

**CITY OF ROELAND PARK, KANSAS**  
**GOVERNING BODY WORKSHOP MINUTES**  
**ROELAND PARK CITY HALL**  
**4600 WEST 51<sup>ST</sup> STREET, ROELAND PARK, KS 66205**  
**October 20, 2025, 6:00 P.M.**

- Michael Poppa, Mayor
- Benjamin Dickens, Council Member
- Jan Faidley, Council Member
- Emily Hage, Council Member
- Jennifer Hill, Council Member

- Matthew Lero, Council Member
- Tom Madigan, Council Member
- Kate Raglow, Council Member
- Debbie Schraeder, Council Member

- Keith Moody, City Administrator
- Jennifer Jones-Lacy, Asst. City Admin.
- Kelley Nielsen, City Clerk
- Cory Honas, Police Chief
- Donnie Scharff, Public Works Director

(Roeland Park Governing Body Workshop Meeting Called to Order at 6:33 p.m.)

**MINUTES**

**A. Governing Body Workshop Meeting Minutes October 7, 2025**

*The minutes were approved as presented.*

**II. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**A. Chapter 14 - Police Chapter Review Including E-bike and Scooters**

Ms. Jones-Lacy reviewed the definition of micromobility. She said the Governing Body had previously discussed these devices in public spaces such as parks, but now they need to discuss them as it pertains to public streets and sidewalks. There have been some resident complaints about the use of e-bikes and scooters as well as some requests for the City to regulate their use. Most of the users are younger people and they want a policy that is safe for everyone and consistent with their neighboring communities. Ms. Jones-Lacy said they have reviewed what other communities are doing. Standard recommendations are that the devices ride on the right side of the road, carry no more riders than what the device is designed for, and speed limits of 20 miles per hour on roadways and 15 miles per hour on sidewalks.

Ms. Jones-Lacy presented the following questions for the Council to consider and discuss:

Should cyclists be allowed to overtake other cyclists and cars while riding?

Should they require helmets for all riders or just minors?

Should they require full face helmets?

CMBR Faidley asked what the difference is between a full face and regular helmet? Ms. Jones-Lacy said a full face helmet is like a motorcycle helmet. It provides additional eye and face protection than that of a standard bicycle helmet.

CMBR Raglow commented it would be difficult to regulate passing and would recommend they allow it and hope that riders would use common sense.

CMBR Lero said to be able to pass does make sense. He said there is not much of a difference between the faster e-bikes and a small motorcycle. He recommended helmets for minors, and it would be a harder sell for adults. He also did not recommend requiring a full face helmet.

CMBR Madigan said he used to ride a bicycle and a motorcycle. The number one cause of fatalities is head injuries. He said it is ridiculous to require full face helmets for minors, but under 18, they do need to wear a helmet. He also asked if the police would be the regulating authority of the traffic on the sidewalk.

City Attorney Mauer said the ordinance covers all vehicles whether they are on the sidewalk or the street.

CMBR Faidley asked CMBR Lero why he was not in favor of a full face helmet. CMBR Lero said that some are more decorative than an actual full face helmet and would be difficult to regulate. He does want to see minors wear helmets.

CMBR Hage also supports children wearing helmets. She also mentioned issues of riding on the sidewalks instead of the streets and wants to see the City engage in education and partnerships with parents, the schools, and through social media.

CMBR Hill said that some of the regulations they are discussing are already addressed by the rules of the road. They do need to keep in mind that they are a small city meshed in among others, and they should be consistent as it will be confusing to change rules city by city.

CMBR Raglow said where they are located between cities, she would love to require everyone wears helmets but agreed that certainly it should be required for minors.

CMBR Faidley said she could see an advantage in waiting for the recommendations expected from MARC at the beginning of the year. She said the situation right now is very volatile and reacting immediately may not always result in the best decisions. She also did not want them to lag behind and not protect the children who are using these devices, so she is torn on moving forward or waiting. CMBR Faidley asked Ms. Jones-Lacy what surrounding communities have passed.

Ms. Jones-Lacy said they have varying restrictions. Roeland Park does not have a lot of bike lanes, and they want to make sure it is allowable to ride on the sidewalk. Most communities have a helmet requirement for minors. She added that Fairway has even more restrictive regulations than what Roeland Park is proposing.

CMBR Faidley said she read that one community required adult supervision under a certain age. Ms. Jones-Lacy said that it is Fairway.

CMBR Madigan said they cannot put off the safety of the children until March to hear what MARC will say and they should go ahead and move forward with the requirement of helmets. They can always rescind that decision if they determine it is not as important.

There was a consensus that cyclists should be allowed to overtake or pass another vehicle.

There was consensus that helmets be required for minors, but full face is not required.

The discussion moved to whether the City should regulate how many vehicles can park on a residential single-family lot. The impetus for this is the concern of over-parking on one lot. It was noted that it is an unsightly aesthetic. The Codes Official has been trying to get the residence into compliance. There

have been requests from residents on whether they can restrict the number of cars in residential zoning districts.

Ms. Jones-Lacy presented the following discussion questions to the Governing Body:

What should the maximum number of cars allowed on a single lot?

Should parking limits be restricted to what is visible from the street?

Ms. Jones-Lacy showed samples of some driveways/paved areas of residences in the City with how many vehicles could potentially be parked.

CMBR Dickens said he does not like telling people what they can do on their property, but 12 cars in the driveway does seem excessive. He was not sure how to get the correct data and asked if they could regulate vehicles to the number of drivers in a household.

City Attorney Mauer said they would not be able to do that. He used the example of one person in a residence who is a car collector. He said if they felt they had to regulate it, it would be best to pick a specific number to be allowed.

CMBR Madigan said that all vehicles must be parked on concrete and this homeowner was allowed to put all their concrete in. Ms. Jones-Lacy said that a lot of the concrete work done was unpermitted. CMBR Madigan asked about overnight parking of commercial vehicles and said some of them looked commercial. Ms. Jones-Lacy said they have an ordinance restricting overnight commercial parking on the street. CMBR Madigan said he would have a tough time telling someone they cannot park in their driveway that has been doing so for years and now they cannot because the City has changed their mind.

Ms. Jones-Lacy said the vehicles must be operable and registered and the homeowner could say they are. CMBR Madigan asked why they could not check the vehicles. It was noted that some of them were backed in and the tags are not facing the street.

Police Chief Honas said they do not have any grounds to go onto the property to inspect the registration status of the vehicles.

CMBR Lero said finding the correct number is the tough part and asked where do you stop this.

CMBR Hill said they need to look at their DEI policies as they live in a community with many Hispanic families, which one attributes that they live multi-generational, and have a need for ample parking. She also does not want to create an ordinance because of one residence. They have regulations on the amount of permeable surface allowed in a yard and no broken down cars. She feels like this is over-reach.

City Manager Moody said for perspective, they have made amendments to single-family development standards and how much can be dedicated to a garage space based on the width of the home. They have set precedent and an example of how to keep vehicles from becoming the dominant component of a single-family dwelling.

CMBR Faidley agreed they should not make an ordinance for one property. She spoke with the Codes Officer and there have been code enforcement issues at this home previously. She said there used to

be a fence around the property that was falling and was removed. It would require a variance to put in a new fence like the one that was removed.

CMBR Hage said she does not see how they can do this without it being arbitrary. If someone has a big party at their home, then they are out of compliance for the number of cars, and that is not in the spirit of what they are trying to accomplish. She said it is not for them to act like an HOA. She added that they do want things to look tidy as this area is a gateway to the City.

CMBR Madigan said that many of their guidelines and ordinances have been passed with a grandfather clause. Ms. Jones-Lacy said it is difficult in this case because they do not know the residents. People move in and out all the time and renters change, and they are not notified by the landlord, so it would be difficult to know who was grandfathered in.

There was agreement from the Governing Body they did not want to move forward with limiting the number of parked cars at a residence.

Ms. Jones-Lacy reviewed some of the notable changes to Chapter 14. There was some cleanup of the language, Removal of duplicate language contained in other ordinances and those already covered in state law or STO.

A citizen offered comment that she is glad the City wants to be consistent and have a united message. She said that allowing e-bikes to be classified as bicycles is not safe. She thanked the Governing Body for looking at this and that as a physician she saw more breaks and injuries of children over the summer.

Ms. Jones-Lacy asked whether the Governing Body wanted to wait to hear from MARC before moving forward with the e-bike/scooter ordinance.

CMBR Hage asked if they can make a commitment now and review again when the MARC regulations come out. Ms. Jones-Lacy said if the Governing Body feels this is more urgent, then they can approve it sooner rather than later. Once the MARC report comes out, the Governing Body can amend the ordinance if they feel there is a need.

CMBR Faidley would like to see them lean heavily into education as a policy.

This item will be brought before the Governing Body at the November 3<sup>rd</sup> City Council meeting. It will also be reviewed again in March following MARC recommendations.

### **III. Committee Minutes**

*The were no Committee minutes attached.*

### **IV. ADJOURN**

CMBR Raglow adjourned the meeting.

(Roeland Park Workshop Adjourned at 7:23 p.m.)