

Minutes

Land Bank Board of Trustees

Tuesday, March 1, 2016 - 3:00 p.m.
City Hall, 125 East Ave. B

City of Hutchinson, Kansas

1) CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL

The following members were present: Mark Eaton, Luke McConnaughy, Dan Garber and Jim Gilliland. Sue Poltera was absent. Staff in attendance were Jana McCarron, Director of Planning & Development; Amy Denker, Housing Program Coordinator; and Stephanie Stewart, Planning Technician.

2) APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of January 5, 2015 were approved on a motion by Gilliland, seconded by Garber, passed unanimously.

3) ANNOUNCEMENTS – None.

4) UPDATES

4a. Financial Update:

Gilliland went over the financial report stating \$16,778.64 was carried over from last year. With the addition of the \$10,000 allocated from the City with the 2016 Budget and expenditures for limb removal and abatement of 300 W Sherman, the Land Bank has \$26,298.64.

Gilliland inquired about the Land Bank property located on East 5th Avenue and asked if staff had contacted the listing realtor to let him/her know about the possibility of purchasing the Land Bank lot. Denker said that the house is still on the market and the realtor has been made aware of the Land Bank lot. The “available” sign is still on the property.

5) PROPERTY REPORT

Denker said that all of the Land Bank properties have been cleared of limbs from the ice storm and one limb has been cut down from the property on Avenue C. All properties have a Land Bank “available” sign up.

6) NEW BUSINESS

6a. Property Report - 515 S. Poplar St.

Poltera was contacted by Charles Buckaloo, the current owner of the property at 515 S. Poplar St. The property sits on the west side of Poplar with an alleyway on the south and an existing residence on the north. The lot size is 60'x66' and the property is zoned R-4. The house on the property is in poor condition and the property owner indicated his willingness to demolish the house and donate the land to the Land Bank. The current assessed value is \$2,860 with the residence (\$620 vacant lot). The property taxes are currently up-to-date at \$25.31. McCarron stated potential use would be rear yard expansion for the neighboring lot due to the minimum lot size not being met for infill residential

development, and staff recommends sending a letter to the adjacent property owner to see if there would be any interest in that lot. Garber agreed and thought maybe it might be a good location for a park due to the vacant neighboring lot. Gilliland was concerned that with the surrounding vacant lots, that the Land Bank would have a long turnaround on the property. All members agreed that they should each go drive by and look at the property before deciding. Denker will bring photos and additional analysis to the next meeting.

6b. 16-HOU-11 Avenue C Design Competition

McCarron, Denker and Stewart did research on different cities and how they handle Design Competitions. After evaluating the different types, staff broadly placed them into two categories: 1) Design Competition and 2) Design-Build Competition.

A Design Competition is on a smaller level, in that the competition delivers conceptual ideas for the property but is not connected with a specific construction project. The incentive is a small monetary prize ranging from \$100-\$4000.

A Design-Build Competition is a larger level, in that the competition not only delivers a conceptual idea but the designer must also build their project. The incentive is a larger monetary prize and can consist of the property, construction funding and/or prize money.

Whether the Board selects a Design or a Design-Build Competition, they need to consider the potential designers. Staff believes there are two types of participants; design professionals and design students. Due to the large gap of experience between the two groups, staff recommends that they choose one or the other, but probably not both classes of entries. Staff suggested the Board consider the benefits of using students not only for the project but also as real-world design experience for the students.

Garber asked what happens after a winner is announced. McCarron said they would be awarded the money and then the Land Bank owns the design and can start looking to find a builder/buyer. Eaton said that it will be good press. The Board agreed to move forward with a Design competition focusing on students as the participants. McCarron said staff would get in contact with colleges and universities to incorporate the competition with their curriculum.

7) OTHER

a. McCarron said she was asked by the City Council and the City Manager for a proposals for future housing initiatives. The goal is to form a partnership with organizations like Interfaith Housing Services. Staff is recommending a focused approach (rather than sporadic) and is hoping to remove barriers to application that exist with many of our current programs. Denker added that the Brush Up Hutch! Paint reimbursement program has a lot of hoops to go thru, as well. Garber suggested a block by block design competition, where one house needs a window repair, the next fix the front porch, paint etc. Staff said they would consider this idea either as part of the proposals or the Healthy Neighborhoods Initiative.

8) ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 3:55 p.m. The next meeting will be Tuesday, April 5, 2016 at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Stephanie Stewart, Planning Technician

Approved this 5th day of April 2016

Attest: 