

# Memorandum

## City of Lawrence-Douglas County Planning & Development Services

**TO:** David L. Corliss, City Manager

**FROM:** Planning Staff

**CC:** Scott McCullough, Planning and Development Services Director  
Sheila Stogsdill, Assistant Planning Director

**Date:** July 14, 2010

**RE:** Draft Oread Neighborhood Plan

This memo addresses the issues discussed at the April 20, 2010 City Commission Study Session regarding the draft *Oread Neighborhood Plan*.

### **1. Compliance program for nonconforming uses and structures**

The draft *Oread Neighborhood Plan* supports the expansion of the existing rental registration program to require registration of multi-dwelling structures. This program, as proposed, could be established to be cost neutral and can cover certain multi-dwelling structures, ie, over 50 years old, or all multi-dwelling structures. Staff believes this program is the best vehicle to bring nonconforming structures into compliance and assist with the safety of renters in the neighborhood and city-wide. With regards to structures that would require a substantial amount of upgrades, a compliance schedule could be put in place to allow for a certain amount of time for the compliance to be reached.

### **2. Parking study**

A significant issue in the neighborhood is identifying the scope of the parking problems and solutions to address the problems. Staff submitted a proposal to the MPO to learn whether a parking study could be funded, in part, with federal transportation dollars. A parking study for the neighborhood is currently being discussed as a joint project between the City, the MPO and KU. The study could possibly take place in 2011 if funded.

### **3. Balancing conflicting goals**

The public process did not yield a priority order for the proposed goals. Since the Oread Neighborhood Area is so diverse, priorities and goals will differ throughout the neighborhood. The governing body must often weigh the values of individual goals given a specific development project. The prioritization would occur on a case by case basis.

Below is a summary of issues brought up through the public process. During the introductory meetings for the plan, a list of issues was compiled and prioritized. The top 12 rated items were the issues focused on in the plan. It is not likely to be able to address every issue in the neighborhood plan.

1. Zoning conflicts with parking standards
2. Landlord neglect of structures
3. Preservation of historic resources and character of the neighborhood
4. Bars-trash, behavior, travel through residential areas to get to them, change in drinking age
5. More families in the neighborhood-downzoning to encourage
6. Reinforce use diversity of uses and structures-single-family, mixed use
7. Parking-not enough
8. Tree roots-damage to sidewalks and foundations
9. Appropriate infill-architecture style, type
10. Diversity in housing stock
11. Brick streets & sidewalks-not maintained well
12. Current zoning-too restrictive
13. Lack of greenspace
14. Ownership costs high
15. Owner/city neglect
16. Trash
17. Parked cars prevent proper street cleaning
18. Low owner-occupied homes
19. Zoning often not consistent with the land use
20. More students with less campus housing available
21. Trash dumpsters-where they are located, number
22. Commuters parking in neighborhood
23. Housing statutes & lower tax bills
24. Historic homes lost to rental units
25. Rentals drive purchase prices too high for owner-occupants
26. Boundary-(+/-) adjustments
27. Trash facilities-more receptacles available for public use both daily and during football games
28. Restore quality of the neighborhood
29. Neighborhood orientated retail uses

Staff has made updates to the draft plan based on City Commission discussion. All of the maps have been updated to reflect the new boundary, incorporating 1647 and 1649 Edgehill Rd. All changes made in the plan are shown in red.