

From: Lichtwardt, Robert W [mailto:licht@ku.edu]  
Sent: Sunday, August 10, 2008 5:10 PM  
To: David L. Corliss  
Subject: Type A Homeless Shelters and Workplaces

Dear David,

This is in regard to the proposed text amendment to change the homeless shelters to include the Type A Homeless Shelter for families of up to 15 persons as accessory uses. My main point has been that accessory uses have no description or controls written into the zoning ordinance and therefore are not controlled by the ordinance or by other regulations, although accessory uses as structures do have minimal restrictions. However, as accessory uses these Type A Homeless Shelters have no city oversight or controls because there is no registration, license, or permit that is required. This is also true where the homeless workplaces are permitted as accessory uses. Although there may be no concern regarding the administration of this kind of program through the faith based Family Promise, because this is a general permitted use in the zoning ordinance itself this is open to any private individual or organization to use.

Without proper controls there is always the possibility that there would be abuse of the families and the other residents that these facilities were designed to benefit. For the protection of the residents of the homeless facilities and workplaces, they need city oversight.

Thank you for your concern about this issue. I hope that the City Commission will give this more careful consideration before it is passed.

Betty Lichtwardt

---

**From:** Lisa Harris [lharris@ku.edu]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 11, 2008 5:07 PM  
**To:** mdever@sunflower.com; robchestnut@sunflower.com; mikeamyx515@hotmail.com; suehack@sunflower.com; boog@lawrence.ixks.com  
**Cc:** Joseph Rexwinkle; Scott McCullough  
**Subject:** Text Amendment TA-04-03-08 homeless shelter changes

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed  
Dear City Commissioners:

I am writing to ask you to defer the text amendments on homeless shelters to allow for revision — and for citizen and planning commission review in that process.

Here are a few of my concerns with the current wording.

I think there need to be more guidelines for what management plans should contain to address public safety and neighborliness, especially for any shelter allowed to operate

near citizens' homes. Also, management plans and SUPs are not required for Type A night shelters, and I think they should be.

As I read it, when a management plan is required, it does not have to require that any staff be qualified or trained, does not have to require background checks or other screening, and does not have to address whether visitors are allowed inside or outside the property. A plan *does* require rules of conduct, but sets no parameters for what would be needed in a residential neighborhood.

Other concerns:

- There is no established review process for management plans for Type A shelters.
- Type A night shelters could operate 365 days a year.
- Transportation is not required to be provided to or from Type A day or night shelters.

A few comments about the draft planning commission minutes on this item: My comment about a four-plex was not to express concern that one would be built, but that, by allowing four families in one house, the house essentially would become a four-plex in use. The code does not allow that in single family neighborhoods in other circumstances. Also, my question about the white areas on the map in the staff presentation pertained to my thought that by eliminating planned unit developments from consideration for Type A shelters, we are setting up in inequitable situation where some areas are exempt from consideration simply because it's awkward to address this with code changes, the way the code is written. We ought to be able to find a way to work around that.

The above observations aside, here's what I think about Type A shelters after having a chance to digest the code changes further. While I support the concept of having day-only transient shelters in a community (especially those that would help people get back on their feet), I do not support having them in residential neighborhoods. Besides the density issue in single-family neighborhoods, my reasons primarily have to do with the sense of stability in a neighborhood, affect on property values and desirability for purchase for surrounding properties, and concern about crime and safety. The code states that management plans need to address how to communicate with police and respond to emergencies. I think those conditions are wise, but it gives one pause for putting a facility that needs such a plan among our citizens' homes.

I might be able to support Type A night shelters in churches in residential areas if the use were restricted along the lines described by the Family Promise model, to one week per quarter, and with some strong conditions.

We are not the only city that has grappled with this. In 2006 the City of Las Vegas considered changing its zoning to allow a day shelter (operating under the radar) to continue to operate in a residential neighborhood. The staff, planning commission, and city commission all denied the request. The city did, however, acknowledge the value the service the facility was providing and helped identify a new location in a mixed use area. By the way, this was a Family Promise facility.

I support your and staff's intention to serve the homeless in Lawrence with essential services, and I will help in any way I can to increase our options for that in a way that makes the best sense for the community as a whole. I know this is not an easy issue, and it is an important one.

Thank you for your consideration,

Lisa Harris

---

**From: Rachele Christie [rachristie20@yahoo.com]**  
**Sent: Monday, August 18, 2008 6:41 PM**  
**To: David L. Corliss**  
**Subject: Family Promise Program**

My congregation strongly supports Family Promise of Lawrence and has agreed, as part of our mission, to provide shelter and food for homeless families with children for one week every three months. Because of the stringent screening program that Family Promise provides in selecting homeless families for its program, we feel secure in allowing them to stay in our building overnight and to be served by our members. We believe our right to carry out this ministry is protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Further, we believe that Family Promise should be permitted to locate its Day Center in a residential area. Such a location is best for the children's safety. The safeguards Family Promise provides have proved in other communities around the country that it is no threat or blight on the neighborhood. The fears that others have voiced are unfounded. Please do not delay us any longer in carrying out this important ministry.

---

**From: Randy Beeman [rbeeman@sunflower.com]**  
**Sent: Tuesday, August 19, 2008 8:43 AM**  
**To: David L. Corliss**  
**Subject: Family Promise**

Dave, First Christian Church strongly supports Family Promise of Lawrence and has agreed, as part of our mission, to provide shelter and food for homeless families with children for one week every three months. We feel that we are part of the solution here in Lawrence to family homelessness.

Because of the stringent screening program that Family Promise provides in selecting homeless families for its program, we feel secure in allowing them to stay in our building overnight and to be served by our members.

Further, we believe that Family Promise should be permitted to locate its Day Center in a residential area. Such a location is best for the children's safety. I believe the safeguards Family

Promise provides have proved in other communities around the country that it is no threat or blight on the local neighborhood.

Dave, I hope that you encourage the city to allow the Family promise day center to locate in residential areas to continue to be an important component in ending homelessness of families in Lawrence.

Since we need to start as soon as possible, please do not delay Family Promise in carrying out this important ministry.

Randy Beeman

---

**From:** Christine Winters [cwinters@sunflower.com]

**Sent:** Tuesday, August 19, 2008 7:37 PM

**To:** David L. Corliss

**Subject:** Code Changes for Family Promise

Dave,

Slightly more than 30 years ago, I was close to the situation of the people Family Promise intends to help. I was a single parent of two children ages 3 and 6 making slightly more than minimum wage, and unable to pay for medical insurance. I had parents who had the means to help me; my place of employment continued to stay in business; and neither my children nor I had a chronic or debilitating illness. Because I had the help of family and friends during the tough times, I was able to feed my children, maintain a place for them to live, and help them get an education.

The Family Promise program is designed to help families similar to the way I was helped -- a little help to get back on your feet. The program screens the participants very closely. Participants with drug, alcohol, and physical abuse problems aren't allowed to enter the program. The participants must be willing to actively search for jobs and housing. They must save a set amount of their take home pay to get them back in their own home. The families are active participants in making it work and changing their lives for the better. They work one on one with a trained professional to help them mainstream back into society. This program has worked for 20 years in New Jersey and also in other parts of the United States. Its success rate is better than 70%.

In Lawrence, there are more than 100 homeless families per year. That is approximately 250 children. 250 CHILDREN NOT HAVING A HOME TO LIVE IN. Children need a yard to play in. Parents need a place where they can take their children that is safe from the perils of most homeless shelters. Just as you would like to raise your children in a residential area, these parents deserve to be able to have their children in a residential neighborhood where their outdoor playtime can be as normal as possible. Just as you want your family to be safe at night, these parents deserve to feel their children are safe also. The faith-based organizations are willing to provide the space and the funds to make this program work. The City of Lawrence needs to do its part to help these residents get back on their feet.

Please do not delay in passing the code changes for the day center to be in a residential neighborhood and allowing the churches to house homeless families overnight. We need to act now to provide appropriate shelter before the cold weather hits. Even one child without a safe place to sleep at night is too many.

Christine Winters

---

> From: Len Andyshak [mailto:revlen@ku.edu]

> Sent: Tuesday, August 19, 2008 9:23 AM

> To: David L. Corliss

Subject: In support of Family Promise

> Dear Mr Corliss,

Please know that many of us in Lawrence are very excited about the possibility of participating in Family Promise through our churches and are thrilled at the chance to help homeless families in this practical way. This program has been very successful in many communities and would be a wonderful addition to our community.

Len Andyshak

---

**From:** Judy Williams [jwilli305@msn.com]

**Sent:** Tuesday, August 19, 2008 8:17 AM

**To:** David L. Corliss

**Subject:** homeless/daycare/churches

I support Family Promise of Lawrence. My church has agreed to provide shelter and food for homeless families with children for one week every three months. Because of the screening process that Family Promise provides in selecting the homeless families for its program, I feel secure in allowing these families to stay in my church building overnight. They will be served by members of my church. I believe it is our right to carry out this ministry and we are protected by the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

I firmly believe that Family Promise should be permitted to locate its Day Care Center in a residential area. It would be best for the children. I owned and operated a Day Care Center for twenty years in a residential neighborhood here in Lawrence and never experiences one complaint. I anticipate that the result would be the same. The safeguards Family Promise provides have proven to be successful in other communities around the country. There has been no threat of blight to the neighborhoods. The fears that others have voiced are unfounded. Thank You for your attention to this concern for homeless families in our community.

*Judy Williams*

---

Get thousands of games on your PC, your mobile phone, and the web with Windows®. [Game with Windows](#)

---

**From:** Hilda Enoch [henoch@sunflower.com]

**Sent:** Tuesday, August 19, 2008 2:35 AM

To: David L. Corliss  
Subject: I Left Out a Word in the Subject Line...  
Dear David--

I'd be appreciative IF you'd insert the word --deserve--in the Subject line --as I intended in the letter below --(but it's late!) --to read:

"Family Promise needs and deserves community support"

Thank You. --Hilda

---

**From:** KHite@mizehouser.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 19, 2008 8:22 AM  
**To:** David L. Corliss  
**Subject:** social services need in Lawrence

Mr. Corliss,

I am sure you are probably being inundated with communication about Family Promise, both for and against. I don't want to add to this communication with a long letter or email. However, I am on the board of Family Promise and wanted to make myself available if I can be of any assistance in communicating. It seems that we have been associated, because of the housing status of the people we intend to serve, with the chronic homeless. I think with appropriate communication of our model of operation and the screening and rigors of our program that we can overcome this prejudice.

Another reason I wanted to contact you was to inquire whether there is any way that we can begin some provisional special use process. Our goal was to have a day center available to begin providing services by November 1st. The location we have in mind is an exceptionally good one because of its proximity to the community resources that the people we serve will need in order to reshape their lives and move back into permanent housing. It is a misconception of the community to think of this as a shelter of any type as it is simply a center from which training and preparation can occur. It is a workforce training center social services agency more than anything else.

It grieves me to see that we are moving toward fall and winter with such a good program stalled on the runway. Any assistance you can provide in advising us of the most expedient way to proceed would be very appreciated.

Thank you for all you do for the community.

All the best,

Ken

---

Kenneth R. Hite, CPA

Mize, Houser & Company  
120 East Ninth  
Lawrence, KS 66044  
Phone: (785) 842-8844  
Fax: (785) 842-9049  
Email: khite@mizehouser.com

---

Privileged/Confidential Information may be contained in this message. If you are not the addressee indicated in this message (or responsible for delivery of the message to such person), do not read, copy, forward, or process in any other way, this email or attachments to this email. To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the IRS, we inform you that any tax advice contained in this communication (including any attachments) was not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for purposes of (1) avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or (2) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed herein.

---

From: Carol and Victor Carr [vicandcarol@sunflower.com]  
Sent: Tuesday, August 19, 2008 8:39 AM  
To: David L. Corliss  
Subject: Lawrence Family Promise Program

Dear Mr. Corliss,

My congregation, First Christian Church, strongly supports Family Promise of Lawrence. There is a group of people anxious to get started and help MAKE A DIFFERENCE. Because of the stringent screening program that Family Promise provides in selecting homeless families for its program, we feel secure in allowing them to stay in our building overnight and to be served by our members..

Further, we believe that Family Promise should be permitted to locate its Day Center in a residential area. Such a location is best for the children's safety. The safeguards Family Promise provides have proved in other communities around the country that it is no threat or blight on the neighborhood. The fears that others have voiced are unfounded.

PLEASE DO NOT DELAY US ANY LONGER in carrying out this ministry.

Sincerely,

CAROL ANN CARR  
230 Michigan St., Lawrence, Ks.  
842-2331

---

From: Carl Burkhead [carlb@sunflower.com]  
Sent: Tuesday, August 19, 2008 7:49 PM  
To: Sue Hack; mdever@sunflower.com; Boog Highberger; Mike Amyx; Rob Chestnut  
Subject: Family Promise

Dear Commissioners:

I know this is late, but I also know that you won't find a better solution to the part of the homeless problem in Lawrence involving children than you will with the Family Promise ministry. First off, you have a ministry with a well known track record. Secondly, you have a Distinguished Professor who is heading up the local ministry. Thirdly, you have at least a dozen churches that want to be a part of the ministry. Finally, you have other churches that are willing to serve in a support role. What is the cost to the City to help with the homeless problem? Nothing? This isn't even a faith-based ministry involving Federal money. It's a ministry where people are willing to help other people. I think the gains far outweigh the losses. Carl Burkhead

---

**From:** Julie Avila [jewelsavila@yahoo.com]

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 20, 2008 5:17 PM

**To:** David L. Corliss

**Subject:** Family promise

Dear David,

My congregation strongly supports Family Promise of Lawrence and has agreed, as part of our mission, to provide shelter and food for homeless families with children for one week every three months. Because of the stringent screening program that Family Promise provides in selecting homeless families for its program, we feel secure in allowing them to stay in our building overnight and to be served by our members. We believe our right to carry out this ministry is protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Further, we believe that Family Promise should be permitted to locate its Day Center in a residential area. Such a location is best for the children's safety. The safeguards Family Promise provides have proved in other communities around the country that it is no threat or blight on the neighborhood. The fears that others have voiced are unfounded.

Please do not delay us any longer in carrying out this important ministry.

Vince and Julie Avila  
637 N. Nottingham Rd.  
Lawrence, KS 66049

---

**From:** Ryan Hickman [hickman@sunflower.com]

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 20, 2008 10:56 AM

**To:** David L. Corliss

**Subject:** Family Promise Code Change Approval

Dave,

Our congregation at Morning Star Church strongly supports Family Promise of Lawrence and has agreed, as part of our mission, to provide shelter and food for homeless families with children for one week every three months. Because of the stringent screening program that Family Promise provides in selecting homeless families for its program, we feel secure in allowing them to stay in our building overnight and to be served by our members. We believe our right to carry out this ministry is protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Further, we believe that Family Promise should be permitted to locate its Day Center in a residential area. Such a location is best for the children's safety. The safeguards Family Promise provides have proved in other communities around the country that it is no threat or blight on the neighborhood. The fears that others have voiced are unfounded.

We look forward to helping those in need in our community and would appreciate the support of the city in helping our community solve a problem that has gone unnoticed and unsolved for far too long. The homeless families with children need to be helped and they can be helped through this ministry and

without tax payer dollars. Please approve the code changes and let people get started helping other people.

Ryan D. Hickman  
President, Midwest Student Ministries

---

**From:** tbrinson@midweststudentministries.com  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 20, 2008 6:10 PM  
**To:** David L. Corliss  
**Subject:** Family Promise of Lawrence  
Dear Dave Corliss and City Commission,

My congregation strongly supports Family Promise of Lawrence and has agreed, as part of our mission, to provide shelter and food for homeless families with children for one week every three months. Because of the stringent screening program that Family Promise provides in selecting homeless families for its program, we feel secure in allowing them to stay in our building overnight and to be served by our members. We believe our right to carry out this ministry is protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Further, we believe that Family Promise should be permitted to locate its Day Center in a residential area. Such a location is best for the children's safety. The safeguards Family Promise provides have proved in other communities around the country that it is no threat or blight on the neighborhood. The fears that others have voiced are unfounded.

Please do not delay us any longer in carrying out this important ministry.

Thank you for your time,

Torrie Brinson  
[tbrinson@midweststudentministries.com](mailto:tbrinson@midweststudentministries.com)

---

**From:** Rich Lorenzo [mailto:rlorenzo@sunflower.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 20, 2008 12:06 PM  
**To:** David L. Corliss  
**Subject:** Family Promise

Dave:

I attend Morning Star Church and we strongly support Family Promise of Lawrence and have agreed, as part of our mission, to provide shelter and food for homeless families with children for one week every three months. Because of the screening program that Family Promise provides in selecting homeless families for its program, we feel secure in allowing them to stay in our building overnight and to be served by our members. We believe our right to carry out this ministry is protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Further, we believe that Family Promise should be permitted to locate its Day Center in a residential area. Such a location is best for the children's safety. The safeguards Family Promise

provides have proved in other communities around the country that it is no threat or blight on the neighborhood. The fears that others have voiced are unfounded.

Please do not delay us any longer in carrying out this important ministry.

Thanks,

Rich

**Richard A. Lorenzo**  
**Senior Financial Consultant**

*Berthel Fisher & Co. Financial Services*  
*3310 Mesa Way, Suite 101*  
*Lawrence, KS 66049*  
*785.843.7070*  
*785.843.2763 (fax)*

---

**From:** Rick Mullen [rick@msclawrence.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 20, 2008 10:16 AM  
**To:** David L. Corliss  
**Subject:** Family Promise

**My congregation strongly supports Family Promise of Lawrence and has agreed, as part of our mission, to provide shelter and food for homeless families with children for one week every three months. Because of the stringent screening program that Family Promise provides in selecting homeless families for its program, we feel secure in allowing them to stay in our building overnight and to be served by our members. We believe our right to carry out this ministry is protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.**

**Further, we believe that Family Promise should be permitted to locate its Day Center in a residential area. Such a location is best for the children's safety. The safeguards Family Promise provides have proved in other communities around the country that it is no threat or blight on the neighborhood. The fears that others have voiced are unfounded.**

**Please do not delay us any longer in carrying out this important ministry.**

**Regards,**

**Rick Mullen**

***Rick Mullen***  
Executive Pastor  
Morning Star Church  
998 N. 1771 Rd., Lawrence, KS 66049  
(785) 749-0023

[www.msclawrence.com](http://www.msclawrence.com)

---

**From:** ncarson@midweststudentministries.com  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 20, 2008 10:43 PM  
**To:** David L. Corliss  
**Subject:** Family Promise  
Dear Dave,

I just wanted to write you to let you know that I'm a part of Morning Star Church which plans to host Family Promise one week every three months. This is such an important and necessary program for our city.

Please carry out this ministry. Please also endorse a day center in a residential area for the children's safety.

Thank you.  
Naomi Carson  
2708 Harrison Pl.  
Lawrence, KS 66047

---

**From:** thevarajoo [t@sunflower.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 20, 2008 1:16 PM  
**To:** David L. Corliss  
**Subject:** Family Promise of Lawrence  
Mr. Corliss,

Please approve the code change to allow Family Promise to open it's doors to serve the homeless. If helping homeless is a crime or has to be mulled over, it's a shame on humanity.

Please don't put "road blocks" on a group of citizens trying to help the homeless., regardless of the group. What was the last thing you personally did to help the homeless? This could be it.

Thanks,  
Paul

---

**From:** Rachel Leland [mailto:rachleland@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 20, 2008 3:26 PM  
**To:** David L. Corliss  
**Subject:** Family Promise

My congregation strongly supports Family Promise of Lawrence and has agreed, as part of our mission, to provide shelter and food for homeless families with children for one week every three months. Because of the stringent screening program that Family Promise provides in selecting homeless families for its program, we feel secure in allowing them to stay in our building overnight and to be served by our members. We believe our right to carry out this ministry is

protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Further, we believe that Family Promise should be permitted to locate its Day Center in a residential area. Such a location is best for the children's safety. The safeguards Family Promise provides have proved in other communities around the country that it is no threat or blight on the neighborhood. The fears that others have voiced are unfounded.

Please do not delay us any longer in carrying out this important ministry.

Sincerely,

Rachel Leland

---

**From:** Madalon Vann [vannx10@yahoo.com]

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 20, 2008 10:04 PM

**To:** David L. Corliss

**Subject:** Family Promise Day Center

Mr. Corliss, I am a resident of the Barker neighborhood as well as a parishioner of one of the churches that are going to house the homeless families that come through Family Promise. I would like to urge the city to pass the new regulations that would make it possible for Family Promise to locate in a residential neighborhood. I attended the Barker neighborhood meetings on this issue and found the comments and fears to be totally unfounded. If they are concerned about neighborhood blight they need to report 2 homes on the 1500 block of Rhode Island as well as 2 homes on the 1500 block of New Hampshire to the city for condemnation. They are that run down. The issue about cars doesn't hold water. It is rare to find homeless families with cars since they generally can't afford to keep them or run them. If they are concerned about kids hanging around they only need to watch the kids from Central Jr. High gather at the Community Theatre to smoke and throw their trash around. I lived right beside Central for 4 years. I have worked with homeless families and single parents for 27 years and have not ever witnessed the issues my neighbors were talking about. This location at 1501 Rhode Island would be ideal for families as it is centrally located to shopping within walking distance as well as numerous potential areas of employment. It is also in walking distance of several schools, Central, LHS and Cordley. My family and I will be involved in volunteering at the home and have no concerns about being around the families that would be screened for the program. Please allow this program to start up immediately. We have a problem with homeless families and need as many homes and or day centers as we can establish in Lawrence. All these families need are a hand up to permanent living. Thank You for your time. Sincerely, Madalon Vann

---

From: jsmith2@sunflower.com

Sent: Wednesday, August 20, 2008 11:04 AM

To: David L. Corliss

Cc: lawrencefamilypromise@yahoo.com

Subject: Family Promise program

Our congregation (St. Johns) strongly supports Family Promise of Lawrence and has agreed, as part of our mission, to help provide food for homeless families with children for one week every three months. We believe our right to carry out this ministry is protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Further, we believe that Family Promise should be permitted to locate its Day Center in a residential area. Such a location is best for the children's safety. The safeguards Family Promise provides have proved in other communities around the country that it is no threat or blight on the neighborhood. The fears that others have voiced are unfounded.

Please help us by not delaying us any longer in carrying out this important ministry and service to the community.

Larry and Jewel Smith  
1432 Lawrence Avenue  
Lawrence, Kansas 66049

---

**From:** Jeremy Brakenhoff [mailto:jeremybrakenhoff@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 20, 2008 1:25 PM  
**To:** David L. Corliss  
**Subject:** Family promise

Hello Dave-

I wanted to write to show my support for family promise.

My congregation strongly supports Family Promise of Lawrence and has agreed, as part of our mission, to provide shelter and food for homeless families with children for one week every three months. Because of the stringent screening program that Family Promise provides in selecting homeless families for its program, we feel secure in allowing them to stay in our building overnight and to be served by our members. We believe our right to carry out this ministry is protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Further, we believe that Family Promise should be permitted to locate its Day Center in a residential area. Such a location is best for the children's safety. The safeguards Family Promise provides have proved in other communities around the country that it is no threat or blight on the neighborhood. The fears that others have voiced are unfounded.

Please do not delay us any longer in carrying out this important ministry.

Sincerely- Jeremy

---

From: Joshua McCleary [jmcclary@sunflower.com]  
Sent: Wednesday, August 20, 2008 1:08 PM  
To: David L. Corliss  
Subject: Family Promise

Dear Mr. Corliss,

Our congregation strongly supports Family Promise of Lawrence and has agreed, as part of our mission, to provide shelter and food for homeless families with children for one week every three months. Because of the stringent screening program that Family Promise provides in selecting homeless families for its program, we feel secure in allowing them to stay in our building overnight and to be served by our members. We believe our right to carry out this ministry is protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Further, we believe that Family Promise should be permitted to locate its Day Center in a residential area. Such a location is best for the children's safety. The safeguards Family Promise provides have proved in other communities around the country that it is no threat or blight on the neighborhood. The fears that others have voiced are unfounded.

Please do not delay us any longer in carrying out this important ministry.

Thank you,

Josh McCleary  
Lawrence, KS

---

**From:** Brooke Waters  
**To:** David L. Corliss  
**Sent:** Wed Aug 20 20:03:57 2008  
**Subject:** Family Promise  
Dear Mr. Corliss,

My congregation strongly supports Family Promise of Lawrence and has agreed, as part of our mission, to provide shelter and food for homeless families with children for one week every three months. Because of the stringent screening program that Family Promise provides in selecting homeless families for its program, we feel secure in allowing them to stay in our building overnight and to be served by our members. We believe our right to carry out this ministry is protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Further, we believe that Family Promise should be permitted to locate its Day Center in a residential area. Such a location is best for the children's safety. The safeguards Family Promise provides have proved in other communities around the country that it is no threat or blight on the neighborhood. The fears that others have voiced are unfounded.

Please do not delay us any longer in carrying out this important ministry.  
Brooke

[www.straightupbeautiful.com](http://www.straightupbeautiful.com)  
<http://www.myspace.com/beautydefineddifferently>

---

**From:** Stephanie Fawcett [mailto:sfawcett@sunflower.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 20, 2008 3:42 PM  
**To:** David L. Corliss  
**Subject:** Family Promise Day Center

Dear Mr. Corliss,

I am a member of Morning Star Church here in Lawrence. Our church, along with several others in our community, is involved in the Family Promise ministry to help homeless families here in Lawrence. Our congregation has committed to participating in housing and feeding families who qualify for the program one week every three months. We are confident that the stringent screening required to accept participants into the program will safeguard our building and the members who are volunteering. Not only do we believe this is the right thing to do, it is protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution.

In order for this program to succeed, these families must have a Day Center from which to operate. I believe it is safe and right for this setting to be in a residential neighborhood, namely for the sake of the children of these homeless parents who will be going to and from school, will want to play in parks or with other neighborhood children, participate in after-school activities, and would benefit greatly from the stability that a residential area would provide. As these are *families* that will be in the program, and these families have been carefully screened, the fears that have been voiced in opposition to the Day Center are unfounded. This has proven to be a safe and effective solution in many other communities where Family Promise has been operating. Therefore I urge you to support the decision to allow the Day Center to be established in a residential neighborhood in Lawrence.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Fawcett

---

**From:** mhickman@midweststudentministries.com

**Sent:** Thursday, August 21, 2008 2:01 PM

**To:** David L. Corliss

**Subject:** Family Promise of Lawrence

Dear Mr. Corliss,

My congregation at Morning Star Church strongly supports the Family Promise of Lawrence program and has agreed to provide shelter and food for homeless families with children for one week every three months. We believe that the screening process will provide a safe environment for the volunteers as well as the homeless in need. The First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States protects our right to minister to others in this way.

I also believe that Family Promise should be allowed to have its day care in a residential area in order to provide safety for the children. The fears that have been voiced in regard to this are unfounded and should bear no weight in the decision made to support this beneficial ministry.

Please respond quickly in supporting this ministry. Help is needed soon.

Thank you for your time.

Miriam Hickman

---

**From:** Hope, Nancy Francesca [nfhope@ku.edu]  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 21, 2008 1:19 PM  
**To:** David L. Corliss  
**Subject:** Support of shelter for families with children

Dear Mr. Corliss:

Please accept this email as evidence of support from St. John the Evangelist Catholic Church for the proposed Family Promise of Lawrence program. Our congregation has voted to do this, so it is not just my individual voice, but the voice of the 1100+ families of the congregation speaking on this issue.

We certainly understand the concerns voiced by opponents to this project since it is new in our town, but similar programs in other communities across America have demonstrated that it is no threat to or blight on nearby neighborhoods. Therefore, please shepherd this program through the bureaucratic process in a timely fashion.

Sincerely,  
Nancy Hope

---

**From:** JASON KIDD [jelkidd@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 21, 2008 10:00 PM  
**To:** David L. Corliss  
**Subject:** Family Promise  
Mr. Corliss,

My family and church family strongly support Family Promise of Lawrence and has agreed, as part of our mission, to provide shelter and food for homeless families with children for one week every three months. We feel secure in allowing these families to stay in our building overnight and to be served by our members due to the stringent screening program that Family Promise provides in selecting homeless families for its program. We believe our right to carry out this ministry is protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Further, we believe and would love to see the Family Promise Day Center be permitted to locate in a residential area. This would be the best location for the children's safety. Family Promise provides safeguards and these have been proven in other communities around the country that it is no threat or blight on the neighborhood. The fears voiced by others have been unfounded.

Please, do not delay us any longer in carrying out such an important need and ministry in our community.

Sincerely,  
Jason & Erin Kidd  
Morning Star Church

---

**From:** Patti Lyon  
**To:** David L. Corliss  
**Sent:** Thu Aug 21 10:10:49 2008  
**Subject:** Family Promise of Lawrence  
August 21, 2008

Dear Dave,

My congregation strongly supports Family Promise of Lawrence and has agreed, as part of our mission, to provide shelter and food for homeless families with children for one week every three months. Because of the stringent screening program that Family Promise provides in selecting homeless families for its program, we feel secure in allowing them to stay in our building overnight and to be served by our members. We believe our right to carry out this ministry is protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Further, we believe that Family Promise should be permitted to locate its Day Center in a residential area. Such a location is best for the children's safety. The safeguards Family Promise provides have proved in other communities around the country that it is no threat or blight on the neighborhood. The fears that others have voiced are unfounded.

Please do not delay us any longer in carrying out this important ministry.

Patti Lyon  
St. John the Evangelist Parish  
Lawrence, KS

---

**From:** Debbie McCarthy [got2want2@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 21, 2008 10:21 AM  
**To:** David L. Corliss  
**Subject:** Family Promise of Lawrence  
Hello David:

My congregation strongly supports Family Promise of Lawrence and has agreed, as part of our mission, to provide shelter and food for homeless families with children for one week every three months. Because of the stringent screening program that Family Promise provides in selecting homeless families for its program, we feel secure in allowing them to stay in our building overnight and to be served by our members. We believe our right to carry out this ministry is protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Further, we believe that Family Promise should be permitted to locate its Day Center in a residential area. Such a location is best for the childrens safety. The safeguards Family Promise provides have proved in other communities around the country that it is no threat or blight on the neighborhood. The fears that others have voiced are unfounded.

Please do not delay us any longer in carrying out this important ministry.

Debbie McCarthy  
Parishioner  
Saint John the Evangelist Church

Debbie McCarthy, Realtor  
Hedges/Realty Executives  
1037 Vermont  
Lawrence, KS 66044

(785) 841-2400 - office  
(785) 218-3448 - mobile  
(785) 843-5487 - fax

DebbieMcCarthy@RealtyExecutives.com

---

**From:** Scott Robinson [mailto:scottr@sunflower.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, August 22, 2008 10:44 AM  
**To:** David L. Corliss  
**Subject:** Family Promise

Mr. Corliss,

My congregation strongly supports Family Promise of Lawrence and has agreed, as part of our mission, to provide shelter and food for homeless families with children for one week every three months. Because of the stringent screening program that Family Promise provides in selecting homeless families for its program, we feel secure in allowing them to stay in our building overnight and to be served by our members. We believe our right to carry out this ministry is protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Further, we believe that Family Promise should be permitted to locate its Day Center in a residential area. Such a location is best for the children's safety. **The safeguards Family Promise provides have proved in other communities around the country that it is no threat or blight on the neighborhood. The fears that others have voiced are unfounded.**

Please do not delay us any longer in carrying out this important ministry.

Scott Robinson

785-727-4404

---

**From:** plek10berg@aol.com [mailto:plek10berg@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, August 22, 2008 2:11 PM  
**To:** David L. Corliss  
**Subject:** day center for Family Promise

My husband, Michael, and I welcomed about 40 neighbors to our home August 7 to hear about Family Promise (a proposed new ministry based on a proven national program to help families in need) and to ask questions and raise concerns. We appreciated the interest but were a bit taken back by the resistance to the idea of a day

center for the program being located in our neighborhood.

The questions raised about the number of people involved, the cars that would be added to the neighborhood, the safety of children playing in an unfenced yard, the house being empty at night, the screening process for participants, the training of volunteers were valid and relevant. We thought the organizers answered what questions they could and were taking into consideration all the concerns.

=0 A

During the lengthy discussion it became apparent that much of the distress was centered on a proposed change in wording for zoning in neighborhoods. That, too, seems to be a valid concern. However, we have little patience for trying to figure out all the 'what ifs' of such proposals especially in light of a member of the planning commission who reportedly voted in favor of the change speaking against it at our neighborhood meeting. At least one protester of the neighborhood day center made it clear that speaking out against the change next Tuesday would not be against Family Promise but would be against the zoning change. However, they are still against the day center in the neighborhood.

At the end of the meeting we couldn't really tell how the majority of the group felt. Were most in agreement with the dissenters or simply quiet? Many expressed their support privately to us as they left. If the permit is given for the day center to locate in a residential area will the decision be made by a very vocal minority? We will be fine with any decision that represents the majority.

Now the question seems to be: How will the City Commission handle this. Will they give a special permit for a day care center as they originally planned to do? Will they delay making a decision so long that the program cannot begin in any location? We hope the taskforce and the board of Lawrence Family Promise won't give up because of all the obstacles they've encountered. Much progress has already been made. It is a good program and one that our community needs – for the sake of the children. \

Because of the success of the national program on which Family promise is based and because of the stringent screening program that Family Promise provides in selecting families in need, we feel secure in allowing them to spend days in our neighborhood. We feel strongly that these families will benefit from experiencing a few weeks in a safe, clean comfortable home in a family friendly neighborhood.

This will be much different from the drop in center and Salvation Army services to homeless persons. Most people, including some from our Barker neighborhood, cannot imagine the difference in serving the working poor rather than the chronic homeless. The safeguards Family Promise provides have proven in other communities around the nation that there is no threat or blight on the neighborhood. The fears that others have voiced are unfounded.

Please do not delay so long that Family Promise can not begin on their targeted starting date in November. They may not be able to get their director of choice if the delay is

too long to guarantee the beginning time for employment.

Pat & Mike Lechtenberg  
1701 Barker Avenue  
785-842-1992

---

**From:** Barbee, Sherry  
**Sent:** Friday, August 22, 2008 3:32 PM  
**To:** 'dcorliss@ci.lawrenceks.us'  
**Subject:** Family Promise Day Center

Good afternoon Mr. Corliss,

I'm sending you this letter in response to Family Promise of Lawrence and the delay for the code changes for the Day Center that is needed. This is a wonderful opportunity for the community of Lawrence to come together to provide shelter and food for the homeless **families** (please remember this includes children). The families have to go through an extensive screening process to even be accepted into the program and for this reason, we as a church feel secure to allow them to stay in our church building overnight and be served by our church members. The neighbors in the area where the Day Center is being proposed should also feel this security for the same reason. Education is needed for anyone with concerns about this program, not delaying in doing what is right for the families in their unfortunate situations.

Thank you for your time and attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

Sherry Barbee  
(Member of Morning Star Church)

---

**From:** tim o'brien [obrkids@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, August 23, 2008 10:22 AM  
**To:** David L. Corliss  
**Subject:** Family Promise Shelter

Dear Mr. Corliss--

Thank you for your work for the city of Lawrence.  
I'm writing in support of the Family Promise Shelter.

I have looked into this program and strongly believe in its efficacy. I would support such a shelter even if it were planned to be next door to my own house.

Please help the Family Promise cause.

Tim O'Brien 832-0942

---

**From:** casad@sunflower.com

Sent: Sunday, August 24, 2008 8:47 PM  
To: David L. Corliss  
Subject: Family Promise

Dear Mr. Corliss,

Family Promise is a program that provides food and shelter to families with children for a specific amount of time. It is a national program which has met with success in many other cities. Several churches in Lawrence have banded together to offer such a refuge here, but apparently the City Commission is reluctant to authorize the effort without more public input.

Speaking as an individual and as a member of one of the churches, I believe that permission should be granted. The screening process for selecting eligible families is very stringent, we feel secure in allowing them to stay in the house and to be served by our congregants. We also believe that Family Promise should be permitted to locate its Day Center in a residential area as that is much better for the children involved.

Often people in such desperate circumstances need just a bit of temporary help to become operational again. I think that the City Commission should grant permission for this important venture, thereby helping the families involved and helping the churches carry out a very basic mission.

Sincerely,

Sarah Casad  
842-8120 1130 Emery

---

From: Brent Lamb <lamb\_ks@yahoo.com>  
To: David L. Corliss  
Sent: Sun Aug 24 19:52:01 2008  
Subject: Family Promise

Dear Mr. Corliss,

Please forward this e-mail to the appropriate people:

I have been involved with Homelessness issues in Lawrence, thanks to my daughter who has been throwing birthday parties for the homeless for the last 7 years. In that time, we have seen many sides of the issue. But I have never seen a program that offers the opportunity to really do something about the issue of homeless families that will require so little of the community.

Who would oppose a program that has a 95% success rate? Or oppose a program where the participants are fully screened and do not include people who are currently drinking or on drugs? Who would oppose a program that will actually put people back on the tax roles as opposed to suck money from the tax roles?

I understand the "not in my neighborhood" attitude. But we are not talking about another Open Shelter. We are talking about a fully staffed and supervised center where the members of the family can go to gain access to skills training and services they need to move out of homelessness. They will only be there from 8 to 5. They need a residential setting for the safety of the children. Johnson County will open its second center, soon. If they can do handle two, then surely we can open one.

I urge you to vote to approve the changes necessary for this important program to proceed. Don't let the voice of a vocal minority sway something that many people across the community feel is so important.

Brent Lamb

---

**From:** Jean Khatib [mailto:jeanesk@sunflower.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 25, 2008 7:12 PM  
**To:** David L. Corliss  
**Subject:** family promise

I support the Family Promise Program in Lawrence and support its day center wherever feasible. Thanks for all your good work. Jean Khatib

---

**From:** Sandy Walton [mailto:sandy@firstbaptistlawrence.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 25, 2008 4:06 PM  
**To:** David L. Corliss  
**Subject:** Family Promise

Dear Mr. Corliss,  
My congregation, First Baptist Church, of which I am a part of the pastoral staff, believes strongly that Family Promise is a powerful way to help certain families who have encountered difficult circumstances to gain stability again. As a congregation we have voted and agreed to provide shelter and food for homeless families with children for one week every three months, as a part of our mission and ministry. Because of the stringent screening program that Family Promise provides in selecting homeless families for this program, we feel secure in allowing them to stay in our building overnight and to be served by our members. We believe that locating the day Center in a residential area would be the best location for the children. The safeguards Family Promise provides have proved in other communities around the country to be no threat to, or blight on the neighborhood.

I would urge the city counsel to consider carefully what would be in the best interest of the Family Promise program as they seek to help the homeless, while at the same time protecting the integrity of residential neighborhoods.

Sincerely Yours,

Sandra M. Walton  
Associate Pastor  
First Baptist Church, Lawrence, KS

---

**From:** Jackie Stafford [mailto:jackiestafford@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 25, 2008 8:27 PM

**To:** David L. Corliss  
**Subject:** TA 04-03-08

Dear Mr. Corliss,

I am writing to you to express my serious concerns with the proposed text amendments to TA 04-03-08. I live in the Barker Neighborhood and learned of the proposed changes to city code when Family Promise spoke to the neighborhood about their desire to open a day center for homeless families at 1501 Rhode Island. I am thankful that they presented their plan to us, otherwise many of us would not have known about the possible changes. Although my concerns about a day center being located at 1501 Rhode Island are many, I am even more concerned with the proposed changes to zoning codes.

I strongly urge the planning commission and the city to reconsider the changes in the text. I do not think a day center or homeless shelter should be located in a residential neighborhood -- be it the Barker Neighborhood or any other Lawrence neighborhood. In addition, I do not think these services should be located in close proximity to a school -- elementary, junior high or high school. If Family Promise is granted a special use permit, their day center will be right across the street from Central Junior High. As I researched Family Promise and their work nationally, I have found no rationale from them in favor of placing other Family Promise programs in residential neighborhoods. In fact, most of their programs are in commercial or industrial areas.

This is not an issue of "Not in my backyard." Instead, it is an issue of what is best for our city's neighborhoods. I know our city is faced with a shrinking budget and a growing homeless population. As a teacher and parent, I feel strongly that we need to work together to solve the homeless issue. I don't, however, think these code changes are in the best interest of the community.

I urge the planning commission to reconsider the changes as well as inform the rest of Lawrence of these possible changes. If the proposed language is passed, everybody's "backyard" will be a possible location for a day center or overnight homeless shelter.

Respectfully,

Jackie Stafford  
1640 Massachusetts Street

---

**From:** Kenny Nall [mailto:kufirst01@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 25, 2008 10:17 PM  
**To:** David L. Corliss  
**Subject:**

Hello, my name is Kenny Nall. I am Debbie Nall's son. Please disregard the previous letter that possibly may have been sent to you. My mother has been interested in allowing her house to be used as a homeless shelter (day center). She has regularly attended city planning meetings. She's been an active member of the Lawrence community for years. She's orchestrated local concerts and events for churches and worked for the school district for fifteen or so years.

There has obviously been controversy and concern over the planning of homeless shelters in certain areas of the city, mainly residential zones. The concern is definitely warranted for many reasons. Yet, those concerns are far outweighed by the benefits of this opportunity. I'm sure you've heard both sides of the argument and may have already made up your mind, but I urge you to listen to the advocates of this plan and to my point.

Citizens of a city should be associated with good works in the community and I would be cautious of turning down relevant causes such as this. It's simple, the difference to make a change should be more important than the possible concerns that may arise. Furthermore, Family Promise has certainly taken into account and have created solutions for any situations that may occur. Lawrence should be proud of its residents who are willing to take chances to better their community and the city administration should grasp both sides of the issue and commend those willing citizens for their eagerness. My mother has always been devoted to doing good in the community and she and her late husband thought about and were willing to pursue this chance for progress. I hope you understand their passion and deliberate in favor of theirs and Family Promises case.

---

**From:** Bruce Morgan [mailto:pastor@firstbaptistlawrence.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 25, 2008 4:01 PM  
**To:** David L. Corliss  
**Subject:** Family Promise

Mr. Corliss: I write to you in my role as Interim Pastor of the First Baptist Church of Lawrence, to speak on behalf of Family Promise, and its need for a Day Center to serve as the hub for assisting homeless families who will be housed temporarily in churches throughout our community, until permanent housing is secured. I have served as a volunteer in an identical program in Johnson County, which serves Kansas City area families who are temporarily homeless; and it works effectively there, utilizing the same model of housing the families in churches, and then providing transportation for them to the Day Center, where they receive training in securing employment and assistance in finding permanent housing. We serve only families, mostly mothers and children. Such a center is appropriate for a residential neighborhood, where there would be strict supervision of the program by Family Promise staff. The people we will be serving are good citizens who have encountered financial hardship. I fear that in the current economy, we may be seeing more good citizens forced from their homes, making the Family Promise program all the more crucial for Lawrence. I trust you will convey to the city council our fervent hope that you will approve the zoning necessary to allow our Day Center to open, so that our service to families may begin. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Appreciatively yours,

The Rev. Bruce W. Morgan  
First Baptist Church  
1330 Kasold Dr.  
Lawrence, KS

---

**From:** Debbie Nall  
**To:** David L. Corliss  
**Sent:** Mon Aug 25 06:45:13 2008  
Hello....

I am Debbie Nall and own the home that Family Promise is wanting to use for their day center at 1501 Rhode Island. My husband and I have lived there for over 20 years and in those 20 years we have had over 70 people living with us off and on. (In our 39 years of marriage, we have had over 200 living with us from 1 day to 3 years.) Folks who had no place to go: broken marriages, recovering alcoholics, recovering drug addicts, men who just got out of prison, abused women, homeless families whose kids were at Central (where I worked for 17 years), single, blind mother waiting for her Habitat for Humanity home for her and her three children. All of them recommended by local churches or schools. The home is perfect for such a thing as Family Promise. It is what my husband and I had wanted our home to go for when we knew we were going to be moving due to my husband's illness.. We did not counteroffer on the contracts we had on the house because we were holding off for a large family or something like the FP day center.

Never once did we have a problem with any one we had staying at our house nor did we have any complaints from our neighbors who all knew about the folks we took in. I would say that 90 % of the neighbors now are in favor of FP moving there. It seems that it is only a handful who are upset over the "HOMELESS" living in their backyard. Sad to say, they have not grasped hold of the concept of FP nor do they want to even give FP a chance. 1st off they need to realize they are families without a home. Two: they are NOT living there. They hear the word homeless and panic. They think of transients and the ones holding up their cardboard signs saying "I'm homeless. Need money." You want to roll your window down and say, "Get a job like the rest of us". FP families are not them.

The unique thing about FP is that the folks have to be screened. NO drug, alcohol abuse, sex offenders, no criminal history and a criminal background check is done. There are rules to follow to qualify and if they do not follow the rules, they are out. If I was to rent it or sell it to anyone outside of FP, who does the criminal background check for me? Not I. I would rather have FP be there and know that the ones coming there have been screened. That seems pretty safe to me versus the alternative.

If my house was paid for, I would let FP use it free of charge. That is how much I believe in the idea. How many others out there would do the same with their own personal home where they have raised their family and have lived there for over 20 years? Very few, if any. I 100 % believe in the ministry of this organization. 20+ year track record. Over 130 FP's around the nation. Run by 99 % volunteers and no government handouts. That is a win-win situation. Do you realize that Joe Reitz who is steering heading this, I believe is a volunteer? And he has raised the funds, and has gathered over 500 volunteers since he began promoting FP?. Plus he has the churches lined up waiting for this to happen. Why? Because he believes in FP and so do the volunteers. Why else would he tackle such an overwhelming task if he did not believe in the project?. Look what he did to help the LEO Center and Heartland Medical Services. That has been a BIG Huge success in Lawrence. When he heard and realized how many displaced families were living in Lawrence and heard about FP, he began pursuing it with all his heart. Lawrence needs more Joe Reitz's. Lawrence needs Family Promise. Family Promise is NEEDED in Lawrence. Desperately needed. Especially now with cold weather around the corner.

Another perfect reason for 1501 is that it is so close to a grocery store, downtown, schools, KU, SRS, local bus system, parks. It's ideal !

I love the ideal that they have to save 80% of their income for those who have jobs so they will have money ready when a place opens up for them. How awesome is that?

There is so many great things about Family Promise that I could go on and on but I won't. I just wanted to email you to tell you that I think 1501 Rhode Island is a perfect location and I know that many of the neighbors surrounding the house are in favor of it. Neighbors such as the Maynard-Moody's, Theil's, R. Smith, A. Burdett, R. Minder (school board member), Falkenstein, Birchfield, Lechtenberg, Cromwell's, and Claytons. These are neighbors who live next door, across the street, up the block. Sally Howard who is the lead counselor for Kathleen Seibelus who owns the house next door is in total favor of FP.

Please don't let a few neighbors with the loudest voices spoil it for the families who are without a home. Especially with winter fast approaching. Even if the house wasn't mine, I would be 100 % in favor of FP being at 1501 Rhode Island because of all the reasons I stated above plus some.

Thank You for your time and consideration regarding Family Promise.

Debbie Nall

---

**From:** OzTalent@aol.com [mailto:OzTalent@aol.com]

**Sent:** Monday, August 25, 2008 1:05 PM

**To:** David L. Corliss

**Subject:** Family Promise needs our support

Hello Dave,

It is unfortunate that misinformation is guiding the neighbors of the proposed location for the Family Promise program.

This is a small, select group of families with children who are taking the herculian effort to do what it takes to be self-sufficient. It is important that the neighbors and all involved understand the hard work these families are undertaking to become self-sufficient. They are certain to be good neighbors and to be of no trouble to the neighborhood. This is a highly structured and demanding program. It is much different than open population program where accountability is difficult. Also, these families will be leaving this property in the early evening to stay at churches, so the day center will only be used in the day.

I know many people that wish they had neighbors that had the kind of accountability that these families will have. Plus they will have the Family Promise director and the churches involved for accountability.

I would welcome the opportunity to speak with the neighbors or city officials to help insure zoning is given to this important program in our community.

Sincerely,

Steve Ozark

InterFaith Intiative

Volunteer Coordinator

[oztalent@aol.com](mailto:oztalent@aol.com)

785.760.3143

---

**From:** clim@midweststudentministries.com  
**Sent:** Monday, August 25, 2008 1:28 PM  
**To:** David L. Corliss  
**Subject:** Family Promise Program

Dear Dave Corliss,

My congregation strongly supports Family Promise of Lawrence and has agreed, as part of our mission, to provide shelter and food for homeless families with children for one week every three months. Because of the stringent screening program that Family Promise provides in selecting homeless families for its program, we feel secure in allowing them to stay in our building overnight and to be served by our members. We believe our right to carry out this ministry is protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Further, we believe that Family Promise should be permitted to locate its DayCenter in a residential area. Such a location is best for the children's safety. The safeguards Family Promise provides have proved in other communities around the country that it is no threat or blight on the neighborhood. The fears that others have voiced are unfounded.

Please do not delay us any longer in carrying out this important ministry.

Yours sincerely,

Cheh Lim

Midwest Student Ministries

---

**From:** Derk & Dana Landes [mailto:ddlandes@sunflower.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 26, 2008 2:53 PM  
**To:** David L. Corliss  
**Subject:** Family Promise

My congregation strongly supports Family Promise of Lawrence and has agreed, as part of our mission, to provide shelter and food for homeless families with children for one week every three months. Because of the stringent screening program that Family Promise provides in selecting homeless families for its program, we feel secure in allowing them to stay in our building overnight and to be served by our members. We believe our right to carry out this ministry is protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Further, we believe that Family Promise should be permitted to locate its Day Center in a residential area. Such a location is best for the children's safety. The safeguards Family Promise provides have proved in other communities around the country that it is no threat or blight on the neighborhood. The fears that others have voiced are unfounded.

Please do not delay us any longer in carrying out this important ministry.

Thank you,

Dana Landes

E-mail message checked by Spyware Doctor (5.5.1.322)  
Database version: 5.10560e  
<http://www.pctools.com/spyware-doctor/>

---

**From:** Robin Bedenbaugh [mailto:rbedenbaugh@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 26, 2008 7:26 PM  
**To:** David L. Corliss  
**Cc:** holly.mercer@alumni.ku.edu  
**Subject:** Text Amendment TA 04-03-08 - Expressing our opposition

Mr. Corliss,

We are writing to express our opposition to Text Amendment TA 04-03-08, related to homeless facilities. While we support efforts to help the homeless, we feel that allowing programs in residential neighborhoods will not be beneficial to neighborhoods and ultimately, do not go far enough to provide real support to the homeless in Lawrence. Specifically, we are concerned that this particular amendment has been attached to other amendments affecting the homeless due to the machinations of Family Promise.

We live in Barker Neighborhood, where Family Promise of Lawrence intends to open a day shelter for the homeless. Their communications with residents of Barker Neighborhood have been disingenuous at best. The opposition has been described in an editorial to the Lawrence Journal World as a "vocal minority." We hope to add our voices to the chorus to ensure you that opposition is more widespread in our neighborhood than you may have been led to believe by the members of Family Promise and those who support this amendment.

Allow us to illustrate the story from our perspective.

Sometime in July 2008, we were approached by Pat Lechtenberg. She stated that the owner of the house at 1501 Rhode Island was planning to turn the house into a "welcome center" for homeless families. Note the terminology used was a "welcome center" for homeless families; the term shelter was never used by her. Mrs. Lechtenberg asked if we were opposed to having such a center in the neighborhood. We stated that in theory, we did not oppose such a facility, but would need more information before we could offer any support. She pressed us to sign a statement in support of the center; we declined, and she asked if she could use at least use our names. At this point we became concerned, because she a little too anxious to get us to say "yes" to something

that had been introduced in a matter of seconds, with no real explanation as to what we might be supporting.

We heard nothing more until we were made aware that there was a neighborhood meeting on August 7 at the home of Pat and Mike Lechtenberg. The purpose of the meeting was to introduce Family Promise, and the organization's planned use of 1501 Rhode Island as a homeless day center. At this meeting, Barker neighborhood residents were shown a video produced by Family Promise. We agree that Family Promise is doing good work to assist homeless families. While representatives of the Lawrence Family Promise organization were long on messages designed to tug at our heartstrings, they were short on facts. In particular, Joe Reitz was less than forthcoming that he, on behalf of Family Promise, had instigated a change to the City of Lawrence Code that would affect not only Barker Neighborhood, but also many other neighborhoods and homeowners throughout the city. He also failed to mention that he had already sent a letter to the Planning Commission on July 18th, stating that there had already been discussions with the neighborhood, and that they had encountered no opposition. While they may not have encountered outright "no" answers, they most certainly did not gain our approval.

During the August 7 meeting, both Mr. Reitz and the owner of 1501 Rhode Island noted that they would not proceed with this plan for the house if the neighborhood did not approve. Only one person mentioned immediate approval of this shelter, while the rest of us suggested we needed more information before we could even consider it. The next day, Price Banks sent a letter to the Planning Commission suggesting that the neighborhood had now been consulted and that it was okay to move forward.

Most Family Promise day centers are located in industrial, commercial, and mixed-use zones. Our understanding is that Family Promise needed the proposed zoning change to allow not only the day center, but also the shelters in its partner churches. City employees then extended the proposal to its current state. We are writing not only to express our concerns about the proposed Type A day shelter at 1501 Barker, but to the Text Amendment TA 04-03-08 in general.

We support Lawrence's programs for its homeless residents, but feel these facilities should not be located in single family neighborhoods. They are better suited for commercial and industrial zoning. As the existing proposal is worded, there are not enough checks in place to assure homeowners-and homeless citizens who would potentially make use of the Type A facilities-of a safe, well-maintained, and regulated environment. Moreover, we are very concerned about the effect on property values in affected neighborhoods. While Family Promise may well be a good, well-managed organization, despite the duplicitous nature of the communication of the local representatives, we cannot count on other organizations or individuals being this organized, and the zoning changes do not currently take these or other potential issues into account.

We urge you to reconsider the scope of the proposed zoning changes, and reject the proposal.

Signed,

Holly Mercer and Robin A. Bedenbaugh  
1600 Rhode Island St.

---

From: mistermitten@sunflower.com <mistermitten@sunflower.com>  
To: David L. Corliss  
Sent: Tue Aug 26 23:44:48 2008  
Subject: Comment to Text Amendment TA04-03-08

Dear Mr. Corliss,

I would like to express my concerns regarding the proposed text ammendment changes regarding Type A zoning. These changed would have a significant impact on the Single Family Neighborhoods throughout all of Lawrence. The information contained within the document is quite extensive and most citizens would not have a thorough understanding of the language involved.

I am asking that the proposed changes for Type A zoning be removed from the original request for Shelters to be allowed in Industrial zoning areas.

Once the entire city has been informed of the propsed changes and has the opportunity to research and understand the implications to all of Lawrence, the committee could then solicit feedback from the community.

Several neighborhood associations have compiled issues and concerns related to having Homeless Shelters located within established Single Family neighborhoods. Some neighbors in our area have submitted detailed comments to LAN as well as the Mayor and City Commissioners.

Thank you for your attention to this issue that has a high potential for financial impact to many homeowners in the community.

Sincerely,

Scott and Jana Montgomery  
1500 New Hampshire  
Lawrence, KS 66044

---

**From:** Amy Fore [mailto:amyl.fore@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 26, 2008 1:02 PM  
**To:** David L. Corliss  
**Subject:** Concerned Barker neighborhood resident

Lawrence City Commission,

My name is Amy Fore. I live two doors away from Family Promise s proposed homeless daycenter site. I am a single mother and am opposed to this project on many levels.

I understand the hardships that go with single parenting from the loss of spousal support to becoming the sole wage earner who gets diagnosed with a chronic disease which inevitably caused the loss of a job. I simply could not work, and lucky enough we were taken into a residence that had the stability that my children and I needed.

Now that those serious health issues have (hopefully) passed we have been climbing out of that situation, but it has left my family feeling vulnerable. We moved into this neighborhood for the

fact that it is a good, safe neighborhood. Most of the residents on this end of the block are single women and a lot of us have children. We have created a safe secure block by getting to know each other and checking up on each other on a regular basis. We help each other when needed.

Family Promise's proposed project of rotating and shuffling 14-15 strangers in our tight knit community would effectively dismantle that sense of security that we have purposefully created there. It does not seem that this project would create the stability needed for children in desperate situations. From this personal stand point alone, I oppose the changing of any text in the code for the creation and maintenance of homeless night shelters and daycenters.

On to a more practical and public level, the logistics of this proposed center do not seem to have been thought out. Before the ONE meeting that Family Promise had with the residents of the Barker neighborhood, they had not thought of nighttime security, parking, a fence for children to play in the yard instead of the street, or the fact that there is only one bathroom for 14-15 people to share within an hour time before work and/or school.

This proposed site is across the street from Central Junior High. When parents pick up their children or on the days when there are football games or any other activities, there is no parking on the street. The community theater is right there, and when a show is being put on, again there is no parking. Family Promise had not thought about the traffic. 15<sup>th</sup> Street is a busy street with people driving down it quickly even when there are no activities.

I am concerned with many other aspects to. Who will watch the small children who are not of school age? Will it be a licensed person? Will it be brought to fire code? Will there be a streetlight at the end of the block for nighttime? There are many more questions that have not been answered adequately enough to impel me to embrace this concept.

I feel that a face and a voice from someone who will directly be affected by this proposed shelter needs to be heard. I also think you need to be made aware of the type of neighborhood that this is. We are tight knit because we understand that a community who knows and cares about each other makes for a safe and secure place to raise children. Please reconsider changing text on the homeless shelter codes and the proposed shelter for the site of 1501 Rhode Island St.. Thank you.

Respectfully,

Amy Fore

---

**From:** Mary Cornwell

**To:** David L. Corliss

**Sent:** Wed Aug 27 07:16:59 2008

**Subject:** message from Charles and Mary Cornwell

We want to let you know that we support the Family Promise and its mission to provide shelter and food for homeless families with children . Because of the stringent screening program that Family Promise provides in selecting homeless families, Family Promise should be permitted to locate its Day Center in a residential area. We live in the neighborhood that is being considered.

Further, we believe that such a location is best for the childrens safety. The safeguards Family Promise provides have proved in other communities around the country that it is no threat or blight on the neighborhood. The fears that others have voiced are unfounded.

---

From: Ann Huppert <achuppert@gmail.com>  
To: David L. Corliss  
Sent: Wed Aug 27 11:40:00 2008  
Subject: Re: TA 04-03-08

David Corliss, City Manager  
dcorliss@ci.lawrence.ks.us

Dear Mr. Corliss,

I am writing as a homeowner in the Barker Neighborhood. I have come late to the discussions regarding the proposed amendments to the development code and the specific proposal by Family Promise, having been unaware of meetings held in the neighborhood earlier this month. At this point, however, I am particularly concerned with the tone of conversations within the neighborhood, in opinion pieces in the Journal World (both print and online), and with what has come to seem an inadequate amount of public information regarding what represents – for better or worse – a significant proposed change in the city zoning.

While I would say that much of what I am hearing from some members of the neighborhood sounds to varying degrees alarmist and reactionary, I would equally argue that this is based on inadequate information from the city commission and planning department, which has allowed what might be misinformation to circulate. I am not opposed in principle to the type of center that is under discussion. But in order to promote long standing acceptance, it is essential that the approval process be as careful, complete, and transparent as possible so as to have long-term sustainable support from the community. The fact that neighbors feel as though Family Promise has acted duplicitously and that the City Commission is moving both too quickly and towards forcing something upon neighborhoods, all suggest that a better process is needed.

It is in the best interest of the city, of the individual organizations that cater to the homeless population, and of the homeless members of our community that new facilities be embraced and not rejected by the neighborhoods. The diatribes and misinformation I

have encountered to date show that we are nowhere near that at this point.

Sincerely,

Ann Huppert  
1622 New Hampshire St.  
achuppert@gmail.com

---

**From:** Erin Kennedy  
**To:** David L. Corliss  
**Sent:** Wed Aug 27 15:51:11 2008  
**Subject:** Homeless Daycenter  
Mr. Corliss,

I am a resident living at 1630 Barker Avenue with my husband and two small children. It is my understanding that today is the last day to submit a letter to express my concerns about the proposed homeless day center at 15<sup>th</sup> and Rhode Island. I oppose the day center and the related zoning proposal.

My husband is gone one week a month with his job (at the very minimum). That leaves me at home with my two small children by myself. Barker Avenue is an extremely busy street. Currently, I hear people walking down the street late into the evening every night. I cannot support a facility that would increase foot traffic in our neighborhood. I understand that there will be screening as a part of the operation of the day center. However, I think it will be impossible to deter people from walking through the area to find out what the center is all about. In addition, the bus goes down Barker all day long. In fact, people often perch on the steps in front of my home waiting for the bus.

To be honest with you, we could easily flee to the suburbs to avoid any of these issues, but I love this area and I am committed to this neighborhood. I don't think it is an issue of compassion, but whether or not this residential neighborhood is an appropriate location for a homeless day center. Mr. Corliss, I'm sure that you would agree that a proposed homeless day center would be inappropriate on Carmel Drive or Turnberry Drive. Similarly, I am confident that the City will recognize that the day center would be equally inappropriate at 15<sup>th</sup> and Rhode Island.

Thank you for your consideration.

Erin Kennedy

---

From: David L. Corliss  
Sent: Wednesday, August 27, 2008 5:02 PM  
To: Scott McCullough  
Subject: FW: comment on TA 04-03-8

-----Original Message-----  
From: Mary Wharff [mailto:mgwharff@sunflower.com]

Sent: Wednesday, August 27, 2008 4:37 PM  
To: David L. Corliss  
Subject: comment on TA 04-03-8

Hello Mr. Corliss, planning committee members, and city commissioners, Today in the newspaper, the Family Promise organizer mentioned the Las Vegas chapter of Family Promise. After a bit of research, this is the whole story. For 10 years, the chapter used a home in a high-density residential area without ever obtaining proper zoning. A change in laws required all non-profits to get a business license, and as a result, the issue came to the fore. They had to apply for a zoning variance, but neighbors objected, citing too many social services already in their area. The variance was denied. My guess is that the neighbors actually were not happy with Family Promise, otherwise why would they have objected? They'd had 10 years to sell neighbors on the mission, to build a good relationship with their community.

At that point, the city began to help them look for another site, and one was located DOWNTOWN, where proper zoning is not an issue. Everyone in Las Vegas appears to agree that this solution is the best for all concerned.

Please consider this story as you mull the zoning issues before you -- which are being pushed forward by Family Promise. Lawrence's in-town neighborhoods are amazing. Las Vegas would kill for such neighborhoods to be within four blocks of their downtown. Are Lawrence's in-town family-oriented neighborhoods worth protecting? That's the question before you.

Below is the newspaper article with the information I've stated above. The article is dated 4.17.08.

Thank you,  
Mary Wharff  
1535 Rhode Island

Stephens Media Group <<http://www.reviewjournal.com>>

<javascript:void(printArticle());>

Powered by

<javascript:  
window.open('http://www.clickability.com/382.html',", 'toolbar=no,  
width=475, height=600, resizable=1, scrollbars=0'); void("");>

Click Here to Print <javascript:void(printArticle());>

SAVE THIS

<javascript:void(open('http://stephensmedia.savethis.clickability.com/st/saveThis?partnerID=68031&urlID=30388764&origin=11', 'click', 'height=450,width=510,title=no,location=no,scrollbars=yes,menubars=no,toolbars=no,resizable=yes'));>

| EMAIL THIS

<javascript:void(open('http://stephensmedia.emailthis.clickability.com/et/emailThis?clickMap=createPT&partnerID=68031&urlID=30388764', 'click', 'height=450,width=510,title=no,location=no,scrollbars=yes,menubars=no,toolbars=no,resizable=yes'));>

| Close <javascript:self.close();>

## **Family Promise is homeless no more**

Nonprofit agency moves into new facility

By BEVERLY BRYAN  
VIEW STAFF WRITER

After a period of uncertainty, nonprofit homeless services agency Family Promise is on its feet in a home of its own.

The agency had operated out of a single family home in the high-density residentially zoned area in West Las Vegas for 10 years, unaware that they were improperly zoned.

Last year they found out that, to receive funding, they would need to get a business license under a new law requiring licenses even for nonprofits. This is when the second revelation about their zoning came. The only way the agency could avoid moving was to apply for a zone variance, or special exemption from the zoning. When they appealed to Las Vegas City Hall on May 17 of last year, some Ward 5 residents protested, saying they didn't want anymore social services in their neighborhood. The zone variance was denied and as Family Promise executive director Terry Lindemann said, "We basically became a homeless homeless shelter."

But Las Vegas Mayor Oscar Goodman vowed to personally find a new location for Family Promise within the six months before their land entitlement expired at the rent they were paying at the time (\$1 a year to another nonprofit). This turned out to be no empty promise.

"The mayor really stepped up to the plate. He worked with all departments in City Hall," Lindemann said.

This was especially necessary because finding the right space for Family Promise could have taken some time. Family Promise wanted a single-family house for their day site, where families come for counseling and referrals to other social services. They also can do laundry, shower and store their belongings at the site.

"Our program always wants to be in a home because that's the model we represent," Lindemann said. The idea is a that returning a family to a home-like place is a big part of the program's success in helping families become, and stay, stable.

Lindemann finds it makes case management easier because the children are happier in a home and so the parents are more comfortable and open to being helped as well.

The day site is not a shelter. Families in the program actually sleep at a faith house, a church, mosque or synagogue volunteering their space where families are provided with three meals a day.

Family Promise works with religious groups regardless of denomination.

Lindemann describes the faith house's role as being that of "a compassionate bed-and-breakfast." The experience is far less traumatic, especially for a child, than the typical stay at a homeless shelter. She believes this is a big part of preparing a family to return to normalcy. Every effort is made to avoid labelling a family as homeless.

"We don't refer to the homeless families that walk through our doors as homeless, we refer to them as guests," Lindemann said.

The agency's methods have proven to be effective. Family Promise averages an 80 percent success rate.

Another aspect of the program Lindemann believes is successful is the way the program stays in touch with families that have graduated. They offer a music and arts class for the kids and further life skills classes for their parents. They are planning to begin a mentoring program soon where volunteers will act as life coaches to help families stay stable after leaving Family Promise.

Finding a new home for Family Promise presented a challenge because, Lindemann said, there are no residential neighborhoods willing to accept a social service agency.

Enter Stephen Harsin, director of neighborhood services, who was working at the time on the remodeling of the Downtown Senior Services Center at 320 S. 9th St. The center occupies what was once a Baptist church, and the senior food co-op, Jude 22, was being moved from the detached parsonage into the main building. The old parsonage was to be demolished to make room for parking when Harsin suggested the space as a possible fit for Family Promise to Las Vegas City Councilman Lawrence Weekly's office and the office of the mayor.

Everyone concerned quickly agreed it was a perfect fit. It had the proper zoning and, best of all, it was a single-family home. Since the city owns the land they are able to lease it to Family Promise at \$1 a year for the next five years.

The city was able to help Family Promise get \$150,000 in federal funds to bring the kitchen and bathrooms into compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, put in wood floors, and paint and refurbish the office spaces. Along with funds received from private donors, the agency was able to prepare the house within two months, much to the satisfaction of both the city and Family Promise.

"Instead of just giving them the keys, like, 'here, you can use it.' We were able to bring it up to their needs," Harsin said.

The new space even has a little more square footage. Lindemann calls it beautiful.

A ribbon cutting and house blessing was held on March 29. Bruce Ewing, a Family Promise volunteer and member of the cast of Phantom-The Las Vegas Spectacular, performed and leaders from churches around the valley came out to bless various rooms in the house.

According to Harsin, the city welcomes Family Promise to stay as long as the location continues to meet their needs. Lindemann said, for now, they're happy right where they are.

Find this article at:

<http://www.viewnews.com/2007/VIEW-Apr-17-Tue-2007/East/13692371.html>

Click Here to Print <javascript:void(printArticle());>

SAVE THIS

<javascript:void(open('http://stephensmedia.savethis.clickability.com/st/saveThis?partnerID=68031&urlID=30388764&origin=11','click','height=450,width=510,title=no,location=no,scrollbars=yes,menubars=no,toolbars=no,resizable=yes'));>

| EMAIL THIS

<javascript:void(open('http://stephensmedia.emailthis.clickability.com/et/emailThis?clickMap=createPT&partnerID=68031&urlID=30388764','click','height=450,width=510,title=no,location=no,scrollbars=yes,menubars=no,toolbars=no,resizable=yes'));>

| Close <javascript:self.close();>

Check the box to include the list of links referenced in the article.

---

**From:** Brendan M. Lynch

**To:** David L. Corliss

**Sent:** Wed Aug 27 08:39:27 2008

**Subject:** Public comment about rezoning to accommodate homeless shelters

Mr. Corliss:

I write to express my strong opposition to proposed changes in the city code that would encourage shelters for the homeless to open in residential neighborhoods throughout East Lawrence.

As a parent, I am troubled that the city would subject residential communities full of kids to an onslaught of transients, many of whom are shown by statistics to have lives marked by addiction, abuse and mental illness. People move into residential neighborhoods in a city like Lawrence to raise their children in peace and safety, not to inject them into a misguided social engineering experiment that puts families at risk and communities on edge.

Also, the fact that "planned" – and usually wealthier – neighborhoods are *exempt* from the city's shelter scheme is a truly despicable bit of pandering to the privileged and to developers. **This is a**

**tacit admission by city planners that these shelters are in no way beneficial for neighborhoods, or else these “planned” communities would have been included in the shelter scheme.**

Moreover, the result of excluding “planned” neighborhoods is that the shelters likely will mass in East Lawrence, a part of the city already woefully neglected by our municipal authorities — just look at our roads. It is no accident that Family Promise has targeted the Barker area, and not Alvamar Heights.

If these shelters are not disruptive and potentially damaging to communities, then every neighborhood and development in Lawrence would have been included in this plan, including those of the politically connected and well-to-do.

I sympathize with people experiencing homelessness in these hard times, and have great admiration for those who want to help others. Unfortunately, our federal and state governments – and for that matter, our local government – don’t do enough to alleviate homelessness. So I encourage and support measures that would facilitate the growth of facilities for the homeless.

But shelters belong in areas zoned for commercial and industrial purposes.

My reasoning is simple: Residential neighborhoods are for residents, not transients who are clients of nonprofit businesses. Would you also allow businesses in residential areas? What about hotels? For these shelter groups are businesses and hotels of a sort, are they not?

The proposition made by your planning staff, encouraged by the Family Promise group and boosted by Mayor Dever, is already causing great consternation and distrust in the Barker neighborhood where the first “day shelter” is being contemplated. But the zoning changes are hardly known in Lawrence at large — there has been minimal press coverage. Once an understanding of the city code overhaul becomes widely understood, I believe the outcry will become politically uncomfortable for city officials who would disregard the welfare of the city’s parents, homeowners and residents.

Thus, I ask you, your planning staff and the city commission to reconsider. Please facilitate homeless people and those who would help the needy among us. This is morally and ethically an excellent impulse. But please do not disrupt vital communities in Lawrence by injecting homeless populations into residential neighborhoods full of kids. Look instead to areas already zoned for business and industrial use.

Sincerely,

Brendan Lynch  
1617 R.I.

---

-----Original Message-----

From: Deborah McMullen [mailto:deborahmcmullen@sunflower.com]

Sent: Thu 8/28/2008 6:38 PM

To: Deborah McMullen; David L. Corliss

Cc: Michelle Leininger; Scott McCullough; Sheila Stogsdill

Subject: apologizes

To Whom It Concerns:

Lawrence is a fabulous place to call home! People are giving and accepting here in Lawrence. The diversity of the city is one of it's attractions. With diversity also comes politics and zoning and difficult discussions and decisions. With that in mind and heart I would ask that you vote no on the change in zoning in TA 04-03-08 as attached.

I have mixed emotions of course as the issue includes homelessness but the zoning seems too broad and confusing with far too many people using the typical single family home. When I look at any changes to residential zoning a red flag goes up. I think we need to keep the residential areas consistent. If this were a store, gas station or restaurant I would not see them as a good fit into existing residential either. Please consider the changes attached as enhancing the proposed zoning change to TA-04-03-08 as attached in Dear Neighbor. The day shelter is a good idea and there is a great need in Lawrence. We do not say it is not. However it is not going to just fit anywhere. If you look at the family promise web site you will see that 99% of their facilities are not located in residential areas. An apartment building or converted multi family 4 plex would seem more appropriately zoned and offer the amount of usable space and facilities a day shelter will require. For one example; the zoning calls for a minimum of 2 baths and with 15 people using them to bath it is just not realistic. We really need to preserve the residential zoning so that there is consistency in all Lawrence neighborhoods.

Our neighborhood has a home at the corner of 15th and Rhode Island that seems to be the catalyst for this change. In this particular case the home is just too small for up to 17 people, regardless of use. It is just south of the junior high and very close to it's neighbors. The corner is already too dense and over burdened with traffic. 2 Attendants and 15 people or up to 4 families is just too much in the average residential neighborhood in Lawrence regardless of where or who will be using it. Our neighborhood feels strained with this issue and the appearance of it being about the shelter itself but our concern is with use in general and shoehorning too many people into one home. Also we are concerned with the potential for the use to change and be increased, and the erosion of the residential code protection. Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter. It is most appreciated.

Deborah McMullen  
1608 Rhode Island St.  
Lawrence Kansas 66044

---

**From:** Larry Powers  
**To:** David L. Corliss  
**Sent:** Thu Aug 28 06:23:10 2008  
**Subject:** Family Promise Day Center  
Dave Corliss, City Manager  
City Hall  
6 East 6th Street  
Lawrence, KS 66044

Greetings Mr. Corliss:

In the August 27<sup>th</sup> edition of the Lawrence Journal World, on the front page, an article stated that 20% of Lawrence residents live below the poverty level. The Director of East Central Kansas Economic Corp, Jeannette Collier, stated, "Six new homeless families showed up in my office Monday."

With the state of our economy, I feel this is something that will continue to be an issue for the City of Lawrence, as it is for many cities across our nation. Family Promise is an organization

which tries to alleviate at least some of this burden by providing temporary housing while families with children ‘get back on their feet.’

Family Promise has been helping homeless families for over twenty years in over 140 communities, since its inception in New York. As the Director of Family Promise in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania states on her website, “While not a religious organization, we get the majority of our volunteers from faith-based organizations because they have a strong desire to help and a built-in volunteer base.” – [www.ihncares.org](http://www.ihncares.org)

The Family Promise website, [www.familypromise.org](http://www.familypromise.org), states, “Our mission is to help low-income families nationwide achieve lasting independence and to redress the underlying causes of poverty and homelessness.”

“Family Promise was founded on the belief that Americans are compassionate people who want to make a difference. Our promise has been to link those in need with those who want to help. Twenty years and 120,000 volunteers later, our pledge is ever broader and deeper.”

Once established in Lawrence, Kansas, Family Promise will provide training to all volunteers and training is mandatory before anyone is allowed to participate as a volunteer. Clients for the program are screened before they are accepted and no one with a history of violence or who is currently addicted to drugs is allowed into the program. The organization desires to help only those who want the opportunity to improve their lot in life. The organization only accepts families with children.

In order to be effective in Lawrence, we need an adequate place to set up a ‘day center.’ The clients will use the day center as a source of contact during day hours and will reside in church buildings during the evening and night hours.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter, that together we make work toward the goal of meeting the needs of homeless families with children in Lawrence, Kansas.

Respectfully,

Larry Powers  
2921 Iris Court  
Lawrence, Kansas  
[kansaspoet@sbcglobal.net](mailto:kansaspoet@sbcglobal.net)

---

**From:** Lisa Harris [[lharris@ku.edu](mailto:lharris@ku.edu)]  
**Sent:** Monday, September 01, 2008 11:03 PM  
**To:** Joseph Rexwinkle; David L. Corliss  
**Subject:** Suggestions for changes in TA-04-03-08 on homeless facilities  
Hi Joe (and Dave),

Joe, thanks very much for the extra time to send in my suggestions for changes to TA-

04-03-08. You asked for suggestions for specific changes to the amendment, so I tried to be as specific as possible.

The changes I am suggesting are intended to clear up some confusion in reading and understanding the code and also to create a way to accommodate smaller family-oriented homeless facilities in Lawrence without placing them in single-family neighborhoods (This is still my preference at the moment.) Some of the suggestions are very minor, some not so much. Here goes:

**Change the “homeless shelter” term (Type A or B) to “overnight homeless center.”**

[This would clear up confusion about the difference between a day center and a shelter in our code. Some folks think a shelter is a 24 hour facility, based on their knowledge of shelters elsewhere.]

**In the table in Article 4, change the wording slightly to emphasize “Use-specific standards.”**

Add a hyphen to say “Use-Specific Standard” in the right column (small point, I know) and change key to say “\*Use-Specific Standard Applies” Some people trying to read the code are getting confused here, and this might help.

**Change the definition of families to “Families [as defined in Section 20-1701 (1) and (2).”**

[This would make it clear that the development code’s definition #(3) of “family” – three unrelated people – would not apply in this case; in other words, you could not have 4 such families in a Type A facility, making 12 unrelated people.] As it is written now, the amendment seems to conflict with itself.

Or better yet, family might be better defined here as one or two parents and their children under 19 yrs of age related by blood or adoption. Something like that. ??

**Add more specific language about what management plans need to contain.**

Include specific areas that should be addressed under rules of conduct, like substance abuse, loitering outside boundaries of facility, physical or verbal abuse, etc. You might look at Family Promise’s rules of conduct for some guidance. I have not seen them, but FP states they are effective.

Add requirements for formal screening of guests for substance abuse, history of violence, pedophile, etc., for Type A facilities.

Require trained staff be present at all times at all homeless facilities.

**Remove consideration of Type A homeless shelters in any residential zoning category that does not already allow 4 families in the same building (and preferably limit to commercial and industrial zoning, and RSO).**

**Add language that serves to limit the number of homeless or social service facilities that can be located in a given geographic area.**

Joe, your PPT mentions that some cities do this, but I have not researched this in order to suggest specific language.

**Add special use permit and management plan requirement to Type A overnight centers (shelters) and other homeless facilities.**

The idea being that any home or business near a potential site for a homeless facility should be provided the opportunity to ask questions and provide comments before the decision to locate the facility has been made...

**Change “operated and staffed by a public, nonprofit, charitable or religious institution” to “operated and staffed by a religious institution.”**

I think this is the intent, isn't it? Having the other types of institutions listed might bring opportunities we are not as comfortable with.

**Add requirement for an annual report for Type A day and overnight centers, with a copy sent to city staff and the relevant neighborhood representative.**

This would help the city keep on top of any problems with homeless centers and give the city the information needed for addressing them. It would also put the city in a proactive position rather than relying on citizen complaints. The report could include compliance with management plan, # and character of any police calls or citizen complaints, how they were addressed, staffing challenges, etc.

**Increase overnight square footage per person from 35 to 50.**

Cleveland, OH is considering 50 as a reasonable number. 35 does seem very low.

**Add language that homeless facilities shall not have direct access to abutting and/or adjoining properties.**

Phoenix, AZ does this. I suppose the intent of this could be handled under rules of conduct if the management plan required it.

**Add language that open areas surrounding homeless facilities shall be screened from view from abutting and/or adjoining properties by hedges, trees, other landscaping, or fencing.**

Phoenix, AZ does this.

**Add a requirement that a Type A overnight center (shelter) shall not operate more than 4 weeks per year.**

This would put a reasonable limit on the accessory use. I'm not sure if four weeks is the right amount; it is based on the Family Promise model; I'm not sure what else to recommend.

Finally, I have a request for the staff report to the planning commission to include more detail about cities that allow homeless facilities in single-family residential neighborhoods. I'd like to know what cities those are (especially any that are

comparable in size to Lawrence), and some information about the single-family neighborhoods in which they have been placed (lower-income, middle-income, whether blighted, etc).

Thanks so much for your consideration of these suggestions. I appreciate your hard work on this text amendment, and the extra time the city is taking to consider further changes based on public input.

If you have any questions about my suggestions, please feel free to call me at 864-2590 (days).

Lisa

---

**From:** CL Suenram [cynarch@sunflower.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 04, 2008 5:26 PM  
**To:** David L. Corliss  
**Cc:** Joseph Rexwinkle; Scott McCullough; CL Suenram  
**Subject:** public comment

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Red  
Mr. Corliss,

August 25, 2008, we sent an email letter to the City Commissioners and the City/County Planning Commissioners regarding homeless centers/shelters being allowed in residential neighborhoods. Our letter does not appear in the General Public Comments that are posted on-line for the Planning Commission Homeless Text Amendment. We wonder why.

Below is our letter:

The records of 1200-1202 New York Street of July 2005 thru September 2007 don't really speak for themselves as you didn't live there regarding why a homeless shelter should not be allowed in a residential area. Granted, it (1200-02 NY) was never named a homeless shelter but that's what it became with "support" of the Community Open Shelter in it's placement of homeless tenants.

Property values became impaired. Criminal elements abounded. "Friends" of the homeless whose home this is/was, come from in town and from out of state. One wonders, "who lives there?" The landlord himself could not even answer that question for us. The infrastructure of sewer and trash and police force become strained. People congregate.

The quasi-homeless shelter was forced upon us in this part of the East Lawrence Neighborhood - "can't pick your neighbors". It is not fun. With the demolition of the what was the codes-violations-crack-house of 1200-1202 NY, the neighborhood is healing.

With regards--  
Arch Naramore  
Cindy Suenram  
1204 New York  
Lawrence 66044  
842-4912

-----Original Message-----

From: Lorenz, Sue

Sent: Tue 8/26/2008 5:02 PM

To: 'dcorliss@ci.lawrence.ks.us'

Subject: Comment to Text Amendment TA04-03-08

Dear Mr. Corliss,

We are writing in strong support of the issues raised by Concerned Citizens of the Barker Neighborhood regarding the proposed establishment of a homeless day center at 1501 Rhode Island Street by the organization "Family Promise." Various churches seem to have arrived at a well-worked out agreement with Family Promise to provide overnight housing for homeless families; however, residents of our neighborhood were not included in discussions and were taken by surprise (alerted by an article in the Journal World) at the proposal to establish the day shelter in our neighborhood.

The response of Family Promise supporters, all of whom are no doubt well-intentioned, is to dismiss neighborhood concerns with pleas to "open your hearts" and by referring to "dissenters" who don't really have the support of the "quiet ones" who allegedly approve the proposal. The organization claims never to have had any problems with a neighborhood facility, though it's not clear how many they've established. We don't know of any organization, even the best-run, which can honestly claim never to have had any problem with implementation or follow-through on a project.

Most residents of the Barker Neighborhood recognize that homeless families need assistance with job training, life skills, etc. And many Barker-area residents are active participants in community programs to help those in need. But the proposal to house up to three unrelated families, with 14 occupants, and no one in the house at night seems ill-conceived. How would temporary day residents develop a connection to the neighborhood? And without a connection or ownership, why care what happens to the area? And an empty house at night is an invitation to crime.

We respectfully ask that the Commission consider seriously the comments of the Concerned Citizens of the Barker Neighborhood. We ask that the requirement for Special Use permits for such facilities be maintained, and that regulations for the health and safety of homeless clients and other neighbors be put in place if such a permit is granted.

The particular location for this day shelter is problematic, even if the Commission finds in favor of zoning changes which would permit such uses. The intersections of 15th Street at both New Hampshire and Rhode Island have complicated bus and car traffic (morning and evening), poor sight lines, and erratic pedestrian traffic from Central Junior High School. In addition, student "loungers" from CJHS have long used the south side of 15th to congregate. This would put them practically in the yard of the proposed shelter--not good for the residents and their children.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments in the process of evaluating the proposed zoning changes.

Sincerely,

Sue and Tom Lorenz

1546 Rhode Island Street

785.841.1566

(residents at that address since 1986)

**From:** Kathryn Conrad [mailto:kathryn.conrad@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, September 08, 2008 2:23 PM  
**To:** David L. Corliss  
**Subject:** resend: comments on Type A shelter code change proposal

8-14-08

Dear Mr Corliss,

The proposed code changes on the table do not adequately ensure safety for the homeless population being served or the interests of the neighbors to the proposed Type A facilities.

The Family Promise model, which is indeed more regulated than the new code changes required, still fails to address several concerns; and the organization has had no further communication with the Barker neighborhood where the day shelter will be located, despite claims to the contrary. Some general concerns with the day center model were it located, as suggested, in an all-residential neighborhood:

- the Family Promise organization proposes a day shelter that is closed and locked at 5 pm, thus leaving a house in a residential neighborhood regularly unattended for the night.
- It will have no trained staff person dedicated to or licensed in childcare.
- It will have up to 14 people in it (4 families) for generally less than three months at a time, thereby allowing no time or motivation for integration of the families into the neighborhood.
- It will have only one full-time staff person who is on site for only 5 of the 7 days that the shelter is open.
- Although supporters have claimed the need for homeless children to have a 'normal' housing experience, school-age children will actually spend little time there (less than 3 hours/day during the week), and will not be allowed any visitors (according to Prof. Reitz's statement to the Barker neighbors' meeting).

The issue of the Family Promise center has been framed by supporters as creating a 'normal' and 'safe' housing situation for homeless children. But the organizers have also made clear that the day center is precisely that: a day center that is effectively a shower, laundry room and social service office, with a shuttle to area churches at 5 pm. There is nothing in the day center proposal that requires it to be in an all-residential area; to call the day-center controversy a housing issue is misleading. Although the Family Promise plan appears to have a good track record, none of the organizers have spoken at all to the specific concerns associated with this site (e.g., parking, lack of adequate play space, traffic and safety concerns, and more). The claims that neighbors' concerns are unfounded is inaccurate and does nothing to address them. The repeated emphasis I have heard on 'strict screening' is indeed not at all the issue, at least for me; single homeless people, or people with drug addictions or who come from abusive family situations, are as worthy of attention and care as those 'screened' individuals Family Promise plans to serve.

I personally believe that a strictly regulated model of day and night centers for the homeless in churches in residential as well as mixed-use areas could work; and I'm sure there are other models that could work effectively with strict oversight, such as the Family Promise model with a day center in a mixed-use, commercial, or residential area. But the proposed code changes are worrisome and the issues raised by the Family Promise group's specific proposal for the 1501 Rhode Island site speak to the necessity for more careful planning before code changes are enacted. I believe more careful consideration is in the best interests of all of the citizens of Lawrence, housed and unhoused.

Thank you for your interest in this most important issue.

Kathryn Conrad

1621 Rhode Island