

Bobbie Walthall

Subject: RE: city comm reg agenda 2

From: Patricia Sinclair
Sent: Tuesday, December 01, 2015 11:55 AM
To: Bobbie Walthall
Subject: city comm reg agenda 2

To: Mayor and City Commissioners
From: Patricia Sinclair
Re: Opposition to regular agenda item 2
Date: December 1,1 2015

I write to voice my strong opposition to granting the resolution proposed for regular agenda item 2 re 800 New Hampshire.

1. This proposal will not benefit the public and will create a problem for those citizens who attempt to park downtown.
2. Additionally, it will create another building that changes the face of downtown, and will cause wind and shade and other problems for the general public as well as nearby residential homes.
3. There is no reason for the public good to give money or variances for yet another tall building by the same developer/s. It would appear that the building, as well as others recently constructed nearby, are devoted to serving the needs of some future citizens rather than those who are already living here and have needs to use facilities downtown. We have seen the havoc created by the other recent projects, with the loss of bus parking, variances that extend to the limit, closed streets, workers using public parking and sidewalks leaving nothing for the public and endangering them. I was unable to safely park to make a donation to the Social Service League, for example. Many people need to visit the courthouses and municipal court, for example, and already face difficulties in doing so. It is unfortunate that the bus service downtown has been taken away from this area, and looks to be moving away from downtown even more.
4. The timing of this proposal is such that many citizens have been away and are not able to voice their opinions. It seems that it would be better to wait for the appointment of our new city manager before any more such major decisions are made. What is the rush?
5. If a proposal is good, then it should be able to stand on its own and not require public financing and variances.
6. Since the developers talk about renting apartments, please examine their record as landlords before subsidizing more. I would suggest this for anyone proposing to develop apartments with public assistance, and here not even setting up subsidies for tenants.
7. This building might not be strong enough to withstand any additions. The Lawrence Journal World had an article about its history and I have included a link. It was the Riling Building, which housed an auto dealership downstairs and an armory upstairs. After a fire in 1938, this building was considered too damaged to maintain the second floor and the armory was moved. Do we know for certain that it can sustain the proposed addition, or will we find more unpleasant surprises as the project proceeds.

<http://www2.ljworld.com/weblogs/the-archives/2015/mar/4/were-tanks-once-parked-on-pachamamas-roo/>

Thank you.

Bobbie Walthall

From: Richard Heckler <rheckler2002@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, November 27, 2015 11:44 PM
To: Leslie Soden; Stuart Boley; Mike Amyx; Lisa Larsen; Matthew Herbert; Bobbie Walthall
Subject: Need of new sales tax revenue

12/1/15 City Commission Agenda

Receive recommendation from the Public Incentive Advisory Committee on Industrial Revenue Bond financing for a redevelopment project at 800 New Hampshire Street and adopt Resolution No. 7135, authorizing the issuance of up to \$7,800,000 in industrial revenue bonds for the 800 New Hampshire Street project for the purpose of obtaining a sales tax exemption on project construction materials.

Staff Memo & Attachments Parking Memo

https://www.lawrenceks.org/assets/agendas/cc/2015/12-01-15/12-01-15_cc_agenda.html

During the meeting perhaps the commissioners could explain to taxpayers how Lawrence, Kansas does not need new/additional sales tax revenue.

Richard Heckler
taxpayer