

## **Bobbie Walthall**

---

**From:** Morland <fourmorlands@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 06, 2017 11:23 AM  
**To:** Bobbie Walthall  
**Subject:** Please do not re-zone East Lawrence

Hello, my name is Timothy Morland, I just wanted to send a quick message to the Commissioners expressing my lack of support for the rezoning initiative.

I own and live in one of the properties to be rezoned. I have been to the historic resources commission meeting, the planning commission meeting, and spoken to city staff directly about this issue, but let me say again, I do not see widespread support or the need to re-zone the properties.

I think the term current usage in this instance would define this as a neighborhood in flux. As property taxes continue to rise, I can only see the results of this initiative reducing residents options and making it more difficult for people to remain in their homes. I don't know that the current zoning is perfect, but replacing it with more non-conforming lots is not a solution. Also it is not clear how one of the aims of the initiative, to reduce spot zoning and tall buildings next to small building, is accomplished by mixing R24, R12, and R5.

This is an important area, and I love living here. Please do not adopt the new zoning, and if possible send the proposal back for refinement, to create something with widespread support that truly reflects the unique current usage and potential of the area.

Timothy Morland 737 Connecticut.

Attached is correspondence that was received prior to publication of the staff report.  
*This information will be updated if/when more correspondence is provided to staff.*

<b>Name</b>	<b>Date Received</b>	<b>Provided to Historic Resources Commission</b>	<b>Provided to Planning Commission</b>
Gordon Sailors	3/11/2017	Yes	Yes
Kayse & Stephen Aschenbrenner	3/14/2017	Yes	Yes
Jim Slough (2)	3/15/2017	Yes	Yes
Brent Morrison	3/16/2017	Yes	Yes
Mark Kaplan	3/16/2017	Yes	Yes
Barbara Michener	4/21/2017	No	Yes
George Pisani	4/23/2017	No	Yes
John Swift	4/24/2017	No	Yes
Brent Morrison	4/24/2017	No	Yes
Jim Slough	4/24/2017	No	Yes
Cris Combs	4/24/2017	No	Yes
Jan Schaaake	4/24/2017	No	Yes
Serina Hearn	4/24/2017	No	Yes
Ardys Ramberg	4/24/2017	No	Yes
Barry Shalinsky	4/24/2017*	No	No
Angela Reed	5/06/2017	No	No
James Dunn	6/01/2017	No	No
Jo Polk	6/05/2017	No	No
Jim Slough	6/05/2017	No	No
Gordon Sailors	6/05/2017	No	No
Taylor Rodgers	6/05/2017	No	No
Randy Ham	6/05/2017	No	No
Serina Hearn	6/05/2017	No	No

\*This correspondence was received after the deadline for all written communications to the Planning Commission.

**From:** [Gordon Sailors](#)  
**To:** [Becky Pepper](#)  
**Subject:** East Lawrence Rezoning  
**Date:** Saturday, March 11, 2017 5:31:07 PM

---

Becky,

I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes in zoning to the East Lawrence neighborhood in which I own a house. It will have a financial impact on me, and other property owners in the area. That is a very unfair change to do away with the flexibility that comes with the zoning I have had on the property for the 25 years I have owned it. While I have always rented it as a three bedroom house, the zoning would have allowed other uses in the advent of a catastrophic loss due to a tornado or fire.

I know that there are people in the neighborhood who are concerned with the changes that have occurred, and are coming, but most of those are the results of the large luxury apartments built on New Hampshire, and the projects taking place on Pennsylvania in the Arts District. To my understanding, most of the other building that has happened, and some of the increased demand for property in this area is directly related to the increased desirability to live close to downtown that has been brought to light by some of these large developments.

I don't think you would appreciate having the value of your property decreased by actions from the city.

Please take the concerns of the property owners into account as this decision is made.

Thanks again for your attention.

Gordie Sailors

Gordon Sailors  
gordiesailors@gmail.com

**From:** [kayse aschenbrenner](#)  
**To:** [Becky Pepper](#)  
**Subject:** East Lawrence re-zoning  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 14, 2017 5:40:12 PM

---

To whom it may concern,

My husband and I are landlords of 3 rental properties in Lawrence. Our most special and favored rental is our 1800's historically recognized 4 plex at 728 Rhode Island St. We purchased the once owner occupied yet neglected property in 2014 and since have spent over 30k bringing it back to its original charm and historic significance. We are very proud of our commitment to not only bringing this special home back to life but also providing our renters with the opportunity to live in this wonderful east Lawrence neighborhood. Enjoying the charm, community and wonderful downtown atmosphere that we all know and love.

We have become increasingly concerned over the proposal to change zoning in east Lawrence to **RM-12D**. Our home would be allowed to keep its existing status and we would not be directly affected, however, we are worried about the effects it will have on other homeowners as well as the continued preservation of the current neighborhood. While it is obvious that those proposing this change are well intentioned, if allowed, this could unexpectedly and inadvertently increase the exact type of activity in the neighborhood that homeowners are hoping to thwart with this initiative. Stopping large scale complexes from invading east Lawrence and compromising the historic significance of the neighborhood, as well as the character that the community as a whole treasures is of utmost importance to us and others invested in East Lawrence. We are very much in favor of supporting these directives but not at the expense of limiting the improvements and freedoms that the homeowners in east Lawrence share or making zoning changes such as the one proposed that could steer the neighborhood in another undesirable direction.

There must be other, less severe changes that can be made to help preserve the integrity of this neighborhood as well as truly accomplish the goals set forth with the proposed zoning changes that would be in the best interest of all homeowners. I imagine most, if not all homeowners in this area would be in favor of expanding the historic district as a way to help protect the simplicity and beauty we love. Perhaps changing to another zoning that would protect those owning multi-unit homes and those that may want to add on in the future as their needs change while still preventing large buildings and disproportionate renovations. At the very least we would propose that a vote be given to homeowners in this area after all pros and cons have been adequately explained. I don't think that even those supporting this change understand how their freedoms will be hindered or how this may affect their property values moving forward. We believe that most of us want the same neighborhood protections, but there must be a better way to get there that avoids the pitfalls that could come from such a drastic measure such as this and instead truly works toward the common good.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Kayse and Stephen Aschenbrenner

**From:** [troutdadd@aol.com](mailto:troutdadd@aol.com)  
**To:** [Becky Pepper](#)  
**Subject:** HRC meeting 3/16  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 15, 2017 5:50:46 AM

---

Ms. Pepper,

I tried to locate email addresses for the HRC board and failing to find any I trust that you can forward my message. Thank you. Jim Slough

Dear HRC,

You have been asked to determine if rezoning the East Lawrence neighborhood to single family is appropriate given the history of the neighborhood. While you have many more resources available to make that decision than I do I want to give my 2 cents worth on what I know and have seen in my 34 years of experience in the hood. I first came to East Lawrence in 1983 to start my business (Free State Glass) and subsequently started buying real estate in the area in 1991.

In the late 80's and early 90's the owner occupancy rate in the area was hovering around 28%, the vast majority of the properties were rentals. Even today the majority of the properties (I believe it's 51%) are used as rentals. Traditionally the area has been a working class neighborhood and it had a fair share of high density living arrangements like boarding houses and room rentals. My house at 812 RI had three mailboxes on it when I purchased it in 1991. The previous owner lived downstairs and rented out two "apartments" upstairs where the tenants shared a kitchen and bath. The tradition of higher density goes back to the 1800's when railroad workers and other transient workers were able to find

temporary housing in the East Lawrence area. While you can pick and choose what you want to make your decision I feel the history supports the multifamily traditions of the neighborhood. I mean why else was this

area given the zoning it has now when modern zoning categories were established?

This move to change the zoning is a misguided effort directed at a perceived threat (the building of apartment buildings) while the true forces driving change in the neighborhood go unaddressed.

Changing the zoning to

protect the area from large scale apartment buildings will do nothing to stop the development currently going on by owner occupants converting this older housing stock into McMansions. I believe that eliminating the

multifamily zoning will accelerate the changes that have already been occurring. Pretty soon East Lawrence will more closely resemble Old West Lawrence. The eclectic vibe that is East Lawrence will be killed by the very

actions taken to "save" it. Other actions would actually produce an outcome that would preserve the character of the hood without stripping property owners of the zoning they expected to keep when they made the decision to invest

in the area. Expanding the historic district and having as many contributing members as possible would forever protect the hood from the perceived threat of mass demolition for apartment buildings. Limiting the size of

additions like has been done in Oread would do the most good stopping the real changes that are happening. Please don't accelerate the destruction of East Lawrence by approving this change of zoning to single family. I ask that you

look beyond the static find that this area has truly and historically been used as multifamily. Thank you for your time, Jim Slough

**From:** [Scott McCullough](#)  
**To:** [Becky Pepper](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Questions  
**Date:** Thursday, March 16, 2017 10:46:45 AM

---

**Scott McCullough**, *Director*

Planning and Development Services – [www.lawrenceks.org](http://www.lawrenceks.org)

City Hall, 6 E. 6<sup>th</sup> Street

P.O. Box 708, Lawrence, KS 66044-0708

office (785) 832-3154 | fax (785) 832-3160

*"Your opinion counts! Customer feedback helps us serve you better. Please tell us how we're doing by completing this short online Customer Satisfaction Survey:  
<http://lawrenceks.org/pds/survey/satisfaction>."*

**From:** troutdadd@aol.com [mailto:troutdadd@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 15, 2017 7:04 AM  
**To:** Scott McCullough  
**Subject:** Questions

I understand that you are just acting at the request of the neighborhood association in advancing this rezoning request. Is there no standard to look at the request in terms of effectiveness of accomplishing the stated goal? (saving the hood from apartment buildings). I mean if they wanted to build a moat around the hood (just as effective as the rezoning request in my book) would you advance that idea as well? These people need to be saved from themselves not encouraged to proceed with this reckless approach. As far as RM24, RM12 or RM12D the real limiting factor is parking so you can't really put more people in a RM24 than a RM12 (technically you could have more units but not more bedrooms). These people have no idea of the gift they are giving up by going in this direction and I may encourage KT or others to talk to you about the value of having auxiliary structures etc. Instead of including landlords in the process we have been perceived as "the enemy". It is in landlords interests as well to preserve the character of the neighborhood. How long before all these newcomers start bitching about KT's yard art?

I have no interest in accepting the RM12D, I respectfully request to retain my RM24 as it is the only option offered that protects my property rights. I would accept RM12 if it were offered. I have no desire to take on more risk in the event of fire or other catastrophe. I also feel that owners of 4 bedroom houses should be given a multifamily zoning as that would allow them to use there properties in the manner they have already been using them. (that's the buzz on this, to continue already established use). I think all owners should be actively recruited to give their opinion on what they want/feel needs to happen to their properties, not have this misguided effort shoved down their throats.

I do not envy you and the position you are put in, I understand the fine line you have to walk but I do feel that you understand the zoning change isn't going to stop the changes that have been occurring.

Thanks for your time, Jim Slough

**From:** [Brent Morrison](#)  
**To:** [Becky Pepper](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Rezoning  
**Date:** Thursday, March 16, 2017 10:03:49 AM

---

Ms. Pepper,

I want to go on record again to emphasize my disagreement with the proposed rezoning efforts in East Lawrence. These efforts seem to be overboard in correcting a problem that perhaps does need some revision but needs careful attention. I don't feel like changing most of the zoning to single family adequately solves the issue of big apt complexes invading the neighborhood which seems to be the main problem.

Thank You  
Brent Morrison  
1022 Avalon Rd  
Lawrence, KS  
785 766-1305

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Brent Morrison <[rbmorrison@sunflower.com](mailto:rbmorrison@sunflower.com)>  
To: [Bpepper@lawrenceks.org](mailto:Bpepper@lawrenceks.org)  
Sent: Mon, 28 Mar 2016 17:13:31 -0400 (EDT)  
Subject: Rezoning

Ms. Pepper,

Due to the short notice, prior business commitments do not allow me to attend the public meeting to learn about potential rezoning of the area north of E 9th St. in the ELN. Consequently, I would like to voice my opposition to this possible rezoning particularly where Rhode Island is concerned. I own a property that would be affected by this change that has been used since the 1800's as a multi dwelling structure and along with other older multi dwelling structures on the street most accurately reflects the existing character of RI street. My property was rehabbed to Natl Historical Society standards in 2007 and under their standard was to be maintained accordingly. Additionally I am currently in negotiation to purchase another property on Rhode Island and this would definitely effect it's future potential for rehab. Therefore I don't see how changing the zoning on Rhode Island conforms to historical accurate use.

Lastly, As a case in point I would be curious as to how many of the houses along that two block stretch of Rhode Island are listed and registered with the city as rentals? I'm guessing over 50% and suspect there are some that are being used as rentals that are not registered. Again, I don't see the reason for change along this block.

Thank You and please keep me informed,

Brent Morrison - 785 766-1305 - [rbmorrison@sunflower.com](mailto:rbmorrison@sunflower.com)  
1022 Avalon Rd  
Lawrence, KS 66044 million



**From:** [markkaplan@gmail.com](mailto:markkaplan@gmail.com) on behalf of [Mark Kaplan](#)  
**To:** [Mike Arp](#); [Tracy Quillin](#); [abailey@sloanlawfirm.org](mailto:abailey@sloanlawfirm.org); [kentfry@gmail.com](mailto:kentfry@gmail.com); [Brenna Buchanan](#); [dave.evans@gouldevans.com](mailto:dave.evans@gouldevans.com); [Stan Hernly](#); [Lynne Zollner](#); [Tom Markus](#)  
**Cc:** [Domer, Dennis](#); [Bill Tuttle](#); [Dave Loewenstein](#); [Robert Baker](#); [Phil Collison](#); [Dave Evans](#); [jim mccrary](#); [Richard Kershenbaum](#); [Pam Blackburn](#); [Eric Jay](#); [John Swift](#); [Cris Combs](#); [Natalie Redding](#); [Barry Shalinsky](#); [Dennis "Boog" Highberger](#); [Tony Peterson](#); [Eric Kirkendall](#); [Nicolette proudfoot](#); [Christine Brandt](#); [East Lawrence Neighborhood Association](#); [Aaron Paden](#); [mick palmer](#); [A. Townsend Peterson](#); [David Lewis](#)  
**Subject:** An appeal for support of the proposed downzoning of Old East Lawrence's north end....  
**Date:** Thursday, March 16, 2017 1:57:24 PM

---

Dear Historic Resource Commissioners --

As a more than 40-year resident of Old East Lawrence -- I'm writing in support of the proposed desperately-needed ELNA-sponsored downzoning for the district's north end, which is on your agenda this evening.

Few if any of our resident property owners seem to recall the proscribed legal measures utilized in 2006, when this 10-block heart of Lawrence's Original Town Site of 1854 was blanket-rezoned RM-24 -- with the obvious intention of eventually leveling these blocks of historic homes, with a pattern that currently allows up to 82 residential units per block of 24 standard 50' wide lots. You all can begin to officially reverse that egregious mistake by city hall tonight -- by moving this item along to the Lawrence-Douglas County Planning Commission with your imprimatur, via your sacred responsibility to protect what's left of the heart of our nationally-significant historic site of Lawrence, Kansas, as a birthplace of America's Civil War.

This district is mortally threatened by a host of taxpayer-subsidized redevelopment projects, in progress, and proposed, on all four sides -- and the current 2006 zoning designation was designed to erase it in its entirety. Yet the district we observe today is little-changed from the post-Civil War era of the rebuilding of Lawrence, following the massacre of more than 200 men and boys here, at the hands of Confederate irregulars, seven weeks after the Union battlefield victory at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, in the summer of 1863. Let's step up to the plate in 2017 -- to ensure that the symbolism and heritage and human narratives represented by the built environment of this historic mixed-use district -- the oldest in Lawrence -- is well-acknowledged and protected, for many more years to come.

Thank you for your public service.

Sincerely,

Mark Kaplan  
1029 Delaware  
Lawrence

**From:** [Barbara Michener](#)  
**To:** [Becky Pepper](#)  
**Subject:** Rezoning in east Lawrence  
**Date:** Friday, April 21, 2017 10:35:13 AM

---

My husband & I live at 1300 Rhode Island. We are in favor of the zoning rectification that is proposed by the East Lawrence Neighborhood Assoc. We love our area with all its faults and hope that improvements can be in line with the existing residential limitations.  
Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Pisani, George R.](#)  
**To:** [Becky Pepper](#)  
**Subject:** East Lawrence rezoning proposal  
**Date:** Sunday, April 23, 2017 9:04:49 AM

---

Good Morning Ms Pepper,  
While I am on record as being in favor of the shift from RM24 to single family rezoning (and still basically am), a neighboring owner on Rhode Island St has expressed concern that the rezoning would hamper his effort to replace two of the rather run-down houses in the 812-828 Rhode Island sequence with duplex-type dwellings.

He has been a very responsible owner/landlord in the block, and so I wanted to express my support of (if possible within the plan) zoning that series of lots to something duplex-favorable.

In the old code, I saw a RMD classification, defined as "The RMD District is designed to provide for duplexes only. Such district is encouraged to be used as a buffer between RM districts and RS districts. " Given the extensive development of New Hampshire St to high-rise (by Lawrence standards) multi- , the east side of Rhode Island certainly fits the buffer model.

Sincerely,  
George Pisani  
809 Connecticut

**From:** [John Swift](#)  
**To:** [Becky Pepper](#); [John Swift](#)  
**Subject:** East Lawrence zoning  
**Date:** Monday, April 24, 2017 12:03:57 AM

---

Ms. Pepper,

I've lived in East Lawrence since 1981, and have lived in the former parsonage of St. Luke's AME for thirty years. I am writing in support of the proposed rezoning of the north end of East Lawrence.

I was very surprised to learn I was living in RM-24 zoning. I'd always thought it was zoned duplex, which I believe it was until the 2006 rezoning, which took place without my or anyone else I know having been aware of it. I treasure my neighborhood, and it really is a unique historic place, which would be impossible to replicate under today's economic circumstances. Where else can one find so many small and medium-sized original houses, still largely intact? Brick streets, stone curbs, this really is a treasure, and it would be such a shame to lose it to the development pressure that has been growing in recent years. I think it is important to consider that value and worth are far more than a price tag. This is a community, and many people, myself included, call it home. I plan to make my little bungalow into an historically correct airplane bungalow, to accommodate my new family, but putting my life savings into a house located in an unstable setting is not a good idea. I hope the Planning Commission acts to protect our unique historic residential neighborhood from being overrun by redevelopment, which would greatly enrich a few people in the short run, at the expense of an irreplaceable cultural treasure, the loss of which would be felt by a far greater number of people. Thank you for your service to our community, and thank you for taking the time to read and consider my concerns and those of my family and neighbors.

Best regards,

John Swift  
818 New York  
Lawrence KS 66044

[Preview attachment St. Luke AME.JPG](#)



[St. Luke AME.JPG](#)  
[2.7 MB](#)

**From:** [Brent Morrison](#)  
**To:** [Becky Pepper](#); [Brent Morrison](#)  
**Subject:** 812 & 816 Rhode Island proposed rezoning  
**Date:** Monday, April 24, 2017 4:35:42 AM

---

Ms. Pepper,

I am writing to express my adamant opposition to the proposed rezoning request for my property at 812 Rhode Island. I have owned this property since 1992 and maintained it as a three unit complex until I began a two year restoration project completed in 2007. Due to the extensive restoration costs required for the 140 year old property I was unable to complete the third unit as planned and had to put that phase on hold for a projected 15 year timeline. I have faithfully adhered to that schedule for 10 of those years and feel this would be a gross injustice to me and frankly the past history of the home to alter my ability to progress forward with this project. Please realize I purchased this home 25 years ago with proper zoning allowing me to plan accordingly and do not see the wisdom of altering it now. I respectfully ask that you maintain my current RM24 zoning.

I would also like to express my opposition to changing the zoning at 816 Rhode Island. The property is adjacent to my property at 812 Rhode Island and I have entered into an agreement to purchase this property after 15 years of negotiating with the owner. The house has sat vacant for 10 years, is in major disrepair and is blighting the neighborhood. It appears it is unrepairable and I would replace it with a new historically accurate project compatible with the current RM24 zoning. I would note that 822 Rhode Island is maintaining its RM24 zoning and I believe 826 Rhode Island is also. It therefore seems logical that 812 and 816 should maintain RM24 as well.

Thank You for this forum to express my concerns.

Brent Morrison  
1022 Avalon Rd  
Lawrence, KS 66044  
785 766-1305  
[rbmorrison@sunflower.com](mailto:rbmorrison@sunflower.com)

**From:** [troutdadd@aol.com](mailto:troutdadd@aol.com)  
**To:** [Becky Pepper](#)  
**Subject:** Zoning change....I vote NO!!  
**Date:** Monday, April 24, 2017 6:02:06 AM

---

I vote NO for the bogus zoning change. If this change is to preserve peoples current use then why are owners who rent 4 bedroom homes to 4 people no longer going to be allowed to continue to do the same? There are real threats to the neighborhood and this zoning change does nothing to address the real threat (gentrification). I understand the anxiety some people feel that they must do something but this is the wrong thing to do. Please just say no to this ineffective, harmful idea. This also goes against the Commissions stated goal of increasing density downtown. Please vote NO to allow this zoning change. Thank you, Jim Slough

**From:** [Cris Combs](#)  
**To:** [Becky Pepper](#)  
**Subject:** East Lawrence Zoning  
**Date:** Monday, April 24, 2017 9:24:27 AM

---

City of Lawrence Planning Commission

Attn: Rebecca Pepper

RE: Zoning in East Lawrence in areas north of 9th Street

Ms. Pepper,

My name is Cris Combs and I am the owner of two properties in the 800 block of New York Street in East Lawrence and am writing to support downzoning from RM24 to RS. When I purchased the property at 830 New York in the early 1980's the area was zoned RM2.

My preference is for lower density occupancy, preferably single-family owner occupancy by families with children. Low density rental of single family residences is also fine by me. I would also like to see more green space required and existing trees preserved when possible.

An example of what I do not want is what exists in the Oread neighborhood where students are packed into houses like sardines. One single family residence on our block is occupied by a group of students who require six parking spaces. It is my understanding that the number of renters in the house has likely been influenced by a drastic rent increase from the previous owner to the present one. I have been told by the previous owner that he charged \$900 per month and have heard that the new owner charges \$1500 per month. Same house, no improvements. Previously, the house has been occupied by both families and smaller numbers of students. For me, the issue is density.

Also, the construction of duplex is planned just to the north of the above-mentioned residence. I would prefer the construction of a single-family residence.

If you have any questions please contact me by email.

Thank you.

Yours truly,

Cris Combs

Sent from my iPad



**From:** [Jan Schaake](#)  
**To:** [Becky Pepper](#)  
**Subject:** East Lawrence rezoning  
**Date:** Monday, April 24, 2017 10:05:50 AM

---

Jan Schaake

S. Jan Schaake | Clovis Construction Inc. | PO BOX 455, Lawrence, KS 66044 | 785-979-5078

[JanSchaake@gmail.com](mailto:JanSchaake@gmail.com)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message and any attachments are for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain proprietary, confidential, trade secret or privileged information. Any unauthorized review use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited and may be a violation of law. If you are not the intended recipient or a person responsible for delivering this message to an intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

Hi Beccy,

It is a mistake to rezone east Lawrence to RS-5. That zoning will gentrify the neighbor hood. A new zoning classification is needed to Protect and maintain the character of east Lawrence

**From:** [Victorian Homes](#)  
**To:** [Becky Pepper](#)  
**Subject:** \*Corrected email: Against Zoning Change - East Lawrence  
**Date:** Monday, April 24, 2017 10:06:47 AM

---

Ms. Pepper:

On average 20% of all apartment complexes are unoccupied. By rezoning, downsizing, this neighborhood, it helps push the extras into the apartment complexes that are continually being built.

Neighborhood associations who support downsizing in a neighborhood which has existed before zoning laws existed, do not represent the hardworking Mom and Pop landlords, whose rights are being taken away. Neighborhood associations do not represent groups of people who though not related by "blood" consider themselves a family.

These associations are unwittingly playing into the hands of the big developers they are afraid off. They take their frustrations, and fear of change by hurting the small individual landlords who have not done what they fear.

This down zoning law only benefits the big developers who need more bodies to fill their apartments.

I doubt that my vote matters, but just for the record, I want to express my disapproval of this latest attack on taking away rights of property owners.

Sincerely,

Serina Hearn  
732 Connecticut St,  
Lawrence, KS. 66046

**From:** [Denny Ewert](#)  
**To:** [Ardys Ramberg](#)  
**Cc:** [Becky Pepper](#)  
**Subject:** RE: re-zoning in East Lawrence  
**Date:** Monday, April 24, 2017 11:03:17 AM

---

Thank you for your email.

**Ms. Denny Ewert, Administrative Support**  
[dewert@lawrenceks.org](mailto:dewert@lawrenceks.org)  
City of Lawrence, Planning & Development Services  
6 E 6th Street, Lawrence, KS 66044  
office (785)-832-3159 | fax (785)-832-3160  
[www.lawrenceks.org/pds/](http://www.lawrenceks.org/pds/)

*"Your opinion counts! Customer feedback helps us serve you better. Please tell us how we're doing by completing this short online Customer Satisfaction Survey:  
<http://lawrenceks.org/pds/survey/satisfaction>."*

**From:** Ardys Ramberg [mailto:ramberg.ardys@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 24, 2017 11:02 AM  
**To:** Denny Ewert <dewert@lawrenceks.org>  
**Subject:** re-zoning in East Lawrence

Dear Planners,

I would be remiss to not express my desire for this neighborhood to keep its friendly, family feeling. I strongly feel that single residential zoning is very important for retaining this magnificent community, its school, its old housing. Already downtown seems as if its footprint threatens our homes. Of course we love our downtown, but absolutely, the housing that is here, and so vulnerable will be supported by the proposed zoning change requested by our wonderful neighborhood association. Please do change us to a single family zoning. Thanks! Ardys Ramberg, 812 New York St.

To: Lawrence / Douglas County Planning Staff  
Lawrence / Douglas County Planning Commission  
Lawrence City Commission

From: Barry M. Shalinsky

Date: April 24, 2017

Re: East Lawrence Rezoning Proposals

I have been the owner of 633 and 645 Connecticut Street since the early 1980's. I have had the pleasure of residing at both of these properties, and currently rent both of them to families. In recent months, I have been putting significant financial resources into making repairs to 645 Connecticut. These are in the nature of historical restorations because the property is on the local historical register. The property was placed on the local register with my approval and active involvement, and in similar fashion I have been working to have it placed on the state register. I hope to live in one of the properties as my retirement home someday.

I write in support of the proposition that East Lawrence properties would benefit from less intensive residential zones that reflect the character of the area as one with generally modest and affordable single family homes. That being stated, I do not agree with every specific change being proposed for reasons stated below. More on that later.

First, in evaluating the proposed zoning changes, it is important for the decision makers to do so within a proper historical context. Prior to the 1980's, the area of East Lawrence north of 9<sup>th</sup> Street appeared on municipal planning maps as the "Kaw Industrial District", despite the fact that it had been comprised primarily of modest single family housing for working class families for nearly 100 years. Most of the area had M-2 Industrial zoning at the time.

On a personal note, in 1980, I was a young recent graduate of the KU Law School when I took a position as a VISTA volunteer for what was then known as the East Lawrence Improvement Association. I was assigned to visit with property owners in the M-2 zone to obtain their support for changing the zoning to a residential zoning category. Clearly, the designation as "Kaw Industrial District" and the M-2 zoning were an existential threat to the area's continued long term viability as a residential area, particularly in light of the Haskell Loop highway project that had been planned for the area. During the course of my canvassing, I met the owner of 633 Connecticut who was listing it for sale, and long story short, she was quite happy to sell it to someone who would love it and work to protect it as a residential property. Approximately three years later, I also purchased 645 Connecticut which had been added onto in the late 1950's to become a group home for individuals with developmental disabilities

As a result of ELIA's efforts in the early '80's, much of the area between 7<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> Streets was rezoned from M-2 to RM categories. This was seen as a good compromise at the time, in order to get the area zoned residential. Because there were a number of vacant lots at the time, multi-family housing, particularly housing built under the auspices of the Section 8 program, was seen as a viable strategy for creating a census of young children who could help populate New York School, which was under threat of closure. Section 8 housing was also seen as a potential bulwark against gentrification. New multiple family housing was indeed constructed, and this rezoning proposal on the table properly does not disturb that in any way.

Unfortunately, three of the property owners north of 7<sup>th</sup> Street, as well as some of the decision makers at City Hall did not favor rezoning the area north of 7<sup>th</sup> Street from M-2 zoning at the time and so the industrial zoning remained for a few more years. Later in the 80's, the owners of all four Connecticut Street properties and three of the Rhode Island Street properties filed an application for RM zoning to match the zoning of the rest of the north end of the neighborhood. Despite assent from the Planning Commission, the City Commission turned down the request. The property owners filed suit in Douglas County District Court alleging the decision was unlawful. Ultimately, the suit was settled and all parties agreed to RO-2 zoning at the suggestion of the planning staff. This is why the area north of 7<sup>th</sup> Street has RSO zoning (the successor to RO-2 when the code was rewritten about a decade ago), instead of the RM zoning that is present between 7<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> Streets.

It is the area north of 7<sup>th</sup> Street currently zoned RSO that I wish to address in the remainder of my comments. It should be noted that RSO is technically a single family zoning category, so unlike most of the areas under consideration, the area north of 7<sup>th</sup> Street already has single family zoning, albeit with more flexibility than RS-5. I believe that the RSO zoning was and is appropriate for the entire area north of 7<sup>th</sup> Street; every existing use is compatible. That being said, RS-5 is also an appropriate zoning category for most of the current RSO properties. As such, I do not take exception to rezoning my property at 633 Connecticut as RS-5.

I strenuously disagree with the proposal to rezone 627 Connecticut to RM-24. The house was recently converted back to a single family home after being a rooming house for several decades. This property should remain as RSO, or be changed to RS-5 as it is similar in size and character to 633 Connecticut.

I also disagree with the proposal to change 645 Connecticut from RSO to RM-12D. As noted above, RSO is technically a single family zone and RM-12D is not. Although the property currently has two residential units, for a few years in the early 1990's, it was used as a law office by my then co-owner. As I continue to invest in the restoration of the property, I would like to have the flexibility to be able to couple office and residential uses as envisioned by RSO zone in order to make continued investment economically viable. Given my commitment to enhancing the residential character of East Lawrence for over 35 years, my entire adult life, I do not take this position lightly. The fact is, the RSO zoning has worked. Moreover, at nearly 3500 square feet the house is double to triple the size most homes in the neighborhood, and given its historic significance, the home's stature and visibility, the RSO zoning and land uses are not out of line. Finally, I think it is appropriate to look at the character of the immediately surrounding areas in determining whether zoning for residential and office uses is appropriate and compatible. Directly to the east of the property is the old Coca Cola warehouse, currently used as a body shop (zoned industrial). To the northeast is an auto repair shop (also zoned industrial), and to the southeast are a variety of commercial uses, primarily home repair materials (zoned commercial). Directly to the south is a small church, which was formerly a liquor store (zoned commercial). To the southwest is a professional accounting office (zoned commercial). To the west, northwest and north are single family homes (zoned residential). The central business district, Riverfront hotel and office uses, parking and train depot are all just a block away. RSO zoning and land use does not degrade or compromise any of the nearby properties nor their zoning. As such, I respectfully request that 645 Connecticut be permitted to remain as RSO and not to be changed to RM-12D.

Thank you for your consideration.

**From:** [Porter Arneill](#)  
**To:** [Becky Pepper](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Rezoning in East Lawrence  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 10, 2017 11:24:54 AM

---

[Here you go. . .thanks!](#)

**From:** Angela Reed [mailto:angelareed229@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 06, 2017 7:44 AM  
**To:** City Hall email  
**Subject:** Rezoning in East Lawrence

Hello,

I oppose the new rezoning proposed for the East Lawrence area. I just moved here with my girls (14 years old & 16 year old) last fall and chose it because of the neighborhood. I am trying to advocate for community building by gardening, meeting and talking with my neighbors, and showing genuine care of the community by picking up trash, etc. My girls and I really love it here. Please keep it protected from too much commercialism or excessive constructions of new buildings.

Thanks  
Angela Reed

## Becky Pepper

---

**From:** JAMES DUNN <lloreddunn@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 01, 2017 3:38 PM  
**To:** Becky Pepper  
**Subject:** East Lawrence rezoning

Ms Pepper:

I have been a property owner in East Lawrence since 1978--I am not in favor of the rezoning request currently before the Lawrence City Commission.

James C. Dunn  
843-5272

## Becky Pepper

---

**From:** Jo Polk <jo-acmanagement@sunflower.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, June 03, 2017 9:33 AM  
**To:** Becky Pepper  
**Subject:** zoning change

My name is Jo Polk, and I just wanted to let you know that I OPPOSE the zoning change. I see a lot of big older homes standing vacant and not being taken care of properly with this change in the zoning. If they want to improve the neighborhood they need to enforce the rules they already have in place. We don't need anymore rules and regulations! And the majority of us sure can't handle anymore taxes!



## Becky Pepper

---

**From:** troutdadd@aol.com  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 04, 2017 6:54 AM  
**To:** Becky Pepper  
**Subject:** East Lawrence rezoning proposal.

I do not support this zoning change. I hope that enough like minded individuals are responding the same way to show that this change is not "what the neighborhood wants".. I mean, that is the whole reason for doing this right? Never mind that all studies show that if you want to increase the vitality of a downtown area the way to do that is to INCREASE not DECREASE density. Even the commissioners know this. That is why they are willing to offer incentives for projects that INCREASE density downtown. I understand that some residents are nervous about the changes that are happening in the area but this rezoning will do nothing to stop those changes. What is happening is gentrification. RM 24 zoning is not being used to radically change the nature of the neighborhood. The change is being caused by new owner occupiers that want to live downtown. Changing the zoning will just free up more locations encouraging accelerated gentrification. I do support other measures that could slow down the process, like increasing the size of the historic district or limiting the size of additions (like in Oread). Those steps would help preserve the existing housing stock and help retain the nature of the neighborhood. When newcomers buy a property and put an addition on that is twice as big as the existing house that does disturb the fabric of the neighborhood. Rezoning to single family will do nothing to stop what has already been occurring. I ask you to please vote NO on this rezoning and let's find real solutions to the problem, something that may actually help. Thank you, Jim Slough

## Becky Pepper

---

**From:** Gordon Sailors <gordiesailors@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 04, 2017 6:09 PM  
**To:** Becky Pepper  
**Subject:** East Lawrence Zoning Change

Ms Pepper,

As a property owner in East Lawrence for many years, I am writing to oppose the zoning change that is being considered. It is totally unfair to penalize my family financially because the properties that I purchased years ago have had their values increase in recent years. I don't look at this as a negative, and see it totally driven by a desire by many people to live within the urban core. When you purchase a property, you are under the assumption that the regulations in place at the time of purchase will still remain the same at which time we may want to part with that property. This zoning change will knock a significant sum from my properties worth.

This is the same argument a small vocal minority pushed through the city regarding houses in the Oread neighborhood. The planning department spent two years devising a plan to make it legal to be given an exemption for the number of parking spaces required on a property if it met a set size requirement. This would have given investors or families a financial incentive to rehab these dilapidated homes. They wanted to save the neighborhood by making investment in many of these run down houses actually profitable.

The argument from the few owner- occupants who loudly complained was that they wanted to change the use of a neighborhood back to single family occupancy, which had not been the primary use for many decades. The problem with that argument is the extreme cost in rehabbing those houses. Their plan made no sense economically. Therefore many of those homes that could have been made safe, and ready to take on another 100 years of use, will slowly slip in to greater disrepair, and will eventually be replaced by a different generation of structure, which will not match what currently exists. Therefore in an effort to push forth their agenda, they have actually accelerated it's decline.

I fear this is the same thing that will occur to this East Lawrence neighborhood in that many of the houses people want to save will slip into disrepair due to the extremely high cost of rehabbing them. Along with this, current owners will be penalized financially because their property will have different occupancy limits than what were in place at the time they purchased them.

I urge the zoning change to be turned down.

Thanks for listening.  
Gordon Sailors

Gordon Sailors  
gordiesailors@gmail.com

## Becky Pepper

---

**From:** Taylor Rodgers <mason8974@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 04, 2017 8:52 PM  
**To:** Becky Pepper  
**Subject:** East Lawrence Neighborhood Zoning - Vote Against Rezoning

Hello,

I heard that I could voice my support to your email for or against the proposed rezoning.

**My name is Taylor Mason Rodgers. I own the house at 833 Connecticut St. and I am against the rezoning as it currently stands.**

I think rezoning fails to address the supply glut it'll cause for housing in East Lawrence. I have a roommate moving into a spare room in a month who specifically mentioned he had to leave his last place because the landlord assumed the rezoning would occur and he would be over the 3 non-related residents limit.

I think it'd be better to reach a compromise to still allow duplexes, accessory dwelling units, etc. that are within the aesthetic appeal of the neighborhood.

Thank you and appreciate all the work you guys put in!

## Becky Pepper

---

**From:** Randy Ham <randy@teamham.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 05, 2017 9:56 AM  
**To:** Becky Pepper  
**Cc:** Beth Ham  
**Subject:** RE-Zoning

Becky Pepper,

I just wanted to express my opposition to the proposed zoning changes in East Lawrence.  
I own several properties in that area and see absolutely no need for this change.

I would add that this re-zoning will do nothing to change the value of the homes in the area either.  
With nearly 25 years in Real Estate sales and development I would be happy to discuss the reality of the market with anyone foolish enough to believe this will change anything.

I do NOT want my zoning changed.

Sincerely  
Randy Ham



**Randy Ham** / Broker ABR, CRS, GRI  
(785) 766-7575

**Realty Executives-Hedges Real Estate, Inc.**  
1037 Vermont St. Lawrence, Ks 66044  
[SEARCH HOMES - TeamHam.com](#)

## Becky Pepper

---

**From:** Victorian Homes <victorianhomes@rainbowworks.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 05, 2017 10:52 AM  
**To:** Becky Pepper  
**Subject:** Against Zoning Change - East Lawrence

Ms. Pepper,

I am against the rezoning of East Lawrence.

Please see email sent April, 24th, 2017 stating reasons why I am against.

Sincerely,

Serina Hearn

### Rainbow Works, LLC

1941 Massachusetts Street

Lawrence, Kansas 66046

Office: 785-842-6618

Fax: 785-749-4875

[victorianhomes@rainbowworks.net](mailto:victorianhomes@rainbowworks.net)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Victorian Homes** <[victorianhomes@rainbowworks.net](mailto:victorianhomes@rainbowworks.net)>  
Date: Mon, Apr 24, 2017 at 10:06 AM  
Subject: \*Corrected email: Against Zoning Change - East Lawrence  
To: [bpepper@lawrenceks.org](mailto:bpepper@lawrenceks.org)

Ms. Pepper:

On average 20% of all apartment complexes are unoccupied. By rezoning, downsizing, this neighborhood, it helps push the extras into the apartment complexes that are continually being built.

Neighborhood associations who support downsizing in a neighborhood which has existed before zoning laws existed, do not represent the hardworking Mom and Pop landlords, whose rights are being taken away. Neighborhood associations do not represent groups of people who though not related by "blood" consider themselves a family. Neighborhood associations are a minority representing the silent many who are often too busy to be meddling in other peoples affairs.

These associations are unwittingly playing into the hands of the big developers they are afraid off. They take their frustrations, and fear of change by hurting the small individual landlords who have not done what they fear.

This down zoning law only benefits the big developers who need more bodies to fill their apartments.

I doubt that my vote matters, but just for the record, I want to express my disapproval of this latest attack on taking away rights of property owners.

Sincerely,

Serina Hearn  
732 Connecticut St,  
Lawrence, KS. 66046