouse (if applicable): 

2. Name of Corporation (if applicable): NA

3. Street Address: 1120 E 75th Terrace

4. City, State, Zip: K.C., Mo. 64131

5. Home Phone #: 816-365-1901 Work Phone #: 913-261-2167

6. E Mail Address: ravis@ibtinc.com

7. List Properties you own in Wyandotte County: 415 Sandusky, 442 Barnett,
   440 Barnett, 625 Northrup, 2748 S 8th Place

8. Do you (or your spouse) have any Code Enforcement violations? Yes  No X

9. Are you (or your spouse) delinquent on any licenses or taxes in Wyandotte County? Yes No X

Section 2: Proposed Land Bank Purchase.

1. Address(s) of Property: 2748 South 8th Place
   - Vacant Land
   - Structure

2. Proposed Use of Property:
   - Parking. (Must comply with UG regulations) Go to section 4.
   - Rehabilitation of existing structure. Requires building permit. Go to section 3.
   - Other:
Section 3: Construction Project Information.

1. Does the project comply with current zoning? Yes ___ No ___ (Call Planning & Zoning at 913-573-5750)

2. Type of Ownership: Individual ___ Corporation ___ Nonprofit: ___
   Other: ____________________________

3. Must attach a letter of credit or pre-approval letter from your bank.

4. Must attach drawings for your proposed project.

5. Proposed use of property:
   o Home Ownership.
   o Rental Home.
   o Business/Commercial Use.
   o Apartments.
   o Other, Specify: Yard extension for rental home at 2738 S. 8th Place

1. Will you seek Tax Increment Financing or other public tax exemptions? ___ NO ___

2. Will you seek Neighborhood Revitalization Tax Rebates? ___ NO ___

3. Starting Project Date: ___ N A ___ Completion Date: _____________ Comments: ___

Section 4: Additional Comments & Terms of Proposal.

Incomplete applications will not be considered and will be returned to the sender.
As the applicant I attest that the information in this proposal is accurate. I attest that I have read the Unified Government's Land Bank policy and agree to the terms and conditions of it. I understand that the Unified Government reserves the rights to reject any proposal without cause.

Applicant's Signature  Print Your Name Date  Rex Davis 4/31/15

Return Completed Application to: Land Bank, 2nd Floor, 710 N. 7th, KCK 66101
Fax 913-321-0237 Phone 913-573-8977
Attn: Land Bank Manager, Chris Slaughter
Section 1: Personal Information.

1. Applicant’s Name: **Yuri Garcia**
   Spouse (if applicable): 

2. Name of Corporation (if applicable) 

3. Street Address: **2026 N. 13 St.** 

4. City, State, Zip: **Kansas City KS. 66104** 

5. Home Phone: **913)562-4150** Work Phone #: 

6. E Mail Address: **ygarcia948@yahoo.com** 

7. List Properties you own in Wyandotte County: 

8. Do you (or your spouse) have any Code Enforcement violations? **Yes** **No**

9. Are you (or your spouse) delinquent on any licenses or taxes in Wyandotte County? **Yes** **No**

Section 2: Proposed Land Bank Purchase.

1. Address(s) of Property: **2024 N. 13 St.** 
   - Vacant Land 
   - Structure 

2. Proposed Use of Property:
   - Parking. (Must comply with UG regulations) Go to section 4.
   - Rehabilitation of existing structure. Requires building permit. Go to section 3.
   - Other: ____________________________
Section 3: Construction Project Information.

1. Does the project comply with current zoning? Yes__ No__
   (Call Planning & Zoning at 913-573-5750)

2. Type of Ownership: Individual__ Corporation__ Nonprofit: __
   Other: _______________________________________________________

3. **Must** attach a letter of credit or pre-approval letter from your bank.

4. **Must** attach drawings for your proposed project.

5. Proposed use of property:
   - Home Ownership.
   - Rental Home.
   - Business/Commercial Use.
   - Apartments.
   - Other, Specify: _____________________________________________

6. Will you seek Tax Increment Financing or other public tax exemptions? ______

7. Will you seek Neighborhood Revitalization Tax Rebates? ______

8. Starting Project Date: ___________ Completion Date: ___________

Comments: ____________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

Section 4: Additional Comments & Terms of Proposal.

**extend my yard**

_________________________________________________________________

Incomplete applications will not be considered and will be returned to the sender.
As the applicant I attest that the information in this proposal is accurate. I attest that I
have read the Unified Government’s Land Bank policy and agree to the terms and
conditions of it. I understand that the Unified Government reserves the rights to reject
any proposal without cause.

Applicant’s Signature: Yvui Garcia
Print Your Name: Yvui Garcia
Date: 4/22/15

Return Completed Application to: Attn: Land Bank Manager, Chris Slaughter
701 N. 7th St, Suite 421, KC, KS 66101
Fax 913-573-5745 Phone 913-573-8977
Unified Government Land Bank Application

Section 1: Personal Information.

1. Applicant's Name: Jacquette Noble
   Spouse (if applicable): ____________________________

2. Name of Corporation (if applicable): ____________________________

3. Street Address: 814 Quindaro Blvd.

4. City, State, Zip: KC KS 66101

5. Home Phone #: 913-766-3445 cell
   Work Phone #: 913-633-8241

6. E Mail Address: jacquette.noble@ymail.com

7. List Properties you own in Wyandotte County: 814, 812 Quindaro Blvd.

8. Do you (or your spouse) have any Code Enforcement violations? Yes ___ No X

9. Are you (or your spouse) delinquent on any licenses or taxes in Wyandotte County? Yes ___ No X

Section 2: Proposed Land Bank Purchase.

1. Address(s) of Property 810 Quindaro Blvd.
   o Vacant Land
   o Structure

2. Proposed Use of Property:
   o Yard Extension. Go to section 4.
   o Parking. (Must comply with UG regulations) Go to section 4.
   o Garage. Requires building permit. Go to section 4.
   o Home Addition. Requires building permit. Go to section 3.
   o Commercial Construction. Requires building permit. Go to section 3.
   o Rehabilitation of existing structure. Requires building permit. Go to section 3.
   o Other: ____________________________
Section 3: Construction Project Information.

1. Does the project comply with current zoning? Yes__ No__
   (Call Planning & Zoning at 913-573-5750)

2. Type of Ownership: Individual X Corporation__ Nonprofit: __
   Other: ____________________________

3. **Must** attach a letter of credit or pre-approval letter from your bank.

4. **Must** attach drawings for your proposed project.

5. Proposed use of property:
   - Home Ownership.
   - Rental Home.
   - Business/Commercial Use.
   - Apartments.
   - Other, Specify: ____________________________

6. Will you seek Tax Increment Financing or other public tax exemptions? ______

7. Will you seek Neighborhood Revitalization Tax Rebates? ______

8. Starting Project Date: ______________ Completion Date: ______________

Comments:

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

Section 4: Additional Comments & Terms of Proposal.

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

Incomplete applications will not be considered and will be returned to the sender.
As the applicant I attest that the information in this proposal is accurate. I attest that I have read the Unified Government’s Land Bank policy and agree to the terms and conditions of it. I understand that the Unified Government reserves the rights to reject any proposal without cause.

Jacquetta Noble  ____________________________________________________________________________
Applicant’s Signature  Print Your Name  April 27, 2015  Date

Return Completed Application to: Attn: Land Bank Manager, Chris Slaughter
                                    701 N. 7th St, Suite 421, KC, KS 66101
                                    Fax 913-573-5745 Phone 913-573-8977
Section 1: Personal Information.

1. Applicant's Name: Guiding Star M.B.C
   Spouse (if applicable): N/A

2. Name of Corporation (if applicable): Guiding Star M.B.C

3. Street Address: 3035 North 27th Street

4. City, State, Zip: Kansas City, Kansas 66104-4472

5. Home Phone #: Work Phone #: 913.371-7651

6. E Mail Address: info@guidingstarmbc.org

7. List Properties you own in Wyandotte County:
   3024, 3028 & 3035 N. 27th St. KCK

8. Do you (or your spouse) have any Code Enforcement violations? Yes No X

9. Are you (or your spouse) delinquent on any licenses or taxes in Wyandotte County? Yes No X

Section 2: Proposed Land Bank Purchase.

1. Address(s) of Property: 3049, 3053 & 3055 N. 27th St. KCK
   - Vacant Land
   - Structure

2. Proposed Use of Property:
   - Parking. (Must comply with UG regulations) Go to section 4.
   - Rehabilitation of existing structure. Requires building permit. Go to section 3.
   - Other: Property extension
Section 3: Construction Project Information.

1. Does the project comply with current zoning? Yes__ No__
   (Call Planning & Zoning at 913-573-5750)

2. Type of Ownership: Individual___ Corporation___ Nonprofit:___
   Other:__________________________ N/A

3. Must attach a letter of credit or pre-approval letter from your bank.

4. Must attach drawings for your proposed project.

5. Proposed use of property:
   o Home Ownership.
   o Rental Home.
   o Business/Commercial Use.
   o Apartments.
   o Other, Specify:__________ N/A

6. Will you seek Tax Increment Financing or other public tax exemptions?_____

7. Will you seek Neighborhood Revitalization Tax Rebates?_____

8. Starting Project Date:______ N/A ________ Completion Date:______

Comments:_________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Section 4: Additional Comments & Terms of Proposal.

Extension of church property for future use.
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Incomplete applications will not be considered and will be returned to the sender. As the applicant I attest that the information in this proposal is accurate. I attest that I have read the Unified Government’s Land Bank policy and agree to the terms and conditions of it. I understand that the Unified Government reserves the rights to reject any proposal without cause.

[Signature]
AL Bradford
Apr 24, 2015

Applicant’s Signature: [Signature]
Print Your Name: AL Bradford
Date: April 24, 2015

Return Completed Application to: Attn: Land Bank Manager, Chris Slaughter
701 N. 7th St, Suite 421, K.C., KS 66101
Fax 913-573-5745 Phone 913-573-8977
Section 1: Personal Information.

1. Applicant’s Name: **Gloria Cheza**
   Spouse (if applicable): ____________________________

2. Name of Corporation (if applicable): ____________________________

3. Street Address: **953 Ray Ave**

4. City, State, Zip: **Kansas City, KS 66101**

5. Home Phone #: **913-216-6720** Work Phone #: ____________________________

6. E Mail Address: ____________________________

7. List Properties you own in Wyandotte County: **953 Ray Ave** ____________________________

8. Do you (or your spouse) have any Code Enforcement violations? Yes _ No √

9. Are you (or your spouse) delinquent on any licenses or taxes in Wyandotte County? Yes _ No √

Section 2: Proposed Land Bank Purchase.

1. Address(s) of Property: **951 Ray Ave**
   - Vacant Land
   - Structure

2. Proposed Use of Property:
   - Parking. (Must comply with UG regulations) Go to section 4.
   - Rehabilitation of existing structure. Requires building permit. Go to section 3.
   - Other: ____________________________
Section 3: Construction Project Information.

1. Does the project comply with current zoning? Yes__ No__
   (Call Planning & Zoning at 913-573-5750)

2. Type of Ownership: Individual__ Corporation__ Nonprofit: __
   Other: ______________________________________________

3. **Must attach a letter of credit or pre-approval letter from your bank.**

4. **Must attach drawings for your proposed project.**

5. Proposed use of property:
   - Home Ownership.
   - Rental Home.
   - Business/Commercial Use.
   - Apartments.
   - Other, Specify: ________________________________________

6. Will you seek Tax Increment Financing or other public tax exemptions? ______

7. Will you seek Neighborhood Revitalization Tax Rebates? ______

8. Starting Project Date: ________________ Completion Date: ________________

Comments:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Section 4: Additional Comments & Terms of Proposal.
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Incomplete applications will not be considered and will be returned to the sender.
As the applicant I attest that the information in this proposal is accurate. I attest that I have read the Unified Government’s Land Bank policy and agree to the terms and conditions of it. I understand that the Unified Government reserves the rights to reject any proposal without cause.

[Signature]

Gloria Chea 4.29.15

Applicant’s Signature  Print Your Name  Date

Return Completed Application to:  Attn: Land Bank Manager, Chris Slaughter
                                  701 N. 7th St, Suite 421, KC, KS 66101
                                  Fax 913-573-5745 Phone 913-573-8977
Unified Government Land Bank Application

Section 1: Personal Information.

1. Applicant's Name: Branda Jonec Nunez-Baltazar
   Spouse (if applicable): ________________________________

2. Name of Corporation (if applicable) ________________________________

3. Street Address: 1517 N. 26th St

4. City, State, Zip: Kansas City, KS 66102

5. Home Phone #: 913-379-1989 Work Phone #: ________________________________

6. E Mail Address: 20671106@gmail.com

7. List Properties you own in Wyandotte County: 1517 N. 26th St
   K (KS 66102)

8. Do you (or your spouse) have any Code Enforcement violations? Yes _ No X

9. Are you (or your spouse) delinquent on any licenses or taxes in Wyandotte County? Yes _ No X

Section 2: Proposed Land Bank Purchase.

1. Address(s) of Property: 1517 N. 26th St
   o Vacant Land
   o Structure

2. Proposed Use of Property:
   o Yard Extension. Go to section 4.
   o Parking. (Must comply with UG regulations) Go to section 4.
   o Garage. Requires building permit. Go to section 4.
   o Home Addition. Requires building permit. Go to section 3.
   o Commercial Construction. Requires building permit. Go to section 3.
   o Rehabilitation of existing structure. Requires building permit. Go to section 3.
   o Other: ________________________________
Section 3: Construction Project Information.

1. Does the project comply with current zoning? Yes___ No___
   (Call Planning & Zoning at 913-573-5750)

2. Type of Ownership: Individual___ Corporation___ Nonprofit: ___
   Other: __________________________________________________________

3. **Must** attach a letter of credit or pre-approval letter from your bank.

4. **Must** attach drawings for your proposed project.

5. Proposed use of property:
   o Home Ownership.
   o Rental Home.
   o Business/Commercial Use.
   o Apartments.
   o Other, Specify: ________________________________________________

6. Will you seek Tax Increment Financing or other public tax exemptions? _____

7. Will you seek Neighborhood Revitalization Tax Rebates? _____

8. Starting Project Date: _______________ Completion Date: _____________

   Comments: ______________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

Section 4: Additional Comments & Terms of Proposal.

I have kids and a dog, so I would like a fenced yard for a small playground for them.

Incomplete applications will not be considered and will be returned to the sender.
As the applicant I attest that the information in this proposal is accurate. I attest that I have read the Unified Government’s Land Bank policy and agree to the terms and conditions of it. I understand that the Unified Government reserves the rights to reject any proposal without cause.

Applicant’s Signature: ___________________________ Print Your Name: _______________
Date: 05-04-15

Return Completed Application to: Attn: Land Bank Manager, Chris Slaughter
701 N. 7th St, Suite 421, KC, KS 66101
Fax 913-573-5745 Phone 913-573-8977
**Unified Government Land Bank Application**

### Section 1: Personal Information.

1. Applicant's Name: **Ross P. Lee**
   Spouse (if applicable):

2. Name of Corporation (if applicable): **Lions Economic Foundation**

3. Street Address: **417 Richmond Ave**

4. City, State, Zip: **Kansas City, Kansas**

5. Home Phone #: __________ Work Phone #: 913-340-0484

6. E Mail Address: **K.C. mont Zion s.p.e. net**

7. List Properties you own in Wyandotte County:

8. Do you (or your spouse) have any Code Enforcement violations? Yes __ No __

9. Are you (or your spouse) delinquent on any licenses or taxes in Wyandotte County? Yes __ No __

### Section 2: Proposed Land Bank Purchase.

1. Address(s) of Property: **1913 North Thompson St**
   - Vacant Land
   - Structure

2. Proposed Use of Property:
   - Parking. (Must comply with UG regulations) Go to section 4.
   - Rehabilitation of existing structure. Requires building permit. Go to section 3.
   - Other: **Future development**
Section 3: Construction Project Information.

1. Does the project comply with current zoning? Yes__ No__
   (Call Planning & Zoning at 913-573-5750)

2. Type of Ownership: Individual__ Corporation__ Nonprofit: __
   Other: _____________________________________________

3. **Must** attach a letter of credit or pre-approval letter from your bank.

4. **Must** attach drawings for your proposed project.

5. Proposed use of property:
   - Home Ownership.
   - Rental Home.
   - Business/Commercial Use.
   - Apartments.
   - Other, Specify: ______________________________________

6. Will you seek Tax Increment Financing or other public tax exemptions? _______

7. Will you seek Neighborhood Revitalization Tax Rebates? _______

8. Starting Project Date: ________________ Completion Date: ________________

   Comments: ___________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________

Section 4: Additional Comments & Terms of Proposal.

We own properties 406-70 Richmond Ave which we have
developed into three-story apt. The property in question is right
behind the Richmond development. We would like to add to the
space behind these homes — a double would greatly enhance.

Incomplete applications will not be considered and will be returned to the sender.
As the applicant I attest that the information in this proposal is accurate. I attest that I
have read the Unified Government's Land Bank policy and agree to the terms and
conditions of it. I understand that the Unified Government reserves the rights to reject
any proposal without cause.

Applicant's Signature: CL. Patmos Print Your Name: CL. BACOLIS 4-25-2015
President of Downtown Economic Foundation

Return Completed Application to: Attn: Land Bank Manager, Chris Slaughter
701 N. 7th St, Suite 421, KC, KS 66101
Fax 913-573-5745 Phone 913-573-8977
Section 1: Personal Information.

1. Applicant’s Name: Phillip A. Brown_______________________________________ Spouse (if applicable): Gloria M. Brown__________________________________________

2. Name of Corporation (if applicable)__________________________________________

3. Street Address: 2503 North 43rd Street_____________________________________

4. City, State, Zip: Kansas City, Kansas 66104____________________________________

5. Home Phone #:785.393.0936________ Work Phone #:___________________________

6. E Mail Address: phillip.a.brown@live.com____________________________________

7. List Properties you own in Wyandotte County: 2503 N43rd Street____________________

8. Do you (or your spouse) have any Code Enforcement violations? Yes__ No☑

9. Are you (or your spouse) delinquent on any licenses or taxes in Wyandotte County? Yes__ No☑

Section 2: Proposed Land Bank Purchase.

1. Address(s) of Property 144 N 61st Street, Kansas City, Kansas 66102_______________
   o Vacant Land ☑
   o Structure

2. Proposed Use of Property:
   o Yard Extension. Go to section 4.
   o Parking. (Must comply with UG regulations) Go to section 4.
   o Garage. Requires building permit. Go to section 4.
   o Home Addition. Requires building permit. Go to section 3.
   o Commercial Construction. Requires building permit. Go to section 3.
   o Rehabilitation of existing structure. Requires building permit. Go to section 3.
   o Other:__________________________________________________________
Section 3: Construction Project Information.

1. Does the project comply with current zoning? Yes__ No__ (Call Planning & Zoning at 913-573-5750)

2. Type of Ownership: Individual  Corporation___ Nonprofit: ___
   Other:_________________________________________

3. **Must attach a letter of credit or pre-approval letter from your bank.**

4. **Must attach drawings for your proposed project.**

5. Proposed use of property:
   o **Home Ownership.**
   o Rental Home.
   o Business/Commercial Use.
   o Apartments.
   o Other, Specify:_____________________________________________________

1. Will you seek Tax Increment Financing or other public tax exemptions? __No____

2. Will you seek Neighborhood Revitalization Tax Rebates? __No____

3. Starting Project Date: ____6-1-15_________ Completion Date: __8-30-15_________
   Comments: __________________________________________________________

Section 4: Additional Comments & Terms of Proposal.

Incomplete applications will not be considered and will be returned to the sender.
As the applicant I attest that the information in this proposal is accurate. I attest that I have read the Unified Government’s Land Bank policy and agree to the terms and conditions of it. I understand that the Unified Government reserves the rights to reject any proposal without cause.

Applicant’s Signature      Print Your Name Date

Return Completed Application to: Land Bank, 2nd Floor, 710 N. 7th, KCK 66101
Fax 913-321-0237 Phone 913-573-8977
Attn: Land Bank Manager, Chris Slaughter
New Century Bank

2815 Anderson Ave
Manhattan, KS 66502
Phone: 785-532-9066
Fax: 785-539-2249

Dear Phillip & Gloria

Thank you for your application for your new home loan – we will be glad to assist you! My name is Alysha Marionnette McDonald and I will be your loan officer. My loan processor’s name is Liz Hibbard and together as a team here at New Century Bank we hope to provide you with prompt and caring service in order to get you into your new home.

Based on your application you have been pre-approved for a Conv 30 year fixed rate loan for $188,700 with estimated monthly payment, including taxes and insurance, to be around $1,383.98 with the following requirements:

1. Two Appraisal conducted – One for the subject property and one on the current home
2. New Century Bank taking a mortgage on current home in the amount of $48,200 until you sell your home during construction for the down payment

Please note that New Century Bank will conduct a two time close, one for the construction loan and one for the permanent loan. The closing cost have been estimated and wrapped into the loan amount so you should only have to only have a cash requirement of $25,000. The construction loan will be an interest only loan at 7%, and New Century Bank will be working toward obtaining the approval for the end loan prior to construction. Should you be approved for the end loan you will automatically be approved for the construction loan.

This pre-approval is based upon your verified income/debts/credit status remaining the same or better, and an appraisal that has been approved by underwriting with a value to support the value of the home.

You will be contacted by our processor, Alysha Marionnette McDonald, requesting documentation from you to continue the processing of your loan. We will send disclosures to you outlining your closing costs, and when we receive them back we will order your appraisal. Your closing will be set once we have final loan approval. You can see that any delays in receiving the documentation will delay your closing.

Your Pre-Approval is good for 90 days.

Thank you again for allowing New Century Bank to assist you!!

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Alysha Marionnette McDonald
About This Model


Notes:
Standards & Features

**Interior**
- Smooth Drywall Throughout
- Flat Ceiling with 8' Sidewall Throughout
- Stipple Ceiling
- Coveless Ceiling Joints
- Brushed Nickel Langford 5-Arm Dining Room Light
- Brushed Nickel Langford 3-Arm Nook Light
- Glass Light Shades Throughout
- 6-Panel Interior Doors Through-out
- Pro-Hung Door Jambs
- Mortise Door Hinges
- Metal Interior Passage Sets
- Floor Mount Door Stops
- Smoke Detectors with Battery Back-Up
- Wire Shelving in All Closets
- Brushed Nickel Interior Package Includes: Door Handles, Hinges, Huntington Brass Metal Faucets and Cabinet Hardware

**Exterior**
- Prairie Lantern Light at Front Door
- Patina Square Light at Rear Door
- Two GFI-Protected Exterior Receptacles
- Vinyl Dutch Lap Siding dropped down to Cover Sill Plate
- O.S.B. Sheathing with House Wrap Under Siding
- 5/12 Roof Pitch
- 7/12 Roof Pitch on AU169A &amp;

**Exterior (continued)**
- 15' Fixed Eaves on All 28 &amp; 42 wides
- 12' Fixed Eaves on All 32 wides
- Architectural Shingles
- Ridgevent Roof Ventilation System
- 3/0 x 6/8 Fiberglass 4-Lite Classic Oak Front Door with Deluxe Dexter
- Door Handle with Deadbolt
- 3/0 x 6/8 Fiberglass 6-Panel Rear Door Handle with Deadbolt
- Keyed-Alike Locksets
- Vinyl Insulated Windows with Low-E Glass and Grics
- Double and Triple Windows are Mulled
- 12' Raised Panel Shutters on Front Door Side

**Construction**
- 2x10 Transverse Floor System on 16" Centers**
- 3/4" Tongue and Groove OSB Floor Decking
- 2x10 Double Rim Joist
- 2x6 Exterior Walls on 16" Centers**
- 2x4 Interior Walls on 16" Centers**
- 40# Roof Load

**Kitchen**
- GE 30" Free Standing Gas Range with Electronic Ignition
- Power Range Hood with Light
- GE 18 Cubic Foot, No-Frost Refrigerator with Ice Maker

---

Notes:

---

---

---
Standards & Features (continued)

**Kitchen (continued)**
- Refrigerator Surround
- 8" Stainless Steel Single Bowl Sink

**Baths**
- 60" One-Piece Fiberglass Tub/Showers
- One-Piece Fiberglass Shower with Glass Door in Glamour Baths
- Fiberglass Drop-in Tub in Glamour Baths
- Tub Overflows
- 1.6 Gallon Per Flush Elongated Toilets
- China Stool, Tank, and Lid
- China Sinks with Overflows and Pop-Up Drains
- Lighted Vent Fan in Each Bath
- Recessed Medicine Cabinet in Master Bath in Most Models
- Anti-Scald Valves on Showers & Tubs

**Cabinetry**
- Evermore Custom Cabinetry (KCMA Certified)
- Hardwood Oak Square Top Raised Panel Cabinet Doors
- Hardwood Oak Cabinet Stiles
- Contemporary Cabinet Hardware
- Concealed Cabinet Hinges
- Crown and Under Cabinet Moulding on Overhead Cabinets
- 30'/42" Staggered Height Overhead Lined Overhead Cabinets
- Adjustable Shelves in Base and Overhead Cabinets
- Refrigerator Surround with 24" Deep Overhead Cabinet
- Drawer Over Door Base Cabinets
- Dovetail Drawer Construction
- Full Extension 75# Drawer Guides on all Drawers
- Base and Center Shelves in Base Cabinets
- Wilson Art Laminate Countertops with Bevel or Crescent Edging
- 4" Wilson Art Laminate Backsplash
- Tip-Out Trays at Sink
- Base Shelf in Vanities
- 33" High Vanities
- **Spacing for Framing Members may vary due to Design Requirements**

**Insulation**
- R-19 Fiberglass Insulation in Walls
- R-38 Avg. Blown Insulation in Ceiling

**Utilities**
- 200 AMP Electrical Service &ndash; 40/40 Box
- Copper Wiring Throughout
- 95 Plus Efficient Gas Furnace with:
  - 8-Panel Furnace Door
  - Fiberglass Heat Ducts
  - Perimeter Heat System
  - Ceiling Air Return System
- Air Conditioning Thermostat with 5-Wires
- 40 Gallon Electric Water Heater

---

Notes:

---

Commodore Homes | 1423 Lincolnway East Goshen, IN 46526 | 574-533-7100 | www.commodorehomes.com
Standards & Features (continued)

Utilities (continued)
with Pan
Main Water Line Shut-Off Valve
Water Shut-Off Valves-Where Accessible
Plumb and Wire for Washer
Wire and Vent for Dryer
MO-89 Cabinet Over Washer and Dryer Area
One Exterior Water Faucet

Flooring
Choice of Various Styles of SHAW Carpet
with R2X Soil and Stain Resistance
- 5 Styles: New Day, Echo, Natural Weave, Adaptation or Undertones
- Choice of 20 Standard color options and numerous optional colors
- Standard Carpets are all 25 oz
Rebond Carpet Pad with Tackstrip Carpet Installation
No-Wax Vinyl Floor Coverings, featuring Congoleum
Entry Foyer Vinyl Flooring, featuring Congoleum

Bedrooms
Ceiling Lights
Egress Window Each Bedroom
Wire Shelving in Wardrobes
30" Interior Passage Doors
Switched Light in All Walk-In Closets

Energy Efficient Standards:
Low-E Vinyl Insulated Windows
95+% Efficient Gas Furnace

Energy Efficient Standards: (continued)
Fiberglass Heat Ducts
Fiberglass Exterior Doors
R-38 Ceiling Insulation (avg.) and R-19 Wall insulation
</strong>
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## TRANSFERS TO LAND BANK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of KCK</td>
<td>450 Walker Ave</td>
<td>Future development request from Mt. Zion Economic Foundation and Rev C. L. Bachus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>APPLICANT ADDRESS</th>
<th>LAND BANK ADDRESS</th>
<th>PROPOSED USE</th>
<th>LOT SIZE</th>
<th>LAND BANK RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Jackson</td>
<td>3518 n 35th St</td>
<td>3530 N 35th St</td>
<td>Yard Extension</td>
<td>165 X 250</td>
<td>The Standing Committee has asked that the applicants be contacted to appear at the June 1, 2015 meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Flores</td>
<td>3539 Bell Crossing Dr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yard Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 1: Personal Information.

1. Applicant's Name: Michael H. Jackson
   Spouse (if applicable):

2. Name of Corporation (if applicable)

3. Street Address: 5200 W 57th

4. City, State, Zip: Rockland Park KS 66205

5. Home Phone #: 913-530-5855 Work Phone:

6. E Mail Address: mjackson1956@gmail.com

7. List Properties you own in Wyandotte County: 3455 Bell Crossing, 3521 Bell Crossing, and 3518 N 35th KCK

8. Do you (or your spouse) have any Code Enforcement violations? Yes [X] No

9. Are you (or your spouse) delinquent on any licenses or taxes in Wyandotte County? Yes [X] No

Section 2: Proposed Land Bank Purchase.

1. Address(s) of Property: 3530 N 35th
   - Vacant Land
   - Structure

2. Proposed Use of Property:
   - Parking. (Must comply with UG regulations) Go to section 4.
   - Rehabilitation of existing structure. Requires building permit. Go to section 3.
   - Other:
Section 3: Construction Project Information.

1. Does the project comply with current zoning? Yes__ No__
   (Call Planning & Zoning at 913-573-5750)

2. Type of Ownership: Individual__ Corporation__ Nonprofit:__
   Other: _______________________________________________________________________

3. **Must** attach a letter of credit or pre-approval letter from your bank.

4. **Must** attach drawings for your proposed project.

5. Proposed use of property:
   - Home Ownership.
   - Rental Home.
   - Business/Commercial Use.
   - Apartments.
   - Other, Specify: _____________________________________________________________

6. Will you seek Tax Increment Financing or other public tax exemptions? ______

7. Will you seek Neighborhood Revitalization Tax Rebates? ______

8. Starting Project Date: ________________ Completion Date: ____________________

Comments: ___________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

Section 4: Additional Comments & Terms of Proposal.

I would like to purchase the property 3530 N 35st to extend my yard. This way I can ensure this property is close to my home. How can I get the Land Bank approval for $150,000?

Incomplete applications will not be considered and will be returned to the sender.
As the applicant I attest that the information in this proposal is accurate. I attest that I have read the Unified Government’s Land Bank policy and agree to the terms and conditions of it. I understand that the Unified Government reserves the rights to reject any proposal without cause.

Applicant’s Signature: ___________________________________________________________________________
Print Your Name: _______________________________________________________________________________
Date: _________________________________________________________________________________________

Return Completed Application to:  Attn: Land Bank Manager, Chris Slaughter
701 N. 7th St. Suite 421, KC, KS 66101
Fax 913-573-5745 Phone 913-573-8977
Wyandotte County Land Bank

Best & Final Check Off List

Your Best and Final Must Contain the Following Items:

1. Total Bid for Property(s):
   - 3530 N 35th St $750.99

   (The quoted price for this property is $150.00)

2. Proposed Plan for Site(s):
   
   Extend my property line so I can maintain and keep clean this property.


Applicants Signature: [Signature]

[Signature]
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Section 1: Personal Information.

1. Applicant’s Name: Maria Louderes Flores
   Spouse (if applicable): ____________________________

2. Name of Corporation (if applicable) ____________________________

3. Street Address: 1703 S Maple St Apt. B

4. City, State, Zip: Ottawa, Kansas 66067

5. Home Phone #: (913) 719-0855 Work Phone #: ____________________________

6. E Mail Address: ____________________________

7. List Properties you own in Wyandotte County: 3539 Bellcrossing
   35th North 35th street

8. Do you (or your spouse) have any Code Enforcement violations? Yes No X

9. Are you (or your spouse) delinquent on any licenses or taxes in Wyandotte County? Yes No

Section 2: Proposed Land Bank Purchase.

1. Address(s) of Property: 3530 N 35th St Kansas City KS
   • Vacant Land
   • Structure

2. Proposed Use of Property:
   • Yard Extension. Go to section 4.
   • Parking. (Must comply with UG regulations) Go to section 4.
   • Garage. Requires building permit. Go to section 4.
   • Home Addition.Requires building permit. Go to section 3.
   • New Home Construction. Requires building permit. Go to section 3.
   • Commercial Construction. Requires building permit. Go to section 3.
   • Rehabilitation of existing structure. Requires building permit. Go to section 3.
   • Other: ____________________________
Section 3: Construction Project Information.

1. Does the project comply with current zoning? Yes___ No___
   (Call Planning & Zoning at 913-573-5750)

2. Type of Ownership: Individual___ Corporation___ Nonprofit: ___
   Other: ________________________________________________

3. **Must** attach a letter of credit or pre-approval letter from your bank.

4. **Must** attach drawings for your proposed project.

5. Proposed use of property:
   - Home Ownership.
   - Rental Home.
   - Business/Commercial Use.
   - Apartments.
   - Other, Specify: ______________________________________

6. Will you seek Tax Increment Financing or other public tax exemptions? _____

7. Will you seek Neighborhood Revitalization Tax Rebates? _____

8. Starting Project Date: ________________ Completion Date: __________

   Comments: ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________

Section 4: Additional Comments & Terms of Proposal.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

*Incomplete applications will not be considered and will be returned to the sender.*
As the applicant I attest that the information in this proposal is accurate. I attest that I have read the Unified Government’s Land Bank policy and agree to the terms and conditions of it. I understand that the Unified Government reserves the rights to reject any proposal without cause.

*Maria de lauros Floras*  *Maria de lauros Floras*  3-20-15

Applicant’s Signature  Print Your Name  Date

Return Completed Application to:  Attn: Land Bank Manager, Chris Slaughter
  701 N. 7th St, Suite 421, KC, KS 66101
  Fax 913-573-5745  Phone 913-573-8977
WYANDOTTE COUNTY LAND BANK

BEST & FINAL CHECK OFF LIST

Your Best and Final Must Contain the Following Items:

1. Total Bid for Property(s):
   - 3530 N 35th St $1,800

   (The quoted price for this property is $1650.00)

2. Proposed Plan for Site(s):

   I want this property because 3 years ago my house was set on fire. I moved to Florida a couple of years ago and I want to move back to my property because I got permission to place a mobile home and I plan to live there. I'm a single mom with 5 girls. I just want to feel safe and have more space. I've noticed that there is a lot of trash in this property like tires and more trash because people like to dump trash there. There was trash on my property and cleaned it up. I would be happy to get this property and clean it up. This is why I'm interested in this property. Thank you.

Applicants Signature: Hacío Flores
WELLS FARGO’S REO DONATION PROGRAM

Wells Fargo's REO Donation program is designed to facilitate the transfer of Wells Fargo owned or serviced REO properties to cities and public nonprofits that provide sustainable homeownership or rental opportunities to low- to moderate-income (LMI) families. In an effort to stabilize neighborhoods and prevent blight, Wells Fargo expects all donated properties to be secured and maintained until they can be rehabilitated and occupied.

The Land Bank has the opportunity to participate in this program and has been presented 630 Tenny Ave for donation. There are other banks/financial institution/national groups that offer these opportunities.

This is an excellent opportunity to follow in our purpose as stated in the Wyandotte County Land Bank Policy.

The purpose of the WCLB is to return tax delinquent and distressed property to productive use that benefits the community.

Discussion: What procedures/practices should the Land Bank Manager consider when presented with opportunities such as the current one?

We should examine the follow factors:

- Time between scheduled Standing Committee/Full Commission meetings
- Authority for approving
- Reporting aspects for future meetings