

FORT HARRISON REUSE AUTHORITY BOARD MINUTES
Monday, May 16, 2016

The FHRA Board met in public session at 9120 Otis Avenue, FHRA conference room, Lawrence, IN at 5:30 p.m.

FHRA Board Members Present

Mr. Ed Treacy, President
Jeff Congdon, Vice President
Ms. Marci Reddick, Member
Mr. Curtis Bigsbee, Member

FHRA Staff Present

Mr. Freddie Burrus, Executive Director
Ms. Heather Millikan, Executive Assistant

Public in Attendance

April Pyatt, Ice Miller
Chris Barnett, Lawrence CDC
Kim Reeves, Browning Investments
Will & Marcy Worley, Porter Books & Bread
Sherron Freeman, Lawrence Common Council
Bob Pychinka, LL resident
Bruce & Nancy Hugon, LL residents
Matt Culbertson, Boston Commons HOA
Breena & Trace Yates, LL residents
Jeff Magner, LL resident
Greta Meglin, LL resident
Carol & Dick Schwartz, LL residents
Tom Marten, LLW HOA
Maryanne O'Malley, LL resident
Deb Lecklider, LL resident
Cam Starnes, City of Lawrence
Jeffrey Meglin, LL resident
Bill Beckwith, LL resident
John Anderson, LL resident
Daries Greer, LL resident

Official Public Meeting was called to order by Mr. Treacy at 5:30 p.m. Mr. Treacy stated that as was mentioned at previous board meeting the board would like anyone wishing to ask any questions or make any statements to first please state their name and their address for the record.

Secretary Treasurer Brown is not here but there are copies of the financial report for people to look at.

Mr. Treacy stated we did have an expense at this building. Mr. Burrus stated it was around \$39,000 in repairs to the roof and HVAC system due to the storms last month.

Mr. Burrus gave an Executive Director's update. Mr. Burrus stated there will be no Friday's At the Fort this summer but will be replaced by weekends by the PFL and Judy Byron. There is a schedule of events for the summer you can find on their website. Envoy at 5723 Birtz will be opening soon with 44 new employees coming to Lawrence. Realty Quest and other clients will be moving in there later in June. The occupancy rate is at 93% and occupancy at The Post or FHOS is around 87%. The final engineering plans for Otis Avenue are complete and bids are going out in mid June. Please feel free to email Freddie with any additional questions.

The next item of business is approval of minutes from the April 18, 2016 meeting.

Mr. Congdon made the motion to approve the minutes and Ms. Reddick seconded. The motion unanimously passed.

Mr. Treacy asked if there were any questions or comments.

Bruce Hugon stated a few meetings ago there was a presentation by a landscape architect from McCordsville regarding the old PX. Mr. Burrus said she has not responded back to us in the attempts that we made to contact her. Mr. Treacy stated said she was having problems with the State Historical with the bricks inside the building. Mr. Burrus said Dave Duvall turned down their plans.

Mr. Hugon asked why the stated would have an interest in the interior. Mr. Burrus said there are certain things on the interior that are protected just like the stairs at the Merici building. We have tried to assist her with ARC process and financing but we have not heard back.

Mr. Hugon asked how the FHRA goes about marketing that building. Mr. Burrus said we can put a for sale sign on it. Mr. Hugon said there are people in the room who have an interest. Mr. Treacy stated to have them contact us and we can work on a deal.

Someone asked the price. Mr. Treacy said bring us a deal and we'll negotiate. He said the reason we bought that building was to control the use. It was going in a direction no one wanted it to go in. We want to preserve the facilities and were attempting to take control of it. The church that bought it was trying to redo it and but ran into problems and it's hard to control what a church does once they own it. We paid a high price to get the building back but we did it to preserve the building and figure it out long term. Mr. Burrus said there are three people looking at it right now.

Tom Marten a resident asked about Mr. Hugon's question about a for sale sign on some properties that FHRA has for sale. Are we opposed to not putting a for sale sign in the front yard? Mr. Congdon said what could and probably would happen is people would say that's not a nice building. He asked Mr. Martin if he would agree since he's a professional developer that it's a level of difficulty to recycle it and wouldn't want an amateur developer to do that. Mr. Congdon said that is what happened before with the people from the church. They started to realize it was a bigger project than they could have ever anticipated so we paid a lot of money to buy it back.

Mr. Marten said if there is a developer out driving around and likes the neighborhood they won't know it's for sale. Why not put it out for sale. Mr. Congdon said Freddie gets calls everyday. The board would need to decide if that's in the best interest. Mr. Marten said we would get

more in the net we're casting if we did that. Mr. Marten also said it adds to the neighborhood that people know that it's for sale and not that it's just a vacant building and what's going on with it.

Dr. Bob Pychinka the president of Lawton Loop East HOA asked in between the people trying to purchase a building who is responsible for the safety of that building. Mr. Treacy said we are. Dr. Pychinka stated there has been an open pit unlocked behind that building for thirteen years waiting for someone to fall in.

Mr. Burrus stated that as of tomorrow there will be a construction crew working on that building and closing that pit off. Mr. Pychinka said he's surprised someone hasn't filed a suit. Mr. Treacy said we are just now the property owner and didn't own it then. Mr. Pychinka asked who is responsible before that. Ms. Reddick said the owner of the property was responsible. He said in the past was there anyone responsible to have the prior owner keep the building safe. Mr. Congdon said the City of Lawrence would be responsible and need to handle that with code enforcement. Mr. Treacy said we bought it to take control of it but before we were not responsible. Mr. Treacy said we know we have a responsibility now as owners and we are in the process of doing it. Mr. Treacy told Dr. Pychinka he should have filed a complaint with the City if there was an issue. Dr. Pychinka said he doesn't understand why the FHRA didn't take control before now because it hasn't been cleaned up and Mr. Treacy said because we didn't own it but we do now. Dr. Pychinka said it was all ridiculous. Mr. Treacy thanked him for his comments.

Ms. Greta Meglin asked about the tall grass and who is responsible for mowing. Mr. Burrus said we are for the old PX and that should be cut. She said she would drop an email about it and Mr. Burrus said please do. She said the Maude building has 18 inches of grass and Ms. Reddick said the City would be responsible. A gentleman said the grass has been cut.

Mr. Daries Greer of Moorhead building said he signed a form a few years ago to have the white building torn down. He said by giving that building, the access road would be put in. Where is that at currently? Mr. Treacy said it was all part of the same plan. He said the Maude building was never part of that package. Where is the Maude building now and Mr. Treacy said the whole situation is tabled right now to see if there is any interest in it.

Ms. Meglin asked who. He said all the residents. The FHRA haven't been doing anything but other principals involved have been meeting with other folks. Mr. Greer asked about posting the agendas for when it's coming back up and Ms. Pyatt said the notices and agendas are posted 48 hours before the meeting.

Ms. Deb Lecklider is new to the area and lives on Lawton Loop East. She asked where we put the information and who are the final decision makers? Mr. Treacy said it depends on what buildings she's talking about. He said most of the buildings are owned by private developers. She said she went to a meeting and they were talking about the apartment building and what would happen to the road. So who has the final decision? Mr. Treacy said he believes we would. Ms. Reddick said we generally have authority over the land we own but not everything. Members of the public and developers come to meetings at the city regarding the roads connected to the apartment projects. Ms. Lecklider wanted to know the reason the project is on hold. Mr. Congdon stated the reason its on hold is because there has been activity with a petition that has been against it. So with input from the public the FHRA decided we better slow it down. He asked if she was familiar with the petition and she was. We try to believe that if people are feeling that strongly about it we should wait and get everyone's full input.

Ms. Meglin asked if the proposal of the apartments doesn't go thru does it also table the access road or is there a separate plan for the access road and another use for the land if the apartments don't go thru. Mr. Treacy said they were hoping for everything but it's pretty much a package deal in terms of the road.

Mr. Congdon said one of our responsibilities of the FHRA is building a tax base here because sometime in the future there will be no need for the FRHA and the city of Lawrence will then enjoy the entire tax base. This is a TIF district but unlike other TIF districts where they add to the base taxes and then the development adds to taxes. Because this was a federal installation our TIF base started at zero. We don't want to start spending \$2-3 million on a road without some return on investment since the return belongs to everyone in this room in the TIF district paying taxes. If there is opposition to the apartment building it would be difficult to justify putting a road in without getting a tax base. As homeowners we enjoy a 1% tap cap, on apartments its 2% and commercial development it's 3% tax cap. We look for a good mix of those here so that the city of Lawrence can know they are going to have a good tax base.

Ms. Maryanne O'Malley of Lawton Loop West asked basically what we are saying is the FHRA is not interested in cultivating the community on Lawton Loop. She was told when they bought their home there would be an access road going in for the people that live there and in the condos or other development on the loop. Mr. Congdon said that is not true because we designed the thought process 2-3 years ago. This has evolved over years. Mr. Treacy said he's been on the board four years and there were no plans for a road out there. Mr. Congdon said he's been on the board longer than anyone and he knows there was never a plan.

Mr. Congdon said the current board developed this plan because it was a mess back there. We spent the money to tear the white building down. As that evolved we talked about putting a real road back there but would need to offset it with some additional tax money. There was a tax credit program talked about with the Maude but the majority of the community was against the tax credit program. VLB tried to develop all those buildings and all banks involved ended up taking a loss or taking it back. Mr. Hugon and his wife lived all by himself in a building for years.

Meyer Najem was convinced they could get a return on investment by putting the Maude East back behind the Maude to give them a return. That would give the FHRA a return and give us incentive to put the road in. That creates a good tax base of somewhere between \$80 - \$120,000 per year and keeps everyone else's taxes from going up to the moon each year.

Ms. O'Malley said there is a difference between developing a building and cultivating a community and it's not all about making money. There are people who would develop the building. Mr. Congdon said he didn't know what her point was. She said she is talking about a developer doing the project only to make money than that is not the right developer. Mr. Treacy said that is why the project is on hold.

Mr. Marten said going back to tax base if he understands correctly the condo complex is based on 1% of the assessed value of each unit. Do you know what that equates to for the tax base? Mr. Congdon asked how many units we are talking about. A gentleman said his taxes are \$1700 per year including homestead and mortgage credit. Mr. Congdon estimated \$2,000 x 48 is \$96,000. Mr. Marten said roughly \$90-\$100,000 per year is generated by those three buildings. Mr. Congdon said to balance that all the buildings went into bankruptcy. Mr. Marten said tax money has been going into the TIF district with nothing in return. Mr. Congdon said the money also goes to schools, fire and police departments. People in this area receive these services. Ms. Reddick said a portion of his property tax money goes to schools, libraries, etc.

He asked what portion of the money goes to the TIF district and Ms. Reddick said that she didn't know. Mr. Congdon said the TIF district keeps the money and a portion goes back to the city each year and with SB 151 a larger amount will go back to the city this year. The city provides services to us and the biggest chunk of property taxes go to the school system.

Mr. Marten said his point is we are talking about an apartment building and all the taxes it would generate and there are 48 units that do generate a portion of that. He feels they are discounting those peoples desire to have enhancements behind the building with an access road. Mr. Congdon said you live in the building and like the rest of the world you pay taxes. Mr. Treacy said people moved in the way the building was with no promise of a new road going in but it just came up in the last couple of years. We are not taking something away from somebody because there was never a plan to put a road back there and do it responsibly to improve the service. Mr. Marten doesn't understand why the two are tied together and why the road is off the table.

Mr. Greer said in living in the Moorhead building on the loop what they understood was if we get the building we get the road. There was never any conversation about the Maude project. Mr. Congdon said he has been a victim of hearing information that has changed as it has been passed along. Mr. Congdon said since he's been on the board the white building was a disaster. The two condo buildings owned the white building and he said he felt they had a responsibility to take care of it themselves but FHRA took it off their hands. Mr. Congdon stated we bought the building from you and tore it down right away. Mr. Greer said we got real estate out of it. Mr. Congdon said if people agree, we have dead real estate back there.

Ms. Meglin stated the question that comes from their community is there continues to be discussion about the development of the buildings but they as a community couldn't be any clearer about their lack of interest in the apartments being built back there yet it continues to be discussed. She stated they have thoughts that they think would help enhance the community. She doesn't feel her voice is wanted to be heard or the voice of the community. How do they share their ideas and the things they would like to see as homeowners and taxpayers of the community? She would like to see more retail, green space, and good access roads for the businesses back there. Mr. Congdon said there is only one business and that is Porter's Books and Bread.

Mr. Marten said there is only one retail but his building has about 50 people in his buildings each day. Mr. Congdon stated Ms. Meglin said retail but he is aware there are more businesses over there.

Ms. Meglin stated she isn't talking about groceries because she has groceries within her reach. There are people coming to the new Theater we are trying to revive and there are no restaurants or places for people to go have a drink after a show or other entertainment. Why are we not supporting the development we have in the community already.

Mr. Congdon said with the real estate downturn we had a few years ago we couldn't get anyone to come visit us or build here. Now we build the Fort building out in front and its 87% occupied and Jockamo Pizza is doing very well. We don't build buildings we attract developers to build but they go to Fishers and Carmel. The developers ask about our rooftops and they say we are not ready yet. We are trying to bring more rooftops. Mr. Congdon talks to retailers and developers everyday. We have a professional broker, Beth Patterson who is working for us and she's gone to shopping center conventions and held broker open houses and keeps coming back empty handed. We had a big developer here and his attitude was they don't do anything

on speculation. We put the Fort building up on speculation. We took the risk and our tax dollars were paying for it. We debated it mightily to make sure we would make a good decision.

Ms. Meglin said the number of rooftops has become a tired argument because we have a lot of rooftops going in. Mr. Congdon asked if she has seen how many rooftops are in Fishers and she said she does not live in Fishers.

Ms. Reddick said we have heard this thru out the spectrum of developers and brokers we are talking to so we are not hearing it from just one segment and that's why we are doing the library. We could have filled parcel J full with junk but we have been trying to wait for the good projects to come along. She said we appreciate her comments and people coming to meetings and talking and if there is a consensus in her Lawton Loop group and they want to make a presentation we would be happy to hear it. The trouble is everyone has different ideas and it doesn't seem there is a present consensus.

Ms. Meglin agreed that there is not a consensus right now but they are not looking for that chain restaurant to go in. They are looking for the Porter's or the Jockamo's. So how do they appropriately market to the right places that aren't like an Applebee's or something like that.

Ms. Reddick said that was a consideration when they interviewed brokers because that's how deals get done. She said we don't want chains but independent people. We are trying to do that.

Mr. Treacy said we had a broker event at Jockamo's with 50 different brokers to get the exposure. So we are doing what we can.

Mr. Congdon asked Ms. Kim Reeves of Browning Investments to come forward to tell everyone what we are doing around here. Ms. Reeves said to be clear her scope for Browning is really just the Village and it doesn't affect Lawton Loop so she doesn't spend any time on that matter. She said they are putting together an RFP to attract developers to do something in parcel J. they are putting in infrastructure in parcel J. They are working with Ackermann Group to expand the multi family development there. They are working with David Weekley building houses. There is a lot happening. They are working everyday to bring businesses and development here.

Mr. Congdon asked if they perceive some obstacles in the profession. Ms. Reeves said the problem is there is not enough land to fix the rooftop issues. There are only 40 acres left and you can't change that. It is also economics of the demographics. Also we are landlocked so we are trying to do everything we can do but the problems with the retailers we want are they don't have credit. It is not going to be enough for developers to do that just based on their credit and she believes it will take the boards ability to support that thru financial incentives or master lease or something like that.

Mr. Congdon said he has talked to the board and they don't always agree but he drives thru downtown Fishers and they've got the Switch, the Nickleplate and Meyer Najem built headquarters there. But they were only able to accomplish that because they went straight up. When they do parcel J if they don't go up they will be going out with asphalt and they do agree that they don't want acres and acres of asphalt. When you start talking about retail there are only so many parking spaces per building. When they use parcel J which is considered the water front property, on our side of 56th street, let's be very particular what we put there. We turned down McDonalds. We are on the same page you are on. He has several restaurants in

his building but the little guys without the credit if they don't make it then he would be out a lot of money.

Mr. Marten asked that if we don't have enough ground here to make all the rooftops what percentage of land left in the Village do we think needs to be dedicated to residential versus alternative uses like retail, commercial, green space. Ms. Reeves stated they want everything to be mixed use on parcel J. Parcel J won't be just housing accept what they are doing with Ackermann it is more focused on retail and mixed use. There may be housing on parcel G. We always want a mix like a townhome project. Parcel F they want to have an office focus with maybe some residential on upper floors.

Mr. Marten asked if Ms. Reeves feels we have enough traction with the residential we have in play to entertain some of the other ideas. Ms. Reeves said yes but retail is another beast. They will really have to think outside the box.

A woman stated that to get back to the Maude building and the access road we are getting more housing and we are here as a group because many of us don't want an apartment building to come in and the access road is contingent upon the apartment. But with the amount of taxes coming in from other developments does the access road need to hinge on weather or not we develop that into an apartment. She asked how much more tax money will we be generating for the investment for the road.

Mr. Congdon said The Fort apartments has 224 apartments and at 93% occupancy. Without the tax base from those apartments we would not have the ability to show a proforma analysis that we generate enough revenue to support another bond issue. Folks that have lived here for a while no we used to have rough roads and now they are widened and there are rain gardens and that was \$10 million. We bonded the PX and Commissary and the 56th street bridge. Our credit rating is top notch right now but if our credit rating ever slipped our interest rates would go thru the roof. To produce the bond for the access road we have to prove that we've got enough tax base now.

Mr. Congdon asked her what her personal reason was for not wanting the apartments. She said she likes where she lives and she likes the quiet and the no traffic on the loop. She thinks the apartments will generate a lot more traffic. She doesn't like how the DFAS people park on the loop and are rude and don't adhere to speed limits and she doesn't want that much more traffic on the loop.

Mr. Congdon said the petition put out had an inaccurate amount of people listed to live there. It would be physically impossible to have that many. If you had 1.5 people per unit you would have 120 people and the majority would go to work everyday and on weekends people will go to Mass Ave. He understood but to counterpoint, he's lived on the loop a long time. Mr. Marten stated he asked for her opinion. Mr. Marten said you can't have 1.5 people in a house so you have to round up to 2 people per house so that would be 200 people.

Mr. Hugon said he would like to correct the impression that everyone in the room is against this project because it's not true. He personally participated in a meeting with the Lawton Loop East meeting at the Moorhead and Brooks building where Karl Meyer and Chris Barnett made a presentation with a lot of very positive comments afterwards. Then there was another meeting where the project was presented to the Davis building with significant positive feedback. There are a lot of people who live on the east side who want to see the road put in and the Maude building developed and are ok with the apartment building that Meyer Najem is talking about.

The criteria that was developed back in spring 2013 put together by Paul Grayson and others at Lawton Loop East and the Davis building set forth certain criteria that any development brings long term sustainability and the idea is that there are a number of us do not believe it should be apartments, condos or commercial but that it meets the criteria like to put in new windows and doors and paint and landscape and put on new porches and the building will meet the historic issues that some people have. The building behind it would be designed to look like the buildings in front of it. It's a really good development project. When it is on the agenda there will be people here to support it.

John Anderson of Lawton Loop East stated there is a survey that went around about the project. A woman of the LLE board said they generated a survey to get a feel for where everyone is. She said it's definitely mixed.

Mr. Dick Schwartz of Lawton Loop East association, he said Mr. Hugon didn't hear any objections. They were told at the meeting there were to be no questions. Most of the people in the meeting didn't know anything about the development. That's what the survey is about now to get opinions. In the two buildings he hasn't talked to everyone but only talked to one person in the building who favors the development. Everyone has reservations or strong objections.

Ms. Reddick said it would be helpful for the board to have those.

Mr. Congdon said some of the objections are maybe based on lack information of the total project. Mr. Schwartz said that they have gotten two reports that Chris at the CDC put out. Everyone has seen those two documents from Chris with the drawings which were very helpful. They have gotten a lot of information that way. There is a big disagreement on the number of people, number of cars. Most people just don't buy it. In two bedroom apartments there are more than 1.5 people.

Mr. Congdon asked Chris Barnett of the CDC if he could give the mix of apartments. Chris didn't have the totals with him but estimated 8-10 studios. In the east building it has 22 one bedroom and 22 two bedrooms. The Maude would have 16 one bedroom and 12 two bedrooms. The ideal was since the unit mix was 50% and 50% it was suggested one person in the one bedrooms and two in the others and a number of cars that matches that and that tracks with Indianapolis parking code.

Mr. Congdon asked how many spaces in the underground parking garage. Mr. Barnett said 56 in the east building and an additional 60-70 around the two buildings not counting anything off the property. He said they also calculated the parking at the Fort apartments and they have one, two and three apartments.

Mrs. Schwartz stated she disagrees with the comparison of their housing on the loop to the Village and comparing the village apartments planned with a certain number of people and parking spots and to impose that as a standard for Lawton Loop development is erroneous and not right.

Mr. Schwartz stated we have 16 units in the Moorhead building that are 2200 to 2500 square feet. Two bedrooms mostly and some have more and they average 1.5 people per unit and have two garages per unit.

Mr. Congdon said not everybody can afford a condominium.

Ms. Breana Yates of Lawton Loop West stated she is not for or against the apartments but wants to know why they haven't talked more about condo ownership so that we have value in the people living in the apartments or condos to make sure they love the fort like they love the fort.

Ms. Yates also stated the access road will turn into a city street. That causes concern that they will have more and more people from DFAS parking back there. That is a big concern.

Mr. Congdon said if you surveyed the board they would love to put condos in but they aren't developers. If you talk to the Meyer Najem people they don't think the return would be as good. Mr. Congdon said we don't develop buildings we make things ready for someone else to develop. Ms. Yates asked if you could talk to someone about building condos here. He said if you bring us a developer that wants to develop the Maude into condos then we'll see condos.

She said she feels bad for building 671 and Porter's and trying to get people into there. Mr. Congdon said as we are aware DFAS is the federal government.

Ms. O'Malley said she and her husband were sold a vision and many bought into that vision and she thinks Mr. Congdon can understand. What was supposed to happen in the historic loop area and what happened were different things and that's why they aren't happy. They invested and have been stakeholders there for a very long time and bought into a completely different vision that will never come to fruition so what you put out in the universe will come back to you.

Mr. Anderson said he retired from DFAS and the construction at DFAS is for parking and hopefully you won't have the parking problem for much longer.

Mr. Vail said the board has taken steps to dispose of the original master plan that they were sold on and to rezone the buildings so that they are now in that situation. So to say that the FHRA are not developers, he doesn't think it portrays the active role that the board taken and he and the O'Malley's bought into in writing what this community was supposed to be and what they would like to see.

Mr. Treacy stated the only building we've had control of is the one we own now.

Mr. Congdon said Mr. Vail has been there as long as he has and knows the VLB problem. She bought all the buildings and went broke on all of them. PE McCallister sold Tom his building. Mr. Vail said time has caught up and people from Lawton Loop east and the Davis building and right to the south of the Maude building is a mixed use building appears to be working out. Going to apartments because it makes Meyer Najem the most profit is not a good argument for the people who have put blood, sweat and tears into their homes.

Mr. Condon reiterated that if you bring us a developer. Find someone to develop it. Mr. Vail asks how long the board will give him. Mr. Congdon said we don't own the building. Meyer Najem owns the building so they would have to talk to Karl Meyer. Mr. Vail said the meeting that happened three or four meetings ago the board was going to give Meyer Najem \$1 million in loans. Mr. Treacy said that has been tabled. Mr. Vail said that was an active role the board was playing in putting in the apartments.

Ms. Meglin asked as a board how they feel that this addition of an apartment building behind the Maude building enhances the historical character of this community. Mr. Congdon stated that we have new building, new townhouses. She said separate from the actual old historic

buildings. How will the addition of that building enhance Lawton Loop East, Lawton Loop West and the parade grounds. Mr. Congdon stated it will increase our tax base and increase the number of residents and where the retail is lacking it will have a better chance to come in. As far as the historic aspect of it, what is here is here and we are not tearing anything down.

Mr. Congdon asked Ms. Meglin what she would propose and what she would do. She said she would put in a decent access road for the east building. Mr. Congdon asked if she was going to pay for it herself. She replied no sir and he needed to stop being condescending or she would stop talking. Mr. Treacy stated that was enough name calling and lets move on.

Ms. Yates stated if we are going to build things here they have to be within the historical boundaries architecturally of the fort because we fell down with the David Weekley homes. She said they don't look anything like the Fort. Ms. Reeves said they weren't supposed to because they are in the Village. She said they could be in Greenwood or Fishers or anywhere. She said they live in Fort Ben.

Mr. Burrus said they did meet the historic because they were 100% brick. Chris Barnett said the building Meyer Najem proposed to build walks a fine line. Historic preservationists have two things they are concerned about. That they don't alter an existing historic building so much that it alters the historic character and secondly if you build something newer in a historic district is doesn't look like an exact copy or a faux reproduction but somewhat represents the era in which its built. In historic Lawton Loop the vistas are of concern. So building something right on Lawton Loop would never be permitted. The next row back from the loop should be respectful of what's already there. The same materials, roof lines and same general design but with a different modern element that distinguishes it from the historic properties. Also, an example in the condos would be to make those modern functioning buildings they have elevator towers and garages. They are more or less hidden from view of Lawton Loop. They are there to make development viable. The idea of a second building to make the Maude viable you need some more units in the base to absorb the cost of managing the building. It's all a package and a modern addition. It's kind of a compromise. All of these tend to be negotiations with the historic preservation folks. There are strict standards for renovations. They can't do gables or terraces or porches on the sides because they didn't originally have them. They also need access to the building so they don't have to trespass everyday.

One thing that hasn't been mentioned and he can't speak for Karl Meyer but he can say that the access road is a 22 foot wide strip behind the building. The new road would be wider and be landscaped and have curbs and sidewalks but would require a larger portion of ground owned by Karl Meyer. People forget that someone else owns that land.

Mr. Martin said its important to remember that Karl Meyer and the Lawrence CDC owns a portion of the land but don't forget you are asking most of the people on Lawton Loop east to give a portion of their land that the building you designed fits on. Mr. Barnett said in order that people would have access to it.

Mr. Treacy asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Bigsbee made the motion and Mr. Congdon seconded. The motion passed unanimously and the meeting adjourned at 6:50.

The next meeting will be June 20, 2016 at 5:30 p.m.

Minutes Approved:



Edward Treacy, President

RUSSEN GROW SEC/Treasurer



Jeff Congdon, Vice President