

Bobbie Walthall

To: Diane Stoddard
Subject: RE: Sunrise/Arch

From: Dennis Brown [<mailto:djbrown806@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, December 06, 2015 10:14 AM
To: Diane Stoddard
Subject: Sunrise/Arch

Diane, could you forward this to City Commissioners? I would like to provide further input on the two issues I commented on last Tuesday.

Sunrise Rezoning:

As I understand it, if a new owner wished to open up a garden center with the exact operation as Sunrise ran, they would need the same zoning classification that is being requested here. I don't think the argument can be made that this request would intensify use over what's occurred in the recent past. If you did, you might wish to focus on aspects of the proposal other than Central Soy to make it. Central Soy is a local, family-owned, small food production facility that utilizes a commercial kitchen. Calling the business a factory is inaccurate and should not be used to promote this point of view.

I thought we were for small food, local producers, startup agriculture and connecting food production more directly to consumers. This seems like a perfect opportunity to encourage these things. What's a guy got to do to bake a pan of tofu in this town?

I do understand that this decision has ramifications regarding future owners and uses. An SUP should protect the public here. Two members of surrounding neighborhood spoke to this issue. I was not clear if they actually represented the neighborhood association. If they didn't, I would like to know what the Barker leadership is thinking.

If the only alternative you leave for this site is residential downzoning, then a developer can come in and raze the property and install housing, probably along the lines of what was built at the Hanscomb-Tappan property. I think that would be a loss for our historic downtown core. While a number of the structures on the property may not be listable on historic registers, the property as a whole pre-dates the residential surroundings so it has been as much a part of the neighborhood from day one as KU is to Oread, and seemingly without conflict or controversy.

Sidewalk Dining Guidelines:

This request is not coming from an upset group of owners with current dining enclosures. It's coming from a new member of our downtown. So it can be surmised that the impetus for the request is that he is proud of his upcoming business venture and wants to do something special, rather than there is a problem with the current guidelines and they are not functioning correctly. If you deny the appeal, this new owner will not have something taken away; he will have what everybody else has. "Consistent application of the guidelines also establishes a level playing field for highly competitive businesses such as retail and restaurants." (staff report) Nothing is broken here...do you really want to fix it?

The preservation viewpoint regarding the allowance of increased structural elements in the current enclosures is that the more you allow, the more the historic storefronts are obscured, not only physically, but in the way these

new spaces we're creating are both seen and used. The historic front facade entry is what's important here, and that is strongly embraced in our current system of blank space to walk through entering the dining areas.

Artsy, eclectic, funky or the like are not characteristics of downtown in designated historic districts. Specific architectural elements and usage patterns would be. While there is an overall feel to be considered, that would tend to be focused on the historic sense of place. Our historic downtown is Massachusetts Street, Lawrence Kansas.

I may not have communicated well regarding art and the HRC. HRC will review an art installation if it potentially could impact a listed property. What I meant to say was HRC won't pass a proposal on 'style points'. If HRC feels a proposal doesn't meet the intent of the guidelines it won't win approval, whether the art itself is seen as desirable or not. You have been charged on this item, per Randy's comments, to evaluate this as if you were the HRC.

Bobbie Walthall

To: Tom Harper
Subject: RE: Historic Preservation, Downtown Design Guidelines & the Arch debate

From: Tom Harper [<mailto:tomharper@stephensre.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, December 02, 2015 9:25 AM

To: Mike Amyx; Leslie Soden; Stuart Boley; Matthew Herbert; Lisa Larsen; Diane Stoddard; Lynne Zollner; Scott McCullough

Subject: Historic Preservation, Downtown Design Guidelines & the Arch debate

Good morning- Thank-you for your service to the City of Lawrence.

I watched some of the City Commission meeting last night.

It was frustrating to see the debate about the arch. Commissioners Herbert & Larson seemed to base their support on other items that had nothing to do with the arch. Mayor Amyx stated he respects the HRC and LPA. This statement was confusing due to his disregard of the unanimous vote by the HRC to deny the applicant and the LPA's recommendation to deny.

I can only imagine the people on the HRC questioning why they are serving on that board when the City Commission disregards their recommendations.

This may seem like a small item, but it could become a larger problem and I would hate to see this moment as being the start of "ticky tacky", out of scale "fluff" on Mass Street.

Please consider the unintended consequences of your decision on our Downtown.

Tom Harper